



## **Aid coordination for IDP housing in Georgia, 2008-2011**

- **The MRA lacks financial and political support from the executive leadership;**
- **The MRA's poor communication and information-sharing practices belie underlying problems in capacity and government will;**
- **The government and donors could have made a quicker shift from short-term crisis to long-term development funding mechanisms;**
- **Media and communications are seen by the MRA as a tool for self-promotion, rather than as a neutral information sharing mechanism.**

*21 October, 2011*

**Tbilisi** - Transparency International Georgia (TI Georgia) has published a summarizing report about aid coordination for IDP housing in Georgia in 2008-2011. The report documents and consolidates TI Georgia's observations over two and a half years monitoring the provision of durable housing to IDPs. The main focus is on the interactions between four sectors – government, donors, aid agencies and civil society – to understand how the outcomes of assistance are affected.

The report also includes a brief case study of aid coordination in the criminal justice sector, which provides a useful comparative context. TI Georgia focuses on the process of coordinating and implementing criminal justice reform, which spans a large number of government ministries and agencies as well as donors and NGOs. The aim here is to use the comparative context as a launching pad for understanding and improving assistance to IDP housing.

### **The key findings of this study are:**

- The Ministry of Justice is institutionally strong vis-à-vis other government agencies and has an impressive human resource capacity while the Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees (MRA) has less financial and political support from the executive leadership.
- The MRA's poor communication and information-sharing practices belie underlying problems in capacity and government will.
- Both the government and donor approach to durable housing solutions for IDPs treated the problems as acute post-war emergencies, which prevented smooth transition from short short-term crisis to long-term development funding mechanisms. The latter would have forced a more thoughtful and comprehensive approach to the housing for old caseload IDPs.
- Media and communications are seen by the MRA as a tool for self-promotion, rather than as a neutral information sharing mechanism. This contributes to the entrenched politicization of IDP issues in Georgia.

Based on these findings **TI Georgia makes the following recommendations for the government and the donors:**

- The MRA needs to be empowered with greater human and technical resources and the authority to bring relevant agencies into step with its own vision.



- The MRA needs to operate under greater degrees of transparency; information sharing should be further institutionalized into the structure of the Steering Committee at the Ministry.
- IDP housing assistance needs more accurate planning, coupled with the assurance of long-term commitments of funding from donors.
- Donors need to have stricter control over the way funding is spent, especially over the details of projects, and should require stronger evidence-based decision-making.
- The MRA needs to take a more meaningful approach to engaging with media and parties that are critical of it.

**Contact Persons:**

*Nana Lobzhanidze, Transparency International Georgia, [nana@transparency.ge](mailto:nana@transparency.ge), (995 32) 932 129*

*Caitlin Ryan, Transparency International Georgia, [caitlin@transparency.ge](mailto:caitlin@transparency.ge)*

*Lasha Gogidze, Transparency International Georgia, [lasha@transparency.ge](mailto:lasha@transparency.ge), (995 32) 921 403*



OPEN SOCIETY GEORGIA FOUNDATION  
ფონდი ოპენ საზოგადოების საქართველო

This study was made possible by the generous support of the Open Society – Georgia Foundation. The views expressed here reflect TI Georgia’s views only.