



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Needs Assessment Report

Training and Consultation Support (TCS) to public policy units of the ministries of Georgia in framework of the project

Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia

July 3, 2018

Developed/published with the assistance of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with funds of UK aid from the UK government. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies nor those of UNDP, or of AoG. This report was prepared by Public Administration International (PAi) in partnership with GEC Corp. (GEC) and Centre for Training and Consultancy (CTC)

Content

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Project Background	6
3	Needs Assessment Methodology	7
3.1	STAFF CAPACITY ASSESSMENT	7
A.	<i>Self-Assessment</i>	8
B.	<i>External and Independent Assessment</i>	8
3.2	POLICY PLANNING ASSESSMENT	10
4	Needs Assessment Findings and Results	12
4.1	POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY PLANNING	12
4.2	REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY PLANNING	12
4.3	INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY PLANNING	13
4.4	HUMAN RESOURCE RELATED ISSUES	14
4.5	TRAINING RELATED ISSUES	19
4.6	INTERNAL PROCESS AND PROCEDURES RELATED ISSUES	24
4.7	GUIDANCE RELATED ISSUES	25
5	Recommendations	27
5.1	POLICY, REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY PLANNING	27
5.2	APPROACHES TO HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITIES DEVELOPMENT	27
5.3	ELABORATION OF POLICY PLANNING DOCUMENTS	30
	Annex 1. List of Questions Asked During the Interviews (Policy Planning Assessment)	31
	Annex 2. Capacity Assessment Questionnaires	33
	Annex 3. List of Meetings Held During the Needs Assessment Process	38
	Annex 4. List of Planning Documents Adopted by GOG in 2017	40

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
AoG	Administration of the Government of Georgia
CS	Civil Service
CSR	Civil Service Reform
CTC	Centre for Training and Consultancy
GEC	JSC GEC
GoG	Government of Georgia
GRF	Governance Reform Fund (UNDP)
HR	Human Resources
HRM	Human Resources Management
PAi	Public Administration International
PAR	Public Administration Reform
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
ToR	Terms of Reference

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2015, the Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) adopted the "Public Administration Reform (PAR) Roadmap 2020," which outlines the six major policy areas in its public administration reform efforts: policy development and cooperation, human resource management, accountability, service delivery, public finance management and local self-government.

The main goal of this project - Training and Consultation Support (TCS) is to increase capacity of ministries' policy units in public policy analysis and thus improve the policy making process in the country, strengthen the link between policy planning and budgeting, enhance the nexus between policy planning and implementation and build strong mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating and accountability.

By the time of submitting this report the team has completed Needs Assessment of the ministries in policy planning area and the results¹ and findings identified within this process and recommendations elaborated based on them are presented in this document. All those findings and recommendations will form the basis for effective trainings delivery and policy planning procedure development.

Needs Assessment was conducted from 24th April to 8th June by the local and international consultants and was comprised of two elements - Staff Capacity Assessment (through Self-Assessment and Independent External Assessment) and Policy Planning Assessment. Here are summarised the findings identified through the research as well as the recommendations elaborated by the project team:

Policy, Regulatory and Institutional framework for policy planning

Research Findings

Unified approach towards establishing a comprehensive policy development and planning system in Georgia started in 2014. The key priorities and steps in regard to establishment of the unified system were laid down in two policy documents – the "Public Administration Reform Roadmap"² and the "Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015 – 2017"³. Following the actions foreseen by these planning documents, the AoG has prepared and the GoG had adopted two binding documents that regulate the approach towards policy development and planning, as well as monitoring, reporting and evaluation, namely – the "Policy Planning Manual"⁴ and the "Common Policy Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation System"⁵.

In interviews, representatives of the line ministries confirmed that in policy development and planning processes they comply with the requirements of both documents and that the AoG is checking this compliance during inter-ministerial consultation process.

According to the representatives of the ministries, there is no special network of civil servants involved in policy development and planning that would meet on regular basis to discuss implementation of the unified policy development and planning system and issues/problems arising during this process. However, the representative of the AoG told that there is a special working group created for co-ordination of activities under the policy development and co-ordination area of the Public Administration Reform Roadmap. The representative of the AoG also informed that the members of the Working Group act as contact points in the ministries for the AoG, through whom work on the specific policy areas is streamlined.

¹ Please note that the most of information (with certain exceptions) is provided in an aggregate way, not to identify any particular shortcomings at institutional level, but rather identify challenges/issues and solutions at a systemic level.

² Ordinance of the GoG No. 427 of 19 August, 2015 on Approval of Strategic Planning Documents: "Public Administration Reform Roadmap 2020" and "Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015 – 2017"

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ordinance of the GoG No. 629 from 30 December 2016 on Approval of the "Policy Planning Manual".

⁵ Ordinance of the GoG No. 628 from 30 December 2016 on Approval of the "System for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation of Activities of the Government".

Recommendations

- A. To intensify the work of the Policy Development Working Group and comply with the frequency of meetings as envisaged by the ToR for its work, i.e. having a meeting of the group on a quarterly basis.
- B. To reach agreement between the key centre of government institutions – the AoG, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice⁶ – on a joint approach towards checking different key elements of draft planning documents.
- C. To collect the best practice in terms of public consultation process and come up with a single solution on process and procedure for involving organised civil society in the policy development and planning process.
- D. It is necessary to make sure that all the legislative acts regulating the policy development and planning process in Georgia are mutually consistent and coherent and set out clear requirements for the quality of the process.
- E. To offer methodological and capacity building support to the ministries in order to promote application of cost benefit analysis and impact assessments of policy options in the initial phases of policy planning to ensure effectiveness of policy interventions. To develop common strategies or/and methodology for costing policies.

Human Resource and Trainings Related Issues

Research Findings

Currently, some of the ministries have a special analytical department/unit that plays a role of the internal co-ordination unit and ensures elaboration of policy planning documents and monitoring of their implementation. Others have all policy development and planning functions located within the specific sectoral policy departments/units that have all the necessary specific experience of the policy area.

Taking into account that almost all interviewees complained about a relatively high staff turnover, regular trainings along prudent review and hands-on advice provided by the centre of government institutions⁷, are the only possible solutions for improving the overall quality of the planning documents.

Self-assessment results revealed that the need for training seems to be greatest in undertaking theory of change analysis, monitoring and evaluation, establishing the effectiveness of policy interventions, understanding how to use evidence synthesis and thinking broadly and creatively.

Based on the results of external and independent analysis, it is evident that there is a greater perceived need for acquire/improvement the ability to access, and use appraise appropriate statistical information, the ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions, the ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy and an understanding of economic appraisal methods.

Recommendations

To strengthen the capacity of civil servants involved in policy development and planning process a set of new training modules is proposed:

⁶ The AoG, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice are the three institutions that perform critical centre of government institutions according to the OECD SIGMA "Principles of Public Administration"⁶ under the Principle 1 "Centre-of-government institutions fulfil all actions critical to a well-organised, consistent and competent policy-making system".

⁷ The AoG, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice are the three institutions that perform critical centre of government institutions according to the OECD SIGMA "Principles of Public Administration"⁷ under the Principle 1 "Centre-of-government institutions fulfil all actions critical to a well-organised, consistent and competent policy-making system".

- **Module 1 - The Policy-Making Process**
- **Module 2 - Identifying the Problem – Data Management**
- **Module 3 - Identifying and monitoring objectives and outcomes**
- **Module 4 - Identifying Policy Options**
- **Module 5 - Impact Analysis**
- **Module 6 - Evidence Synthesis**
- **Module 7 - Policy Impact Assessments**
- **Module 8 - Economic Appraisal of Policies**
- **Module 9 - Implementation and Delivery**

Elaboration of Policy Planning Documents

Research Findings

Interview process revealed that there are no unified internal procedures (i.e. step by step explanation of process) within or across the ministries that would guide their work on elaboration of the policy planning documents. This process is organised based on previous experience obtained in policy planning but is therefore highly dependent on institutional memory that taking into account a rather high turnover rate is unsustainable approach for a long run.

There are some common traits between the ministries on how this process is approached and dealt with. Normally, for elaboration of cross-sectoral policies and subsequent elaboration of planning documents for their implementation (strategies and actions plans), as well as for monitoring the implementation process an inter-ministerial council is created.

Several ministries during interviews mentioned that overlaps between strategies is a major problem. This raises a question of how issues like these could be solved already during elaboration of the planning documents, without waiting that the centre of government institutions check the drafts already at a quite late stage of inter-ministerial consultations.

Recommendations

A typical procedure of policy development and planning process should be elaborated based on the best practices of the ministries to ensure a uniform approach towards elaboration of planning documents.

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Government Planning and Innovations Unit within the Administration of Government (AoG) has led a process of development of the “Public Administration Reform (PAR) Roadmap 2020”, where the major directions of the ongoing reforms in the public administration system is outlined. In 2015-2016, the Government began implementing the Action Plan for PAR Roadmap 2020. Throughout this period the main actions entailed the creation of the legislative basis for reforms in multiple areas, especially that relates to Civil Service Reform. Additionally, the functional review process was initiated in the line ministries with subsequent development of principles for institutional design and recommendations for the ministries.

By implementing the PAR, the Government of Georgia (GoG) strives to renewal of its public administration system to make it more efficient, effective and transparent. The PAR (according to the roadmap) concentrates on the six areas, one of which is policy development and coordination. The policy development and planning guideline has been developed in 2016, however the full deployment is not in place.

According to the project ToR, the ministries are facing the following challenges:

- Low capacity of ministries in strategic planning, policy development and policy cycle process, including institutionalization of coherent and uniform process of how strategies and action plans are developed;
- Weak linkage between policy planning and budgeting process;
- Weak linkage between different policy documents;
- The level of knowledge and experience in policy planning and coordination mechanisms deviates across different ministries.

The objectives of this project are following (but not limited to):

- Enhance capacity of ministries in strategic planning, policy development, policy cycle process and coordination, including institutionalizing policy cycle process;
- Enhance capacity of ministries employees in policy planning and development;
- Support in creation and enhancement of equal understanding of policy planning and coordination across different ministries.
- Align with OECD/SIGMA public administration principles.

According to the TOR, the scope of work is focused on:

- Identification/assessment of needs of policy units of all ministries in public policy development and coordination;
- Development of training/coaching/consultation package based on needs assessment results;
- Conduct training of representatives of policy units of all ministries; and
- Delivery of consultation and coaching for selecting and development of policy documents.

At this point the team assessed staff capacity and analysed the policy development and coordination process at each ministry and provided recommendations for strengthening necessary skills and qualifications of the staff and process streamlining and functional distribution. In addition, the team will provide consultancy assistance to each ministry in institutionalization of policy cycle process. That enables ministries and participants of training from the ministries to utilize new knowledge within updated and streamlined process. By doing this, the intervention would have effect not only on the capacity of human capital in the ministries but also would enhance the process and workflow – organizational systems.

3 NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The overall goal of this stage was to implement needs assessment based on methodology described below.

The objectives of this component were:

- To conduct Needs Assessment involving all ministries;
- To consult with AoG and National Statistics Office of Georgia on the existing challenges;
- To develop Needs Assessment report and appropriate recommendations.

The component was accomplished through combination of:

- Interviews and questionnaires;
- Documents and results analysis;
- Process, systems and functions analysis;
- Communication and coordination channel analysis.

As a result of this stage the given Needs Assessment report was developed. Findings identified through the assessment and recommendations developed based on them will be presented to stakeholders.

The Needs Assessment was comprised two elements: **Staff Capacity Assessment** – identifying the needs in terms of the skills and competencies required for effective policy development and implementation and **Policy Planning Assessment** – identifying shortcomings of the current approach to applying policy planning cycle.

3.1 Staff Capacity Assessment

There has been growing recognition in recent years that good policy making requires good analysis⁸. The development of evidence-based policy across the world has been built upon the recognition that policy development and implementation needs to be grounded in sound analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, impact and process evaluation, and economic appraisal of costs and benefits.

There has also been a recognition that good analysis needs to be linked to a deep understanding of the political environments within which policy ideas emerge. This includes the values, beliefs and ideologies that generate political responses to the needs of countries, and the expertise, experience and judgement of decision makers who develop and implements public policy.

A two-stage process was proposed and carried out for identifying staff capacity needs in the Policy Units of individual Ministries of the Government of Georgia:

Stage 1 - A self-assessment by key personnel in each Ministry of the existing strengths and weaknesses in policy development and implementation, and what training and professional development is needed to improve these skills and competencies.

Stage 2 – An external and independent assessment of the capacity of each Ministry to undertake effective policy development and implementation. This stage was undertaken using face-to-face interviews with relevant personnel in each Ministry.

⁸ Bohni and Lemire, 2018, *The Evaluation Industry*, New Direction in Evaluation, Wiley, London.

Cabinet Office, 2000, *Adding It Up*, Cabinet Office, London, Cabinet Office.

Cabinet Office 2003, *Magenta Book*, London, Cabinet Office.

HM Treasury, 2011, HM Treasury, 2011, *Magenta Book, 2nd Edition*, London,.

Gertler et al, 2011, *Impact Evaluation in Practice*, Washington DC, World Ban

Stern, E., Stame, N., Mayne, J., Forss, K., Davies, R., & Befani, B. (2012). *Broadening the range of and methods for impact evaluations*. DfID, London, UK

National Audit Office, 2013, *Evaluation in government*. National Audit Office, London.

HM Treasury, 2015, *Manging public money*. London, UK: HM Treasury.

Consolidated findings of the self-assessment and external and independent assessment of the capacity will be taken into consideration in designing training package at the next stage.

A. Self-Assessment

At this stage, assessment of skills, competencies and training needs in ministries was accomplished by key personnel identified in advance. Assessment was undertaken through the questionnaire included in Annex 1. Relevant personnel in each Ministry were asked to consult with colleagues responsible for policy development and implementation and provide a short summary report on (Some of the questions were structured in the form of checkbox questions):

- 1) What they think are the key skills and competencies that are required for effective policy development and implementation;
- 2) The extent to which they currently have these skills and competencies within their Ministry;
- 3) What kind of trainings/courses has staff in their ministry taken for improving policy development and implementation?
- 4) What training and professional development they think they need to improve policy development and implementation in their Ministry?
- 5) What they think are their current strengths in undertaking policy development and implementation;
- 6) What they think are their current weaknesses in undertaking policy development and implementation;
- 7) Which stages does the whole policy planning cycle currently include in their ministry?
- 8) Does their ministry have experience in implementing each stage of policy planning?
- 9) Is there a procedure that ensures planning and distribution of functions and responsibilities at each stage of policy development and implementation in their Ministry?
- 10) What resources (people, specialists, databases, infrastructure) do they think are needed for implementing full cycle of policy planning in their ministry?
- 11) What resources (people, specialists, databases, infrastructure) do they currently have to help them develop and implement policies;
- 12) What additional resources they think are required to improve the policy development and implementation process in the Ministry?

B. External and Independent Assessment

At this stage, assessment of skills, competencies and training needs in ministries was accomplished by the project team. The assessment was undertaken based on face-to-face interviews with relevant personnel identified in advance. Interviews were open-ended to allow free expression of views. Responses were recorded verbatim.

The interviews were designed to assess the following analytical skills and competencies as required for good policy development and implementation:

1) The ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision:

Good policymaking requires policy developers and implementers to think critically about the nature, magnitude and causes of a policy issue or problem, and to look for a wide range of policy options before arriving at a final preferred option.

2) The ability to access and appraise appropriate statistical information:

Good policy making requires policy developers and implementers to access and appraise appropriate statistical information from census data, surveys, administrative data, economic data, and qualitative data (e.g. from in-depth interviews, focus groups, consultative methods, observational data, document analysis and case studies).

3) The ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy:

Good policy making requires the ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes that the policy is seeking to achieve. This includes distinguishing between outcomes (what is to be achieved) from outputs (what is to be produced), and to anticipate both the positive and negative, intended and unintended, consequences of a policy initiative over time.

4) The ability to undertake a theory of change analysis:

Good policy making requires the ability to undertake a theory of change analysis, which enables the policy maker to identify a) the activities that have to be undertaken to develop, implement and deliver the policy; b) the appropriate agencies and partners to implement and deliver the policy, and c) the inputs that have to be provided to make the activities, agencies, outputs and outcomes happen.

5) The ability to identify a wide range of policy options:

Good policy making requires the ability to identify a wide range of policy options within the overall objectives of the policy, and then to narrow these options down to a list of genuine, viable options, including a preferred option for Ministers to consider. This involves searching and appraising the global public policy evidence base to establish what other countries and jurisdictions have done in response to similar policy issues, objectives and outcomes.

6) The ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders:

Good policy making requires the ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders, and to do so in more than a symbolic manner. This wide range of stakeholders should be as representative and inclusive as possible and might be formed into a stakeholder panel from the outset of policy development through to its implementation and production of outputs and outcomes.

7) The ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions:

Good policy making requires the ability to establish the effectiveness of different policy interventions that have been tested using robust impact evaluation methods based on counterfactual analysis. Counterfactual analysis uses experimental and quasi-experimental methods of evaluation to determine what would happen if an alternative policy option was used, or if no action was taken at all.

8) An understanding of evidence synthesis:

Good policy making requires the use of evidence synthesis which includes statistical meta-analysis, narrative synthesis, qualitative synthesis, rapid evidence assessment and evidence gaps maps. These are methods of establishing the balance of evidence on a policy issue, and of estimating ex ante the likelihood of achieving positive outcomes as well as avoiding negative outcomes.

9) An understanding of economic appraisal methods:

Good policy making requires an understanding of economic appraisal methods such as cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis. This includes understanding how costs and benefits are monetised, and how economists use 'willingness to pay' and 'willingness to accept' evidence to attribute monetary values to both costs and benefits.

10) The ability to develop and implement a delivery plan:

Good policy making requires the ability to develop and implement a delivery plan. This involves specifying a) the nature, magnitude and causes of the problem in hand, b) which policy options will have the most impact, and c) a map of the delivery chain that indicates the activities that have to be undertaken, and which delivery agencies will be involved in delivering the required outcomes.

11) An understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives:

Good policy making requires an understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives and the ability to build appropriate monitoring and evaluating methods into the policy development and implementation process. This includes understanding the difference between monitoring and evaluation, and how to use indicators in an appropriate and judicious way (please, see complete External Assessment Questionnaire in Annex 2).

3.2 Policy Planning Assessment

The part of the Needs Assessment dealing with the current situation with policy development and planning issues in the ministries was prepared based on the (a) answers received through structured interviews⁹ with the representatives of all ministries and the Administration of Government (AoG)¹⁰, (b) analysis of planning documents adopted by the Government of Georgia (GoG) during 2017¹¹ and (c) analysis of relevant legislation and planning documents setting up the policy development and planning system in Georgia.

The main goal of this assessment was to identify shortcomings of the current approach to policy development and implementation. The specific objectives of policy planning assessment were:

- To analyze policy cycle process, including policy development and coordination practice within ministries through interviews, desk review;
- To analyze functional distribution to accomplish policy cycle process within ministries;
- To identify needs in above mentioned processes;
- To identify discrepancies between abovementioned processes and policy planning cycle defined in Policy Manual.

The analytical approach of the Needs Assessment of the current practice of policy development and planning is based on the review of (a) legislative, policy and institutional framework of the planning system, (b) human resource capacities and their development approach, as well as (c) current implementation practices. Based on the findings during analysis of all the above-mentioned sources, certain conclusions and recommendations for further improvement of the policy development and planning system are made.

Analysis of policy documents - strategies, actions plans, was conducted based on the requirements envisaged in Policy Planning Manual and the Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015 – 2017 and was focused on checking if the structure and the content of the documents are followed by the requirements and on analysis of current monitoring and reporting approaches of strategies/action plans. In addition, to operationalize basic monitoring and evaluation principles outlined in the Policy Planning System Reform Strategy, the AoG prepared and the GoG adopted a document on the System for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation of Activities of the Government¹². These three documents, alongside the overall objectives and principles set by the PAR Roadmap¹³, establish the core approach towards policy planning in Georgia.

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the project, the Needs Assessment needs to take into account the findings and conclusions of the OECD/SIGMA Baseline Measurement in the area of “Policy Development and Co-ordination”¹⁴. References to the relevant findings and recommendations of the Baseline Measurement are made where-ever it was useful.

⁹ The list of questions asked during the interviews is attached in Annex 1.

¹⁰ The list of meetings held during the Needs Assessment process is attached in Annex 3.

¹¹ The list of planning documents adopted by the GoG in 2017 is attached in Annex 4.

¹² Ordinance of the GoG No. 628 from 30 December 2016 on Approval of the “System for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation of Activities of the Government”.

¹³ Ordinance of the GoG No. 427 from 19 August 2015 on Approval of Strategic Planning documents “Public Administration Reform Roadmap 2020 and Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015-2017”.

¹⁴ OECD/SIGMA “Baseline Measurement Report: The Principles of Public Administration. Policy Development and Co-ordination. Georgia, May 2018”. Available here: <http://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Baseline-Measurement-Report-2018-Georgia.pdf> .

The results of the assessment and proposed recommendations will be communicated to the stakeholders and based on the findings a typical policy planning process (procedure) would be elaborated and implemented in policy units of all ministries at further stage of the project.

4 NEEDS ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND RESULTS

4.1 Policy Framework for Policy Planning

Unified approach towards establishing a comprehensive policy development and planning system in Georgia started in 2014 following a functional review of the AoG carried out by the OECD/SIGMA that identified lack of consistent policy development and co-ordination function in the Georgian centre of government¹⁵.

Based on the results of the functional review later the same year a Department of Policy Analysis, Strategic Planning and Co-ordination¹⁶ (DPASPC) was established within the AoG and tasked with establishing and developing a unified approach towards policy development and planning. Since then, the DPASPC has been in charge of developing legal and policy solutions for implementation of this function, as well as for co-ordinating the work of other institutions in this area of government work.

The key priorities and steps in regard to establishment of the unified system were laid down in two policy documents – the “Public Administration Reform Roadmap”¹⁷ and the “Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015 – 2017”¹⁸. The latter sets out not only the envisaged hierarchy of planning documents, but also set out the compulsory parts of different types of planning documents. It should be noted though, that the “Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015 – 2017” expired at the end of 2017 and a new one has not been elaborated or adopted yet.

According to the representatives of the AoG, a mid-term review of the “Public Administration Reform Roadmap” is envisaged to be carried out during the second half of 2018 and based on its results an updated version of the roadmap would be elaborated that would introduce new actions until 2020. There are two options available for the AoG that are currently under consideration – either to develop and adopt a new version of the “Policy Planning Reform System Strategy” that would cover period until 2020, or to integrate all planning related reform actions into the updated version of the PAR Roadmap and thus minimise the number of the planning documents. Whatever the decision would be, there is an evident need for an updated reform framework in the field of policy development and planning that would take into account improvements achieved since 2015 and identify shortcomings that still need to be covered during the next planning period.

These plans of the AoG comply with one of the recommendations set out by the OECD/SIGMA Baseline Measurement suggesting that *“the AoG should initiate and carry out a comprehensive evaluation of the policy-planning and development system to identify key shortcomings that need to be overcome to ensure better-quality decision making at the level of the Government and close linkages with the medium-term and annual budget processes”*¹⁹.

4.2 Regulatory Framework for Policy Planning

Following the actions foreseen by the two above-mentioned planning documents, the AoG has prepared and the GoG had adopted two binding documents that regulate the approach towards policy development and planning, as well as monitoring, reporting and evaluation, namely – the “Policy Planning Manual”²⁰ and the “Common Policy Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation System”²¹.

¹⁵ OECD/SIGMA “Review of the Structure and Functions of the Chancellery of the Government of Georgia” as of December 2013.

¹⁶ See internal structure of the AoG here: http://gov.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG&sec_id=134&info_id=36110

¹⁷ Ordinance of the GoG No. 427 of 19 August, 2015 on Approval of Strategic Planning Documents: “Public Administration Reform Roadmap 2020” and “Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015 – 2017”

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ OECD/SIGMA “Baseline Measurement Report: The Principles of Public Administration. Policy Development and Co-ordination. Georgia, May 2018”, p.13.

²⁰ Ordinance of the GoG No. 629 from 30 December 2016 on Approval of the “Policy Planning Manual”.

²¹ Ordinance of the GoG No. 628 from 30 December 2016 on Approval of the “System for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation of Activities of the Government”.

The OECD/SIGMA Baseline Measurement however identifies the need for further strengthening of the regulatory framework for the policy planning and development system - *“the Government should streamline the regulatory framework and procedures governing policy planning, in order to clarify and strengthen linkages and alignment between various government planning documents”*²².

The main attention should be paid towards ensuring that the key regulations like the Rules of Procedure of Government²³ and the Budget Code²⁴ are in full compliance with the policy solutions set out in the relevant planning documents (e.g. “PAR Roadmap” and the updated Policy Planning System Reform Strategy), as well as “Policy Planning Manual” and the “Common Policy Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation System”.

In interviews, representatives of the line ministries confirmed that in policy development and planning processes they comply with the requirements of both documents and that the AoG is checking this compliance during inter-ministerial consultation process. They also acknowledged the fact that the AoG is providing necessary support for policy development and planning, either by participating in the working groups responsible for elaboration of planning documents or through advice provided by other means.

The OECD/SIGMA Baseline Measurement, however, suggests that the practice of co-ordination and co-operation efforts by the key centre of government institutions should be improved in order to provide for a more thorough quality check of draft planning documents and guidance on their improvement – *“the AoG should provide more regular and formal written guidance and support to line ministries, including through formal opinions and comments on draft proposals and inputs from ministries on various planning and strategic documents, in order to ensure coherent, comprehensive and consistent policy planning and development. In addition, it should ensure that regular training on policy development and planning is provided for responsible staff of line ministries, to ensure that they understand and apply standards and procedures consistently and accurately during planning, monitoring and reporting”*²⁵.

The representative of the AoG during the interview told that the work on updating the “Policy Planning Manual” is already envisaged as part of the on-going work on elaboration of an electronic monitoring system for the Government Annual Work Plan and other government priority policies.

4.3 Institutional Framework for Policy Planning

According to the representatives of the ministries, there is no special network of civil servants involved in policy development and planning that would meet on regular basis to discuss implementation of the unified policy development and planning system and issues/problems arising during this process.

However, the representative of the AoG told that there is a special working group created for co-ordination of activities under the policy development and co-ordination area of the Public Administration Reform Roadmap. The Terms of Reference of this group – Policy Development Working Group – that were adopted by the Public Administration Reform Council foresees the following functions of the group:

- Providing coordinated interagency strategic policy inputs to the achievement of Policy Planning System Reform in Georgia;
- Promoting positive experiences, lessons learned and practices, new initiatives;
- Institutionalization and capacity building of the policy planning units;

²² OECD/SIGMA “Baseline Measurement Report: The Principles of Public Administration. Policy Development and Co-ordination. Georgia, May 2018”, p.19.

²³ Ordinance of the Government of Georgia No. 54 on Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the Government of Georgia of 7 March 2013.

²⁴ Budget Code of Georgia No. 2440-IIS of 18 December 2009.

²⁵ OECD/SIGMA “Baseline Measurement Report: The Principles of Public Administration. Policy Development and Co-ordination. Georgia, May 2018”, p.20.

- Monitoring of the progress achieved in the implementation of the Policy Planning Strategy and its Action Plans;
- Identifying possible challenges regarding the implementation of the Reform;
- Renewing the Policy Planning System Reform Strategy and its Action Plans;
- Raising awareness on the Policy Planning System Reform.

The meetings of the Working Group – despite envisaged to be held approximately once a quarter – are currently of an ad hoc nature and do not bear a systematic approach. This can be clearly seen from the answers from the interviews with representatives of the line ministries – those who remember these deem them very useful, however, not too frequent.

The representative of the AoG also informed that the members of the Working Group act as contact points in the ministries for the AoG, through whom work on the specific policy areas is streamlined. The staff of the AoG responsible for the policy development and planning are apportioned and clustered around different policy areas (e.g. social dimension, economic dimension, security dimension) and are in constant communication with the ministries. It was also told that the AoG is planning to revitalise the work of the Policy Development Working Group to move towards a more frequent and systemic approach to ensure not only bi-lateral co-operation on certain policy issues, but also cover issues that are relevant for all policy development and planning experts, and the whole system, in overall.

4.4 Human Resource Related Issues

After the policy and regulatory framework, the human resource capacities and their development issues are the most crucial aspects that influence the overall quality of public policy development and planning processes.

Currently, there are differing approaches towards internal structuring of work related to policy development and planning in the line ministries. Some of them have a special analytical department/unit that plays a role of the internal co-ordination unit and ensures elaboration of policy planning documents and monitoring of their implementation. Others have all policy development and planning functions located within the specific sectoral policy departments/units that have all the necessary specific experience of the policy area.

Table 1. List of Policy Units in Ministries²⁶

Ministry	Unit / units responsible for policy development, planning and monitoring
Ministry of Justice of Georgia	Analytical Department
	Department of International Public Law
Office of the State Minister of Georgia for Reconciliation and Civic Equality	Policy Analysis, Planning and International Relations Department
Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	Strategic Planning and International Relations Department
	National Curriculum Department
	General Education Management and Development Department
	Vocational Education Development Department

²⁶ The data is gathered through the interviews or is provided by the ministries and Administration of Government of Georgia.

Ministry	Unit / units responsible for policy development, planning and monitoring
	Youth Policy Management Department
Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia	Division for Policy and Analysis
Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia	Strategic Development Department
	Economic Analysis and Reforms Department
	Economic Policy Department
Ministry of Defence of Georgia	Defence Policy and Development Department
Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	Policy and Analytics Department
	Environmental Policy and International Relations Department
Ministry of Corrections of Georgia	Analytical Department
	Euro-Atlantic integration Division
	Penitentiary Department
Ministry of Finance of Georgia	Budgetary Department
	Tax and Customs Policy Department
	Macroeconomic Analysis and Fiscal Policy Planning Department
	Fiscal Risk Management Division
	Public Internal Control Department
	Structural Reforms Division
Ministry of Internal Affairs	Research and Reforms Division of Analytical Department
Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia	Strategic Planning and Monitoring Division
Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia	Department of European Integration and Reforms
	Infrastructure Policy and Development Partners Relations Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia	Policy Analysis and Planning Division of Political Department
Ministry of Labour Health and Social Affairs of Georgia	Health Department
	Healthcare Policy Division
	Labour Relations and Social Partnership Division
	Pensions and Social Assistance Division

There are significant differences in human resource capacities as well. These become apparent when analysing the numbers of current staffing levels of those units against the planned level, as well as previous policy development and planning experience of people employed there.

Based on the available information it is possible to conclude that the policy units in ministries on average lack 21% of the planned staff²⁷. Normally such gap in staffing levels indicate a rather big additional workload for the employed staff, because the tasks still need to be performed, as well as signals about possible time pressure to conclude certain tasks (e.g. elaboration of impact analysis of different alternatives, working on performance information) that in turn diminishes the quality of outputs.

Another conclusion that can be made based on the currently available information is that there has been an average 74%²⁸ staff turnover in policy units, signalling loss of institutional memory and skilled people, as well as additional resources needed for training the new staff members. The best example of this is an almost complete change of staff in the unit of AoG responsible for the overall management of the policy development and planning system in Georgia.

²⁷ Based on the information provided to the experts, it is possible to calculate that out of 103 envisaged policy staff, only 81 are actually currently employed. It should be noted that this calculation was made only based on information from institutions where both the planned and existing number of staff was provided. Even despite its average nature, lack of capacity is quite evident.

²⁸ This is a very approximate calculation, due to lack of full information provided to experts. However, if 166 persons were appointed and 124 staff were dismissed between beginning of 2015 and end of the first quarter of 2018, it signals a very high turnover rate.

Table 2. Quantitative data on Human Resources involved in Policy Planning²⁹

Ministry	Unit responsible for policy development, planning and monitoring	Planned Number of Staff	Number of Existing (by May) Staff	Average Experience in policy development, planning and monitoring (years)	Staff Appointment in 01/2015 - 03/2018	Staff Dismissal in 01/2015 - 03/2018
Ministry of Justice of Georgia	Analytical Department	15	10	No data	4	8
	Department of International Public Law	No data	9	No data	6	4
Office of the State Minister of Georgia for Reconciliation and Civic Equality	Policy Analysis, Planning and International Relations Department	No data	6	No data	6	2
Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	Strategic Planning and International Relations Department	9	8	2	5	5
	Youth Policy Management Department	14	12	2	2	1
Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia	Division for Policy and Analysis	6	5	2.5	5	0
Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia	Strategic Development Department	5	2	No data	2	1
	Economic Analysis and Reforms Department	No data	4	No data	2	2
	Economic Policy Department	No data	8	No data	2	1
Ministry of Defence of Georgia	Defence Policy and Development Department	No data	43	No data	7	10
Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia ³⁰	Policy and Analytics Department	11	9	5	4	1
	Environmental Policy and International Relations Department	14	14	No data	3	0

²⁹ The data is gathered through the interviews or is provided by the ministries and Administration of Government of Georgia.

³⁰ The data on staff appointment/dismissal in this Ministry is calculated based on annual numbers of employees provided by the Ministry.

Ministry	Unit responsible for policy development, planning and monitoring	Planned Number of Staff	Number of Existing (by May) Staff	Average Experience in policy development, planning and monitoring (years)	Staff Appointment in 01/2015 - 03/2018	Staff Dismissal in 01/2015 - 03/2018
Ministry of Corrections of Georgia	Analytical Department	No data	41	No data	23	15
	Euro-Atlantic integration Division	No data	3	No data	4	1
Ministry of Finance of Georgia	Budgetary Department	No data	28	No data	3	4
	Tax and Customs Policy Department	No data	18	No data	0	2
	Macroeconomic Analysis and Fiscal Policy Planning Department	No data	10	No data	These units are created on the basis of two reorganizations, due to this they experienced staff appointment/dismissal several times	
	Fiscal Risk Management Division	No data	3	No data		
	Structural Reforms Division	No data	1	No data		
Ministry of Internal Affairs	Research and Reforms Division of Information and Analytical Department	11	5	No data	No data	No data
Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia ³¹	Strategic Planning and Monitoring Division	10	9	4	9	0
Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia	Department of European Integration and Reforms	8	7	10	6	5
	Infrastructure Policy and Development Partners Relations Department	No data	4	No data	5	0
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia	Political Department	No data	12	No data	14	4
Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs of Georgia	Health Department	No data	29	10	25	30
	Labor and Employment Policy Department	No data	13	4	19	21
	Social Affairs Department	No data	16	4	10	7

³¹ The data on staff appointment/dismissal in this Ministry is calculated based on monthly numbers of employees provided by the Ministry.

4.5 Training Related Issues

As is the case with the meetings of the Policy Development Working Group, also the trainings on policy development and planning are ad hoc and not systematic. The OECD SIGMA Baseline Measurement concludes – “there is no regular training on planning, monitoring and reporting available for line ministries to ensure that they understand and apply various standards and procedures consistently and fully across all policy areas”³².

Taking into account that almost all interviewees complained about a relatively high staff turnover (and this can also be observed through analysing data in Table 3. Quantitative data on Human Resources involved in Policy Planning), regular trainings along prudent review and hands-on advice provided by the centre of government institutions³³, are the only possible solutions for improving the overall quality of the planning documents.

Table 3. List of Trainings Conducted in Ministries³⁴

Ministry	Trainings on policy development, planning and monitoring undertaken in the ministry
Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia	Techniques to prepare legislative acts; Issues of EU integration; Project management; Spatial planning; Encouragement of investments in regions; Evaluation of impacts of regulations.
Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	Training in developing a policy documents; Policy brief training.
Ministry of Corrections of Georgia	No trainings were undertaken in this area.
Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs of Georgia	Policy development cycle; Ethics; Public governance; Civil service related trainings.
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia	No trainings were undertaken.
Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia	No specific information, but various trainings undertaken.
Ministry of Finance of Georgia	No specific information.
Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia	Trainings on planning and monitoring.
Ministry of Internal Affairs	No specific information.

³² OECD/SIGMA “Baseline Measurement Report: The Principles of Public Administration. Policy Development and Co-ordination. Georgia, May 2018”, p.19.

³³ The AoG, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice are the three institutions that perform critical centre of government institutions according to the OECD SIGMA “Principles of Public Administration”³³ under the Principle 1 “Centre-of-government institutions fulfil all actions critical to a well-organised, consistent and competent policy-making system”.

³⁴ The data is gathered through the interviews and the self-assessment questionnaires.

Ministry	Trainings on policy development, planning and monitoring undertaken in the ministry
Ministry of Justice of Georgia	Training from EU funded project; Study visits in London; Permanently different trainings.
Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	There were plenty of trainings, but because of lack of people and too much work load they were not able to attend all of them.
Ministry of Defence of Georgia	Defence planning course; Project Management (also Ms Project); Resource planning; Policy implementation planning.
Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia	4-5 trainings per year on average. There were more frequent in the beginning (when the Division for Policy and Analysis was created), now less. Trainings in general issues are less frequent, more often sector specific ones.
Office of the State Minister of Georgia for Reconciliation and Civic Equality	Most of the conducted training were sector specific - Conflict management, Mediation, Study visits in Balkans, Cyprus.

The Policy Planning Manual produced by the Administration of Government of Georgia (AoG) has identified the following requirements of Ministries for “developing [an] efficient, transparent and accountable public administration system” (AoG, 2016:3):

- Compliance with the political agenda and institutional framework
- The document of key data and trends
- Analysis of the existing situation
- Goals, objectives and outcomes
- Public consultation and stakeholder/partner analysis
- Evidence of effectiveness of policy interventions
- Effective implementation Mechanisms
- Appropriate baseline, midterm and final impact indicators
- Estimated cost and budget implications of policies
- Risk analysis.

The requirements of the Policy Planning Manual are very similar to the key competencies required for good policy making, as can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Policy Planning Manual Requirement vs Competencies for Good Policy Making

Policy Planning Manual Requirements	Competencies for Good Policy Making
Compliance with the Political Agenda and Institutional Framework	The ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision.
The document of key data and trends	The ability to access and appraise statistical information
Analysis of the existing situation	
Goals, objectives and outcomes	The ability to clarify the objectives of a policy, and the outcomes that the policy is seeking to achieve.
Public consultation and stakeholder/partner analysis	The ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders.
Effectiveness of policy interventions	The ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions that have been tested using robust impact evaluation methods based on counterfactual analysis.
Implementation Mechanisms	The ability to develop and implement a delivery plan.
Baseline, midterm and final impact indicators	An understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives, and to build appropriate M&E methods into the policy development and implementation process.
Estimated cost and budget implications	An understanding of economic appraisal methods, such as cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analysis and risk and sensitivity analysis.
Risk Analysis	

Self-assessment

A self-assessment exercise was undertaken by Ministries to determine which of the above competencies for policy making are already present amongst the staff of 14 Ministries of the Government of Georgia, and which competencies require training and professional development. The self-assessment was undertaken by key personnel in each Ministry using the Self-Assessment Questionnaire in Annex 2.

Only 8 of the 14 Ministries responded to the self-assessment questionnaire. Table 5 below presents a summary of responses to the questions about the skills required for policy development and implementation, and the skills that Ministries already have.

Table 5. Skills Required, and Skills Capacity of Ministries

Policy Making Skills	Skills Required (Responses = 8)	Existing Capacity (Responses =8)
Think broadly and creatively	6	4

Policy Making Skills	Skills Required (Responses = 8)	Existing Capacity (Responses =8)
Use statistical information	7	6 ³⁵
Clarify the objectives and outcomes	8	5
Theory of change analysis	5	2
Identify a wide range of policy options	4	5
Involve a wide range of stakeholders	8	7
Establish the effectiveness of policy interventions	8	3
An understanding of evidence synthesis	4	3
An understanding of economic appraisal methods	5	5
Develop and implement a delivery plan	7	6
Monitor and evaluate policy	5	2

The data in Table 5 above indicate that all of the Ministries that responded considered that the policy making skills listed are necessary for policy development and implementation. Some skills were considered more important than others; i.e. the ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy, involving a wide range of stakeholders and establishing the effectiveness of policy interventions being the most often mentioned. Skills that were considered least important for policy making were an understanding of evidence synthesis and identifying a wide range of options. The remaining policy skills were acknowledged as being necessary for policy making by the majority of Ministries that responded.

The data in Table 5 also indicate that none of the Ministries that responded had all of these policy skills. This suggests that there is some need across all Ministries for training and professional development in all of these skills of policy development and implementation. The need for training seems to be greatest in undertaking theory of change analysis, monitoring and evaluation, establishing the effectiveness of policy interventions, understanding how to use evidence synthesis and thinking broadly and creatively.

In response to the question: "What training and professional development do you think you need to improve policy development and implementation in your Ministry?" verbatim responses included:

- Methodology and criteria for selection of projects within government investments, including: international experience, cost-benefit analysis, effectiveness analysis, determining of expected impact.
- Develop and implement policies; economic assessment methods; monitoring and valuating policy.
- Capacity building in all steps of policy cycle could be interesting, from idea generation, document drafting and policy implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

³⁵ The reported use of statistical information from the Ministries' self-assessment exercise contrasts with the reported need for training in 'using statistical information' from the face-to-face interviews (see Table 4)

- It would be beneficial if a long-term training program was elaborated, so that persons responsible for policy document elaboration could develop a unified approach to policy document elaboration and monitoring.
- It would be beneficial to have one or two people from each department receive the training and then share the knowledge with other employees in the department.
- Development of a strong feedback system within the ministry is essential to achieve the desired long term results.
- Policy planning, monitoring; reporting and evaluation; economic assessment methods; statistical analysis and policy planning methods.
- Monitoring and evaluation of implementation strategic documents.
- Determination of clear goals; activity assessment indicators; improving the effectiveness of monitoring mechanisms; annual assessment; research and analytical documentation preparation and formalisation.
- Elaboration of policy document; planning and performing surveys; policy costing; action plan evaluation and monitoring.

These verbatim comments support the need for training in the proposed policy skills and competencies, and provide additional suggestions such as policy planning, the policy cycle, project selection, policy documentation and budget planning. They also suggest that training should be targeted towards selected people within ministries who can then disseminate the learning to others in the ministry.

External Assessment

An external assessment of the capacities and training needs of Ministries was undertaken by project consultants. This sought to determine which of the above competencies for policy making are already present amongst the staff of 14 Ministries of the Government of Georgia, and which competencies require training and professional development.

The external assessment was undertaken by face-to-face interviews with key personnel in 14 Ministries. The interview guide for these interviews is presented in Annex 2.

Table 6 (below) presents a summary of the interview responses of all the Ministries to the questions about their needs for training and professional development. It indicates that all the Ministries indicated a training need for most of the competencies necessary for good policy making. There is a greater perceived need for training in some of the key competencies, specifically:

- the ability to access, and use appropriate statistical information.
- the ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions
- the ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy
- theory of change analysis
- an understanding of economic appraisal methods.

There was less interest in a few Ministries, or no response at all, for:

- training in thinking broadly and creatively
- the ability to identify a wide range of options and involving a wide range of stakeholders
- evidence synthesis
- delivering and implementing a delivery plan

- monitoring and evaluation.

In most cases this lack of interest in training was associated with not knowing anything about the competency in questions (e.g. theory of change analysis, evidence synthesis), making it difficult for respondents to make an informed judgement.

Table 6. Summary of the Need for Training and Professional Development

Key Competencies	Training Needs (14 Responses)
Thinking broadly and creatively	10
Using statistical information.	14
Clarifying objectives and outcomes	14
Theory of change analysis	10
Identifying a wide range options	9
Involving a wide range of stakeholders	2
Effectiveness of policy interventions	14
Evidence synthesis	9
Economic appraisal	12
Developing and implementing a delivery plan	6
Monitoring and evaluating policies	9

Most ministries indicated that training in the above competencies was not needed universally across ministries, but should be targeted towards people with analytical responsibilities or who had overall responsibility for a policy area (e.g. strategic development, clarifying objectives and outcomes, identifying option for implementation and delivery).

Taken as a whole, the responses to the external assessment of training needs indicates that there is a need for training and professional development of all of the competencies that are considered important for good policy development and implementation, and for the requirements of the Policy Planning Manual.

4.6 Internal Process and Procedures Related Issues

Interview process revealed that there are no unified internal procedures (i.e. step by step explanation of process) within or across the ministries that would guide their work on elaboration of the policy planning documents. This process is organised based on previous experience obtained in policy planning but is therefore highly dependent on institutional memory that taking into account a rather high turnover rate is unsustainable approach for a long run.

There are some common traits between the ministries on how this process is approached and dealt with. Normally, for elaboration of cross-sectoral policies and subsequent elaboration of planning documents for

their implementation (strategies and actions plans), as well as for monitoring the implementation process an inter-ministerial council is created. Members of the council usually are deputy ministers responsible for policy areas concerned. For day-to-day technical elaboration of the planning documents, inter-ministerial working groups are usually created. The secretariat function of the council and leading of the working groups are performed by designated unit within the lead ministry – depending on the model chosen by the ministry it is either the Analytical Department / Unit or some specific sector policy department / unit.

Out of the interviewed ministries, the Administration of Government, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Corrections provided internal regulations – Terms of Reference – for the work of the inter-ministerial councils and working groups. It should be noted that it deals mostly with organisational issues, but do not go into details of what steps should be taken during the elaboration of the planning document. Despite existence of the “Policy Planning Manual” and the “System for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation of Activities of the Government” that set out general (theoretical) approach to the planning process, the approach towards elaboration of planning documents differ between the ministries. Normally, systematising the procedure allows to reach a more uniform (and usually a better quality) output.

4.7 Guidance Related Issues

As noted previously in the report, all interviewed ministries claimed to be following the “Policy Planning Manual”, including the structure of the planning documents, as well as trying to comply with the recommendations on how to approach different stages of planning. It was claimed that the AoG is ensuring compliance checks at various stages of elaboration of the planning documents to ensure it complies with basic quality criteria.

To test this statement, the project experts undertook the analysis of policy planning documents adopted by the GoG during 2017 and found out that:

- Only 5 ministries³⁶ have adopted major policy planning documents in 2017. So some ministries have no experience of preparing a strategy document following the “Policy Planning Manual”. This conclusion supports the need for active development of further guidance materials and delivering trainings for the policy staff of ministries;
- Although the structures of the planning documents differ from ministry to ministry, all planning document comply with the basic structural requirements set by the “Policy Planning Manual”. Our research found out a 100% compliance of the structure of strategic planning documents with the requirements of the Manual;
- It is not evident that comprehensive cost-benefit analysis and/or impact assessment for different policy options was performed for most of the analysed strategy documents as required by the “Policy Planning Manual”. During analysis we did not come across any mention of the use of these methods or any other ones in order to assess different available policy options;
- Costing is performed on action plan level (all the plans costed except for National Cyber Security Action Plan 2017-2018). There is no information provided on costing (i.e. how much implementation

³⁶ - Ministry of Labour Health and Social Affairs of Georgia (National Strategy 2017-2020 for Anti Antimicrobial Resistance; National Strategy 2017-2020 for the Prevention and Control of Noncontagious Diseases in Georgia; National Strategy 2017-2030 of Maternal and New-born Health Promotion and Action Plan of 2017-2019);

- Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia (Action Plan for Implementation of the State Strategy for internally displaced persons - refugees in 2017-2018);

- Ministry of Finance of Georgia (Strategy and the Action Plan for Introduction of Deposit Insurance System in Georgia, State Internal Financial Control System Development Strategy and Action Plan, Action Plan 2018-2020 of the 2016-2020 Strategy for Small and Medium Entrepreneurship Development in Georgia);

- Ministry of Justice of Georgia (Georgian National Anti-Corruption Strategy and its Action Plan of 2017-2018);

- Ministry of Internal Affairs (National Strategy 2017-2020 for Combating Organized Crime and the Action Plan 2017-2018 of the National Strategy 2017-2020 for Combating Organized Crime);

Note: Some of these policy documents may have been elaborated jointly with other ministries. Some of the policy documents adopted in 2017 (National Strategy of Cyber Security of 2017-2018 and its Action Plan; Georgia's Disaster Risk Reduction 2017-2020 National Strategy and its Action Plan) have been prepared by State Security and Crisis Management Council;

of the planning document would cost) at the strategy level, as well as no information on available medium or short-term budget allocations (i.e. how much money is actually already in the budget and how much is missing and needs to be allocated during the budget process or through assistance of development partners);

- In some cases, it is not clear how lower level objectives/goals are derived from higher level objectives/goals and/or how fully the lower level objectives/goals cover the issues raised by the higher level ones. In such cases objective/goal hierarchy lacks clarity and structure;
- Most of the planning documents do not have quantified indicators (baseline and target value) for the higher, outcome level objectives/goals (with only exception being the SME Development Strategy 2016-2020 that was prepared before the adoption of the “Policy Planning Manual”). Specific output level objectives/goals (on action plan level) are quantified in all cases. The lack of the outcome indicators confines monitoring to process level as monitoring of results/impacts is complicated by the lack of target values;
- Risk assessment for strategy implementation is mostly done on very basic level. No possible risk mitigation actions are described.

During interviews, it was told that in many cases international experts are invited to assist in strategy preparation. However, not always these experts follow the guidelines set out in the “Policy Planning Manual”. Also, such approach might suggest that there is a certain element of capacity substitution that might produce problems for the future, once the technical assistance terminates.

Several ministries during interviews mentioned that overlaps between strategies is a major problem. This raises a question of how issues like these could be solved already during elaboration of the planning documents, without waiting that the centre of government institutions check the drafts already at a quite late stage of inter-ministerial consultations.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Policy, Regulatory and Institutional framework for policy planning

- A. To intensify the work of the Policy Development Working Group and comply with the frequency of meetings as envisaged by the ToR for its work, i.e. having a meeting of the group on a quarterly basis.

These joint discussions on problems and possible solutions would allow to achieve better results in all the tasks envisaged by the AoG:

- carrying out review of the PAR Roadmap and amending it;
 - evaluation of implementation of the Policy Planning System Reform Strategy and either developing a new one for the coming period or including all necessary reform actions in the revised action plan for implementation of the PAR Roadmap;
 - updating the Policy “Planning Manual” and “Common Policy Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation System” establishing the IT solution for government-wide implementation monitoring system.
- B. To reach agreement between the key centre of government institutions – the AoG, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice³⁷ – on a joint approach (e.g. even a unified check-list) towards checking different key elements of draft planning documents to ensure that final versions of the planning documents would meet the expected level of evidence-based policy making.
- C. To collect the best practice in terms of public consultation process and come up with a single solution on process and procedure for involving organised civil society in the policy development and planning process. The external stakeholders can have a positive impact on the quality of policies developed, because they sometimes have additional information on the current situation that allows to better understand the problems, as well as assess efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed policy solutions.
- D. After finalisation of all the above-mentioned tasks, it is necessary to make sure that all the legislative acts regulating the policy development and planning process in Georgia are mutually consistent and coherent and set out clear requirements for the quality of the process. At the same time, it is very important to ensure that these requirements are not too strict, cumbersome (read – bureaucratic) and take into account the current capacity of civil servants.
- E. To offer methodological and capacity building support to the ministries in order to promote application of cost benefit analysis and impact assessments of policy options in the initial phases of policy planning to ensure effectiveness of policy interventions. To develop common strategies or/and methodology for costing policies.

5.2 Approaches to Human Resource Capacities Development

To strengthen the capacity of civil servants involved in policy development and planning process a set of new training modules is proposed.

Table 7 below includes a list of training modules that meet the requirements of the Policy Planning Manual and the skills for good policy making.

³⁷ The AoG, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice are the three institutions that perform critical centre of government institutions according to the OECD SIGMA “Principles of Public Administration”³⁷ under the Principle 1 “Centre-of-government institutions fulfil all actions critical to a well-organised, consistent and competent policy-making system”.

Table 7. Policy Planning Manual Requirements, Skills for Policy Making and Training Modules

Policy Planning Manual Requirements	Skills for Good Policy Making	Training Modules
Compliance with the Political Agenda and Institutional Framework	The ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision.	The Policy-Making Process
The document of key data and trends	The ability to access and appraise statistical information	Accessing and Using Statistical Data
Analysis of the existing situation		Identifying the Problem
Goals, objectives and outcomes	The ability to clarify the objectives of a policy, and the outcomes that the policy is seeking to achieve.	Theory of Change Analysis
Public consultation and stakeholder/partner analysis	The ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders.	Stakeholder Involvement
Effectiveness of policy interventions	The ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions that have been tested using robust impact evaluation methods based on counterfactual analysis.	Impact Analysis and Evidence Synthesis
Implementation Mechanisms	The ability to develop and implement a delivery plan.	Developing Effective Implementation and Delivery
Baseline, midterm and final impact indicators	An understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives, and to build appropriate M&E methods into the policy development and implementation process.	Monitoring and Evaluation
Estimated cost and budget implications	An understanding of economic appraisal methods, such as cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analysis and risk and sensitivity analysis.	Economic Appraisal of Impacts
Risk Analysis		SWOT and PESTEL Analysis

The proposed content of the nine training modules is presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Proposed Training Programme to Support Public Administrative Reform in Georgia

Module 1	The Policy-Making Process ▪ The policy cycle ▪ Strategic planning ▪ Policy planning ▪ Policy planning documentation ▪ Project selection ▪ The role of evidence in the policy process ▪ The role of monitoring and evaluation ▪ Legal and regulatory aspects
----------	---

	▪ Budget planning (budget of strategy) ▪ Group work
Module 2	Identifying the Problem – Data Management ▪ What is the problem under consideration? ▪ Identifying the magnitude and dynamics of the problem ▪ Is government intervention necessary? ▪ Using census, survey, administrative and qualitative data ▪ Accessing electronic databases ▪ Geostat and other sources of evidence ▪ The quality of available evidence ▪ Group work
Module 3	Identifying and monitoring objectives and outcomes ▪ What are the policy objectives and the intended effects ▪ Timeliness and feasibility of desired outcomes ▪ Establishing a theory of change – how is the policy supposed to work? ▪ Inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts ▪ Assumptions and sensitivity analysis ▪ Group work
Module 4	Identifying Policy Options ▪ Thinking broadly and creatively ▪ The 'do nothing' option ▪ Counterfactual analysis ▪ Stakeholder involvement ▪ The regulatory impact ▪ Deciding on the final option ▪ Group Work
Module 5	Impact Analysis ▪ Different meanings of impact ▪ Establishing the most effective option ▪ The importance of the counterfactual ▪ Methods of establishing the likely net impact of policy options ▪ Evidence synthesis ▪ Sources of evidence on effective interventions ▪ Group Work
Module 6	Evidence Synthesis ▪ What is evidence synthesis ▪ What makes an evidence review systematic? ▪ Types of evidence synthesis ▪ Libraries of evidence synthesis ▪ Group work
Module 7	Policy Impact Assessments ▪ Economic impacts ▪ Social impacts ▪ Environmental impacts ▪ Regulatory impacts ▪ Group Work
Module 8	Economic Appraisal of Policies ▪ Budget planning

	▪ Cost-Benefit, cost-effectiveness and cost-utility analysis³⁸ ▪ Monetisation of costs and benefits ▪ Discounting and other adjustments to cost and benefits ▪ Willingness to Pay/Accept ▪ Risk and sensitivity analysis ▪ Testing underlying assumptions ▪ Establishing the Net Present Value ▪ Group Work
Module 9	Implementation and Delivery ▪ Developing a delivery plan ▪ Requirements of effective implementation and delivery ▪ Selecting indicators ▪ Delivery trajectories ▪ Monitoring progress ▪ Delivery reviews ▪ Group Work

The content and the case studies for the proposed training programme will need to be developed to meet the specific policy needs and processes of the Government of Georgia. It is anticipated that a period of consultation with the Administration of Georgia, the Ministries of the Georgian Government, and the United Nations Development Programme will be necessary before the content of the proposed training programme can be confirmed.

5.3 Elaboration of Policy Planning Documents

A typical procedure of policy development and planning process should be elaborated based on the best practices of the ministries to ensure a uniform approach towards elaboration of planning documents. This would allow not only to streamline the process and eventually improve the quality of the planning documents, but also to provide necessary guidance in situation where there is high turnover of civil servants.

The typical procedure for elaboration of policy planning process should include steps starting from the decision to initiate the planning process and establishing an inter-ministerial council and working group until finalisation of the planning document and sending it for approval. Taking into account existence of the “Policy Planning Manual”, the typical procedure should focus only on procedural steps to be taken and not duplicating the things already defined.

³⁸ The document ‘Rules and Methodology of Program Budgeting’ is lacking in detail. We have sought further clarification from MoF and have received little in terms of the details they expect to go into budgeting and costing. We believe that further documentation of budgeting and costing may be forthcoming, in which case we will revise the content of this module.

ANNEX 1. LIST OF QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE INTERVIEWS (POLICY PLANNING ASSESSMENT)

General questions

This set of general questions is meant to test whether representatives of the line ministries are actually aware of the core issues related to policy making and planning system in Georgia. Answers to these questions might provide for information on some problems that need to be addressed by the Administration of Government in their further work, especially in terms of communicating reforms and managing their implementation.

Policy framework for planning	- Is there a policy on policy making and planning in Georgia? I.e. what planning document sets out the key objectives to be achieved in terms of building a unified policy making and planning system? - Which institution is in charge of implementing this policy?
	What is your role as a ministry in implementing this policy on policy making and planning? Have you been explained this role?
Regulatory framework for planning	- What is the legal framework (e.g. laws, by-laws, Government decisions) that you take into account during elaboration of any policy planning document (e.g. strategy / action plan)? - What is the regulatory act (law, by-law, Government decision) that you use / refer to the most while developing planning documents that fall in your competence? - Do you think that these are enough and nothing else is needed or you have an idea on what can be added to make your task easier while working on development of planning documents?
	- Have you been explained how different provisions in different legal acts make up a single approach towards elaboration of planning documents? - If you have been explained the above-mentioned things, can you please, indicate who, when and how explained these things to you!
Institutional framework for planning	Is there a network of planning professionals that regularly meet and discuss issues related to policy making and planning? If "Yes", can you please tell who runs this network, who participates and how frequent are the meetings?
	Do you find these meetings useful? If "Yes" in what way and how they make your work easier? If "No", what would be the way how to improve something?

HR related questions

These questions are meant to identify some basic statistical information related to capacities of policy making and planning functions in line ministries. It might also identify some potential issues that the Administration of Government needs to take into account while developing capacity building activities in this area.

Human Resource Related Issues	- What is the total number of staff foreseen for your unit in the internal systematisation? - What is the current number of staff employed in your unit? Is it enough to carry out all tasks attributed to you in terms of policy making and planning? - What is the average number of years of work experience of your staff? - Have your staff members previously worked with elaboration of planning documents or this is their first job related to planning? - How many planning documents have you personally elaborated or been in charge of managing process of elaboration?
Training Related Issues	From the moment your unit was established, how many trainings on policy development and planning have you received? If "No", what kind of training would be most useful for you?

	• Were these trainings provided only to you or to a bigger group of civil servants? • Who provided these trainings? • Do you think there has been enough of trainings provided to you and your staff members to ensure that you can carry out your functions to a full extent? • Based on your experience – which steps of policy-making and planning process are the hardest ones and would require some additional trainings?
--	--

Implementation related questions

The last set of questions is meant to take most of the time and address the actual experience of the staff of policy units in terms of policy making and planning.

Internal process and procedures related issues	• Do you have formalised internal procedures within the ministry that set out process of developing policy planning documents? • If “No”, why? If “No” – do you think such procedure would make your life easier or would unnecessarily complicate your life? • If “Yes” then can you share with us? If “Yes” who developed these procedures and what were the reasons behind it?
Guidance related issues	• Based on the most recent experience of elaborating a planning document, please, tell us about the steps that you took from the moment when you got the task to develop the document until it was adopted by the government. • While describing the process, please, indicate how much time each of the steps required. • What is the average time for elaboration of planning document? Not only this particular, but on average? Do you think you have sufficient time for elaboration of the planning documents or not? • Do you involve non-governmental organisations in the development of planning documents? How and at what stage of the policy planning process?
Monitoring, reporting and evaluation related issues	• Do you proactively ask for any advice while drafting planning documents from the Administration of Government? If “No”, why? If “Yes”, what exactly? • When you draft your planning document do you have enough guidance (i.e. methodology, clarifications during working group process) received from the Administration of Government while drafting policy planning document? If “No”, what would you expect more in terms of guidance? If “Yes” then can you tell us what kind of guidance you have received while drafting? • Which regulation sets out obligations for monitoring, reporting and evaluation process for the policy planning documents? • Are your unit also responsible for carrying out implementation monitoring, reporting and evaluation activities? If “No” then who is responsible for that? If “Yes”, can you please describe the whole process? • How frequently do you prepare implementation monitoring reports? Where is this frequency established? • Does the Government reviews implementation monitoring reports produced by you? If “No”, then who is reviewing these reports? • How are these monitoring reports used in policy planning process? • Have you carried out an evaluation of any planning document that you had been responsible for? If “Yes”, was it prepared by you or some third-party evaluators? If “No”, are you obliged to carry out evaluation? • Do you publish implementation monitoring reports? Are there legal obligations that make you publish these reports so that they would be publicly available? • Do you involve civil society organisations or any other stakeholders from outside the ministry in monitoring, reporting and evaluation process?

ANNEX 2. CAPACITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRES

Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Name of Ministry	
Date of Self-Assessment Completion	
Question	Verbatim Response
1) What do you think are the key skills and competencies that are required for effective policy development and implementation? (Mark in the list given below) ☐ The ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision; ☐ The ability to access and appraise appropriate statistical information; ☐ The ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy; ☐ The ability to undertake a theory of change analysis; ☐ The ability to identify a wide range of policy options; ☐ The ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders; ☐ The ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions; ☐ An understanding of evidence synthesis; ☐ An understanding of economic appraisal methods; ☐ The ability to develop and implement a delivery plan; ☐ An understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives; ☐ Other (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response).	

Name of Ministry	
Date of Self-Assessment Completion	
Question	Verbatim Response
2) In your opinion, which of the following skills and competencies required for effective policy development and implementation do you currently have in your ministry? (Mark in the list given below) ☐ The ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision; ☐ The ability to access and appraise appropriate statistical information; ☐ The ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy; ☐ The ability to undertake a theory of change analysis; ☐ The ability to identify a wide range of policy options; ☐ The ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders; ☐ The ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions; ☐ An understanding of evidence synthesis; ☐ An understanding of economic appraisal methods; ☐ The ability to develop and implement a delivery plan; ☐ An understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives; ☐ Other (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response);	
3) What kind of trainings/courses has staff in your ministry taken for improving policy development and implementation?	
4) What training and professional development do you think you need to improve policy development and implementation in your Ministry?	
5) What do you think are your current strengths in undertaking policy development and implementation?	
6) What do you think are your current weaknesses in undertaking policy development and implementation?	
7) Which stages does the whole policy planning cycle currently include in your ministry?	
8) Does your ministry have experience in implementing each stage of policy planning?	

Name of Ministry	
Date of Self-Assessment Completion	
Question	Verbatim Response
9) Is there a procedure that ensures planning and distribution of functions and responsibilities at each stage of policy development and implementation in your Ministry?	
10) In your opinion, which of the following resources are needed for implementing full cycle of policy planning in your ministry? ☐ Human resources (except for specialists); ☐ Specialists in specific directions (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response); ☐ Databases; ☐ Informational resources (statistical information, researches, etc.) ☐ Communication resources (e.g., to ensure stakeholder engagement); ☐ Resources / means for monitoring; ☐ Infrastructure; ☐ Other resources (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response);	
11) In your opinion, which of the following resources are not currently available in your ministry for implementing full cycle of policy planning? ☐ Human resources (except for specialists); ☐ Specialists in specific directions (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response); ☐ Databases; ☐ Informational resources (statistical information, researches, etc.) ☐ Communication resources (e.g., to ensure stakeholder engagement); ☐ Resources / means for monitoring; ☐ Infrastructure; ☐ Other resources (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response);	
12) In your opinion, what additional resources are required to improve the policy development and implementation process in the Ministry? ☐ Human resources (except for specialists); ☐ Specialists in specific directions (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response); ☐ Databases; ☐ Informational resources (statistical information, researches, etc.) ☐ Communication resources (e.g., to ensure stakeholder engagement); ☐ Resources / means for monitoring; ☐ Infrastructure; ☐ Other resources (Please, specify in the box for a verbatim response);	

External Assessment Questionnaire

Name of Ministry:					
Date of Interview:					
Questions	Answer Options				
1) The ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision.					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. How do you go about thinking broadly and creatively in this way in your Ministry?	-	-	-	-	Verbatim Response
iii. Need training to improve their ability to think broadly and creatively, and not be bound by tunnel vision?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
2) The ability to access and appraise appropriate statistical information.					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Where do policy makers in your Ministry go to find appropriate statistical data for policy development and implementation planning?	-	-	-	-	Verbatim Response
iii. What problems do policy makers in your Ministry have in terms of accessing appropriate statistical information?	-	-	-	-	Verbatim Response
iv. Need any training to improve their access to appropriate statistical information?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
3) The ability to clarify the objectives and outcomes of a policy.					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training to be able to clarify the objectives and outcomes that the policy is seeking to achieve?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
4) The ability to undertake a theory of change analysis					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training in how to undertake theory of change analysis?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
5) The ability to identify a wide range of policy options					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Access to electronic databases	-	-	-	-	List of Electronic Databases
iii. Need any training in how to search and appraise the global evidence base?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
6) The ability to identify and involve a wide range of stakeholders					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. How do your policy development and implementation personnel go about involving a wide range of stakeholders?	-	-	-	-	Verbatim Response
iii. Need any training in how to involve a wide range of stakeholders?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response

7) The ability to establish the effectiveness of policy interventions					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training in how to establish the effectiveness of different policy interventions using counterfactual analysis?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
8) An understanding of evidence synthesis					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training in how use evidence synthesis?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
9) An understanding of economic appraisal methods					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training in economic appraisal methods?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
10) The ability to develop and implement a delivery plan					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training in how to develop and implement a delivery plan?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response
11) An understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives					
i. To what extent do you have this ability in your Ministry?	Not at all	A Little	Quite a Lot	A Great Deal	Verbatim Response
ii. Need any training in monitoring and evaluating policy initiatives?	Yes	No	-	-	Verbatim Response

ANNEX 3. LIST OF MEETINGS HELD DURING THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Date	Title of Institution	Representatives of Institution	Position of Representative	Representatives of Project Participating
30/04/18	Ministry of Labour Health and Social Affairs of Georgia	Keti Goginashvili	Head of Healthcare Policy Division	Philip Davies, Irakli Mizandari, Eka Katamadze, Gvantsa Gigauri
01/05/18	Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	Eka Zviadadze	Head of Policy Analysis Department	Philip Davies, Irakli Mizandari, Gvantsa Gigauri
02/05/18	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia	Revaz Chkheidze	Head of Policy Analyzes and Planning Division of Political Department	Philip Davies, Eka Katamadze, George Simongulashvili
02/05/18	Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia	Giorgi Kezherashvili	Head of Reforms and Strategic Programming Division of Department of European Integration and Reforms	Philip Davies, Eka Katamadze, George Simongulashvili
03/05/18	Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia	Tsisnami Sabadze Eter Munjishvili Nino Javakhadze	Head of Economic Policy Department Head of Strategic Development Department Deputy Minister	Philip Davies, Martins Krievins, Irakli Mizandari
03/05/18	Ministry of Finance of Georgia	Pridon Aslanikashvili Giuli Chkuaseli	Deputy Head of Macroeconomic Analysis and Fiscal Policy Planning Department Head of Public Internal Control Department	Philip Davies, Martins Krievins, Eka Katamadze
04/05/18	Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia	Tamar Tsulukidze	Strategic Planning and Monitoring Division	Philip Davies, Martins Krievins, Eka Katamadze, George Simongulashvili
04/05/18	Administration of Government of Georgia	Mariam Danelia	Advisor at Policy Analysis, Strategic Planning and Coordination Department	Philip Davies, Martins Krievins, George Simongulashvili

04/05/18	Ministry of Internal Affairs	Giorgi Sakhokia	Head of Administration	Philip Davies, Martins Krievins, Eka Katamadze, George Simongulashvili
07/05/18	Ministry of Justice of Georgia	Zurab Sanikidze	Head of Analytical Department	Martins Krievins, Irakli Mizandari, George Simongulashvili
07/05/18	Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	Kakha Khandolishvili Natia Gabitashvili	Head of Strategic Planning and International Relations Department Head of Policy Planning and European Integration Division of Strategic Planning and International Relations Department, Horizon 2020 National NCP Coordinator	Martins Krievins, Irakli Mizandari, George Simongulashvili
07/05/18	Ministry of Defence of Georgia	Tato Kvamladze	Deputy Head of Defence Resource Management Division	Martins Krievins, Irakli Mizandari, Eka Katamadze
11/05/18	Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia	Tinatin Ramishvili, Tinatin Iobadze, Nikoloz Kobakhidze	Specialists at Division for Policy and Analysis	Irakli Mizandari, Gvantsa Gigauri,
11/05/18	Ministry of Corrections of Georgia	Elena Beradze Giorgi Aladashvili Irakli Tchitanava	Head of Department of International Relations and European Integration Deputy Head of Penitentiary Department Deputy Head of National Probation Agency	Irakli Mizandari, Gvantsa Gigauri
16/05/18	Ministry of Labour Health and Social Affairs of Georgia	Lika Klimiashvili Tea Gvaramadze	Head of Labor Relations and Social Partnership Division Head of Pensions and Social Assistance Division	Irakli Mizandari, Gvantsa Gigauri
16/05/18	Office of the State Minister of Georgia for Reconciliation and Civic Equality	Tina Ghogheliani	Policy Analysis, Planning and International Relations Department	Irakli Mizandari, Gvantsa Gigauri
18/05/18	National Statistics Office of Georgia	Maia Guntsadze	Deputy Head of Geostat	Irakli Mizandari, Gvantsa Gigauri

ANNEX 4. LIST OF PLANNING DOCUMENTS ADOPTED BY GOG IN 2017³⁹

№	Title of Policy Document	Date of Adoption by GOG
1	National Strategy 2017-2020 for Anti Antimicrobial Resistance	11/01/17
2	Action Plan for Implementation of the State Strategy for internally displaced persons - refugees in 2017-2018	13/02/17
3	Strategy and the Action Plan for Introduction of Deposit Insurance System in Georgia	02/03/17
4	State Internal Financial Control System Development Strategy and Action Plan	21/03/17
5	Action Plan 2017-2018 of the Strategic Document for Implementation of Public Administration - "Georgia's Public Administration Reform Guide 2020"	28/12/17
6	National Strategy 2017-2020 for the Prevention and Control of Noncontagious Diseases in Georgia	11/01/17
7	Georgia's Disaster Risk Reduction National Strategy 2017-2020 and its Action Plan	11/01/17
8	National Strategy 2017-2018 of Cyber Security and its Action Plan	13/01/17
9	National Strategy 2017-2020 for Combating Organized Crime and its Action Plan of 2017-2018	05/05/17
10	Georgian National Anti-Corruption Strategy and its Action Plan of 2017-2018	27/09/17
11	National Strategy 2017-2030 of Maternal and Newborn Health Promotion and Action Plan of 2017-2019	06/10/17
12	Action Plan 2018-2020 of the 2016-2020 Strategy for Small and Medium Entrepreneurship Development in Georgia	28/12/17

³⁹ The list was provided by Administration of Government of Georgia