Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Short Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1 – Adoption of improved production techniques</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Rates of adoption of improved production techniques were generally higher among the participants than among comparison producers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 – Revenue generated from agricultural activities</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Considerably larger proportions of the project participants made sales of the products supported under this project in 2012 than did the comparison households, resulting in significantly greater revenue being generated by the average participant household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 – Improved household income and nutrition</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Household income was considerably higher among supported tomato producers than in comparison households, with a smaller difference among the potato producers and beekeepers. There was no detectable effect on household income among households supported in cattle breeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4 – Increased asset wealth</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Evidence of a significant increase in asset ownership since 2007 among the supported tomato and potato producers, relative to comparison households. No evidence of a corresponding increase among households in the livestock and beekeeping components of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome 5 – Improved self-confidence and community participation**

Project participant’s significantly higher scores on measures of community participation, self-efficacy and self-reliance than comparison respondents. The size of these changes vary between those in the different components of the project.

---

### 1. What follow-up to the review have you undertaken or planned (if any) e.g. discussion, analysis, workshop?

This project, implemented between 2007 and 2012 in partnership with the Civil Society Institute (CSI), aimed at strengthening incomes among smallholder producers by improving production and marketing techniques. One hundred and fifty households in two regions of western Georgia were directly supported with a programme of training, technical support, and the provision of capital and productive inputs over a four year period.

The Effectiveness review of the “Supporting Rural Livelihoods and Employment in Western Georgia” (GEOA45) project was shared with the Georgia CD and Livelihood Officer, who organised a meeting of Oxfam Georgia livelihood team and partners a week after to discuss the report findings. Feed back of OGB staff and partners were shared with ER team via Skype call.

Unfortunately, the timing for the Effectiveness Review was not perfectly tuned to Georgia new Economic Justice (EJ) Programme design plan, which has taken place from Mid December 2012 till end of Feb 2013. The ideal scenario would have been for the evaluation to take place earlier and ER report and recommendations to come before the new EJP development in order to use ER findings better. When designing new EJ program market based approach with GEM it encouraged change into geographical regions as well as change of implementing partners.

### 2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme’s effectiveness?

Generally, it is OK, the findings concur with my own expectations of the project’s effectiveness. It’s also important to note that the project didn’t have a budget line for baseline, thus it was hard for Georgia team to have our own evidences to compare with the ER report findings.

### 3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?

Yes, the Effectiveness Review identifies the following areas that were particularly strong: high rate for adoption of improved production techniques, and increased quantity of agriculture produce sales which resulted in an increase of beneficiaries’ income.
4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?

No, there were no weak or very weak areas of the project components that the Effectiveness Review identified. However, the report stated that cattle breeding beneficiaries weren’t as successful as others, their income and assets ownership were not as high as that of tomato and potato producers. ER team were informed that some beneficiaries didn’t report honestly because they were concerned about losing their status on the social subsides agency (therefore losing monetary benefit), but this argument wasn’t considered.

5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?

No, the project was closed 5-6 months earlier, before ER took place.

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

Country team and the project partners are encouraged to consider the following: a) Investigate the reasons for the differences in impact on household wellbeing between the various components of the project; b) Use the quantitative estimates of impact on household income and other indicators of wellbeing to inform future decisions on the optimal intensity for livelihoods programming. These recommendations are not directly relevant to the new EJP and investing in exploring these may not be a good value for money, however the new EJ projects will target one of the regions, Samegrelo in particular, where we will consider recommendation b.

We would like to have more clear and actionable recommendations about what to do next, and have them included in the report.

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?

We partly answered this question above. Additionally, Regional Centre’s provide continuous support to our EJP: we had a cycle of Skype calls with the Regional Programme Manager and Regional Livelihood Lead to bring learning from this and other ERs into the new 5.5 million EC-funded four-year EMPARD project.
7. **The reports will be published by Oxfam. If you have objections to this, please say so and explain why.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No objection. Oxfam in Georgia has a strong commitment to the Open Information policy and are keen to publish all project information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>