



**Civic Monitoring in Georgia**  
**WORKSHOP FOR CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS**  
**Tbilisi, Georgia**  
**Venue: Marriot Courtyard Hotel**  
**February 26, 2007**

**GROUP 1. SWOT Analysis of legal and regulatory environment**

The group outlined the basic laws creating legislative environment in which NGOs of various profile are operating during implementation of civic monitoring in various areas.

1. Georgian Constitution
2. General Administrative Code
3. Law on State Secret
4. Orchus Convention
4. Various by-laws and internal regulations in various state bodies

The group agreed that legal environment hampers free obtaining of public information, which main component in civic monitoring. In this respect, the group identified as threats/barriers the following breaches in a legislative system of Georgia:

1. The absence of the government's will to tolerate with civil monitoring
2. Ignorance (lack of knowledge) of laws by state officials
3. Deliberate misinterpretation of legislation by officials
4. The sense of impunity for unlawful actions among the officials and absence of any precedent of punishment of official for illegal prohibition on public information
5. The inconsistency of bylaws with administrative code that hampers release of public information
6. Changing of laws with purpose to tailor them to the interests and needs of authorities
7. Frequent changing of laws and non-transparency of this process
8. Inaccessibility to justice for ordinary citizens (extremely high court dues and procrastinated court procedures)

With regard to legislative component in civic monitoring the group identified as weaknesses the following:

1. Wide strata of the Georgian population are not aware of their rights and don't have even elementary necessary knowledge of laws
2. Mismatching in posing of problem and supplying with information about problem solving
3. Low capacity of civil society organizations

In regard to "Opportunities" the group outlined the following:

1. Make civil society more proactive in demand of legally guaranteed access to public information
2. Give wide publicity and provide wide information of public about any violation of law by state officials
3. Appeal to court and/or civil, administrative action

4. Campaign of “bombardment” (multiple inquiries for public information by many CSOs and citizens)
5. Mobilization of international organization to exert influence on the government
6. Search and mobilization of respective internal resources inside CSO to solve the problem

## **GROUP 2. SWOT Analysis. Accessibility and public awareness of civic monitoring**

The group identified as “strengths” the following:

1. NGO’s experience and resources
2. Existence of relevant information about subject of monitoring
3. Accessibility to the information
4. Human resources
5. Trustworthiness

Among the “weaknesses” the group identified the following:

1. NGOs are excessively specialized on specific issues, fields and incapable to embrace wide topics
2. Civic monitoring is not a subject of NGOs specialization and only a part of other activities
3. Donors have shifted their focus on government to the detriment of NGOs
4. Deficiency of human resources
5. Misbalance between central(Tbilisi-based) and regional NGOs
6. Lack of NGOs’ cooperation with media
7. Low civic activism in society
8. Negative public attitude to NGOs and their activities
9. Poor cooperation inside the NGO sector
10. Lack of sustainability and spontaneous activism in civic monitoring
11. Insufficient coverage of regions by civic monitoring
12. NGOs –satellites of the authorities
13. Poor definition and demarcation between civic monitoring and civic advocacy

Among the “threats” the group named the following factors:

1. Poor coverage of civic monitoring by media
2. Problem of keeping neutrality from politics
3. When NGO sector “Loses face”
4. Scarce financial resources caused by incorrect focus areas chosen by donors
5. Existence of conformism (e.g. personal relations etc)
6. When NGO is fails to realize realities and becomes excessively closed-door
7. Lack of communication between NGOs and NGOs and society

The group views as “opportunities” the following

1. Develop new mechanisms of civic monitoring
2. Increase trustworthiness and qualification of NGOs
3. Increase public awareness and overcome problems
4. Provide continuity of civic monitoring
5. To work more independently
6. Harmonize civic advocacy and civic monitoring

7. Promote lobbying activities
8. Intensify contacts with interest groups
9. Increase regional and interregional cooperation

### **GROUP 3. SWOT Analysis. Approach, techniques and methods of civic monitoring**

The group identified as “strengths” the following:

1. Selection of the right subject/topic for civic monitoring
2. Expertise/experience
3. CSO is trustworthy and recognizable by public
4. Acts in coalition with other CSOs
5. Methodologies of civic monitoring are proven and tested

The group identified as “weaknesses” the following:

1. poorly forecasted outputs and outcomes
2. Wrongly selected topic/subject of monitoring
3. Disruptions in civic monitoring
4. Lack of unbiased experts
5. Concealing of information, lack of integration
6. Absence of alternative scenarios
7. Insufficient development of methodologies
8. Absence of information exchange among the different sectors of civic players
9. Lack of knowledge sharing and poor communication
10. Target groups are not and/or poorly defined
11. Scarce resources

The group identified as “threats” the following:

1. The lose of actuality of the subject/topic of civil monitoring
1. Indifference of media to civic monitoring
2. Lack of close cooperation with media
3. Increased influence of various interest groups
4. Discrediting of monitoring results
5. Safety during civic monitoring
6. Lack of independence of court system
7. Poor recognizability of CSO(s)
8. Scarce resources
9. Lack of coordination between donors
10. Lack of efficiency, low level of mobilization
11. Unstable environment
12. Absence of political will of the government towards civic monitoring

## **Drafting of the recommendations on the way forward:**

### **1. Efficiency/effectiveness of methods**

Problem Identification – relevant, based on expertise, application driven  
Make clear definition of civic monitoring and civic advocacy  
Define system of self-assessment  
Sharing/mapping of information, experience, research – KMS (create space for sharing (portal, database etc in agreed format)  
Make inventory of civil monitoring effective instruments(tools) - create guidebook on civic monitoring, training and capacity building  
Promote lobbying and cooperation with donors  
Linkage between monitoring and advocacy  
Make inventory and evaluate the already implemented projects on civic monitoring  
Publish literature/guideline about civic monitoring

### **2. Staff and professionalism**

Sharing of expertise  
Encourage open competitions  
Improve recruiting system  
Invest more fund in training experts  
Expand sphere of expertise  
Enhance internal capacity of an organization (incl. donor assistance)  
Link with academics/academic institutions

### **3. Decentralization/Unequal development of CSOs in center and regions**

Situation analysis – identification of strength and weaknesses  
Enhance integration of civic sectors in Tbilisi and regions – regular thematic/issue-based meetings and discussions, support inter-regional projects (encourage donors)  
Strengthen the role of regional media  
Knowledge sharing-Coaching (Tbilisi-regions)  
Integrated projects (mirror project in the region)  
Inter/cross-regional  
More attention to capacity building of CSO in regions and identification of underserved regions

### **4. Communication**

Intensify media contacts of CSOs, promote marketing communication  
Intensify and enhance cross-sector relations (regular communication on top of issue-based networking)  
Activation of donors, improve CSO-donors communication, donors must have better information about fields of activities of CSOs  
Enhance dialogue with authorities, learn their expectations (study)  
Improve communication methods with Media (more market oriented)

### **5. Image and trustworthiness of CSOs**

Improve technique of dissemination of message(s)/rhetoric  
Make CSOs' image more professional/academic  
Promote Code of Ethics for CSOs

Learn methods of image creation & communication for CSOs

### **7. Resource mobilization**

Web-portal to share info

Regularly submit info for sharing

Encourage donors to mobilize resources when they work in the same area

Recommend donors to finance internal capacity building of CSOs involved in civic monitoring

NGOs must show more flexibility and creativity in capacity building

### **8. Networks & Coalitions**

Keep to minimal standards and rules of information-sharing

Membership-based associations

Support Issue-based and/or thematic coalitions and networks

Promote inter-regional projects

Create position/vision/principles towards certain issues

Boost thematic meetings, roundtables in regions

### **9. Focusing**

Monitoring must focus on concrete issues

Be more issue-specific

Define ultimate target group for whom monitoring results are destined