1. National development planning and results orientation

Overall quality of national results framework
High-quality, inclusive and results-oriented development strategies are critical for countries’ ownership over their development and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The quality of national development planning in Georgia is medium (75%).

The national development strategy and results framework...
... defines priorities, targets and indicators
✅ YES
... includes budget or costing information
✅ YES
... aligns to SDGs
✅ YES
Regular progress reports are available
NO

Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks by development partners
Development partner alignment to country-led development priorities is at the heart of country ownership. Global Partnership monitoring assesses whether interventions: draw objectives from national development strategies; draw indicators from country results frameworks; use government data and statistics for monitoring; and involve government in evaluations. The first three elements provide the official data to report on SDG indicator 17.15.1. In Georgia, development partners align to country priorities to a low extent (44% - SDG indicator 17.15.1).

2. Multi-stakeholder engagement

Recognising that successful development efforts require the inclusive and equitable participation of all actors, the 2030 Agenda calls for collective action by the whole of society. Global Partnership monitoring examines the engagement of civil society and the private sector from both the perspective of the government and representatives of these stakeholder groups.

Quality of public-private dialogue
Government representatives perceive the quality of public-private dialogue as consolidating, SMEs as consolidating and large private sector firms as consolidating, and trade unions as consolidating.

Enabling environment for civil society organisations...
... was reported as moderate by government representatives, moderate by civil society organisations and moderate by development partners.
3. Quality and use of public financial management systems

### Strengthening public financial management systems

Strong public financial management (PFM) systems are an essential element of good governance and vital to achieving development goals. Georgia experienced **significant progress** in the quality of its PFM systems.

- **Budget**: 68% in place, 32% decline
- **Procurement**: 68% in place, 32% decline
- **Auditing**: 64% in place, 36% decline
- **Financial reporting**: 100% in place, 0% decline

### Development partners’ use of country systems

Development partners’ use of these systems to deliver co-operation both lowers transaction costs but also helps to accelerate their strengthening. In Georgia, use of country PFM systems was reported to be **36%** in 2018.

The share of development co-operation recorded on budgets subject to parliamentary scrutiny was reported at **48%** in 2018.

#### Overall use of country systems

- **Budget execution**: 66% in place, 34% decline
- **Financial reporting**: 68% in place, 32% decline
- **Auditing**: 68% in place, 32% decline
- **Procurement systems**: 68% in place, 32% decline

### Systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment

Adequate and effective financing is essential to achieve gender equality and to empower all women and girls. Georgia has **some elements** of a system in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment, approaching the requirements of SDG indicator 5.c.1.

#### SDG 5.c.1

- **Gender policies**: Not in place
- **Gender-responsive PFM systems**: In place
- **Transparent information on resource allocations**: In place

### 4. Predictability and forward planning

High-quality and timely information on development co-operation helps governments in planning and managing resources for results and can guide development partners in coordinating their support with other providers, as to avoid fragmentation and duplication of efforts. Annual predictability of development co-operation is **low**, with **71%** of co-operation disbursed as scheduled. Medium-term predictability is **high**, with **99%** of co-operation available in forward looking expenditure plans for the next three years.

#### Predictability of development co-operation

- **Disbursements as scheduled**
  - **0% – 100%**: 71%
  - **71% – 100%**: 90%

- **Medium-term predictability**
  - **0% – 100%**: 75%
  - **75% – 100%**: 99%

### Systems to track development co-operation information in Georgia

- **AIMS**: Aid Information Management System
- **DMS**: Debt Management System
- **FMIS**: Financial Management Information Systems
- **Other**: Excel-based systems or similar

#### Georgia vs. LMICs

- **Disbursements as scheduled**: Georgia 71%, LMICs 100%
- **Medium-term predictability**: Georgia 75%, LMICs 99%

### 5. Mutual accountability mechanisms

Mutual accountability underpins the efforts of development actors to meet joint commitments, improve how they work together and increase their development effectiveness. Mutual accountability mechanisms are made up of multiple, reinforcing components that can help enhance transparency and accountability at country level. Global Partnership monitoring defines and assesses mutual accountability against five components. Georgia has five out of five components in place.

#### Component 1
- **Comprehensive policy framework for development co-operation**: In place

#### Component 2
- **Country-level targets for government and development partners**: In place

#### Component 3
- **Regular joint assessment of progress**: In place

#### Component 4
- **Assessments are inclusive and involve non-state actors**: Not in place

#### Component 5
- **Timely, publicly available results of assessments**: In place
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