

## Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

**Regional Director:** Olga Ghazaryan

**Country Director:** Keti Getiashvili

**Name of Project reviewed:** Effective civil society development and improved access to quality health care for poor people in Georgia Project

**Date:** February 2012 (final report concluded)

### Summary of Contribution Scores

| Targeted Outcome  | Extent observed (high, medium, low, none) | Extent of project/campaign contribution (high, medium, low, none) | Specific contribution score*<br>/5 |
|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. Increased organizational, operational capacity of (up to 50) targeted NGOs   | Medium                                    | Medium  | 4                                  |
| 2. Functional coalition of up to 50 NGOs, who [are able to] undertake networking, campaigning, public health research, and policy advocacy and at the national level and in 3 targeted regions  | Low                                       | Medium  | 3                                  |
| 3. The government and insurance companies are presented with recommendations for better and wider insurance coverage to increase accessibility of poor people to health services, especially to the maternal and child services in 3 target regions | Medium                                    | Medium  | 4                                  |
| 4. Increased knowledge of health staff of the use of clinical guidelines and of violation of medical ethic, particularly those by pharmaceutical companies  | Low                                       | Low   | 2                                  |
| 5. Government is better informed about ongoing implementation of the current health care reform based on overall health service privatization and about recommendations how to mitigate its possible negative consequences                          | Low                                       | Medium  | 3                                  |
| <b>Unforeseen Outcome</b>   |   |   |                                    |
| 1. National health care strategic plan developed  | Medium                                    | Medium  | 3                                  |
| 2. Increased trust between government officials and NGOs  | Low                                       | High  | 3                                  |
| 3. Public Defender Office made use of findings of the project   | Medium                                    | High  | 4                                  |
| 4. Amendment of the law on advertisement of pharmaceutical companies  | Low                                       | High  | 3                                  |

|  |
|--|
| 1. What follow-up to the review have you undertaken or planned (if any) e.g. discussion, analysis, workshop?   |
| <i>I found the review was very informative and in future this approach can be replicated for other projects to evaluate things properly based on findings and design more effective programme.</i>   |
| 2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme's effectiveness?  |
| <b>New management response question - No answer available</b>  |
| 3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?  |
| <p>If so, please comment briefly on why you think this was so.</p> <p><i>According to the review results the project succeeded quite well in attempts to broaden and strengthen the coalition Future without Poverty. Mainly the project succeeded in increasing organizational, operational capacity of (up to 50) targeted NGOs and establishing a functional coalition. I think so because in result the coalition managed to expand its activities, establish specific thematic groups and develop joint projects on various health related issues. Due to improved networking, campaigning, public health research and policy advocacy skills provided by the project NGOs stay united in the coalition and have capacity to raise funds and develop joint projects.</i></p> <p><i>The voice of more capable coalition NGOs has become stronger. The government acknowledges and considers the coalition opinion about various aspects of health sector reform. Due to the project, trust between government officials and NGOs has been considerably increased.</i></p> <p><i>The project has been strong in providing recommendations to the government and insurance companies for better and wider insurance coverage. This helped to increase accessibility of poor people to health services, especially to the maternal and child services in 3 target regions. One more strong area was success in preparing the ground for development and acceptance of health care strategic plan by the Ministry of Labour, Health and Social protection.</i></p> |
| 4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?   |
| <p>If so, please comment on why you think this was so.</p> <p><i>There is very limited evidence that the project succeeded in making Government more aware of possible negative consequences of continuing privatization. During the project, privatization that started in 2007 accelerated considerably, and the Georgian government especially MOLSHA became overconfident about their approach and less willing to listen to the others, even when the negative consequences of the privatization became obvious.</i></p> <p><i>Limited success of the project to influence the government, insurance companies, pharmaceutical industry and health staff was mainly due to 3 factors: Overoptimistic assessment of the project possibilities, leading to high targets; accelerated privatization of the health care services.</i></p>   |
| 5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?   |

*The reviewed project is not continuing but certain parts of the programme are incorporated in different projects like that funded by SIDA and Eurasia Partnership Foundation (mainly focuses on coalition capacity building and their involvement in monitoring activities of health care reforms).*

b) What actions are you planning in response to the Programme Learning Considerations?

- One should concentrate educational efforts at less experienced local NGOs that work often in relative isolation and their knowledge is limited.
- More sustained educational efforts and more intensive, in-depth training (indirectly through advising NGO's on appropriate course providers) could achieve deeper levels of understanding on issues proposed by the local NGOs.
- To increase of functionality and cooperation of the coalition, more homogeneity is needed. This can be achieved by either to formulate more specific common objective(s) or more common target group(s) among the NGO's could increase functionality and cooperation of the coalition.
- Suggested that the "Future without Poverty" coalition considers only these new members to join that are motivated and see the added value of such cooperation. For that, the formulation of clear common objectives and plans are fundamental. The last workshop on coalition strategic planning was a good starting point.
- If still wanting to do so, If the Welfare Foundation wishes to continue lobbying government on its own, the aims should be in line with political reality, i.e. what is reasonable and has chance to be accepted by the government.
- Continue to provide information to 1. the Public Defender (and especially its health rights protection officer) in the breaches of medical ethic and misuse of monopoly positions, utilizing coalition members working at the grassroots level to assist in delivering accurate and timely information.
- Continue providing information to the population on insurance possibilities and applications through coalition members.
- In view of the results and limited possibilities of Welfare Foundation and its regional project partners (GSC and Step Forward)to increased knowledge of health staff on the use of clinical guidelines and of violation of medical ethic, it is not recommended to pursue this issue any further.
- Continue to support the strengthening of management and operational capacity of regional and local NGOs, firstly to assist the poor population, but also to have a strong voice on behalf of their target groups vis-à-vis the Georgian government in the longer term.
- To promote, as much as possible, cooperation of the Welfare Foundation with Public Defender Office.

|   |
|---|
| See answer to 6.  |
| 6. If the project/humanitarian response is ending or has already ended, what learning from the review will you apply to relevant new projects in the future? How can the Regional Centre and Oxford support these plans?  |
| <i>We learned from the project that it is important to continue provision of education to local NGOs and it should be more extensive (in depth). The review once again proved that the Coalition through its members should continue to inform their target groups about health rights, possibilities and ways to apply. As well it became more evident that there is a need to continue partnership with the Public Defender's office and provide them with the relevant information on the health situation in Georgia. Accordingly, all these aspects are taken into consideration in health programmes.</i> |
| The reports will be published by Oxfam. If you have objections to this, please say so and explain why.  |
| <i>No objections.</i>   |