



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND REGIONAL ADVOCACY PROJECT IN THE RUSSIAN FAR EAST

FINAL REPORT

MARCH 2, 2010

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Management Systems International.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND REGIONAL ADVOCACY PROJECT IN THE RUSSIAN FAR EAST

FINAL REPORT



A Subsidiary of Coffey International, Ltd.

Management Systems International
Corporate Offices
600 Water Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024



March 2, 2010

Cooperative Agreement No. 118-A-00-06-00084-00

Community Participation and Regional Advocacy Project in the Russian Far East

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Introduction.....	I
Part I: Regional Advocacy – Our Rights Program	2
I. Objectives and Background	2
II. Building skills of advocacy NGOs.....	4
III. Advocating for public reforms.....	12
IV. Promoting advocacy sustainability	21
V. Lessons learned and recommendations for future	31
Attachment I. A – Our Rights Program Targets and Results Achieved	33
Part 2. Municipal Community Alliances Program (MuCAP).....	35
I. Introduction	35
II. Strengthening communities to achieve sustainable economic development	37
III. Strengthening resource centers in building intersectoral cooperation	45
IV. Eliminate barriers between local csos and the local government.....	47
V. Project implementation.....	50
VI. Lessons learned and recommendations.....	62
Attachment 2.A – MuCAP Program Targets And Results Achieved	64
Attachment 2.B – MuCAP List of projects implemented in focus settlements during two stages	68
FISCAL REPORT (for entire project)	72

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to many people for their hard work and commitment to this project over its three-year history. Without their efforts, the project would not have been able to accomplish as much as it did. We cannot list all of their names here, but there are a few we would like to single out.

Firstly, the leaders in civil society, the business community and the mass media that participated in the program should be commended. They ensured continuous activity and promoted dialogue and coordination across all stakeholders. There are too many to name them all here, but we thank them for their unbridled enthusiasm and creativity which produced remarkable results and reforms. Our special thanks go to (in alphabetical order) Lyudmila Baranova, Irina Bogdan, Natalia Evteeva, Tamara Ezhelya, Alexander Ivashkin, Oleg Kaminskiy, Vladimir Kaplyuk, Elena Kholodok, Lyudmila Maximenko, Natalia Mikerina, Irina Nikitina, Vera Pereverzeva, Tatiana Romanchenko, Peter Sharov, Svetlana Sharikhina, Marina Shemilina, Eugeni Shinkorenko, Lidia Titova, Elena Veprikova, Elena U, and many others.

A second group of individuals that worked tirelessly and staunchly against the odds, but achieved much success, were the leaders of the regional Public Advocacy Centers – Larisa Kavun from the Public Organization “Artyom Entrepreneurs’ Council” and Elena Shilo and Nina Polichka from Non-governmental partnership “RFE Legal Resources” -- who took leadership roles and are well-prepared to sustain the efforts begun under the Program. We are also very grateful to the many leaders of the regional and local government authorities who coordinated with our project. In particular, we would like to single out Larisa Demchuk and Mikhail Svishev from the Khabarovskiy Krai Government and Lyudmila Perkulimova from Khabarovskiy Krai Legislature (Duma) who provided strong support throughout all the years of project implementation and built a strong and sustained bridge between the local governments and civil society.

And, of course, we thank the staff of our Khabarovsk project office, led by Natalia Khromova, and assisted by Natalia Alekhina, Natalia Bessonova, Natalia Volgusheva, and Lyubov Naumenko and Olga Likhacheva at ISAR for their dedication, hard work and achievements. Thanks also go to Sergey Pleshakov and his project team at NGO Green House and special thanks to many community leaders participating in the project. Together, these people accomplished important goals to strengthen civic participation in local governance and advocate for reforms that impacted peoples’ lives in a positive way. What they did made a difference.

Last, but not least, we thank Natasha Benediktova and Erin Krasik of the Democracy and Governance Office in the USAID Mission in Moscow for their sincere support and encouragement of this project over the years.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

USAID/Russia's **Community Participation and Regional Advocacy Project** in the Russian Far East produced many successes that have strengthened the foundation for effective citizen advocacy efforts and grassroots initiatives into the future. The project was implemented by Management Systems International (MSI) between September 29, 2006 and November 30, 2009 in Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais. As the name of the project implies, there were two major components: the first part, on community participation, was conducted by NGO Green House (Zeleny Dom) of Khabarovsk, as a pass-through grant which MSI administered. The second segment, on regional advocacy, was conducted by MSI and its major local partners, Initiative Plus in Khabarovsk and the Far East Public Resource Center (I.S.A.R.) in Vladivostok.

The objectives of these two complementary components were to:

1. *Municipal Community Alliances Program (MuCAP)*: Enhance ways for citizens to participate in local governance, promote community-based volunteerism and support the joint efforts of local governments, citizens and businesses around community-driven grassroots initiatives.
2. *Our Rights Program*: Strengthen the capacity of municipal and regional organizations to develop and implement advocacy initiatives that effectively address community priorities and reform policies to improve the quality of life.

Municipal Community Alliances Program

To accomplish its goals, MuCAP conducted a gradual and multi-staged process to encourage and unite the public to address locally designed tasks to benefit their communities. The Program identified 23 target settlements and assisted them to generate development plan. These plans were later used as models for other settlements in the same region. Grants were awarded to local groups and technical assistance through Resource Centers was provided to support implementation of projects elaborated in the plans. Trainers organized activities and workshops for rural activists and local newspapers were selected competitively to disseminate information in the target regions. Additionally, the Program issued a quarterly magazine, *Community and Alliances at the Municipal Level*, which served as an informational umbrella for all recipients. Regular dialogues between activists, rural leaders, regional municipality representatives, and the media were established to build mutual trust and develop common goals that produced increased citizen participation in local governance and many joint projects that benefited the involved communities.

Over the program's three years, activists implemented over 170 projects in the villages of 7 target regions. These projects addressed residential, cultural, and social issues and developed numerous rural enterprises. As a result:

1. Trained activists created new community organizations that settlement leaders and local private entrepreneurs joined.
2. Resource Centers in the regions enhanced their professionalism and credibility, and became crucial stakeholders of the emerging civil society in their areas.
3. The Chiefs of targeted settlements gained pragmatic knowledge and experience in engaging local constituents and utilizing their potential to develop solutions to many local problems. Together with rural activists they created settlement development plans which they implemented.
4. Since the elections of March 2009, new rural managers who enhanced their professional abilities through the Program became settlement chiefs, regional deputies, and members of rural councils.
5. Supported by the program, 15 rural collective enterprises were initiated that employ more than 120 people.

6. At the municipal level, active citizen participation in local governance increased as a result of the Program's activities. In some regions, communal representation in municipalities and public chambers, and targeted civil society programs and municipal grants were created. The first local community development fund sponsored jointly by local entrepreneurs and the government commenced in the Terneyskiy region. Currently, the fund works in three districts of the Primorskiy krai.
7. The School for Trainers began operation, providing training to Khabarovskiy krai professionals who work in rural areas.
8. MuCAP designed a regional program "Increasing public engagement in solving issues of Khabarovskiy Krai urban and rural settlements 2010-2012," which was adopted by the krai Duma in December 2009. NGOs represent the primary force in this regional program.

Our Rights Program

To accomplish the objectives of Component 2, the Our Rights Program conducted activities to:

- Strengthen advocacy skills and capacities of local advocacy groups, primarily through training and coaching
- Support public interest advocacy activities initiated and implemented by local civil society groups, primarily through grants and technical assistance
- Facilitate networking and coalitions among advocacy groups, by convening regional and interregional meetings and encouraging network and coalition building around issues of common interest
- Develop and disseminate advocacy tools and mechanisms and scale-up advocacy activities to reach out to other communities by engaging the local mass media and establishing civil society-local government dialogue
- Institutionalize and build sustainability of citizen advocacy practices in the regions, primarily by establishing Public Advocacy Centers to serve as institutional hubs for future activity.

All program targets were achieved or exceeded over the life of the Our Rights Program:

1. 435 civil society and business groups engaged in advocacy campaigns for legal and regulatory reforms; 34 groups took such action for the first time under the auspices of the Program.
2. 115 advocacy initiatives were conducted of which 55 were adopted or implemented (47.8%). Nine of these initiatives were targeted specifically at improving the quality of life for women and/or youth. All of these initiatives were conducted by coalitions of advocacy NGOs. The reform campaigns were targeted at practical improvements in the budget process, small and medium business development, the environment, housing and communal services, public participation in decision making, healthcare, support for vulnerable groups, land use and urban development, education, and increasing the transparency of authority.

As a result of advocacy campaigns supported by the Program, new regulations have been adopted to open government hearings and encourage public participation in future policies and planning. Administrative barriers to the development of local business have been removed. Citizens have influenced government decisions that would have harmed the environmental status of their communities. Housing and communal service providers have been held accountable for providing quality and affordable work. The rights of pensioners and veterans have been protected. And legal literacy has been strengthened, thus mainstreaming civil, social and human rights and providing citizens with the knowledge to exercise and protect their rights.

3. Almost 38,000 citizens were mobilized by these advocacy campaigns.
4. Over 650 representatives of NGOs and citizen initiative groups received advocacy skills training.
5. 17 regional and interregional events were conducted to encourage networking and coalition building among the advocacy NGOs.
6. Two best practices manuals were developed and disseminated widely to partner groups.
7. Almost US\$11,000 and additional in-kind contributions were made by businesses and business associations to support advocacy campaigns during the last year of the project.

A detailed description of the activities and results of the Our Rights Program are presented in Part 1 of this report. The final narrative of the Municipal Community Alliances Program is presented in Part 2 of this report.

INTRODUCTION

This report documents the activities and accomplishments of the **Community Participation and Regional Advocacy Project** implemented for USAID/Russia by Management Systems International. The project began on September 29, 2006 and ended on November 30, 2009 and was conducted under USAID Cooperative Agreement (CA) No. 118-A-00-06-00084-00.

The project was implemented in two regions of the Russian Far East – Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais -- and had two distinctive major objectives:

- To strengthen the capacity of municipal and regional organizations to develop and implement advocacy initiatives that effectively address community priorities and reform policies to improve the quality of life; and
- To enhance ways for citizens to participate in local governance, promote community-based volunteerism and support the joint efforts of local governments, citizens and businesses around community-driven grassroots initiatives.

To address these objectives, the project was organized into two major components: (1) **Regional Advocacy (“Our Rights” Program)** and (2) **Community Participation (Municipal Community Alliances Program-MuCAP)**.

The Our Rights Program was implemented by MSI directly in partnership with two local organizations: Initiative Plus in Khabarovsk and the Far East Public Resource Center (I.S.A.R.) in Vladivostok. MuCAP was implemented by a USAID-designated local grantee organization, *Green House*, a Khabarovskiy Krai charitable public organization. On the request of USAID, MSI issued an award to Green House on October 20, 2006 and administered this pass-through grant through to its conclusion on July 31, 2009.

These two components had different but complementary goals:

The Our Rights Program supported initiatives that

- advanced citizens’ rights,
- addressed priority issues through effective public outreach and advocacy activities at the municipal and regional levels, and
- facilitated dialogue and networking among civil society organizations to consolidate and coordinate their advocacy efforts.

The MuCAP component

- enhanced ways for citizens to participate in local governance,
- promoted community-based volunteerism, and
- supported joint efforts of local governments, citizens and businesses around community-driven, grassroots initiatives in rural communities.

This report describes the activities and results of each component: The Our Rights component is presented in Part 1. The MuCAP component is presented in Part 2 (it was written by Green House and edited by MSI).

PART I: REGIONAL ADVOCACY – OUR RIGHTS PROGRAM

I. OBJECTIVES AND BACKGROUND

Russia is undergoing a wide range of reforms in many sectors including local governance, housing, health, education, social benefits, among others. Many of these reforms call for or mandate greater involvement of citizens and communities in policy development processes, governance, and public oversight. According to the Federal Law on Local Self-Governance, it is required that citizens participate in developing city charters, identifying priorities for city development, formulating the budget, and monitoring expenditures, as well as participating in other aspects of local self-governance. Public Chambers or Public Councils are being established in many cities and regions to serve as mechanisms for better communication and cooperation between citizens and government. In some regions and cities, public commissions on particular issues (for example, healthcare, education and communal services) have been established to discuss problematic issues and develop effective solutions.

Although citizens are now legally empowered with more rights to participate in policy development and monitoring governmental activities than ever before, the reality of the situation is that they are not often organized and mobilized effectively to be vocal and constructive parties in these processes. Moreover, the government is typically not ready or does not want to encourage public participation and scrutiny. It is still common practice for government to make decisions behind closed doors, ignoring public opinion.

Civil society institutions in the Russian Far East (RFE), as in other regions of Russia, are still in the process of development. Lack of funding sources, high turnover in personnel, lack of coordination, high competition for scarce funding, and lack of information, in combination with insufficient professional knowledge and skills, typically undermine the ability of civil society groups to effectively represent the publics' interests and be a credible advocate for reforms.

Nevertheless, before the Our Rights program started there had been some successful advocacy efforts implemented by civil society and business groups in the RFE region. Several consistent and well organized advocacy campaigns, united by a mission to make government transparent and accountable to citizens, were instrumental in highlighting issues of public concern; mobilizing stakeholders, the general public and the mass media; and pursuing public interests until the issues were resolved.

Still, many advocacy groups lack the knowledge and skills to organize effective advocacy campaigns, competing with each other instead of benefiting from cooperation and synergy. CSOs often lack information about important issues and the experience and action models that can be instrumental for their effectiveness.

Objectives

The Our Rights program, initiated in late 2006 in Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais, was designed to accomplish the following key objectives:

1. Assist municipal and regional groups in implementing priority reforms through effective advocacy campaigns that meet community needs and improve the quality of life;
2. Strengthen the capacity and skills of the local and regional groups and communities to develop and implement effective advocacy campaigns;
3. Establish a viable advocacy group network throughout regions to share experience, increase synergy, and better address multi-level priorities;
4. Develop and disseminate advocacy tools and mechanisms and scale-up advocacy activities to reach out to other communities and enhance the impact of the advocacy effort in the regions; and

5. Institutionalize and build sustainability of citizen advocacy practices in the regions.

Our strategic vision for the Program anticipated the following outcomes:

- Concrete reforms on the regional and municipal levels are implemented as a result of advocacy actions. These include practical and visible improvements in the delivery and quality of public services in the priority fields of housing and communal services, education, the environment, land use, and healthcare, and for groups at risk, as well as more open and accountable processes for budgeting and expending public funds.
- Reforms are implemented and mechanisms established to institutionalize civil society group participation in the local decision making process and in promoting public interests through advocacy efforts.
- Networks of skilled and experienced civil society organizations are established that are capable of advocating for improvements in priority public policy issues at the local, regional and federal levels;
- Effective citizen monitoring and oversight of government operations and decision-making are established, including effective follow-up activities, when required, to rectify problems or abuses.
- Regional Advocacy Centers are established with a demonstrated track record of championing, mobilizing and supporting local groups to develop and implement advocacy activities. The centers are staffed with seasoned professionals who provide technical and legal advice and training to advocacy groups and serve as effective resources of “best practice” in the regions.
- A demonstrated record of effective partnerships and alliances is established among advocacy NGOs, business groups and mass media outlets to advocate for issues that are important to their constituencies.
- A track record of practice and success in citizen advocacy initiatives produces a strong sense of political empowerment – that standing up for your rights can yield results and is a duty of citizens living in a democracy. This sense of empowerment, over time, can reach across a wide range of citizen groups, across many public policy issue areas, and at all levels of government.

Approach

To achieve the objectives and strategic vision of the Program, MSI designed the project with the following major elements:

- **Strengthen advocacy skills and capacity of local advocacy groups.** This component was implemented through extensive and comprehensive training programs and technical assistance provided to local advocacy groups.
- **Support public interest advocacy activities initiated and implemented by local civil society groups.** This was accomplished through financial assistance provided by several grants programs organized by the Program.
- **Facilitate networking and coalitions among advocacy groups.** This was achieved by inviting groups to regularly scheduled regional and interregional networking meetings, disseminating information and advocacy activity results widely, providing local groups with information, and promoting joint action and cooperation.
- **Develop and disseminate advocacy tools and mechanisms and scale-up advocacy activities to reach out to other communities.** Visibility and support for advocacy groups and their activities was accomplished by publicizing their results in the local mass media and with local government,

encouraging the mass media to become an active voice in promoting citizen interests, and establishing civil society-government dialogue and institutions.

- **Institutionalize and build sustainability of citizen advocacy practices in the regions.** Public advocacy centers were established to serve as the hubs for advocacy groups in the regions, providing them with assistance and information, and making advocacy tools and best practices available in conducting advocacy activities.

MSI provided highly experienced and dedicated professionals to lead and manage the project. To ensure local ownership, MSI relied strongly on local professional and groups. The project field office consisted entirely of local staff, while MSI/DC provided part-time technical and administrative support. All training workshops, but one, were conducted by local trainers. Trainers for the major workshops were selected on a competitive basis from around the country, while other training sessions were conducted by local trainers from the project regions. Program meetings were designed to take participant needs, requests, and initiatives into full consideration. The combination of relying on local resources and structuring activities around local needs and priorities were key elements in ensuring local ownership of the activities conducted under the Program.

The results of the Our Rights Program were captured in a series of performance indicators that are presented in Attachment 1.A.

II. BUILDING SKILLS OF ADVOCACY NGOs

A. Needs and capacity assessment

Building and strengthening advocacy skills of local nongovernmental groups was a critical element of the Program. To better address the needs of local groups, we commenced the project by conducting a needs and capacity assessment. Over 110 civil society organizations provided their inputs to the assessment, responding to a questionnaire and participating in focus groups discussions. As well, 14 interviews were conducted with representatives of government and think tanks. The resulting assessment report highlighted existing advocacy capacities of NGOs, government officials, the media, business, other groups, and community leaders, as well as their needs for technical assistance, skills training; small grants, and special assistance. The report also assessed issue area priorities around which advocacy actions might be organized. It identified group needs for building or strengthening their thorough understanding of these priority issues and it pinpointed localities where project initiatives appear to be most required and would be most successful.

This assessment report was broadly disseminated during the interregional meeting in February 2007, at meetings with authorities, through postings on the project's website, via summaries in the project newsletter, and by emailing to a large distribution list. The assessment results guided future technical support provided to NGOs, the training program and the financial support provided through the grants program. Needs and capacities were regularly reassessed during the project through feedback during training and networking meetings and the project's activities were adjusted when necessary to better serve and respond to advocacy groups needs.

B. Developing and implementing advocacy skills and capacity building training program

Our Rights Program Training Courses

The training program was developed based on the results of the assessment. Local advocacy groups indicated limited knowledge and skills in various fields of advocacy. They

Training Programs Conducted

32 trainings organized by the project office with **659** participants (approximately **75%** of participants were women)

229 educational events in advocacy conducted by Program grantees with **7709** participants

demonstrated a need for training in the following topics:

- **Advocacy and lobbying** – how to build advocacy strategies that are closely aligned with an organization’s mission and constituency interests;
- **Citizen watchdogs** – how to develop effective strategies for monitoring, detecting abuse, exposing problems, and advocating for reform;
- **Public outreach** – how to develop effective communications strategies and social marketing;
- **Building coalitions** – how to develop effective alliances, coalitions and partnerships to advocate for change;
- **Sustainability** – how to build sustainable organizations to pursue advocacy missions, financially and technically.

To implement training programs, MSI invited the best available Russian trainers from Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais and throughout the country to participate in a competitive selection process. In total, 659 representatives from civil society organizations improved their skills through participation in 32 training workshops organized directly by the program.

Some 229 more training events were conducted by program grantees and partners with the involvement of 7709 participants.

According to participant feedback collected through evaluation questionnaires, all trainings were successful and useful for most grantees and advocacy groups participating. Brief descriptions of some of these training events are presented below.

- **Training - Negotiation Skills for Advocacy Groups** (*September 28-29, 2007 in Khabarovsk, October 2-3, 2007 in Vladivostok*)

Forty-five participants including program grantees, NGOs, and local government and business representatives of Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy kraia participated in the training. The goal of the training was to build the negotiation skills of advocacy groups, allowing them to better communicate with the government in the pursuit of reform. Participants were trained in various aspects of effective negotiation techniques and learned how to: understand the interests and motivations of



ABOVE: Discussion during the training

Training: “Negotiations Skills for Advocacy Groups”

“I am planning to use the knowledge I obtained during negotiations with authorities and in my teaching and training of students in “Business Communication” and “Conflict Management.” *Carina Konchenko, NF “Far Eastern Center of Economic Education”*

“I absolutely enjoyed the seminar. Such trainings provide you not only with knowledge and skills but with energy to work and create!” *from the anonymous questionnaire*

Training: “Public Participation in Law-making Processes”

100% of participants indicated that they received answers to ALL of the questions and issues they had before the seminar

“Right after the training I plan to learn more precisely the legal documents concerning our settlement and to make suggestions for normative acts improvements” - *from the anonymous questionnaire*

authorities when planning negotiations, plan negotiations and develop negotiation “formulas,” use different strategies and negotiation tactics, reach mutually satisfying agreements, sustain relationships established during negotiations, and follow-up on agreements.

Several interactive role play activities guided participants through all stages of the negotiation process, starting from carefully calibrated planning and development of negotiation

strategies and tactics to conducting negotiations and sustaining post-negotiation agreements. Many participants indicated that they appreciated the training and planned to use it to promote their future advocacy activities.

- **Workshop - Public Participation in Law-making Processes (November 12-13, 2007 in Khabarovsk, November 15-16, 2007 in Vladivostok)**

About 40 representatives from NGOs, the mass media, businesses, and local authorities participated in the training workshop. Participants learned about lawmaking processes, as well as the mechanisms and possibilities for civil organizations to develop local policies and participate in the decision-making process. Local trainers, Dr. Elena Veprikova, Director of the “Far Eastern Center of Social Innovations” and the non-commercial partnership “Civil Initiatives,” and Dina Sharipova, a lawyer with the same organization, brought participants’ attention to the legal documents at the regional and local levels that define public participation in law-making processes. The facilitators also highlighted deficiencies and gaps in current legislation and provided practical advice for the implementation of public participation rights.

- **Training - Business as a Client to NGOs in Advocating for the Public Interest (March 1-2, 2008 in Khabarovsk, March 4-5, 2008 in Vladivostok)**

In December 2007, the MSI Our Rights Program conducted an express survey among grantee organizations to identify their most acute training needs. Over 70% of respondents emphasized that training was needed to help persuade the business community to get involved in public advocacy projects. In response, during March 2008, a two-day training workshop was held entitled *Business as a Client to NGO in Advocating for the Public Interest*.

Participant feedback from the training:

- “Everything was great, especially the high level of professionalism of the trainers. Just perfect!!!”
- “During the training, I got a clear idea of how and whom can I recruit businesses ... and the training inspired me to act, create, implement, and achieve.”
- “The training topic was very vital. You ‘hit the nail on the head,’ ‘have satisfied a thirst.’ Your highly professional trainers have provided us with the necessary information; now it is up to us to use it to the max!

45 participants from both regions participated in the training. Over half were members of the Our Rights Program, while the remainder was composed of representatives of other civil society organizations. Two professional trainers -- Mikhail Savva (from the Southern Regional Resource Center in Krasnodar) and Svetlana Sergeeva (from the Samara regional public organization “Povolzhie”) – conducted the workshops. Both trainers are also members of “Inter-training,” an international organization of trainers and consultants.

During the workshops, participants discussed new opportunities that Administrative Reform could provide for civil society organizations in implementing public advocacy projects; how to build partnerships between NGOs and businesses so they become equal parties in advocating for public and business interests; how to attract businesses to public advocacy activities that are conducted by NGO advocacy groups; and identifying common interests between NGO advocacy groups and the business community, including (a) promoting citizen and business participation in governmental decision-making processes, (b) making government more transparent and accountable to the public, and (c) reducing corruption in government, among others.



ABOVE: Training participants discussing the best ways to dialog with the government.

Participants developed strategies to attract the business community to support advocacy projects. In Vladivostok, training participants expressed a strong need to organize themselves into a coalition of public interest advocacy groups in order to better promote the interests of the Primoriye region.

- **Training - Advocacy through Participation in Governance & Collaboration with Authorities** (*September 23-24, 2008 in Vladivostok, September 25-26, 2008 in Khabarovsk*)

An express survey conducted in February 2008 among advocacy NGOs involved in the Our Rights Program showed that half of them would like to build their skills to establish and maintain an effective dialogue with government and to influence decision making processes.

In response to this request, the project organized a 2-day training workshop in September 2008 on this issue conducted by Mikhail Savva (representative of the South Russia Regional Resource Center and Professor at Kuban State University) and Nina Polichka (Director of Far-Eastern Center of Local Self-Governance, and Professor at the Pacific State University).

At the workshop, the trainers clearly described the structure of government at all levels, and the particular authorities and responsibilities of each level and branch of government. They also pointed out all legal

Training “Collaboration with Authorities”

Participant feedback from the seminar:

“Thank you for the seminar! It is of great importance for my advocacy activities. I wish I could see more representatives of the authorities at such seminars.” - *from the anonymous questionnaire*

mechanisms that citizens have to participate in local governance and decision making processes, as well as the best ways to approach the government and establish fruitful cooperation. With the support of the trainers, participants developed individual and group strategies of collaboration with the federal government and local governance bodies. The participants appreciated the high professionalism of the trainers and well designed and delivered training. Over 70% of the workshop’s participants noted a significant increase in their knowledge on the subject and indicated their readiness to use this knowledge in their advocacy efforts.

- **Training - Public Awareness on Their Rights** (June 1-2, 2009 in Khabarovsk; June 4-5, 2009 in Vladivostok)

In June 2009, Svetlana Rubashkina, a consultant with the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation and the founder of the Center for the Development of Socio-Cultural Projects “Our Trajectory” (Krasnodar) conducted a Public Rights Awareness training workshop. The training was focused on citizen awareness, mobilization, and public participation in advocacy activities. During the training in Khabarovsk, civil society organizations developed ideas for Our Rights Week activities. The objective of the Week was to bring public attention to issues of public rights and educate about citizen rights in various spheres. The Week took place in late September 2009. The Week included various activities conducted by local organizations throughout Khabarovskiy krai. A Festival that was held downtown was also part of the Week. At the training in Vladivostok, participants working in small groups developed plans for NGOs to educate the public about their rights in various critical areas, including the introduction of secondary school education for children with disabilities.



ABOVE: Training participant build strategies to reach out to their constituencies

C. Training provided by local civil society groups with the support of the Program

The Our Rights Program used the capacity and expertise of existing local advocacy groups as trainers for emerging groups. Training sessions were carefully calibrated to the target audience and included help for participants to outline their strategies and work plans for specific advocacy projects they would implement. As well, they received assistance to build constituencies around priority issues in the form of coalitions, task force groups, initiative groups and other relevant forms of coordination and cooperation.

Over 7,709 people participated in 229 training sessions and workshops conducted by local NGOs with the support of Our Rights Program. Training topics included: citizen rights and advocacy related to local policy development local self-governance, the budgeting process, and urban planning; advocating for the rights of ethnic minorities, disabled persons, women, orphans, military draftees, youth, and small entrepreneurs; and advocating for governmental and municipal service delivery in healthcare, housing and communal services, and the environment, among others.

Examples of some of these workshops follow:

- **July 10, 2008, Vladivostok, *The League of Primoriye Credit Brokers* organized and conducted a regional workshop “Financial education of citizens as a critical element in advocating for economic rights”**

The workshop was prepared and conducted in collaboration with the Department of Economics of the Primoriye Administration for **over 160 participants**. The participants represented local credit institutions, civil society organizations, local authorities, and the mass media. Over 300 copies of the brochure “How to escape credit slavery,” which was developed for this event, were distributed to the meeting participants. The conference resulted in a decision to develop and lobby for two laws to improve transparency of financial institutions: a Federal law on brokerage that would regulate brokers’ activities and a regional law on the financial education of citizens. Work groups were formed to work on the draft laws.

- **October 22, 2008, Luchegorsk, Primorskiy Krai, *NGO OKO (Eye)* conducted the seminar “Theory and Practices of Public Self-government Territorial Institutions (STI)”**

The grantee, NGO OKO, in partnership with an NGO, Pacific Coalition, and Luchegorsk local authorities organized a seminar for active residents of residential complexes on establishing STIs. The training intended to develop STI mechanisms in housing and communal services in Luchegorsk. The idea for the seminar was a result of a study tour by Luchegorsk deputies to Birobidgan where they learned about positive experiences of STI development and the role of local self-government bodies in promoting the establishment of STIs. The seminar was conducted by specialists and experts from the Pacific Coalition and co-financed by the Luchegorsk Municipal Committee.

Participant feedback from the training:

- “I am sure these skills would help me in the army. They will also be of great use in any problematic situation in my life” (Anonymous)
- “Before the training I had no idea that I could find a positive side in any negative issue! Now I feel more confident and positive to join Russian army as a soldier” (Anonymous)

For the first time, Luchegorsk authorities organized a public educational seminar on self-governance. Over 50 seminar participants (active citizens, municipal deputies, specialists of housing organizations, and local officials) received useful information on public territorial self-government regulations, learned how to establish STIs and methods of cooperation with local self-government bodies and businesses, and found out more about housing self-government issues.

- **March 27, 2009, Khabarovsk, *NGO Vzlyot* conducted a training session on “Tolerance among Young Draftees in Khabarovsk”**

One of the most urgent issues in the Russian army today is the widespread prevalence of violence against young conscripts. To help address this problem, the NGO “Vzlyot: Center of Military and Patriotic Education” is working with young men in Khabarovsk to help them develop more tolerant attitudes and behaviors before joining the army. On March 27, Vzlyot conducted a youth-led training session on tolerance for second year students from Khabarovsk universities. Part of a six-month project on the “Rights of Military Draftees,” the training mainly addressed issues about the protection of individual rights in the face of senior conscripts and creating good relationships with other soldiers. Under the project, Vzlyot conducted a series of interactive training workshops, site visits to military camps, and a youth festival. Vzlyot also produced and disseminated informational materials on the rights of draftees.

- **March 27, 2009, Khabarovsk, *NGO Mede-Center* conducted a roundtable on the “Role of Indigenous Communities in Sustaining Development”**



ABOVE: Students from indigenous communities report on their findings.

On March 27, the government of Khabarovskiy Krai’s National Community Leaders Retraining Program organized a roundtable on the role of indigenous communities in sustaining development. Among the 40 participants were representatives of several NGOs that were already actively involved in the Our Rights project. Mede-Center, which was implementing a project to educate indigenous people about special legal rights, brought a group of young students who represented indigenous communities to the event. NGOs Gran and Initiative Plus installed an exhibition of more than 200 photos taken as part of the project to document and celebrate indigenous cultures. Government officials assured the participants that their suggestions to modify regional and federal

legislation regarding indigenous communities would be presented to the appropriate authorities.

- **March 28, 2009, Luchegorsk, Primorskiy Krai, *NGO Pervotsvet* conducted the Seminar on “Why should we manage the house?”**

The first seminar in the series of educational events developed and organized by the NGO Pervotsvet under the Public Rights

Such seminars provide us with the possibility to communicate with each other and share experience. Today we learned a lot; for example: what forms of public engagement we can use in everyday work with condo owners; and what additional resources we can attract for the residential improvement.

Awareness grant, “From public initiative to self-government in the housing sphere,” gathered 15 activists. The seminar participants (mainly residential property owners), inspired by the trainer Margarita Tsvetkova, addressed the questions:

Why do condo owners refuse to participate in residential management? and What can we do to engage condo owners in property management? Condo owners shared their experiences and obtained new information on this urgent issue. In the feedback questionnaire, seminar participants indicated that the seminar series assisted them in developing their own approaches for organizing.



ABOVE: Training participants develop approaches to mobilize property owners.

- **Indigenous communities: successes and challenges June 4, 2009, Khabarovsk.**

The informational legal center **Mede-Center** (director Elena U.) and student representatives of ethnic minority groups presented the results of a study conducted under the project, “The Youth of Priamurje: Our Rights – Our Future Students.” The study addressed international and Russian normative legal acts on the status of indigenous peoples at the regional, federal, and international levels. It also collected information on successful activities of ethnic minorities and formed a library of best practices for communities running traditional businesses (fishing, forestry, and reindeer herding).

Twenty five students and professors of Khabarovsk universities attended the study presentation, which raised a number of questions about the legal status of ethnic minorities. Attendees discussed involvement of ethnic minorities in local self-governance within the framework of the FL No.131 on self-governance and limited representation of minority groups despite high concentration of minorities in certain geographic areas. Another issue raised was the absence of proper regulation of “ethno-tourism” in the Law on Tourist Activities which creates obstacles for indigenous communities to develop and run ethnographic tourism activities. Finally, the discussion focused on the lack of benefits for ethnic minorities in remote areas which makes the management of housing, employment and education more challenging. Based on the study and meeting, recommendations to improve the legislation were developed and submitted for the review of the Board of Representatives of the Indigenous Minorities of the North under the Governor of Khabarovsk krai.



ABOVE: Students from indigenous communities discuss recommendations to improve self-governance legislation.

- **June 24, 2009, Garovka-2, Khabarovsk krai, Municipal School of Garovka Town organized and conducted a seminar on “Self-government from A to Z for Rural Town Youth”**

On June 24, 2009, a role play exercise was conducted in a small rural town Garovka-2, located near Khabarovsk. The role play was conducted by the town’s high school as part of the public awareness project, ***The ABCs of Local Self-government*** supported by the “Our Rights” Program. The activity involved over twenty participants – local students, teachers, and working youths. The goal of the game was to practice knowledge and skills received by participants during their participation in a series of seminars on the basics of local self-government as outlined in the FL No.131, On Basic Principles of Organizing Local Self-government in Municipalities of the Russian Federation.

Participants were divided into two groups: ordinary citizens and municipal authorities. Facilitators presented real life scenarios and participants addressed challenges while protecting their interests and obeying the law. Successful findings and inadequacies were discussed after each scenario. Implementers of the project reported that such role plays were efficient tools for raising public awareness on self-government processes. 95% of participants learned new information and deepened their knowledge of how to advocate for the public interest at the municipal level.



ABOVE: Teachers and students learn about legislation on self-governance

- **July 28, 2009, Khabarovsk, The League of Primorye Credit Brokers, seminar “From Homo-Sapiens to Homo-‘Financicus:’ The role of journalists in raising public literacy on finances”**

On July 28, 2009, the first meeting of the Journalists Club took place in Khabarovsk. Financial specialists working on the project, “Advocating Economic Rights of the Public,” discussed how financial literacy could be improved among the general public. Alexander Ivashkin, the Chairman of the League of Credit Brokers of Primorye, the group implementing the project, presented an analysis of modern financial behavior. According to Ivashkin, ordinary citizens have a very limited knowledge of finances. In particular, the public knows very little about activities of financial institutions and available services and products, such as savings, investments, loans, and insurance. People experience financial difficulties every day, starting from simple family budget planning. The reason for that is traced back to their Soviet background and an inability to understand basic principles and schemes of the financial market, as well the nature and functions of financial institutions. It is very important to alter this situation. Journalists and the mass media can play a critical role in this process. Journalists can serve as financial educators and protect Russian citizens from financial frauds. According to Ivashkin, his organization is lobbying for a municipal program that would raise public financial literacy.

D. Training impact and lessons learned

The training program implemented by Our Rights Program played a significant role in educating local groups and providing them with the necessary knowledge and skills to successfully launch and continue advocacy activities. When the program began three years ago, many advocacy groups and organizations of the Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy kraises lacked or had no experience and knowledge of how to implement advocacy activities. They did not know how to start their activity; how to find interested stakeholders or make alliances and coalitions; they had no skills for communicating effectively with authorities and business; and many advocacy groups lacked information on how to raise funds and make their organizations sustainable. The Our Rights Program gave local advocacy groups the opportunity to build their capacity and learn from experiences in Russia and elsewhere. Local experts and consultants were the primary trainers



ABOVE: Learning about citizen economic rights.

As Svetlana Melnikova (a manager of “The Guardians’ Club” from Artyom, Primorskiy krai) said in her training evaluation questionnaire, “Before participation in the “Our Rights” Program trainings I was as a blind kitten not knowing where to go and what to do when advocating for the rights of children, orphans and their guardian parents. The trainings gave me not only the advocacy knowledge but the self-confidence. Now I feel I can do everything!”

As Svetlana Melnikova (a manager of “The Guardians’ Club” from Artyom, Primorskiy krai) said in her training evaluation questionnaire, “Before participation in the “Our Rights” Program trainings I was as a blind kitten not knowing where to go and what to do when advocating for the rights of children, orphans and their guardian parents. The trainings gave me not only the advocacy knowledge but the self-confidence. Now I feel I can do everything!”

Lessons learned in planning, organizing and conducting the training program include the following:

1. **Customization of the training** – Each training session should be carefully tailored to the program objectives and the needs and skills of the participants. While most of the trainers have “off the shelf” training programs, enough time should be allocated to working with the trainers so they can customize the training to address the specific needs of the participants.
2. **Sequence of advocacy training** – Advocacy training programs should be designed to ‘walk’ participants step-by-step along a logical path to build their skills and knowledge, starting from advocacy basics to advocacy campaign design, constituency building, etc. By sequencing topics appropriately and linking them to participant advocacy projects, you ultimately provide not only

practical capacity and skills, but assist participants in implementing their advocacy activities in practice.

3. **Putting together trainer teams** – The best approach for quality training is to use teams of trainers that have long experience working together. At the same time, you may want to mix different trainers from ‘different schools’ or regions to get unique mixes of skills. In this latter situation, it is important to allocate enough time so that the trainers can avoid inconsistencies, repetitions or disconnects in their content and approaches.

III. ADVOCATING FOR PUBLIC REFORMS

A. Providing support through small grants program to CSOs to develop and implement advocacy campaigns

Over the life of the program, seven grant rounds were conducted. In addition, seven targeted grants were awarded to experienced organizations, including two grants to NGOs to serve as Advocacy Centers. By the end of the program, US\$462,000 had been awarded in grants.

In June 2007, the first grant awards were made to NGOs to support advocacy activities in priority areas determined by the Needs and Capacity Assessment. In total, 13 grants were awarded with an average amount of \$6,800 per grant. At the same time, two targeted grants were awarded on a competitive basis to experienced organizations to provide technical assistance and training to advocacy groups on the legal aspects of issues they were advocating for.

In November 2007, MSI awarded grants to six organizations for the implementation of advocacy projects at the provincial level outside of the Primorskiy and Khabarovskiy Krai regional centers. The projects, each averaging \$3,000, targeted efforts to address communal and housing reform, environmental issues, the quality of medical services, public oversight of deputies’ performance, and the rights of marginalized groups. As this grant competition was specifically designed for organizations with limited experience, the grantees received extensive support, including legal assistance, grant management trainings and consultations from program staff.

In February 2008, the Program awarded grants to eleven organizations to address priority areas identified during the Needs Assessments conducted in Year 1. The projects, averaging \$7,600 each, addressed local self-governance, the rights of children and youth, business development, the rights of people with disabilities, the environment, housing and communal services, and healthcare.

At the same time, a media grant competition was conducted to involve local mass media groups in implementing advocacy activities and to encourage collaboration with civil society organizations advocating for citizen rights. One proposal, submitted by Vostok Media, a regional information agency from Primorskiy krai, was supported. This 10 month \$6,935 project started in February 2008 and targeted health problems in Primoriye, in particular, on improving cancer treatment, tuberculosis prevention and providing free medicines for people with cancer.

In April 2008, two targeted grants to the newly established Public Advocacy Centers were allocated, averaging \$63,860 each, to provide training and technical assistance for any groups or associations interested in developing and implementing effective advocacy and lobbying campaigns.

Starting in September 2008 through June 2009, five additional targeted grants were awarded to strengthen reform campaigns initiated during Years 1 and 2 and to initiate new activities. The results of completed grant projects were reviewed and evaluated to identify those that could be transferred to other territories or NGOs, and where additional financial support would likely achieve more effective results. The five selected projects, averaging \$10,000 each, addressed issues of public concern in the following areas: public participation in the

budget process, protection of entrepreneurs' rights, civic participation in urban planning, and public rights awareness.

In January 2009, seven awards averaging \$5,200 each were given to NGOs and municipal organizations to expand public understanding of legal rights and to improve citizen advocacy skills so that they could become active participants in public advocacy campaigns conducted by civil society organizations.

In September 2009, 15 awards averaging \$2,800 each were allocated to NGOs and municipal organizations to implement public rights awareness activities as a part of the Our Rights Week events. The Our Rights Week was held in Khabarovskiy krai from September 28 to October 3, 2009 and aimed to strengthen legal literacy of krai residents on a wide spectrum of human, social, and civil rights, including: rights to participate in local self governance and rights for education, healthcare, social protection and entrepreneurship.

In total, the Our Right Program supported 63 advocacy projects implemented in 10 towns of the Khabarovskiy krai: Khabarovsk, Amursk, Elban, De-Castri, Nikolaevsk-na-Amure, Sovgavan, Khor, Garovka, Anastasjevka, and Nekrasovka and six towns of the Primorskiy krai: Vladivostok, Artyom, Louchegorsk, Ussuriisk, Shkotovo, and Partizansk. The grantees involved over 37,790 people in advocacy campaigns and targeted over 56,100 beneficiaries.

B. Facilitating and providing assistance to civil society organizations to carry out advocacy activities

During the implementation of the advocacy campaigns, all advocacy groups received technical assistance from the project team and its partners and consultants. Each of the 63 supported projects was assisted to develop and effectively carry out its activities, build coalitions and partnerships with other groups and sectors, establish dialogue with the government, and implement effective communication strategies that reach out to constituency groups and gain strong public support. Apart from grant projects, similar assistance was also provided to advocacy groups implementing activities *without* any financial support from MSI.

To institutionalize this technical assistance to advocacy groups, the Program established two Public Advocacy Centers (PACs) within existing NGOs that had implemented effective advocacy campaigns themselves. PAC experts, along with program personnel, provided expert support and coaching for advocacy projects.

In total, over 400 advocacy groups received technical assistance to implement their advocacy activities. As a result of the program and with the support of MSI's Outreach Manager, each advocacy group developed its own project-related Communications/Outreach Strategy that specified its integrated and multi-dimensional approach to public outreach. This approach included active use of the media and the development of media alliances. The program grantees were assisted in implementing their communications/outreach strategies. This assistance included individual consultations on preparing for radio interviews, editing grantee PR materials, developing agendas for PR events, providing grantees with useful materials, linking grantees with journalists, promoting successful PR activities through information products developed by the Program, and promoting the results of grantee projects through a variety of information channels. These efforts resulted in almost 500 media reports highlighting the program's achievements and activities.

C. Impact of advocacy activities

By the end of the Program, program grantees and training participants initiated 115 advocacy campaigns focused on concrete reforms and institutional changes at the regional, municipal and federal levels. The reform campaigns included practical and visible improvements in the following areas of public concern:

- Transparent and accountable budget processes and public access to budget funds;
- Small and medium business development;

Achieved: 47.8% of advocacy campaigns resulted in adopted reforms

- Environment;
- Housing and communal services;
- Public participation in a decision making and law-making processes;
- Vulnerable groups of population;
- Healthcare;
- Land use and urban development;
- Education;
- Increasing transparency and efficiency of authority

Almost half of the initiated activities (55) were adopted by authorities and put into practice, among them: one reform was adopted on the national level, seven reforms - on the krai level and 47 on the municipal and local levels. Many of these initiatives can be replicated in other regions and cities. On the federal level, advocacy groups developed and submitted 11 modifications to federal laws to authorities and one of the federal laws was in fact modified by the authorities to incorporate these recommendations.

Regulatory and governance reforms initiated as a result of strong NGO advocacy efforts that directly addressed community needs, created a sound environment for citizen participation in local self-governance and contributed to improving the overall quality of life. Advocacy activities of program participants had a meaningful impact on lives in the communities they serve.

Several examples of the reforms implemented as a result of advocacy campaigns conducted with the support of the Our Rights Program follow:

Public participation in a decision-making process increased and institutionalized.

4. **Establishment of new Public Councils and Chambers.** Public Councils and Chambers that provide guidance and advice to authorities on specific policy issues were created in several communities and program grantees and trainees became members of these Councils. Examples include the Council on Local Territorial Self-Government Development in Louchegorsk (Primorskiy krai) which consists of representatives from civil society and municipal authorities. The Council can initiate and support public initiatives, review and discuss draft municipal legislation, monitor public opinion on issues in the sphere of territorial and housing self-government, and develop suggestions on how to address these issues more effectively. Creation of the Council was initiated by a local advocacy NGO “OKO” working under the Program. The same organization in partnership with another NGO – Pervotsvet – conducted an advocacy campaign that led to the establishment of the Public Chamber in Pozharsky raion of Primorskiy krai. The Chamber operates at the Raion Legislature (Duma) level and opens the door for civil society to voice its opinion and participate in local policy development and decision making processes.
5. **New regulations adopted for broader public participation.** In several municipalities, new regulations were adopted and existing regulations changed to ensure broad public participation in decision processes. For example, in the rural towns of Anastasjevka and Nekrasovka (Khabarovskiy krai), the NGO Far Eastern Scientific Center for Local Self Government developed model regulations for the budget process that contains mechanisms for taking public opinion into account in decision making process. This model was distributed to 29 municipalities of the Khabarovskiy raion. For decades, local authorities had made decisions that affected life in communities without incorporating public opinion. It took a lot of effort from the project implementers to convince the population that they could influence decision making if they took an active position and worked with government as outlined in the law for local self-government development. Intensive public outreach activities and a series of seminars for citizens were conducted to develop this understanding that people can influence the decision-making process. It was a significant achievement of the project.
6. **New city regulation for open hearings adopted.** Citizens of the city of Sovetskaya Gavan have a rare opportunity now to make direct inputs into future urban development planning for their city.

Thanks to the work of a Program grantee, Ecodal, a new city regulation was enacted that facilitates open public hearings on urban development issues.

Municipal budget processes became more transparent, participatory and accountable, and public access to budget funds improved.

Many projects implemented under the Program targeted budget issues. Budgeting processes are traditionally very formalistic and not open to the public in Russia. Therefore, public access to budget funds is very limited. In general, all of the Program's projects that addressed these issues achieved good results and contributed to an improvement in the transparency and accountability of budget processes. This was not easy, because in some cases authorities were strongly in favor of maintaining the status quo. However, most advocacy organizations that focused on budget issues were experienced and well-respected NGOs that managed to overcome such obstacles and achieve substantial results.

1. **CSO participation in budget planning yielded results.** NGO Public Council of Artyom was successful in facilitating participation of civil society organizations in the budget planning process in Primorskiy Krai. In Artyom, Ussuriysk, and Vladivostok, NGO leaders served as experts at public municipal budget hearings. During discussions with representatives of the local government, NGO leaders employed compelling analytical material and actively sought to safeguard public rights and interests. As a result, 1.5 million rubles from the 2009 Vladivostok budget were allocated to NGOs to conduct cultural activities and to the mass media.
2. **Budget process made open to citizen participation.** Using a new city resolution that allowed citizen groups to participate directly in policy making processes to design new public programs, Khabarovsk advocacy groups headed by the Far Eastern Scientific Center for Local Self Government succeeded in getting two important programs adopted. In December 2007, the Khabarovsk Mayor's office approved two new public programs -- to improve preschool education and construct a new city cemetery. Citizen advocacy groups played a significant role in demanding transparency in budgetary expenditures and promoted these targeted programs. As a result, city funds were used more efficiently and clear accountability paths were established. The city resolution that allowed this enhanced citizen participation in the budgetary process had only been adopted in November 2007 and was also a product of "Our Rights" Program activism.

Private business development in the region is promoted by advocacy activities and active collaboration with Government.

A series of activities implemented under the program targeted business development issues in the region. As a result of a targeted advocacy work by CSOs, several administrative barriers preventing business development were removed, municipal and region level programs facilitating private business development were adopted, and CSO representatives advocating for entrepreneurs rights were invited to become members of newly created public structures influencing business development. Most successes in this sphere were achieved in the Primorye region thanks to the activity of such organizations as the Entrepreneurs Council of Artyom and the League of Trading Businessmen.

1. **New mechanisms and legal bases established.** With active advocacy by civil society organizations, the legislative assembly of Primorskiy Krai passed a law on the Development of Small and Medium Sized Businesses in Primorskiy Krai. In addition, the Administration of Primorskiy Krai approved a plan to create a Council on the Development of Small and Medium Sized Businesses. Marina Shemilina and Larisa Kavun, active members of the Our Rights Program, joined the Council lead by Sergey Darkin, the Governor of Primorskiy Krai. At the September 2008 meeting, the Council discussed the 2008-2010 Plan on the Development of Small and Medium Sized Businesses in Primorskiy Krai. The NGO representatives made significant contributions to the plan.
2. **Primorskiy krai entrepreneurs succeeded in removing administrative barriers.** One of the biggest barriers to business development in Vladivostok was unreasonable fines imposed on local

entrepreneurs. Members of The League of Trading Businessmen monitored the administrative commission's activities and decision-making process under a project grant. Project leaders disputed in court the commission's decisions that if enforced would have adversely affected entrepreneurs in Vladivostok. The court ruled in favor of the entrepreneurs' rights. In addition, the League developed recommendations to amend local legislation to moderate tax regimes for some business activities and succeeded in making authorities adopt this legislation.

3. **Entrepreneurs of Primorskiy Krai succeed in getting Governor to change reporting requirements.** As of January 1, 2008, the requirement for daily reporting of alcoholic beverage sales was changed to a more reasonable monthly reporting schedule, thanks to an effective advocacy campaign conducted by Primorye entrepreneurs working under the "Our Rights" Program. These local businesspeople were mobilized and applied strong and consistent pressure on the Primorskiy krai Prosecutor's office, Arbitrage, General Court, and Governor. Their persistent efforts, combined with conclusive evidence, produced the desired outcome: sales reports are now required only on a monthly basis, as recommended by the business advocates.

Environmental situation in communities improved.

Advocacy activities of environmental CSOs led to concrete improvements in the life of communities, such as ending illegal timber cuttings in Shkotovsky raion (Primorskiy krai), clean up of illegal dumps in the towns of Amursk and De-Castri, and preservation of a park in Khabarovsk. In addition, budget funds were allocated to address environmental issues in both Krai and in the communities of Amursk, Vladivostok and Khabarovsk.

1. **Construction of Vladivostok water treatment facilities started as a result of advocacy campaign.** Advocacy activities were conducted by the Far Eastern Health Foundation as part of the Our Rights Program to promote improvements in wastewater treatment. As a result of their efforts, the Primorskiy krai budget legislation for 2009 included 342 million rubles for the construction of water treatment facilities (WTF), as well as wastewater cleaning activities in Vladivostok. This 2009 budget was nine times larger than in the previous year. The construction already started.
2. **The Khabarovsk community persuaded their Governor to preserve "Dynamo" Park and change the jurisdiction for the park.** Members of the "Our Rights" Project, in conjunction with a large number of NGOs in the Khabarovsk community, staged an effective advocacy initiative that resulted in the regional governor putting a halt to construction plans that would have damaged the natural environment of "Dynamo" Park. Advocacy activists collected signatures, held public hearings and forwarded written appeals to the local prosecutor and mass media to reverse the city's decision to permit construction. Their hard work paid off when the governor passed a resolution that overturned the Mayor's decision and transferred jurisdiction for the park to the regional government where it can be safeguarded against developers.
3. **The Ministry of Natural Resources in Khabarovsk krai developed a program to enhance ecological and environmental literacy.** The Khabarovsk NGO Ecological Fund Amur implemented a project supported by the Our Rights grants program. Under Amur's project, a series of seminars on environmental rights was organized for NGOs, entrepreneurs and average citizens. As a result of their efforts, a new program was developed by the regional Ministry to conduct a set of educational events on environmental issues in several municipalities of the krai between 2010 and 2012.

"We advocated public interests at meetings with city and regional authorities and finally received their support. Both the 2009 city budget and the General Plan for the City of Vladivostok have provisions for allocating budget funds to construct WTF. The main project goal to include financing of WTF construction in Primorskiy krai legislation was achieved," *Peter Sharov, Project Coordinator.*

Housing and communal services provision improved and controlled by the public.

Russia is undergoing a reform in the provision of housing and communal services in accordance with the Housing Code adopted in December 2004. Implementation of some articles of the Code at the municipal level is complicated by the lack of local legislation; the limited understanding of rights and obligations by local authorities, communal services providers and the public at large; and administrative barriers, among others. Informal centers to address these issues were established in Primorskiy krai -- in the towns of Luchegorsk (by NGO OKO) and Artyom (by the Public Advocacy Center), and in Khabarovskiy krai -- in the town of Khor (by NGO Budilnik). While these centers worked locally, they disseminated their accomplishments more widely. As a result, the head of Dalnerechensk town administration requested that NGO OKO extend its activities to his town. Examples of their successes include the following:

1. **Subsidies for public utilities are safeguarded for the underprivileged in the Lazo District (Khabarovskiy Region).** Since January 2008, more than 2000 veterans and pensioners of the Khabarovskiy region's Lazo district have received their proper housing and utility subsidies as a result of advocacy work sponsored by the Our Rights program. By working with local and regional authorities, the implementers stood up for the rights of the underprivileged to vital public services and satisfied their needs. The advocacy initiative ensured that a 50 percent discount was approved by the Head of the Municipal District for local gas supply management and emergency dispatch service for this group of citizens.
2. **The Government of Khor adopted a resolution holding housing and communal services providers accountable to their community.** The authorities of Khor town recently approved a resolution requiring that the local municipal housing services provider be held accountable to the residents of apartment buildings. For the first time in the history of this community, there is a legal document ensuring accountability for residents concerning how payments for housing and public utilities services and how reconstruction plans for repairing high rise apartment buildings are used. The resolution was first approved at the Council of Deputies meeting and later signed by the Mayor of Khor. The resolution was passed thanks to the efforts of the advocacy NGO operating within the framework of Our Rights program.
3. **Activists educated citizens of Luchegorsk to exercise their rights to manage residential property.** Thanks to activities conducted by an NGO grantee under the Our Rights Program, more citizens of Luchegorsk in Pozharsky raion of the Primorskiy Krai actively participate in local self-governance and legal compliance monitoring of housing and public service delivery. Leaders of the advocacy group created a public center to provide assistance to citizens on housing and communal issues and established a Public Council of Home Owners. They also conducted an extensive public education program for homeowners to strengthen their knowledge of legislation and management skills and build awareness of their rights and responsibilities.
4. **Illegal actions of the company providing public communal services were stopped.** In 2007, the mayor of the town of Luchegorsk issued an executive order that awarded a no-bid contract to a company that provides communal services. This company provided very poor services, increased service fees without justification, did not provide needed utilities repair work, and installed water meters in leaking pipes forcing citizens to pay for wasted water. To stop these bad practices, NGO OKO and the Public Council of Home Owners of Luchegorsk conducted advocacy activities that mobilized citizens to stand up for their rights and pressed government to fix the problem. However, despite all their efforts, the local government did not take any corrective action. As a result, the advocacy groups appealed to the Primorskiy Krai

Pozharsky raion authorities asked NGO OKO to educate homeowners of the raion to strengthen their knowledge of housing legislation and management skills. For the first time in the raion's history, an NGO was offered money from the budget to conduct such training. *Svetlana Sharikhina, OKO Chairperson*

Federal Antimonopoly Administration. This body recognized the public's concerns and submitted a legal claim to revoke the contracting decision made by the Luchegorsk Mayor.

Legal literacy in a wide spectrum of human, social, and civil rights strengthened.

Knowing and understanding your rights is the first step toward protecting them. Many projects targeted literacy in legal rights and educated thousands of people via seminars, workshops, lectures, forums, role plays and other activities. These efforts led to concrete improvements that began early and continued after the program concluded.

1. **A course on human rights was re-established at elementary schools of the Primorskiy krai.** In the mid-1990s, a human rights course was conducted at the majority of Primorye's elementary to high schools. However, in the 2005-2006 school year, the course in the elementary schools was withdrawn from many schools and by 2008, it was almost completely ended. The major reason was a lack of educational materials and qualified teachers. Teachers, in contrast, recognized a need for the course and interest of students in the subject. At the same time, the NGO Primorye School of Human Rights and Primorye Institute for Teacher Re-training recognized the need for such a course and the continuing interest of students. They sought to resolve the problem by conducting the following activities:
 - Developed, published, and distributed 2000 copies of a textbook, "My Rights," in Primorye schools. The textbook now serves as the key informational resource for the elementary school course on human rights.
 - Conducted professional training of 135 teachers for the human rights course. The training continued throughout the school year.
 - Educated 360 children in summer camps.

As a result of their work and advocacy efforts, the human rights course was re-established at all elementary schools of the Primorskiy krai.

2. **Civil society leaders protected financial interests of Primorye residents.** During the global financial crisis, financial security issues became very important to citizens. Since February 2008, financial experts, led by Alexander Ivashkin, the Director of the NGO the League of Credit Brokers, have conducted public education activities to improve the financial literacy of citizens.

Thanks to knowledge received at seminars and trainings conducted by the Our Rights Program, we won a labor dispute in court on November 20, 2009. For the first time, the Prosecutor took our side. Besides, we managed to convince the Prosecutor to create a Public Council for his office. Members of our organization will participate in this Council. *Lydia Titova, President, NGO Nadezhda, De-Castri Town, Khabarovskiy krai*

This activity is part of a project implemented with the support of the Our Rights Program. The League of Credit Brokers established a committee that developed a set of proposals for regional authorities to create a system of financial education and protect public financial rights. Educational seminars, meetings with representatives of financial institutions, and a brochure entitled "Ways to Avoid Credit Slavery" became very popular in Primorye. This group has also drafted and submitted to the Vladivostok City Administration a program to build a positive image of financial institutions in Vladivostok and improve public financial literacy by 2012.

3. **Over 16,000 people were educated in legal rights within the Our Rights Week in Khabarovskiy krai.** The Our Rights Week was held in Khabarovskiy krai from September 28 to October 3, 2009. The Week was conducted within the framework of the Our Rights program. The event was also sponsored by the Human Rights Representative in Khabarovskiy krai and the Department of Information and Public Relations at the Khabarovskiy krai Government Administration. The Week

was organized to strengthen the legal literacy of krai residents on a wide spectrum of human, social, and civil rights, including the right to participate in local self-governance and rights for education, healthcare, social protection, and entrepreneurship. During the Week, activities such as workshops, master classes, roundtables, film screenings, discussions, debates, contests and quizzes were conducted in several cities and villages of the krai. Free legal consultations were available for citizens. Overall, 14 NGOs organized 90 activities during the Week reaching out to over 16,000 people. Over 20 news reports about the Week were published and broadcast in media outlets.

Interests of vulnerable groups of population protected.

The Program worked with a variety of vulnerable groups – pensioners, veterans, minorities and the handicapped. Several informal centers were created to provide assistance to these groups. The Primorye Advocacy Center (Artyom) provides assistance and consulting to pensioners and veterans, NGO fund Soldier (Ussuriysk) specializes in military veterans and their families, a Khabarovsk coalition “We are Together,” led by NGO ARIDONS, helps handicapped people, NGO Mede-Center (Khabarovsk) gives free legal advice to indigenous minorities. All of these organizations continue providing assistance in their focus areas even beyond the conclusion of the Our Rights Program. Examples include:

1. **Civic activists in Ussuriysk (Primorskiy krai) defended the rights of families of deceased soldiers.** Families of 35 soldiers who died while serving in Afghanistan, Chechnya, and while working for the Department of Internal Affairs received financial assistance amounting to 10,000 rubles from the municipal budget. The decision of the legislature of Ussuriysk Municipality on December 23, 2008 made this possible. That decision amended the municipal program, “Social support to citizens of Ussuriysk in 2007-2009,” by establishing a fixed amount to be allocated from the municipal budget for one-time aid to families whose male family members served in conflict hot-spots and were left without breadwinners. The advocacy activities of the NGO Soldier, supported under the Our Rights program, were responsible for making effective demands on government that resulted in these payments. Recently, a coalition of 21 veteran organizations – the Military Fellowship of the Far East – created on the initiative of NGO Soldier, appealed to the legislative assembly of Primorskiy krai to provide financial support to widows and children of deceased soldiers throughout the region.
2. **100 pensioners of Artyom received an increase to their monthly pensions** through the efforts of the Primorye Advocacy Center. A group of pensioners contacted the Center because they had heard that the monthly pension of some relatives of Pension Fund employees had increased by 600 rubles. Pensioners wondered if this was favoritism, why it was done, and who was liable for such an increase. First, they contacted the Pension Fund, but did not receive any response. The Center clarified that, according to Law No.173, “On labor pensions in Russian Federation,” pensioners who have dependants are eligible for a pension increase of 600 - 1800 rubles depending on the number of dependants. The Center prepared a model appeal to the Pension Fund and an information leaflet and disseminated this information in the city. As result, pensioners received the increase to their pensions, as guaranteed by the law. Experts of the Advocacy Center believe that information had been concealed from pensioners.

D. Involving the mass media in public advocacy activities

During the first year of the program, the Communications and Outreach Strategy was developed to facilitate broad and timely information dissemination about program opportunities, promote interest by citizens and groups in the communities, and attract more participants to the program. The Strategy was revised and updated over the life of the program to ensure that channels for information dissemination were kept open and that appropriate messages were presented. The revised Strategy focused on working effectively with the media and included conducting a journalist contest, encouraging the media to participate in the grants program, involving the media in advocacy training so they could better understand the issues and tools,

facilitating a dialogue between advocacy groups and the media, and institutionalizing the advocacy culture among journalists through the creation of a journalists' club. In addition, it outlined approaches to engage the media, media organizations and journalists in program activities.

Journalist Contests

The Journalist Contest was conducted three times over the life of the program. This contest encouraged reporters to write about successful advocacy initiatives and initiate their own advocacy campaigns. In total, 82 applications including with over 580 materials highlighting advocacy activities were submitted to the contest. The topics addressed by contest participants varied from local issues to topics of regional and federal importance. Examples include the rights of miners in a small Primoriye town left unemployed after their employer closed the mine, challenges of life in the Russian Far East, rights of homeless people in Khabarovsk, challenges in the development of local self-government in RFE communities and in Russia as a whole, Housing Code reform and its implementation, de-forestation in the RFE, and many others.

The materials were carefully evaluated by an impartial evaluation committee consisting of six respected media experts and one MSI staff member. The table below shows statistics per contest rounds:

Round	Number of applications	Number of winners	Number of materials	Award pool
1 (FY 2007)	23	8	167	\$1,000
2 (FY 2008)	31	12	219	\$2,000
3 (FY 2009)	28	10	203	\$2,000
Totals	82	30	589	\$5,000

Contest participants demonstrated significant progress over the three years in their understanding toward advocacy issues. For the first two rounds, all the submitted materials highlighted advocacy activities implemented by others, while materials submitted for the third round included reports on advocacy initiatives carried out by the journalists themselves. We feel that the program contributed greatly to this advancement since, from the very start, journalists were actively involved in program activities, such as trainings, discussions, roundtables, contests, and direct interactions with program staff and grantees.

Roundtables and discussions for journalists and advocacy groups

Over the life of the program, seven roundtable/discussion sessions for over 130 mass media representatives were conducted to raise their interest in and understanding of advocacy concepts and to motivate lobbying for positive change in communities. Program grantees, local advocacy groups, authorities, business representatives and other interested parties were invited to participate and discuss hot social issues, share opinions, and develop ways for the media to support or initiate advocacy activities. The meetings prompted quality publications and reports on issues of public interest. For example, a meeting about budget monitoring resulted in three newspaper articles and one radio broadcast; and discussions about the role of mass media in promoting civil society resulted in six articles on the internet.

Public Interest Club for Journalists

On June 28, 2009, a group of journalists in Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais established a professional club to facilitate collaborative work to address advocacy issues. The idea to form this media initiative originated during an advocacy workshop conducted by the program. The core members of the Club consist of journalists that participated in program events since the very start where they gained valuable experience, understanding of advocacy concepts and a need to share this knowledge with others and to discuss new issues and achievements with colleagues. Uniting in a club allowed them to institutionalize their activities and provides hope that journalists will continue working on advocacy issues after the program ends.

The Club met three times before the program close to discuss economic rights and financial advocacy issues, upcoming events on increasing public rights awareness, and their participation in the Civil Society Forum of Primoriye. These meetings resulted in a series of publications on the internet and in newspapers.

Grants to media

In October 2007, a media grant competition was announced that encouraged local mass media groups to implement advocacy activities and collaborate with civil society organizations. As a result of their joint activities, seven applications were submitted and one was awarded: Vostok Media, a regional information agency from Primorskiy krai, was selected. The project started in February 2008 targeting health problems in Primorye, in particular, on improving cancer treatment, preventing tuberculosis, and providing free medicines to cancer patients. As a result of two advocacy campaigns they targeted to improve healthcare services at the municipal and federal levels, one reforms was enacted by local authorities at the municipal level; now, 11 drug stores in the city provide free medication to those who are entitled (before only two drug stores did this) and most hospitals have special rooms and personnel who provide citizens with prescriptions for this free medication (earlier no separate rooms and personnel were available).

In addition, a website "Health in the Far East" (www.zdv.su) was established and became a powerful source of information serving about 600 people daily and the number is growing. The site brings together information from many organizations that provide medical care, municipal healthcare organizations, NGOs, and the mass media focused on healthcare issues, promoting healthy lifestyles, drawing public attention to healthcare problems in Primorskiy krai, and providing information regarding preventive healthcare for such diseases as tuberculosis, hepatitis, AIDS, and others.

Grantees working with the media

Through the program and with the support of MSI's Outreach Manager, each program grantee developed its own project-focused Communications/Outreach Strategy that specified an integrated and multi-dimensional approach to public outreach. This approach included active alliances with the media. As a result, grantees were frequently invited by journalists and media outlets to provide interviews and informational materials. As well, reporters regularly participated in grantee events and reported on the issues and the results of advocacy activity. Targeted work with journalists resulted in series of articles highlighting program grantee's successes.

In addition, good working relations were established with the biggest TV channel in Khabarovskiy krai – First Krai TV Gubernia, and a major radio station – DVTRK Vostok Rossii. Program events were highlighted in news programs of these channels, and grantees and MSI staff were invited to speak about advocacy efforts concerning ecology, housing and communal services, and pre-school education. Experts of the Khabarovsk Public Advocacy Center were invited as well.

IV. PROMOTING ADVOCACY SUSTAINABILITY

A. Facilitating the creation of coalitions and networking

Networking

The Our Rights Program succeeded in establishing a network of advocacy groups in the two regions by providing opportunities for groups to share their experiences and facilitating and encouraging groups to partner on implementing advocacy projects. The regional and interregional networking



Above: During the Roundtable in Khabarovsk

meetings became important channels for them to unite around advocacy issues of common interest. Between 2007 and 2009, the Program organized eleven regional and interregional networking sessions. At these meetings, grantees and other interested parties shared information about their projects and exchanged ideas about overcoming obstacles.

During the second year of the Program, some networking meetings were conducted in close cooperation with the Program's two Public Advocacy Centers (PAC). The PACs organized roundtable discussions concerning critical issues and offered capacity building training in conjunction with the meetings. In addition, PAC experts provided input to and review of all advocacy projects discussed during the meetings. The beneficial nature of these regional network meetings is illustrated below by descriptions of May 2008 sessions in Khabarovsk and Vladivostok.

Khabarovsk. Twenty four representatives of grantee organizations operating under the program from the krai got together on for a networking meeting. It started with a training session on citizen rights in Russia and ways to protect those rights organized by Nina Polichka, leader of the newly established Public Advocacy Center in Khabarovskiy Krai. This was followed by presentations of results from the grant projects and concluded with a roundtable meeting attended by representatives of the executive and legislative krai government agencies. Among the participants were the Krai Ombudsman and the representative of the Krai Prosecutor's office, and students from the Far Eastern Academy of State Services.

At the training session, Mr. Vovk, the Director of the regional All-Russian public movement organization For Civil Rights, discussed how citizen rights are defined in Russian and international law. Based on his personal experience, he described the difficulties that civil society organizations often face in defending and advocating for citizen rights. Ms. Polichka deepened the topic by talking about the governmental system in Russia and existing mechanisms for implementing and protecting citizen rights.

Following the presentations, participants described their advocacy projects through a legal lens. They described the government institutions they work with that are responsible for implementing laws in their sector. This discussion helped everyone understand how to be more effective when conducting their advocacy activities in the future.



Above: A.G. Yurtaev: "Being a deputy, I cannot work without the NGOs."

At the roundtable with government officials held on the second day, participants presented the results of their work and also provided the government with concrete ideas and recommendations. Among them were the following:

- Reduce the minimum number of signatures required for introducing legal initiatives into the Duma of the Khabarovskiy krai (currently 4,000 signatures are required). This will provide more opportunities for citizens to initiate new legislation.
- The Krai Duma should draft and enact local legislation to support implementation of federal self-governance laws. Analysis conducted by NGOs showed that local legislation currently supports only about 30% of the requirements set by the federal law.
- Local legislation should be amended so that 15% of local procurements are set aside for nongovernmental organizations representing disabled people.
- Draft and enact a comprehensive normative act to regulate the system of providing social services.

Representatives of government who attended this roundtable promised to support civil society organizations and to promote their initiatives.

Vladivostok. A similar networking meeting was held in Vladivostok with 31 participants in attendance.



ABOVE: A. Ivashkin, the Chairman of the Credit League Brokers of Primorsky Krai

Natalia Khromova, MSI Program Coordinator, opened the meeting with a presentation about the latest program achievements and plans for the next period. Her presentation was followed by remarks by representatives of the Primorsky Krai Administration, Mr. Smirnov and Mr. Evtushenko, and the Deputy of Municipal Duma, Mr. Yurtaev. They emphasized the important role of NGOs in establishing and developing civil society and expressed their interest in further cooperation with NGOs.

On the first day of the network meeting, grantees presented the results of their completed and ongoing projects. Marina Shemilina from the League of Trade Entrepreneurs reported that under their project several legislative drafts and amendments supporting entrepreneurs' rights were prepared and passed to the Primorsky Krai Duma. Mr. Kaplyuk from

the Foundation "Soldat" reported that they promoted a normative legal act to protect the rights of families of military personnel who perished in local wars.

Experts from the recently established Public Advocacy Center in Primoriye, Ms. Kavun and Mr. Varkulevich, analyzed the activities presented, gave examples of the work of other organizations, and provided their recommendations to make advocacy activities more effective.

The second day of the meeting was devoted to a seminar, Lobbying for Public Interests, conducted by Ms. Kavun. Participants reviewed the legal basis for lobbying activities and discussed approaches for organizing and conducting lobbying campaigns. Ms. Kavun shared her practical experience in promoting normative acts, illustrating her presentation with examples from her organization, Artyom Citizens' Council. Mr. Ryabov, the Chairman of the Primoriye Lawyers' Association, talked about his experiences in organizing advocacy campaigns. Participants were also provided with technical assistance on how to work with the mass media to generate media reports supporting public interests. In particular, participants learned about writing and distributing press releases, inviting media representatives to events, and preparing materials for the media.



ABOVE: Workshop participants prioritize citizen rights they want to dedicate their work.

During the third year of the Program, two inter-regional networking meetings were conducted in which the two regional PACs had ultimate responsibility for the meetings. The meeting in February 2009 brought together program participants from both regions to discuss the results of activities implemented by the program and advocacy groups, as well as further developments in joint effort to advocate for practical approaches toward local self-governance. Issues of common interests and concerns were discussed. The last interregional network meeting was conducted in June 2009 and united over 100 participants from Khabarovskiy and Primorsky kraia. At the meeting, participants discussed approaches to address advocacy issues and share experiences among Far Eastern advocacy activists. Representatives of regional and local authorities, the mass media, and business actively participated in the workshop as well. Participants were split into four workshops to discuss advocacy concerning the right to quality housing and communal services, the

right to participate in local self-government, environmental rights, and economic rights. Each workshop participant got a set of handout materials on different advocacy issues, including *Advocacy: from Idea to Reality*, a report illustrating the Program achievements.

After participating in these workshops, journalists from Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais met separately to establish an entity so that they could address advocacy issues more effectively. The club was named *Journalists for Public Interest* and the first meeting was scheduled for July 29, 2009, in Khabarovsk. That session focused on economic rights and financial advocacy. Aleksandr Ivashkin, Chairman of the League of Primorye Credit Brokers, was the keynote speaker.

The June advocacy workshops generated coverage in the national, regional and local mass media. Examples of can be found at the following web links:

http://www.asi.org.ru/ASI3/rws_asf/asi.nsf/va_webpages/0B8727FAD4767607C32575E5001C807FRus

<http://www.nakhodka-city.ru/news.aspx?id=9515&lang>

http://vladnews.ru/2554/Novosti_sobytiya/Zhurnalisty_na_strazhe_prav

<http://www.tatar-inform.ru/news/dv-fo/2009/06/29/173793/>

<http://www.vog.su/top/news/region/319767>

Coalition building

Outside of the networking meetings, grantees and local advocacy groups created coalitions and working groups around particular advocacy issues, such as urban development, participation in local self-government, communal service delivery, healthcare, and the environment, among others. In all, 63 advocacy groups in Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais united 372 local organizations around their activities. The NGO Real Help in Khabarovsk, the Primorsk Public Fund for Social Support and Protection of Veterans Soldat in Ussiriysk, the NGO ARIDONS in Khabarovsk, the NGO OKO in Louchegorsk, and the Public Advocacy Centers in Primorye and Khabarovskiy krai are among others who established effective coalitions (over 10 coalitions in total). MSI facilitated these partnerships as part of the grant application process by requiring grantees to collaborate and provide status reports to each other.

For example, NGO Real Help opened branches in other cities of Khabarovskiy Krai to help parents of children with mental disabilities protect their rights. The Director of the Real Help, Natalia Evteeva, used training and networking meetings organized by the Program to promote ideas that attracted partners and stakeholders. The Deputy of Elban town, Ludmila Vasilenko, and Our Rights grantee Nadezhda, Lidia Titova, became interested in the work of Real Help and initiated parent groups in their hometowns; now, parent groups in Elban and De-Kastri are functioning as local branches of the Real Help. The Elban branch established close relations with the town administration, the Department of Social Service, local deputies, and the business community. The town administration provides the group with a meeting room, while private business owners have sponsored a New Year's Eve 2009 party for children with disabilities. The De-Kastri branch also established good relations with local authorities and interested parties.

Another example of coalition building involved the Fund Soldier. While implementing their grant project, they established the Far East Military Veteran Coalition and 21 veteran organizations joined. According to the director of the project, V. Kaplyuk:

“All the coalition members united around the project. They actively contributed to the development of a municipal program ‘Support Families of Veterans Who Died in Local Wars and Armed Conflicts 2009-2012 in Ussiriysk.’ The project helped to build credibility of the Fund Soldier and, as a result, many citizens and veterans started contacting the Fund seeking help to protect their rights. We have also visited military units, educational institutions, and public organizations to raise public awareness and discuss our problems.”

Overall, the networking activities of the “Our Rights” Program contributed to the development and growth of cooperation among local non-governmental advocacy organizations in the two regions.

Information dissemination

To ensure effective day-to-day communication among advocacy groups, MSI used a variety of mechanisms including a website, listserve and weekly highlights, as well as success stories and newsletters.

Website. The Our Rights website (www.advocacy-ru.org) was updated regularly during the course of the project. The website provided information to NGOs on improving their advocacy skills. Through the website, groups could share their experiences and best practices, and publicize program results. All materials developed within the program were available on the website, including materials developed by many grantees. Information was organized by advocacy topic: local self-government, the budgeting process, housing and communal services, urban construction and city planning, ecology, health, education, social defense, entrepreneurship, and public credits. Over the life of the program, the website had 46,738 visits and 511,005 hits.

List-serve. On a weekly basis, the Our Rights team summarized the results of project activities and distributed the report to 276 subscribers. In addition, success stories, press releases, announcements, and project materials developed by grantees were distributed on a regular basis through the list-serve.

Weekly Highlights. Since April 2008, Weekly Highlights were disseminated widely through the list-serve and the website. Weekly Highlights provided brief information on activities conducted during the past week, an activity schedule for the upcoming week, and major achievement of grantees.

Program newsletter. For the life of the program, nine issues of the program newsletter were disseminated in hard copy and posted on the website. The newsletters highlighted project achievements, program events, success stories of grantees, activity plans for the next quarter, etc. They were broadly disseminated in the region to civil society organizations, research groups, think-tanks, business organizations, the media, local government, and NGOs in other regions.

Success stories. Forty success stories highlighting achievements of program grantees were prepared and distributed electronically via the listserve and the website. In addition, success stories were distributed in hard copy during meetings and presentations with the mass media, authorities and other stakeholders.

Public Advocacy Centers:

- Over **400** advocacy groups served
- **28 reforms** on municipal, regional and federal levels initiated, **22** of them **enacted**
- **13 training sessions conducted** involving almost **300 participants**
- **6 advocacy brochures** developed, published, and disseminated

B. Institutionalizing advocacy by establishing Public Advocacy Centers

As indicated earlier, two Public Advocacy Centers (PAC) were established to institutionalize an “advocacy culture” in the regions and ensure that advocacy technologies, skills, and assistance continued to be available after the project ended. The Centers are staffed by local professionals who have been trained and can promote advocacy and watchdog activities through best practices.

These PACs were established within reputable local NGOs - “RFE Legal Resources” (Khabarovskiy Krai) and “Entrepreneurs’ Council of Artyom” (Primorskiy Krai). These organizations were selected on a competitive basis in June 2007 to work initially as Legal Support Centers. In March 2008, based on successful performance evaluations, the Centers were asked to broaden their services and turned into PACs, officially starting work in April 2008. The PACs serve as information and resource centers, and provide training and technical assistance for any groups or associations interested in developing and implementing effective advocacy and lobbying campaigns.

Examples of the PAC's achievements include:

Khabarovskiy krai

- The activities of practitioners of alternative medicine are now protected by law in Khabarovskiy krai. Alternative medicine is very popular in the Russian Far East among local people and has been in existence for centuries. At the same time, there was no law regulating registration and activities of practitioners. For several years, these practitioners tried unsuccessfully to legalize their activities, but without success. They applied to the Khabarovsk Public Advocacy Center, which reviewed federal and local legislation and appealed to the krai government with a request to adopt a law to legalize the activity of these practitioners. The government responded to the appeal and adopted the law.
- As a result of PAC advocacy, the Khabarovsk City Cemetery will now be maintained by the city as required by the law. Before, the city budget did not include cemetery maintenance costs; instead funds for maintenance were collected from funeral agencies, but this violated existing legislation. After the advocacy campaign organized by the Advocacy Center, the city budgeted the costs for cemetery maintenance officially.
- PAC advocacy resulted in the initiation of monitoring activity by the Territorial Department of the Federal Anti-Monopoly Service in all municipalities of the Khabarovskiy Krai to detect and eliminate cases of monopolies in the funeral services market. This became possible after long and intensive efforts of the Advocacy Center to protect the interests of private funeral companies, whose businesses were significantly limited due city-supported monopolists in funeral services.
- A municipal procurement to improve information coverage of the City Duma was announced as a result of Advocacy Center efforts to increase municipal authority transparency.
- A municipal procurement to conduct *Monitoring of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Khabarovsk City until 2020* was stopped due to numerous violations in announcing the bid, which were revealed by the Advocacy Center. A new procurement was announced after all necessary adjustments were made to comply with Federal legislation.

Primorskiy krai

- As a result of PAC work with local deputies, citizen law-making initiatives became easier to implement in the city of Artyom. The number of signatures needed for initiatives to be considered by the authorities decreased from 150 to 50.
- Illegal construction was halted and the rights of multistory building residents were protected as a result of Advocacy Center representation in the court. The Mayor's decision that authorized construction in the territory was cancelled and construction stopped. The Advocacy Center also provided guidance to residents on the proper ways to register their communal property rights to avoid future legal issues.
- As a result of PAC activities, the Artyom administration modified the way it plans and executes the city budget. Earlier, all reports of the City Administration on budget spending had to be formally approved by the Duma, but the Primorye Advocacy Center conducted a comprehensive monitoring of budget expenditures which revealed a large number of discrepancies. In response, the City Administration was required to correct the discrepancies and submit a revised budget report for the public review. The charter of Artyom City was amended to legalize budget approval by the Duma.
- The draft decision of the Artyom City Duma on establishing tariffs for the lease of land plots contained many opportunities for corruption. The PAC recommended 13 modifications to the draft, thus eliminating these loopholes. Eight modifications were accepted in the adopted version

- The Primorye PAC successfully presented new approaches for public scrutiny of draft City Duma decisions. In the future, PAC experts will be invited by the Duma to review all draft resolutions before they are officially enacted. In addition, the Duma invited Ms. Larisa A. Kavun, the head of the PAC, to join the Commission responsible for the review of resolutions on a regional level.
- According to the law, entrepreneurs who rent municipal facilities for over a year have the opportunity to purchase them. However, in practice, entrepreneurs cannot afford to purchase such facilities without a loan. The PAC and the Public Council of Primorye Entrepreneurs prepared and lobbied for a law that allows entrepreneurs to purchase municipal facilities that are leased continuously for 5 years. The law was adopted by the Krai Legislature.
- The PAC became an active member of an internet community of experts that monitors state and municipal orders. The community was founded after the PAC created a blog in the Live Journal (<http://gull-25.livejournal.com>) about its analysis of corruption in the municipal budget that attracted much public interest. Currently, experts are developing a joint strategy to monitor the public budget.
- Two coalitions created by the PAC -- on housing and utilities service (HUS) issues and entrepreneurial interests -- continued to work after the project ended protecting interests of targeted groups. Currently, the HUS coalition unites seven organizations and the coalition of entrepreneurs unites five organizations.
- The Artyom City Administration placed property rented by entrepreneurs up for sale without giving any purchase opportunity to current tenants as legally required. The PAC in Primorye addressed the Arbitrage Court to protect the entrepreneurs. The Court suspended the decision of the Administration.
- Municipal services in the city of Artyom are more transparent with fewer opportunities for corruption as a result of modifications to the City Charter that were adopted by the Municipal Legislature. The PAC developed six recommended modifications, four of which were adopted.
- The Artyom City Legislature issued a decision on approving tariffs for housing and communal services. This decision violated a Federal Law On Protecting Competition. The PAC brought this issue to the attention of the City Prosecutor. As a result, the Legislature's decision was cancelled. According to the Prosecutor, tariffs for housing and communal services should be negotiated between a service provider and a recipient, as was initially advised by the PAC.
- Municipal property privatization regulations in Artyom and Federal Law No.159 fail to provide clear definitions of a "fair lessee." This lack of clarity creates opportunities for corruption and slows down the municipal privatization process. The Artyom City Administration adopted a PAC recommendation to define "fair lessee" as "an entrepreneur who is without any rental fee debts." As a result, the municipal property privatization process in Artyom became one of the most effective in Russia – 87% of all applicants for privatization were approved by the City Administration.
- The work of Artyom City Administration's Department of Public Appeals has been improved as a result of comprehensive monitoring of the department's work by the PAC. Their recommendations were submitted to the City Administration and presented at the meeting of Artyom Public Chamber. Citizens now will receive concrete answers to their appeals within a specified time.
- Small business development in Artyom will be enhanced and simplified as a result of PAC advocacy on behalf of a group of entrepreneurs that complained about the complicated legislation that regulated small businesses. Some regulations contradicted others and supervising

agencies were not coordinate with each other complicating reporting. The Advocacy Center analyzed these legislative regulations for small business and developed recommendations for improvement. As a result, a working group of authorities and Advocacy Center staff was created to develop new unified municipal regulations for small business.

- As a result of an advocacy campaign conducted by the PAC, the Court of the Primorskiy Krai clarified that citizens can address government institutions directly if they think that the rights of citizens have been violated. According to this decision, even if citizen statements are false, they cannot be fined for “slander.” This decision will significantly facilitate future advocacy campaigns.

C. Developing Advocacy Guides and Advocacy Training Course

Advocacy Guides

Two Advocacy Guides were created and published with the assistance of program grantees, qualified specialists and program staff. The first, entitled *Advocacy Guide*, describes the basic elements of advocacy efforts and discusses advocacy practices implemented by the program’s grantees during Years 1 and 2. Seven priority areas are covered by the Guide: (1) public participation in the legislative process; (2) public participation in the budget process; (3) municipal procurement, (4) urban development; (5) housing and communal services delivery; (6) promoting institutional participation in local self-governance; and (7) protection of environment and natural resources. A group of twelve principal authors from existing grantees prepared descriptions of their projects, detailing issue areas, planned results, techniques, obstacles and lessons learned. 150 copies of the Guide were disseminated among grantees and trainees at program events in September 2008, and then further distributed to CSOs and other interested parties in both regions and throughout Russia in electronic format. The electronic version of the Guide was also posted on the program website.

The second guide was entitled *Advocacy Best Practices Guide* and was published in September 2009. This Guide linked together advocacy training topics with the projects implemented by grantees. Advocacy trainers, PAC experts, grantees, and MSI staff constituted the team of authors. It consists of two parts. The first provides information on major advocacy techniques, such as:

- General aspects of advocacy;
- Legal aspects of advocacy activities;
- How to effectively work with authorities;
- Coalitions, networks, and partnerships;
- Negotiation skills;
- Sustainability of advocacy NGOs; and
- Public relations strategies for advocacy NGOs.

The second part of the Guide was devoted to practical examples from the work of the program grantees. The 13 projects described in this Guide cover multiple areas, including public participation in budget planning, free healthcare services, the rights of people with disabilities, environmental issues, entrepreneurship, economic rights, housing and communal services, and the rights of veterans. This Best Practices Guide was broadly disseminated to a wide range of CSOs, authorities, and other interested parties in both regions and throughout Russia, including online distribution through the Program website.

Advocacy Training Course

Another capacity building tool for advocacy groups was the Advocacy Training Course. This course had several training modules including:

- Advocacy Strategy Development
- Citizen Watchdogs

- Coalition and Partnership Building
- CSOs as Participants in Law-making
- Public Outreach
- Business as a Partner in Advocacy Activities
- Collaboration with Authorities
- Sustainability for Advocacy NGOs

For each module, the program developed all materials to conduct the training (agenda, training plan, handouts, information resources for trainers, etc). The course was disseminated through local advocacy trainers from both regions in November 2009 at the Training of Trainers meeting organized by the Program. It will continue to be used to build the capacity of less mature advocacy groups.

D. Promoting financial sustainability for advocacy activities

Several mechanisms were established in the regions to sustain the activities that began under the Program. For example:

Governmental and municipal support

Khabarovskiy krai

- A legal concept “On the development of non-profit sector in the Khabarovskiy krai” was developed by a working group of program grantees and Governor appointees. The Concept incorporates opportunities for the financial support of NGOs via governmental procurements. To implement this Concept, several regional laws need to be developed and adopted. So far, a regional law “On support of NGOs’ activities” was developed by a group of Program grantees. Apart from non-material types of support, the law provides NGOs with preferential treatment when participating for regional social service provision tenders. The law was actively lobbied through the Krai Legislature by the Department of Relations with Political, Public and Religious Organizations of the Krai Government.
- A coalition of organizations uniting handicapped people, called “We are Together,” in cooperation with the regional government, developed a comprehensive program of support for handicapped children. This multi-million program incorporates different approaches to support handicapped children including the allocation of direct funding to NGOs providing assistance to these children. It is expected that the Program will be adopted for implementation in 2010-2012.
- The Committee on Sport Development and Healthy Way of Life of the Khabarovsk Administration conducts a grant program but, according to existing eligibility criteria, can give grants only to educational institutions and teenage clubs. NGO Vzlyot, a program grantee, developed an alternative grant program regulation that allows any NGO to be eligible for grants from the Committee. At this time, these regulations are being reviewed by the authorities and are likely to be adopted.
- The Krai Government supports the activities of NGOs on ad hoc basis by allocating financial and non-material resources. For example, approximately US\$10,000 were allocated for conducting an NGO Forum in October 2008. In addition, excellent premises to conduct the two-day Forum were provided. Meeting rooms and conference halls in the Government Building were allocated free of charge for NGO purposes. The Government appears ready to cooperate with NGOs, but this support is not yet institutionalized.
- Several program grantees won grants from the President of the Russian Federation to continue activities started within the program. For example, the biggest presidential grant allocated to an RFE NGO, for 6 million rubles, was given to NGO Real Help that began their advocacy activities under the Program and developed into a mature advocacy organization protecting the rights of the

handicapped. Under this Presidential grant, Real Help will broaden its activities to other marginalized groups and work in several raions of the krai.

Primorskiy krai

- The Governments at the municipal and krai level are ready to pay NGO advocacy specialists that worked under the Program for training sessions on advocacy aspects presented to broader audiences. For example, Alexander Ivashkin, President of NGO League of Credit Brokers of Primorye was invited by the Krai Administration to conduct seminars all over the krai to educate the population on financial market issues that people face in their every day lives. Svetlana Sharikhina, President of NGO OKO, was offered the opportunity to educate homeowners of the Pozharsky raion to improve their knowledge of housing legislation and management skills.
- Residents of Vladivostok generally are not knowledgeable of the financial market and consumer credit system that has resulted in a large number of defaults and "credit slavery." Under the initiative of a program grantee, NGO "League of Credit Brokers of Primorye," a Program on the Financial Education of Citizens was developed. The program is likely to be approved and implemented by the city government in 2010.
- Governments at the municipal and regional levels have replicated advocacy materials developed by Program grantees and distributed them in their territories. For example, Artyom's budget process analysis, prepared by the Primorye Advocacy Center was replicated by the local Legislature and disseminated among deputies. The Ministry of Education, as well as the Ombudsman of the Primorskiy krai, replicated a textbook for elementary schools – "My rights" – developed by NGO "Primorye School of Human Rights" and disseminated it to targeted audiences.
- NGOs in Vladivostok did not receive any funding from the city budget even though the projects they implement often concern priority areas for city residents. NGO Artyom Public Council worked with city authorities to gain financial support for NGOs and as a result, 1.5 million rubles were allocated from the city budget to fund NGO projects dealing with sport and cultural events

Business

Khabarovskiy krai

- Khabarovsk Public Advocacy Center provided free advocacy support for funeral businesses. When the Program ends, these businesses have agreed to pay for PAC's services. The entrepreneurs were impressed with the results of PAC's advocacy services when a number of administrative barriers were removed that resulted in a significant savings of time and money. As a result, PAC continues to protect the interests of funeral businesses at the municipal, regional and federal levels on a paid basis.
- NGO Nadezhda (De-Castri town) conducts a variety of advocacy activities concerning the environment, local self-government, citizen watchdog activities, and the rights of marginalized groups, among others. Local businesses see and appreciate the concrete results of these activities that have made De-Castri a better place to live. Their appreciation has resulted in regular in-kind and material donations to implement advocacy activities. For example, a private business paid for a helicopter to transport a journalist from Khabarovsk to De-Castri to write about oil spills in a bay. Another business provided Nadezhda with paper and ink cartridges to publish their advocacy bulletin "I am a De-Castri citizen." Another company involved in the food business provided products for coffee breaks for all meetings and seminars of that Nadezhda conducts.
- NGOs protecting the interests of handicapped children raised in-kind resources from businesses by conducting regular public awareness campaigns in their communities. For example, NGO ARIDONS got a big tent and chairs from the Coca-Cola Company to present films in a city park about handicapped people and their problems, and another company provided free food and

disposable dishes for participants. NGO Real Help attracted a business trainer to conduct a free workshop on leadership to handicapped children. Transportation companies provided these NGOs with free services on a regular basis.

Primorskiy krai

- Louchegorsk NGO “OKO,” specializing in housing and communal issues, established productive relations with the Housing Company that services multi-storied buildings. The company provided free office space for OKO and the company’s employees (economists, engineers and lawyers) became members of the Public Council established by OKO. They continue to provide essential information on housing issues to the Council and to participants of tenant training sessions conducted by OKO.
- NGO League of Credit Brokers of Primorye conducted seminars on financial issues and economic rights and received room rental gratis from several financial institutions interested in the League’s activities.

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE

Program experiences over the three years have yielded many lessons that can be applied to similar programs in the future to promote civil society advocacy. These include the following:

- Networking, coalition building and regular open communications among NGOs, the media, businesses, and government can produce a basic understanding of common interests held on issues of importance to each sector which can enhance the success of advocacy campaigns aimed at reforming laws, regulations and procedures.
- Identifying advocacy leaders or “champions” in particular issue areas or regions is essential to serve as a catalyst and rally the efforts of other groups.
- Many advocacy outcomes can be scaled up successfully from the municipal to the regional and the national levels if the appropriate legal/regulatory frameworks are well understood and key decision makers are identified at the next level to carry the mantle.
- Capacity building training efforts can be extremely useful to develop skills and motivate advocacy action by NGOs. Incremental and customized planning for such training can help to target the primary needs of the participants, taking into account the varying levels of experience and past training of each group.
- Establishing Public Advocacy Centers as regional advocacy resource groups were critical in providing a Russian face to the activities and providing a solid foundation and institutional base for future training and sustainability.
- It is critical for advocacy NGOs to develop effective alliances with the media to promote dissemination of information about their advocacy campaigns, but also to engage journalists in associated investigative reporting.
- Advocacy successes boost the sense of efficacy among participants – that they can have a real impact – and this begets more advocacy attempts and more successes.
- It is essential for advocacy groups to focus on particular issue areas, not only becoming experts in the laws, regulations and procedures concerning those issues, and also developing a public image as the experts. Thus, training programs for advocacy efforts need to address the substance and content of targeted issues, as well as institutional and advocacy skills development.

- Advocacy programs such as this one need to incorporate components on financial sustainability early in the implementation process so that groups can comprehend the need for forward planning, develop the strategies, gain the skills, and nurture the likely sources of future support in government and the business community. It takes the development of trust, understanding, acknowledgement of common interests, and dialogue among various stakeholders to build the foundations for financial sustainability of advocacy groups.

ATTACHMENT I. A – OUR RIGHTS PROGRAM TARGETS AND RESULTS ACHIEVED

	Lifetime target	Achieved results
Objective 1: Assist municipal and regional groups in implementing priority reforms through effective advocacy campaigns that meet community needs and improve the quality of life		
Result 1.1 : Legal, and regulatory and governance reforms initiated as a result of growing NGO advocacy efforts that address communities' needs, create a sound environment for citizen participation in local self-governance, and contribute to improving overall quality of life.		
1. Number of target civil society/ business community groups advocating for legal and regulatory reforms.	40-50 groups	435 groups*
2. Number of policy initiatives carried out by targeted civil society/business community groups.		
a. initiatives identified and conducted	30-40	115
b. initiatives that were adopted by authorities and put into practice	20-30	55
Result 1.2 : Citizens are engaged in public life in their communities		
1. Number of citizens mobilized by advocacy campaigns	1,500-2,000	37,793
Objective 2. Strengthen the capacity and skills of the local and regional groups and communities to develop and implement effective advocacy campaigns		
Result 2.1 : Advocacy groups are equipped with skills, knowledge, and practical experience in better understanding and prioritizing community interests, and designing and implementing effective advocacy campaigns.		
• Number of target civil society/ business community groups undertaking advocacy activities for the first time	10-15	34
• Number of NGOs and citizens groups receiving advocacy related trainings directly from Program	120-150	504**
○ Total participants (men/women)		659 (147/512)
Result 2.2 : Strengthened capacity of women and youth NGOs to advocate for their rights		
Number of advocacy campaigns initiated to improve quality of life for women and youth	6-8	9
Objective 3. Establish a viable advocacy group network throughout regions to share experience, increase synergy, and to better address multi-level priorities		
Result 3.1 : A network of strong and integrated advocacy groups established throughout the region that share experience and interests, build strength, and consolidate regional and municipal level advocacy efforts to more effectively address priorities on municipal and regional levels		
• Number of events or activities in which a partner group demonstrates cooperation, coordination or collaboration with at least one other organization or institution		

	Lifetime target	Achieved results
a. % of all advocacy activities under the project conducted by collaborative groups of CSOs	50%	100%
b. regional and interregional events that involve most of the participating advocacy groups and resulting in joint position statements	15	17
Objective 4: Develop and disseminate advocacy tools and mechanisms and scale-up advocacy activities to reach out to other communities and enhance the impact of the advocacy effort in the regions		
Result 4.1.: Best practices on developing and implementing advocacy campaigns are developed and available for other communities based on successfully implemented advocacy efforts and assistance from advocacy groups in implementing these tools		
1. Number of Best Practices materials produced and distributed by targeted partner groups	2	2 (and 40 success stories)
2. Number of activities held by advocacy groups on how to implement advocacy tools	15	229
Total participants		7709
3. Number of publications highlighting best practices (media reports)	300	499
• Grantee-generated publications		212
Objective 5: Institutionalize and build sustainability of citizen advocacy practices in the regions		
Result 5.1 : Mechanisms for citizen participation in decision-making processes established and institutionalized		
1. Number of government-civil society-business mechanisms for cooperation and action developed	5-8	51
Result 5.2: A Public Advocacy Center established to continue serving communities and provide information, training and technical assistance to groups and associations helping them to effectively advocate for their interests		
1. Number of support services provided and groups served by Public Advocacy Center (PAC)	50	407
Result 5.3 : A Business Forum for Public Policy established to activate the business community around the business community around issues of concern to them and to encourage donation of financial resources and in-kind contribution into an Advocacy Grant Fund to support future advocacy initiatives		
• Total amount of financial and in-kind contribution from business and business association raised to support advocacy campaigns during Year 3 and 4	10% of grants program = \$46,200	US\$ 55,591 (\$10,957 raised + \$44,634 in grantee cost-share)

Notes: * Some groups were involved in multiple advocacy campaigns
 ** Some groups were involved in multiple training sessions

PART 2. MUNICIPAL COMMUNITY ALLIANCES PROGRAM (MuCAP)¹

I. INTRODUCTION

From October 2006 to July 2009, the NGO Green House and a group of partner NGOs implemented the Municipal Community Alliances Program (MuCAP) in seven target regions of Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krajs. The Program was funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through a grant administered by Management Systems International (MSI) under the Community Participation and Regional Advocacy Program.

Overall, the objective of the MuCAP project was to encourage community development and entrepreneurship activities that would improve living conditions in poorly developed regions and settlements.

The Program operated under the following basic principles:

Step by step approach: a gradual and multi-stage process to encourage and unite the public to address a difficult set of tasks;

Funding of activities: the Program invested in areas determined by settlement organizations and trainers. Green House did not exert any influence on the selection process.

Focus: the Program was elaborated through development plans produced by the target settlements. A development plan for each focus settlement was later used as a model for other settlements in the same region.

Control: in each focus settlement and target region, the Program and MuCAP partners promoted a development plan and helped to implement the plan through technical and financial support.

Systemization: Program activities in each focus settlement fit within the framework of the development plan, allowing the Program to concentrate and allocate resources efficiently.

To implement the Program, several practical instruments were employed:

Resource Centers (RC), created on the basis of existing regional NGOs, implemented technical initiatives in target regions. Trainers organized activities in focus settlements. The Program provided training and guidance to RCs and trainers.

Through a competitive process, Green House selected local newspapers to provide informational support in the target regions. Additionally, the Program issued a quarterly magazine, *Community and Alliances at the Municipal Level*, to create an informational umbrella for all recipients.

RCs and educational centers implemented the educational component of the Program, helping rural activists obtain the experience required for the Program.

Activists, rural leaders, members of regional municipalities, and media representatives met on regular basis to improve team work of RCs.

The following results were achieved over the three years of the Program. RC specialists and trainers received training in the techniques and approaches created and designed specifically for the Program. For three years,

¹ Part 2 was written by Green House and edited by MSI.

activists implemented over 170 projects in the villages of seven target regions. The projects addressed residential, cultural and social issues and developed numerous rural enterprises. As a result:

1. Settlement leaders and local private entrepreneurs joined new organizations developed by trained activists. Many organizations registered as nonprofits. In two years, these organizations engaged 15% of the population in focus settlements;
2. RCs that implemented the MuCAP enhanced their professionalism and credibility, and became crucial stakeholders of the emerging civil society in their areas.
3. Chiefs of targeted settlements attained pragmatic knowledge and experience in engaging local constituents and utilizing their potential to develop solutions to many local problems. Together with rural activists, they created a settlement development plan for each settlement. Plans became the primary force of development in most target villages;
4. A group of rural professionals were generated by the Program. Elections in March 2009 saw a number of these new rural managers, who had increased their professional abilities through the Program, become settlement chiefs, regional deputies, and members of rural councils.
5. 15 rural collective enterprises now employ more than 120 people, including but not limited to, the center of household services in Zaozerne (15 jobs), a tailor shop for national clothes and souvenirs in Krasny Yar (17 jobs), and the community farm "Hope" in Korfovka and Nicholas-Lviv (30 jobs);
6. At the municipal level, support and cooperation with the active population in regions increased. In some regions, mechanisms such as communal representation in municipalities, municipal grants, public chambers, and targeted civil society programs were formed. The first local community development fund sponsored by local entrepreneurs and the government opened in the Terneyskiy region. Currently, the fund works in three districts of the Primorskiy krai.
7. The Program created technical projects on rural development in Khabarovskiy krai and other regions. A School of Trainers started operation. The School provides training to Khabarovskiy krai professionals who worked in the local rural areas. The MuCAP designed the regional program "Increasing public engagement in solving issues of Khabarovskiy Krai urban and rural settlements

GLOSSARY	
MuCAP/Program	The Municipal Community Alliances Program.
Target region	Municipal region where the MuCAP operated.
Focus settlement	A settlement that received MuCAP intellectual, financial, and nonfinancial resources. A settlement where MuCAP helped rural NGOs to implement a development plan and conduct trainings.
Rural/settlement organization	An organized group of activists in a focus settlement that includes a settlement chief, local social leaders, entrepreneurs, deputies, and Program trainers.
Settlement development plan:	A 2-3 year work plan focused on socio-economic of a settlement.
Resource center (RC)	An NGO that works in a target region according to an Agreement with Green House.
Program trainer	RC specialist or short-term consultant trained by Green House, who works in a focus settlement. helps/he helps to organize a settlement forum, create a settlement development program, achieve programmatic goals and objectives.
Investment project	A project to form a collective production or business in a focus settlement such as farming collectives, cooperatives, partnerships, etc.
Social project	A project that focuses on cultural issues, improves public services, supports youth initiatives, etc.

2010-2012." The Legislative Krai Duma voted on the program in December 2009. NGOs represent the main force in this regional program.

The targets and life-of-project results for the Program's quantitative performance indicators are presented in Attachment 2.A.

II. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES TO ACHIEVE SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Goal 1 of the project was to build up the communities through joint efforts of all their members, participatory mechanisms, and multisectoral cooperation to achieve economic development and sustainability.

Training took place in settlements of target regions concerning: a) self-governance system, b) internal forces of economic development and stability, c) communication systems among the media, the government, and public institutions, and d) influence on regional municipal institutions and the region as a whole.

Objectives 1 and 2: Identify community leaders and facilitate organization of action teams around community leaders. Transform initiative groups into rural organizations.

The Program started with a search for community activists in 42 settlements in seven target regions through small or "blind" grants. RCs established in each target region conducted the work. This grant round resulted in selection of 19 focus settlements. From October 2007 until July 2009, trainers systematically conducted Program work in 19 focus settlements, in addition to four other settlements selected on past performance basis and experience with USAID. As result, rural organizations launched in all focus settlements. The chart below lists selected settlements:

Krai	Region	Settlement
Khabarovskiy Krai	Lazo	Sldima, Durmin, Mukhen
	Nikolayevskiy	Mago, Krasnoe, Innokentyeva
	Amurskiy	Voznosenskoe, Litivko, Izvestkoviy
	Khabarovskiy	Mirnoe, Korsakovo, Topolevo (Zaozerno), Bichiha
Primorskiy Krai	Terneyskiy	Amgu, Ust'-Sobolevka, Plastun
	Pozharskiy	Pozharskoe, Nagornoe, Svetlogorye, Krasniy Yar
	Ussuriyskiy	Dobropol'e, Korfovka, Aleksey-Nikolskoe
Total:		settlements

- A) Each rural organization had a unique structure. Generally, activists united around common goals or a single charismatic leader with experience in project management and public administration. Members of settlement organizations were a) rural chiefs, who often lead various organizations, b) local entrepreneurs c) municipal leaders d) RC employees (if RC office was located in the settlement), e) active citizens with a sense of responsibility and required skills, and f) rural and district deputies.

Rural organizations were formed in the first two years of the Program. Organizations were formed at the same time as development plans for focus settlements. All rural organizations in the focus settlements created a 2-3 year settlement development plans. Trainers and rural chiefs helped to create development plans for rural municipalities. This was the most important stage of the Program as a whole. Before settlement development plans were created, action groups which were formed

during the “blind” grant round were the only active groups in focus settlements. However, after draft settlement development plans were created, a process which took four to six months, fully functioning rural organizations emerged. Rural organizations were responsible for involving community members and residents in the development programs, self-governance (i.e. the processes of decision making and problem resolution in their respective settlements), investment and social projects. After only six months of work on the settlement development plans, changes in the focus settlements became noticeable. Although the changes were not always immediate or clearly perceivable, all the subsequent activities and conflict resolution which took place in the focus settlements were a result of these transformations. As a result of the Program’s activities, a strong sense of community and participation evolved among the residents of focus settlements, one that was encouraged and reinforced through the end of the Program.

In order to accomplish specific projects, some rural organizations split into work groups according to the number of projects to be implemented. Although these groups worked on separate projects, they united at organizational meetings. Other organizations defined a single goal and concentrated on one project. Moreover, organizations had different approaches when working with the public. For example, the settlement organization of Nargonoe organized 30 families to complete a series of projects to build a fence for local public pastures, a settlement water station, and children playgrounds. In the neighboring Svetlogorie, projects were more diverse. One youth group repaired a sports facility and built a sports hall, and a second womens group helped to increase the capacity of local newspapers and television outlets. Despite their differences and a certain degree of autonomy, these two groups became partners because they worked with the same settlement chief and two settlement leaders. Thus, each settlement organization retained a unique organizational and communication structure as well as public recruiting policy.



ABOVE: An indigenous costume sewing workshop got a new start with the support provided through grants program

- B) When preparing development plans, settlement organizations took into account all ideas, suggestions, and data of internal resources. In addition, organizations conducted marketing research and organized fundraising events. These efforts helped to determine the most important issues confronting each settlement, which the organizations and the local population intended to solve through the Program. The primary goal of each plan was to achieve sustainable development of the relevant rural settlement. One settlement organization interpreted the concept of sustainable development as engaging youth, whereas others chose to invest in certain local economic sectors, or to include residents in planning and improving public services and local self governance. Every rural organization, proving the adequacy of the existing and requested programmatic funds, had the ability to accomplish development plans. During the course of the Program, accompanied by intensive and specialized training sessions, 19 of the 23 organizations achieved planned goals. Some organizations were able to create a foundation for sustainable development and improve results over time. Other focus settlements, where democratic foundations had not been established, needed further assistance.

A successful example was set by the Topolevo settlement where, from 2004 to 2008, the amount of taxed property increased by 13 times, the administration became more active and rural organizations in the Zaozernoe and Matveevka settlements (part of the Topolevo municipality) were established. The development plans for Topolevo and Zaozernogo were also approved, and activists became even more involved in projects. Topolevo received two awards for the best rural municipal

settlement in Khabarovskiy krai and in Russia as a whole. By the last year of the Program, Topolevo was excluded from the list of target settlements as it no longer required outside support. A strong self-governing system funded by local entrepreneurs had emerged in the settlement.

In Pozharskoe and Mukhen villages, local residents became more socially active, forming public boards, and organizing cultural and sport events. Additionally, as a result of the Program's investment projects, two factories for the production of sidewalk material opened. However, despite these significant improvements, the economic wealth in these settlements has not been stable because a strong democratic foundation had not yet been established. More time and funding are necessary to sustain economic and political stability in these rural areas.

Despite these shortcomings, the above-mentioned settlements and several others were prime examples of establishing a foundation for future success through technical and hands-on training of rural activists in addition to the support of local government, settlement residents, and entrepreneurs. Future pragmatic development plans could bring economic and social stability to these villages. Regional programs to support small business were launched. As a result of the Program, newly established municipal grant programs supported a large part of the rural organizations in further development of self-governance, business, and cultural projects.



ABOVE: The Head of Mukhen settlement, Director of newly established side block production workshop, and the Coordinator of the MuCAP grants projects in Pozharsky raion cut the ribbon symbolizing the start of a new workshop.

- C) As the development plans were being drafted, rural organizations had to reconnect and establish new relationships with each settlement and regional local governments (OMCY). A number of issues which arose during the Project implementation were resolved with the assistance of regional deputies, chiefs, and regional administration specialists. Projects initiatives would not be achieved without extensive involvement of regional authorities. Collaboration with the local settlement authorities commenced in the focus settlements during the first year, where the first point of interaction was between the local authorities and the settlement organizations.

Additionally, the work of settlement organizations attracted the attention of the regional press, who was also concerned about the future of rural settlements, and the goals and tasks of the Program. Utilizing public relations skills, settlement organizations began to develop their own informational publications, including village newspapers, bulletins, journals, video clips, and television broadcasts. Through media support, organizations also intended to help professional journalists and journalistic education centers. The joint efforts of the rural organizations and journalists established the foundation for future partnerships.

During the Program, MuCAP recipients supported other regional organizations, such as RCs and trained NGOs. Rural organizations attended NGO conferences in Khabarovskiy krai and regional meetings. Finally, a large number of the settlement organizations (12 of 23) registered as NGOs. These organizations then officially entered the regional NGO community and Green House network. The relationship between the settlement organizations and the other NGOs improved as a result of the Program.

Working meetings, programmatic trainings and conferences, and everyday activities deepened the partnership among settlement organizations. In addition to improving the quality of life in the region, rural organizations strengthened their position in focus settlements and the region.

- D) During the 2-1/2 years when settlement organizations were created, local activists evolved into community-oriented leaders who formed successful institutions. Rural organizations formed regional alliances. Settlement leaders and chiefs, and work groups that operated in many different settlements, were strongly involved in the establishment of alliances. Organizations began to work closely with one another, putting interests of an individual settlement aside in favor of a more communal and region-wide perspective. Towards the end of the Program, settlement organizations began to evolve into public council associations. Public councils were established in the Amurskiy, Lazo, and Lozharskiy regions. A Council was also ready to open in Terneiskiy region. However, these councils did not have a significant influence at the regional level because of this lack of experience and time constraints to meet all objectives of the Program and ensure the sustainability of mechanisms introduced by MuCAP.

Almost all settlement organizations adopted the model of public councils led by settlement chiefs. The first forum to adopt this model was Mukhen. The RC Sodtrudnechestvo drafted operational rules for the public council that were later approved by the chief of Mukhen. The public councils gave settlement organizations official status, enhanced their power, formalized the rights and duties of members, and made cooperation between organizations and settlement chiefs indispensable. The public councils were also a form of self-governed settlements alongside elected officials, chiefs, and deputies. Participation in the public councils was restricted not only to active project participants, but also to Project initiators and interested citizens. The operational code established election mechanisms for council members, rotation schedules, and reporting duties. Thus, at the public council, members addressed problems, possible solutions, and potential projects. Furthermore, members worked on making joint decisions to overcome challenges. In those settlements where rural organizations relied on established “street committees”, their positions were notably stronger than those without such committees. Street committees, in turn, were basic, grassroots units of self governance that united the residents of their communities.

Thus, the village chief gained support of activists who worked on implementing the development plan and establishing strong self governance despite limited availability of resources. As a result of the Program, citizens were able to better understand the work of the settlement leaders, and settlement leaders gained valuable perspectives, on the interests of their constituents. At the same time, the leader was fully aware of constituents needs. As noted by an expert who conducted external monitoring, “the character of the interrelations between the residents and the representatives of local self governing bodies, especially at the settlement level, indicates a high degree of trust, constructiveness, and creativity. In practically all focus settlements, residents would tell me how fortunate they were to have such a settlement chief, and in turn, settlement chiefs would admit how lucky they were to have such constituents. It is the first time I have seen such unanimity.”

Result 1.1: Increase the number of citizens who strive to improve the quality of life in their settlements

The projected quantitative results were achieved under the following circumstances: in 2008 in 23 focus settlements, 5860 people implemented 46 projects, with an average of 127 people per project, 254 people per settlement, and 14% of the settlements population (total of 42,043 people). These figures only represent those people who were actively involved in project implementation. There was also an even gender balance of local participants, with 52.5% male participants, and 47.5% female participants. This statistic demonstrates that projects goals were important for the entire community. Almost half (48.9%) of participants were middle age professionals, which shows that these projects were valuable and economically important to the local population. The Program allowed youth (42.1%), and pensioners (9%) to participate. These numbers speak to

the early successes of the measures enacted by the settlement organizations, as well as to the success and stability of these organizations themselves.

In 2009, 2441 people implemented 27 projects in 19 focus settlements, with an average of 90 people per project, 128 people per settlement, and 6.8% of the settlement population (total of 36,129 people). This year the gender balance remained the same. 73% of the participants were adults. The percentage of the active population fell, due to a) the natural course of events in which not all people were able to volunteer continuously (the small number of those who did volunteer were truly passionate about community development); b) a net outflow of young people; and c) a smaller number of projects and more specific technical specialization. On the other hand, experts believe that the number of involved residents from any focus settlement should not be expected to exceed 3-5%. According to the Director of the Russian Academy of State and Municipal Management in Moscow, S.N. Yurkovoi, a situation in which 10% of the population was active would almost constitute social upheaval or revolution. At the end of Year 2, the Program had more participants than projected by experts. Thus, despite the fact that the number of active participants declined during the course of the Program, its achieved results still exceeded “normal” and expected levels.

Result 1.2. Systematic development of settlements according to plans designed by the settlement organizations

The projected quantitative results were achieved. In order to develop the settlements systematically, settlement development plans were created. In many settlements, previous chiefs and/or specialists had developed 3-5 year plans to promote social-economic growth. These plans intended to provide directions for regional municipalities and established a reporting requirement to ministers or deputies of the regional office for economic development. These programs did not consider public engagement in addressing the needs of their own settlements. Overall, settlement development plans brought together settlement chiefs, local deputies, businessmen, directors of local institutions, and active residents for the first time. Although the development plans relied on MuCAP assistance, all primary costs and issues were resolved through local resources such as local budgets, natural resources, business philanthropy, and most importantly active local citizens. Settlement development plans organized projects according to their complexity, thus making it easier to implement the process of development in stages. Twenty-three settlements had customized development plans. After the first step of the development plan was complete, the settlement councils would evaluate the activities and modify the implementation strategy if necessary. Even after the Program ended, settlement organizations have continued to operate according to their development plans.

Objective 3: Develop small businesses in target settlements.

The projected result to improve public well-being through the collective enterprises (Result 1.3.1) was achieved. For 3.5 years, the Program conducted systematic work in focus settlements and executed a number of investment projects which established manufacturing workshops. Manufacturing outlets designed by settlement residents were collective and provided four or more employment opportunities. Part of the annual profits of these outlets was allocated for settlement organizations. As such, a) local residents participated in investment which improved their level of income; and b) rural organizations received a small type of endowment fund, which they could manage by providing equipment or other resources to the production outlet. Such endowment funds provided needed resources to community initiatives. Work on opening manufacturing outlets (implementing business projects)



ABOVE: Compact multifunctional wood processing equipment purchased with the support of the grant award boosted manufacturing of the products so needed in the community.

gave practical experience to new settlement managers. The following table provides information on manufacturing outlets in focus settlements:

Settlement	Condition at the conclusion of the Program (July 2009)
Khabarovskiy region	
Bichikha	Souvenir shop: located in a renovated room and employed 3 people (1 woman). The shop took orders for souvenir products. Art gallery (conditional investment project): the foundation and gallery walls were built, and work on the roof started but was slowed because of heavy rains. Provides 2 potential jobs.
Zaozernoe	Small mall: opened on June 19, 2009. This outlet that provides services such as carpentry, tailoring and restoration, photo salon, and a gift shop of wooden carvings. The outlet created 12 full time job opportunities, 5 of which were provided to women. An ongoing repair of a premises under a shoe store is projected to provide 4 more positions (cobbler, cutter, and 2 hairdressers)
Lazo Region	
Durmin	Wood craft shop: Opened on 31 May, 2009. Provides employment for 5 people. Takes orders for wood working, house repairs, and requests from neighboring settlements.
Mukhin	Pavement slab workshop: opened on May 31, 2009. Provides work for 5 people. At the same time, work is underway to open a new and larger space for the workshop. The first large order was from the Administration of Mukhin to make pavement slabs for the settlement's main square.
Terneiskiy region	
Ust-Sobolevka	Sheep farm: opened on May 16, 2009. Provides work for 4 people. Also, breeds horses, creating another 4 full time jobs.
Amgu	Wood working shop opened in summer of 2009. The shop created 3 full time jobs. The shop provides wood working services.
Plastun	Printing shop: the premises were renovated, employees were trained, and the printing shop opened. Shop provided 2 full time jobs (currently 2 women). The shop publishes a professional town newspaper The Plastun Herald. Brick manufacturing: creates 2 full time jobs.
Nikolaevskiy region	
Mago	Wood craft shop: opened in March 2009. The shop created 5 full time jobs. The second shop opened soon and a third shop is currently under construction.
Amurskiy region	
Izvestkoviy	Recreation area: as the heavy rains caused an increase in the water level of the man-made lake, tourist cabins were constructed in the village of Izvestkoviy in a dry area. When the dry season comes, these cabins will be dismantled and relocated to the recreation area. Due to the delay caused by natural events, the relocation may be delayed until autumn or the following year. Provides for 5 potential jobs.

Ussurisskiy region	
Korfovka and Nikolo-Lvovskim)	Settlement-owned Co-op: a collective pig farm was built, a flock was purchased, the barns of the members were renovated, and feed was purchased. The farm opened on May 8, 2009. The farm employs 3 people full time jobs and 30 people part time. Women occupy 50% of the jobs.
Pozharskiy region	
Pozharskoe	Pavement slab workshop: opened in August, 2008. In 2009, the boiler equipment was dismantled, the workshop underwent repairs, new slab supplies were purchased, and the production of the workshop tripled. The shop employs 2 people full time jobs and 3 people part time (1 woman).
Nagornoe	Since the summer of 2008, 5 seasonal jobs have been provided to produce animal feed, available to the local population at a 30% discount. Volunteers also mow streets and control the weeds in the collective pastures.
Svetlogorie	Confectionery: on May 28, 2009 the production started. The bakery sells products to the local population at a 30% discount, and provides 5 jobs for women (2 bakers, 3 confectioners).
Krasniy Yar	The tailor store opened in fall of 2008. The store provides tailoring services, produces national clothes and souvenirs. The shop provides work for 17 women, 8 full time positions and 9 part time positions.

Information on profit and funds for settlement organizations will be available in January-February 2010.

Other than investment programs, a number of jobs were created through other social projects: training specialists at training centers in Mukhin, Krasnoe, and Korsakovo, sports coaches in Svetlogore, 2 technical workers for the settlement club in Sidime, and 4 cultural workers in Plastun (at the resort Ladushki).

Overall, the Program helped to establish 16 settlement manufacturing outlets through collective labor. Currently, 14 of the established businesses operate and provide 106 jobs. 11 more jobs will be created in the near future when the remaining 2 manufacturing outlets open in Zaozernom. Successful social projects provided 11 additional unplanned jobs. In sum, the Program created 129 jobs, 59 of which (45%) have been filled by women.

Objective 4: Engage interested local community groups in local development processes

Prior to the Program, settlement activities were complex and general. The public provided very little support to development work. The Program could be successful, only if public opinion about development work would change. Therefore, it was necessary to organize a strong PR campaign utilizing media outlets.

As the Program did have budget resources to fund a large media campaign, the Program administrators organized a 2-stage contest between regional newspapers. At first, newspapers competed for the right to provide informational support to the Program. Green House contracted 7 out of 8 submitted applications. Program administrators also created 7 prize slots for the second stage of the contest with grants ranging from \$800 to \$4,000. The award ceremony took place at the annual Program conference.

Journalists did not have to conduct any additional research. Settlement organizations, trainers and local “public correspondents” provided information to RCs. Then, RCs processed the information and gave it to regional newspapers already in the form of a newspaper article. This mechanism significantly increased the efficiency of the PR campaign. Trainers and settlement organizations were responsible for providing

information to the press. For this reason, the rural organizations, as well as the RCs, had a strong incentive to collaborate with regional newspapers.

Furthermore, the Program worked with the editors of the regional newspapers. Program coordinators organized a yearly meeting with the editors.

At the introductory seminar, journalists learned about programmatic objectives and tasks, and received informational material on previous charity projects. Journalists were invited to large Program events (forums, conferences), as well as to regional work meetings which occurred 2-3 times a year. PR Managers worked closely with the journalists. Some participating newspapers produced publication materials only in collaboration with the Program's PR managers. Thus, the Program created conditions for a successful and effective information campaign.

As result of the PR campaign, the Program produced 610 regional and 65 krai publications, including television and internet materials. Of these, 175 publications were produced in the first year of the Program, 240 in the second year, and 228 in the third year (in which the program operated for only nine months).

Despite the fact that the journalist contest took place in April 2009, the regional newspapers nonetheless actively pursued the Program's media initiatives. In the last quarter of the Program, 90 publications were released at the regional and krai levels. This suggests that the editors had a positive view of settlement development and the Program.

As noted by an external monitoring expert with experience in rural development, "the extensive publishing of large quantities of information on the Program resulted in the creation of a powerful information campaign. If such a campaign would have been purchased normally as a service, it would have required a very large amount of resources. I can honestly say that we never achieved such results with mass media support in our settlement projects."

Other Program events supported the rural media and press. In total, 15 settlement publications started to work in the focus regions, only 4 of which were published before (RC publications). A standard settlement newspaper consisted of 2-3 A4 format pages which were folded in half. Some of the newspapers managed to increase their output by tenfold by the end of the Program. The *Plastunski Herald*, distributed by the RC Rinda, became a free weekly newspaper produced in the local publishing house. Additionally, the video-studio in Mukhin and the cable television channel in Svetlogore became permanent. Almost all of the settlement newspapers were distributed by workers of the settlement libraries, cultural centers, or RCs. Publications established a solid reader-base and were recognized as reputable sources of information by the majority of villages.

One of the primary measures in supporting the settlement organizations became the release of a quarterly periodic publication, the SAM magazine, which was registered in 2008. The circulation was 1000 copies, each of 65-100 pages long. The Program published 10 out of the 11 planned issues. The magazine was widely distributed throughout the target regions, regional government institutions, and in non-target regions of Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krais. It was also available to partner NGOs and other organizations, with a special emphasis on reaching regional and federal ministries. The magazine not only helped to gain the support of the local populations and rural organizations, but also addressed other technical tasks. Other than written publications, there were also 9 electronic versions of the magazine in pdf format, available on Green House's website. Information on successful settlement projects was presented in success stories and was sent to the relevant RCs.

Green House's website (<http://www.zelenyidom.narod.ru>) was created during the Program, providing information on the Program and other projects. The website information provided details on MuCAP work, donors, members, and RCs. Program news and success stories of grantees were always available online. The most important information was also posted on the main page of the website.

Along with other PR instruments, the Program produced a book for coordinators entitled *Village Support: Settlement Development Model*. The book analyzed the causes of poor rural conditions and presented a settlement development model based on the potential of local populations, as well as methodological and practical assistance from donor organizations.

The book attracted attention to the Program, technical support from the partners in Khabarovskiy krai state body and federal institutions. It was published in the middle of the third program year and re-published later.

In May 2009, the television company Dalnevostochnaya directed the film *Being Active: the Key to Settlement Development*. The film spoke about Program instruments, results, and a general settlement development model. The film also served as a PR tool for the Program even after its completion.

Additionally, quotes of the Program Coordinator were included in a number of federal publications. These publications attracted the attention of ministry officials to the activities of the Program. The article *Support Villages: A New Profession For Innovative Development of Small Municipalities* was published in the No. 2 2009 edition of the *Municipal Authority* magazine. The 9th edition of *Municipal Authority* included the article *Activating the Population – Objectives for the Non-Profit Sector*. At the regional level, Green House and the Program created a krai-wide newspaper *Priyamurskiy Statements*, a regional newspaper *Arguments and Facts*, and *Arguments of the Week*. All of the above mentioned publication contained relevant programmatic information in 2009.

III. STRENGTHENING RESOURCE CENTERS IN BUILDING INTERSECTORAL COOPERATION

The second goal of the project was to strengthen the role of resource centers as community leaders linking communities, local government, and civil society organizations in the focus regions. These goals include increasing the role of regional public organizations as stakeholders in regional public movements and as exponents of public opinion and helping public organizations become liaisons between communities/institutions of local governance and other regional civil society organizations.

Objective 2.1: increase the professional level of the RCs to improve the quality of services offered to community and local administrators.

This objective had two components: to make RCs more knowledgeable, and transmit this knowledge to RCs' clients (settlement organizations, chiefs, bodies of local governance, and mass media).

The RC training took place at network meetings no less than three times a year. At the beginning of the Program, the Centers required a training session to administer the "blind" grant round effectively. This training taught about project design, pre-grant and informational seminars, project writing, and project support. RC personnel training covered a great amount of work over a short period of time, the result of which was a "blind" grant round. Some 47 settlements participated in the "blind" grant round submitting 144 applications. Additionally, RC accountants and grant managers had to be trained to assist action groups with analytical and financial reporting.

In the course of the two programmatic years, the RCs were designated to conduct their own grant-round for the initiatives of non-focus settlement residents, paid for by the Program budget. In order to assist the RCs, a grant policy based on that of Green House's was developed, and instruction sessions were conducted in network meetings.

Instructors working for the RCs were also trained to fulfill the duties of Program Trainers. A total of 80 hours of training took place during the first year, in addition to qualifications improvement courses which were conducted on a regular basis during the last 2-3 years of the Program. The first two training sessions for Program Trainers were conducted by a Program partner and director of the AHO "Institute of public and humanitarian initiatives," G.V. Tyurin. It was during these sessions that the Program Trainers received and

shared experiences, and proceeded to support Green House activities in 5 settlements in the Vyazemskovo region and Khabarovskiy krai.

In 2006, the GH conducted a study to determine the needs of MuCAP beneficiaries who participated in training sessions. Questionnaires were given to the following beneficiary groups: members of settlement initiative groups, chiefs of local administrations, RC staff, and regional municipal workers. Based on the collected data, a preliminary list of requirements was drafted. This helped the Program to allocate resources appropriately. In the middle of the second Program year, educational training centers (EC) for rural organizations and RCs opened. Experienced NGOs created ECs on a competitive basis in the Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krai. The subject matter of the study sessions coincided with the overall aims of the settlement organizations, the RCs, and with the general needs of the public. Due to the fact that many settlement organizations decided to register as NGOs or cooperatives, the Program created the RC that focused on registration, reporting, and record keeping (based on OO “Ekodal”, Khabarovskiy Krai). Additionally, since many rural organizations wished to publish their own newspapers, RCs had to provide instructions on creating informational and promotional materials. The Program initiated the EC that helped to create printed and audio/visual materials, use other PR tools, and hosted trainings on the basics of journalism. This center ultimately proved to be very popular and worked well in the third year of the Program.

Educational Centers were also established in the following technical areas:

- tourism, on the basis of Lad, Khabarovskiy krai;
- ecology and improvements, on the basis of the Khabarovsk regional division of the Russian national community for environmental protection, with the participation of the citizens initiative AHO Sotrudnechestvo, Khabarovskiy krai;
- management and establishment of agricultural enterprises, on the basis of the public organization Vladivostok Society for Children Assistance, Primorskiy krai
- support of youth initiatives, on the basis of the Youth Union with the participation of the Center Vslyet, Khabarovskiy krai.

More information about EC work is available below.

The training seminars allowed the settlement organizations to successfully implement their projects. RCs were also able to receive the necessary knowledge and skills and use these newly acquired skills to train the remaining rural organizations.

Trainings for RCs and municipal workers were organized through internships. A number of employees of the regional administration and RCs attended a three day seminar which included a site-visit to the successful MO Tulscoi province in April 2008. As a result, RCs and municipal employees applied experience and perspectives gained at the trainings to the Program forums. During the forum on October 8, 2007, they shared their experiences in creating collective companies operating under communal ownership in the Vyazemskovo region. The following training sessions and forums also resulted from the RC and municipal staff training:

- 15-16 April 2008, Bichikha, the training “Unity of Administrative Self-governance Resources Public Engagement;”
- 23-24 October 2008, Khabarovsk, the Second Khabarovskiy krai NGO Forum
- 1 April 2007, Toplevo, the seminar on successful municipal alliances;
- 30-31 May 2009, Bichikha, Lazo region, the Final MuCAP Program Conference.

Additionally, RCs received the following training during community meetings:

- Training of Trainers;
- Business Planning, and Creative Thinking attended by employees of the local self-governance organizations;
- Internal and External PR, Budget Processes on Municipal Level, and Management;
- NGO PR Today: Trust Against the Crisis.

The knowledge and skills received by RC staff allowed them to manage focus settlements effectively, and help rural organizations design development plans. RCs were also able to maintain work progress until the end of the Program and facilitate the organization of alliances among settlement organizations.

Additionally, several RCs helped regional self-governance institutions to develop and administer grant programs sponsored by rural organizations. In Terneyskiy region of Primorskiy krai, RCs Rinda and Terneys created the Local Community Development Fund. Using private corporate funding, Program disbursements, and donations, the Fund conducted three grant rounds and one regional grant-program in Pozharskiy region. Also, the RC that established the Pozharskiy Regional Public Council, coordinated a consortium of organizations to work on the project Development of Municipal Organizations. The project was executed by Moscow Stable Development Fund. RC employees founded the target Municipal Civil Society Program. Similar programs started in Ussuriysk.

Local self-governance institutions (LSGI) were very grateful to the RCs for their efforts in developing civil society and the economy of the target regions. Some LSGIs even invited members of RCs to act as experts of society development programs.

Regional newspapers that provided informational support to the Program expressed positive response toward the RCs' efforts to broaden informational coverage and expand professional support.

IV. ELIMINATE BARRIERS BETWEEN LOCAL CSOs AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Goal III was to eliminate barriers existing between local CSOs and government in addressing community needs. These goals included removing barriers between the government, self-governance institutions, and civil society sector (public organizations, settlement organizations, alliances, etc) to enforce civil and economic development.

Objective 3.1 Organize alliances of rural organizations in target regions.

Before implementing the Program, organizers conducted a study in the settlement regions. A number of problems identified during the study were to be resolved throughout the course of the Program. The main problem was a disconnect between local and regional authorities and residents. In order to overcome such barriers, the mere support of settlement initiatives was not sufficient.

It was unlikely that the public could change its relationship with local authorities alone. Thus, it was critical to emphasize the importance of rural alliances and encourage participation of rural leaders in civil society's work.

The next step was to create a relationship between regional deputies, municipal authorities, and settlement organizations. The settlement chiefs became active Program participants, and were involved in the fundraising campaign for the settlement development programs. In addition, the successes of the settlement organizations were well covered by the regional press. The Program proposed sending key employees to regional municipalities as interim workers in Tulu. Finally, RCs were in constant contact with regional municipalities and informed them on the progress of the Program, discussed emerging problems, and sought their support. Employees of the municipalities and the regional assembly of deputies were invited to regular

regional meetings. All of these activities served to attract the attention of the regional self-governance institutions to the activities of the rural organizations. In the end, working connections between them formed.

Furthermore, a number of authorities from Khabarovskiy krai took part in the Program. The Ministry of Economic Development and External Communications (MEDAC) constantly monitored Program results, and helped to create working relationships between the Program and regional municipalities. The Krai government and the krai's legislative Duma were particularly interested in two specific aspects of the Program: institutional support and NGO infrastructure development. As stated by the Deputy Minister of MEDAC, E.N. Telushkinoi, "businesses organized in the regions...and activists are simply amazing. From my point of view it is one of the most valuable methods of this Program, which we have not had before. This is true support. We know that in the past, although local and foreign government invested in the development, the projects would come to an end very fast and had minimum results. Sustainable support, however, gives people the opportunity to find jobs and long term results. This, in my opinion, is of the highest value." After the first Program Forum (Oct. 8 2007, Vyazemskiy city), Program employees and MEDAC agreed to create a krai-wide program for settlement development. The design of this program was developed by the Program coordinator and included in the book *Settlement Support: Settlement Development Model*. The draft program was introduced to the NGO Cooperation Council. The Council approved the proposal and decided to establish a working group to implement the program. This required legislation of 2 krai laws "State support and citizens' rights to self governance" and "the development of an economic base for local self governance." Work to pass these laws continues.

Additionally, as an outcome of the Program, the Krai government strengthened efforts to establish infrastructure to support krai NGOs. As stated by the deputy representative of the Legislative Duma of Khabarovskiy krai, L.S. Perkulimovoi, "the government, under the leadership of the vice-governor, prepared legislation to support the non-profit sector and expand the existing structures of civil society in Khabarovskiy krai. I think that this is a very positive direction to be heading in, assuming the Duma passes the law. Secondly, we have long talked about creating Resource Centers. Program regions have such institutions. However, other regions have also expressed a desire for such Centers. Both the manpower and ability to develop such organizations, as well as the desire to improve their settlements are available in these regions. At least we are at the point today where we can assemble once or twice a month and work with civil society activists, but I certainly have faith in the ramifications of the pending law which should soon be approved. In some regions, provisions on municipal grants have already been approved, for example, in the Khabarovskiy and Vyazemski regions."

The fundamental work of the Program on creating alliances of settlement organizations and bodies of local self governance was anticipated to begin in the middle of the third year and continue into the fourth. Previously, the conditions for such activities could not be established. It was planned that in the third year, a sample training session for 7 regions would be designed. Rural organizations, employees of local self-governance institutions and RCs would attend the session. Training participants drafted 1-2 different versions of regional development plans. These pilot development plans included economic and social activities. All parties that attended the session would contribute to the implementation of development plans. Moreover, draft programs were finalized over 6 months and included in target programs with the outlined budgets. These tasks were not completed, because of time constraints.

Nevertheless, the momentum which arose during the Program's work in the settlements and regions was such that the alliance of settlement organizations, RCs, media, and regional authorities began to develop independently. This proved to be a natural process, put into force by communal interests. The first such alliance was formed in the Amurskiy and later Lazo region, and took the shape of a public council which included the heads of the settlements. Another such alliance in the form of a public chamber was founded in the Pozharskiy region, followed by a public council on social innovation being established in the Terneiskiy region. In the remaining regions, alliances of target area settlement organizations were created, all of which came together for working meetings.

Additional obstacles encountered during the MuCAP were administrative-bureaucratic barriers. Businesses usually suffer the most from such barriers, and as the Program sought to create collective enterprises, these barriers also hindered the activities of rural organizations. This issue was analyzed in a regional meeting in Khabarovskiy krai. Information on this issue is provided in the book *Settlement Support*, the federal magazine *Expert*, No. 10 2009, and *Municipal Authority* No. 1 2009.

Priamurskiy Herald, and the regionally distributed newspapers, *Arguments and Facts*, and *Weekly Arguments*, wrote numerous articles about the lack of support for the population and small businesses coming from regional and federal authorities.

Certainly, the government bureaucratic system could not be changed in such a short amount of time. Therefore, Green House has continued to work on this issue.

Objective 3.2 Form local resources to support the activities of community development.

From the beginning, the Program sought local funding resources to conduct activities similar to MuCAP work and achieve equal or better results. Due to the very limited nature of local budgets in 95% of cases, these resources were not considered for such substitutions. Rather, resource replacement efforts were concentrated on the regional, krai, and federal budget levels.

To achieve this goal, the GH signed contracts of intent with the administrators of the target regions. From the beginning of 2008, regional administration granted resources from the regional budget in the sum of 300,000 rubles. In the long term, these agreements have repeatedly helped to solve the financial problems of the Program.

At the end of 2008, the Program conducted a number of successful projects in the focus settlements. The issue of co-finance was more actively raised at the regional working meetings between RCs and settlement organizations. The Program team developed rules and regulations for the municipal grants program and other related documents such as decisions of the Council of district deputies, press announcements and proposals. All of the developed documentation was first introduced in the Khabarovskiy region. The grants program budget was 300,000 rubles. The district administration helped to design the budget, and RCs executed the municipal grants program. In 2009, similar programs were accepted in the Pozharskoy (300,000 rubles) and Terneiskoy (200,000 rubles) districts. In 2010, municipal grant programs will function in all of these regions, including Lazo district.

In Ussuriskiy district, the target program Samoobespechenie managed the co-financing efforts. Under this program, private entities from the focus settlement of Korforka received grants of 30,000-50,000 rubles. Recipient entities were from a number of settlement organizations that worked with MuCAP previously. Samobizpechenie project was financed by MuCAP and local resources. The amount of cost share imparted by Samobizpechenie was around 350,000 rubles.

For a considerable amount of time, the Program was unable to attain co-financing from businesses in the municipal districts as the private sector was significantly weak. Large private donation resources were available only in Terneiskom (LTD Terneiles) and Pozharskom (TD Lutiek) regions, as well as in the city of Ussuriskie. The RC Rinda in the Terneiskie district managed to draw the interest of the Director of the LTD Terneiles. After the success of the “blind” grant round, the LTD Terneiles and RC Rinda became a co-founder of the Northern Primoriye Development Fund. With the financial support of the Program, LTD Terneiles, the Fund, and other donors carried out three grant rounds. The TD Lutiek could not provide financial support, because it was owned by a larger energy company. As there were no functioning RCs in Ussuriskiy, it was not possible to raise funds from businesses in that settlement area.

The best results were achieved at the level of the focus settlements. The amount of the contribution from 2007 to 2008 was 581,801 USD, with 282,219 USD given by the Program. Grantees raised 3.5 times more

funds than expected. In total, the budget of grantees exceeded the amount of grants by 30-50%. The amount of the cost share provided by grantees from 2008 to 2009 was 220,421 USD, with a contribution of 202,085 USD from the Program. Grantees raised funds more than 2 times than what was expected (\$108,925).

To attract local funding, GH enacted a number of measures. GH invited employees of regional state bodies to MuCAP events and maintained a constant informational campaign throughout the course of the Program. Unfortunately, Primorskiy krai did not express a strong interest in the Program. Key departments and ministries of Khabarovskiy krai administration, on other hand, provided strong support of the Program. This partnership yielded considerable results. Thus, the new governor of Khabarovskiy krai, V.E. Shportom, ordered a number of ministries and departments to prepare proposals for the funding of the program, *Developing Economic Base of the Local Self-Governance*. Green House designed the program. The Ministry of Economic Development and External Communications responded to this with a proposal and provided 20 million rubles. During a meeting with representatives of NGOs, the Acting Representative of the President of the Russian Federation suggested that Governor Shportin needed to support settlement businesses through NGO programs. The Governor received an order to budget 35 million rubles for the program. In tandem with this effort, work has been being carried out to create a framework law on NGO support. The law would require state institutions to promote settlement development through NGOs and other social directives.

V. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

I. Prepare and support RCs and trainers

Resource Centers (RC) and trainers implemented Program activities in the target regions. RCs and trainers implemented Program activities in the target regions. 7 trainers and 8 RCs provided assistance to communities in 4 raions in Khabarovskiy krai (Khabarovskiy, Lazo, Nikolaevski, and Amurski) and 3 raions in Primorskiy krajs (Ussuriyski, Terneiski, and Pozharski).

RCs performed according to work plans and had the following functions:

1. Implement grant components (information campaigns, pre-grant and post-grant training, administering grant competitions, and others);
2. Communicate with settlement organizations and initiative groups and establish cross sector interaction;
3. Provide informational support.

Green House established strong working relationships with RCs.

The Communication Manager Larionova E.P supervised Resource Centers and settlements. She prepared grant agreements, received and tracked reporting, and coordinated RC activities according to work plans.

Due to an insufficient number of municipal NGOs, RCs were selected on a non-competitive basis. Green House signed 1-year contracts with 5 RCs, in addition to probation agreements. At the end of the probation period, all RCs had equal capabilities. At the end of every programmatic year, the agreements with each of the RCs were extended for the next year. The only exceptions were RCs in Lazo and Amurski regions of Khabarovskiy krai. These RCs were organized on the basis of municipal institutions, and after the registration of the public organization groups which carried out the functions of RCs, a tender for RCs was announced in these regions. As a result of the tender, agreements for RCs were made with new the NGOs. In Ussuriysk, the RC supervised by the trainer Matveeva closed at the end of the first Program year.

Throughout the Program, educational trainings took place to increase the effectiveness of RCs and trainers.

Network meetings and trainings were the primary educational tools. At meetings, RCs and trainers gave presentations on their work, achievements, and difficulties from the past period. They were also able to receive consultations from coordinators and members of the Program work group. Network meetings were

hosted in the beginning and at the end of each Program cycle. Specialized training sessions were also conducted at these meetings by either a Program member or a qualified trainer.

The Program organized eight network meetings.

On November 10-11, 2006, 7 RCs received training on grants, technical and financial reporting. They also received tips on how to establish and maintain good professional relationships with journalists. Communications Manager Minayev E.V., the leading specialist of the Communication Department, and representative of the Office of the Governor of Khabarovskiy Krai Demchuk L.N, organized a series of hypothetical business scenarios. The business scenarios helped members of RCs to understand the importance of cooperation with Local Self-Governance Institutions (LSGI). After the training, RCs were able to transfer their newly acquired skills and knowledge to residents and interested parties in their regions.

On February 12-13, 2007, GH met with RCs to transfer knowledge and expertise in the field of grant and clerical reporting.

On May 5, 2007, at the Khabarovsk network meeting and training led by Turin G.V., participants discussed ongoing issues involving the “blind” grant round and projects in non-focus settlements.

On September 5, 2007, the network meeting opened a week-long training for RCs at Dukhovo, in Terneyskiy region of Primorskiy krai. Participants discussed the results of the “blind” grant-round, made preliminary selections of focus settlements, hosted experimental committee meetings to select the winners of regional media and journalist contests, discussed plans for the Program’s second year, and organized RC grant-rounds for non-focus settlements.

On February 14, 2008, a network meeting took place at the settlement of Bichikha in Khabarovskiy krai, prior to a 2-day educational seminar. Participants discussed concepts for the development of focus settlements and scenarios of work meetings in the regions.

On June 26, 2008, 2-hours of training on business planning and a discussion on network cooperation took place.

On October 20, 2008, the network meeting in Khabarovsk focused on the results of the first grant-round in focus settlements and goals of the second grant-round.

On March 6, 2009, a network meeting in Khabarovsk covered the successes and problems in the development of focus settlements, raised issues concerning RCs and new NGOs, and set goals for the final phase of the Program.

Network meetings always had an educational training component.

On February 13, 2007, Gleb Turin, the representative from the Program’s partner organization, led an introductory training for RCs. The goal of the training was to introduce the concept of rural guidance to RCs that would later evolve into a form of management. On 14 and 15 February, the team of Gleb Turin, representatives of the RC LAD, and members of the Program group visited the settlements Bichikha and Topolevo. The team had discussions with local residents, representatives of the administration, members of the deputy commission, and initiative groups that had applied for “blind” grants. They presented the results of the LSGI, and in several cases, discussed applications and the situation of the settlements.

On November 28, 2007, RC coordinators and accountants attended a training session on the management of regional grant-rounds. They developed a detailed grant policy and reviewed the entire cycle of the grant program.

On May 4-6, 2007, RC trainers and outside trainers attended an instructional course for trainers. The Program Coordinator Pleshakov S.A. and Program partner Turin G.V. led the training. Participants worked with 2 different types of settlement scenarios: a) where the settlement chief strongly supported the Program but the

population did not (designed by GH for the Vyazemsk region), and b) where the population provided strong support for the Program but the settlement chief did not (designed by a Program partner from Arkhangelsk region). The Program partner also presented instruments to improve the performance of the work group. Finally, trainers helped to determine prospective settlements.

On May 7, at the meeting with the residents of Durmin settlement, Green House constructed development ideas and plans. The meeting incorporated all the concepts drafted as a result of the group work which took place at the training on May 4-6 2007.

On September 5-11, 2007, Svetkova R.F., representative of the NGO Pervocvet from Luchegorsk, conducted a 2-day training for RCs. Barova V.V. and Dremlyuga S.A. from the Charity Development Fund of Tyumen conducted a 2-day training on Social Work for Development. The primary goals of the training sessions were to educate RCs on how to provide technical support to settlements through social initiatives.

On June 26-29, 2008, the Director of the IMCommunications consulting agency, Lovushkina L., conducted a business planning training session for RCs and trainers. At this session, the trainers learned about the basics of business planning, practiced developing business plans, and were exposed to real life examples from small settlements. The instruction courses allowed trainers to help organizations from focus settlements to collectively promote economic growth.

On October 21-22, 2008, Maximenko L.I. hosted a training session in Khabarovsk on budget operations at the municipal level. RC employees received information on budget planning, resources, budget components, implementation, reporting, democratic procedures for budget approval, the role of the administration, deputies, and public input into budget development and approval.

On March 4-5, 2009, RC employees participated in a small educational conference, Management and PR of NGOs Today: Trust Against Crisis. The conference was led by specialists from the Saint Petersburg Center for NGO Development and focused on strengthening and developing NGOs during the financial downturn through PR.

On June 1-2, 2009, Polichka N.P. conducted a training session in the settlement of Sosnovka to determine the structure of the settlement's development algorithm, promote regional focus programs, and further involve the population in development procedures. She also discussed focus programs as an instrument to use the regional budget for the development of settlements.

A total of 149 training sessions were conducted under the MuCAP Program.

II. Work in target regions

Work in the focus regions was conducted with 4 groups: the general population, rural institutions of local self-governance levels, regional institutions of local self-governance, and the regional media.

A Committee of Program Experts was created to conduct a fair and independent evaluation of grant applications and other applications for financial support (education, participating in meetings, etc). The Committee consisted of the following individuals:

1. Perkulimova L.S., the Deputy Chairman of Khabarovskiy krai Legislative Duma;
2. Demchuk L.N., the specialist of the Department of PR and Communication with Parties, Public and Religions Organizations under the Senator and Krai Administration;
3. Romanchenko A.V., the Director of Khabarovskiy krai Department for Economic Growth and Outside Relationships;
4. Khromova N., the Coordinator of "Our Rights" Program;

5. Malcev N.V., the Director of the Department of Interagency Cooperation Against Use and Distribution of Drugs, Khabarovskiy krai Federal Inspection Office for Drug Trafficking.

The Committee was formed based on GH input and on the basis of the candidates' and volunteers' experience. Employees of the MuCAP Program hosted the elections. The Committee of Program Experts operated according to the MuCAP Program's Committee Regulations.

Green House executed the Program in three stages.

PROGRAM STAGES

Year	Time period	Program stages	Goals
I	Nov. 2006-Sept. 2007	I. Blind grant round	Search for interested and talented leaders from rural regions.
I-2	Oct. 2007 – Apr. 2008	II. Conceptual	Determine concepts for development of focus settlements.
2	May- Nov. 2008	III. Practical– I (implementation of the stage II). Establishment of rural organizations.	Implement first concept for settlement development, unite and strengthen rural organizations, create relationships with rural leaders, establish rural networks. Prepare non-focus settlements to participate in the Program.
3	Nov. 2008 – Jun. 2009	IV. Practical – 2 (implementation of stages II and III). Institutionalization of total organizations, formation of alliances.	Exchange among focus settlements. Unite rural organizations in the network, institutionalize public committees on the rural level. Support rural self-governance on regional municipal level. Rural organizations help to establish budget policy on rural level.

Work with the population was conducted in stages.

PROGRAM STAGES

year	Time period	Program stages	Goals
I	Nov. 2006-Sept. 2007	I. Blind grant round	Search for rural, interested and talented leaders
I-2	Oct. 2007 – Apr. 2008	II. Conceptual	Determine concepts for development of focus settlements
2	May- Nov. 2008	III. Practical– I (implementation of the stage II). Establishment of rural organizations.	Implement first concepts for development of settlements, unite and strengthen rural organizations, unite with rural leaders, establish rural networks. Prepare non-focus settlements to participate in the Program.
3	Nov. 2008 – Jun. 2009	IV. Practical – 2 (implementation of stages II and III). institutionalization of total organizations, formation of alliances.	Rotate focus settlements. Unite rural organizations in the network, institutionalize public committees on the rural level. Support rural self-governance on regional municipal level. Rural organizations help to establish budget policy on rural level.

Stage I – “blind” grant round. The total number of projects was 144. The Committee of Experts approved 59 projects. From February until August 2007, the initiative groups implemented 58 projects in 42 settlements of seven focus regions. Activities ranged from building local sports facility to starting or expanding local businesses, organizing information centers, and conducting environmental clean up activities, and others. The table below shows the geographic distribution of the projects supported with the “blind” grants program.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE BLIND-GRANT PROJECTS

Name of the Grant Project	Location
Khabarovskiy krai	
Amurskiy region	s. Dzhuhen, s. Izvestkoviy, s. Voznessenskoe, s. Achan, s. Elban, s. Litovko,
Lazo region	s. Khor, s. Sidima, s. Mukhin, s. Durmin, s. Pereyaslovka, s. Mnogovershiny
Nikolaevski region	s. Ovsyanoe pole, s. Konstantinovka, s. Mago, s. Krasnoe, s. Nikolaevskina-amure, s. Innokentevka,
Khabarovskiy region	s. Kazakevichevo, s. Osinovaya rechka, s. Mirnoe, s. Krasnorechenskoe, s. Ilinka, s. Nekrasovka, s. Sikachi-Alyan
Primorskiy krai	
Pozharskiy region	s. Pozharskoe, s. Nagornoe, s. Fedoshevka, s. Svetlogor, s. Ignatevka, s. Krasniy yar, s. Verniy pereval,
Terneiskiy region	s. Amgu, s. Ternei, s. Ust-Sobolevka, s. Malaya Kema
Ussuriskiy region	s. Timiryazevskiy, s. Aleksee- Nikolskoe, s. Vosdvezhenia, s. Rakovka, s. Korsakovka, s. Korfovka

In addition, anticipatory support projects were started in five settlements which had previously participated in a similar program funded earlier by USAID in the Russian Far East. Trainers who had previously worked on settlement development projects in the framework of the *Engage* model led the projects. Previous experience in organizing activists and designing work plans was used as a foundation for the rural development model. Settlement organizations in the prime-settlements designed settlement development plans for their villages, directed project implementation, and submitted 12 applications to compete for settlement projects in focus areas. The applications were subject to an internal and external review process, and all applications were subsequently approved.

In assessing the influence of the projects, the following criteria were used:

1. What percentage of the population was influenced by the Project?
2. Did the Project engage the majority of target population in MuCAP work?
3. Did initiative groups have an organizational structure?
4. Did the project engage the settlement administration and deputies in MuCAP work?
5. Did the project attract additional funding?

The settlements that met the above criteria became focus settlements. Grant awards varied from \$2,000 to \$9,900 with a total grant pool of \$40,400. The projects were implemented from July to October 2007. Activities ranged from building a recreational park to converting a school buffet into a national cuisine restaurant to attract tourists, opening five newspaper stands, creating a development fund for the local community which co-finances a number of settlement initiatives, and other community mobilizing activities.

Projects were implemented in three settlements in Khabarovskiy krai (s. Bichikham s. Topolevo, s. Matveevka) and two settlements in Primorskiy krai (s. Dobropolie and s. Ternei).

All of the focus settlements competed to keep their status of focus settlements in the next (third) year of the Program.

Each focus settlement was assigned a trainer. Trainers performed their duties according to the following steps:

1. form associations of active settlement residents;
2. evaluate internal resources;
3. develop ideas for development;
4. organize marketing research;
5. help to design the settlement development plans;
6. develop projects;
7. commence project activities and project implementation; and
8. provide consultations, technical and psychological support.

Since the settlements were too large for the RCs to support alone, Program trainers were also involved in the projects. In Ussurisk, the trainer worked alone without the assistance of an RC.

From November 2007 until May 2008, the Program, trainers, and rural organizations worked to draft a settlement development plan. After the approval of the settlement development plans, the rural organizations selected target projects based on a competition between projects proposed by focus settlements. The projects then went through internal and external reviews. In total, 23 focus settlements submitted 49 projects, 46 of which were approved. Total award amount constituted \$269 990. Projects were implemented from April to November 2008. Projects included a wide spectrum of activities, including laying water supply pipes; building school yards, sports facility, and playgrounds; establishing pavement slab shops; organizing brick production shops; opening a center for providing municipal services to the population; creating a settlement newspaper; and opening a center of arts and crafts, among others. More detailed information about activities is provided in Attachment 2B.

From August to September 2008, grant managers conducted site-monitoring visits to 70% of the projects. At the network meeting in October 2008, the RCs and program groups conducted an internal evaluation of grant projects. In November 2008, the Program coordinator travelled to the target regions and 18 settlements to meet with the regional administrations. Submitted project activity reports provided accurate descriptions of the work conducted in the focus settlements and target regions. Based on the decision of the Council of Experts, which took into consideration a decrease in Program funding, only 19 of the 23 focus settlements were retained.

District	Region	Settlement
Khabarovskiy krai	Lazo	Sidima, Durmin, Mukhin
	Nikolaevskiy	Mago, Krasnoe, Innokentevka
	Amurskiy	Voznesenskoe, Izvestkoviy
	Khabarovskiy	Mirnoe, Korsakovo, Bichikha
Primorskiy krai	Terneiskiy	Ust-Sobolevka, Plastun
	Pozharskiy	Pozharskoe, Nagorno, Svetlogore, Krasniy yar
	Ussuriskiy	Dobropole, Korfovka (together with Nikolo-Lvovskim)
Total:		19 Settlements

The settlement organizations of the 19 focus settlements, with the help of the trainers, evaluated their performance against the settlement development plans, and adjusted work as necessary. The rural organizations then developed two-step programs to adjust the projects. The 19 settlements implemented 27 projects during the second competition. All of the projects underwent internal and external evaluation, and not a single project was rejected. The projects were implemented from January to May 2009 and included many activities, including building a sports facility, constructing a tourist recreation zone, reviving a cultural house, and organizing a gallery of arts and crafts, among others. A complete list of activities is presented in Attachment 2B. RCs monitored the projects and presented their reports to the Program groups.

Besides the projects mentioned above, work was also carried out in the non-focus settlements, implemented through a special grant round in 2007. Nineteen of the 23 focus settlements in 2008-2009 (stage IV on the “Program stages” table) continued to participate in the Program. To attract non-focus settlements to the Program, the GH hosted a special grant-round and invited them to work meetings and other RC activities.

Grant rounds took place in six target regions. By the end of the first Program year, the RC in Ussuriskiy closed. Some 63 applicants participated in the grant round for non-focus settlements. RC and regional experts evaluated grant applications. Later, the GH issued 29 grant awards described in the table below:

Grant No.	Name of Grant Project	Location	Grant cost	Primary project activities
Lazo region	s. Chernyaev	2 projects	\$2 856.64	Develop a park area and develop and open “Health room
	s. Geogrievskoe	1 project	\$1 428,32	Organize a youth chamber as center of settlement initiatives
	s. Oborskoe	1 project	\$1 428,32	Build a sports arena
Nikolaevskiy region	s. Ozerpakh	2 projects	\$2 624.04	Develop a premises for women’s council, conduct number of activities; create a museum at the school
	s. Mnogovershinii	2 projects	\$2 928.05	Open a theatrical studio; conduct a cleaning of the Okhotskiy coast
	s. Oremif	1 project	\$1 530,34	Construct outdoor sports facility
Pozharskiy region	s. Guberskaya	1 project	\$1 999,65	Construct a hockey rink
	s. Verkhneperevalskoe	1 project	\$1 469.13	Open a sport hall
	s. Fedosevskoe	2 projects	\$2 938.26	Open a children’s sports hall; open a social house for veterans, and establish a settlement museum
	s. Guberskaya	1 project	\$1 469.13	Build corral for cattle
Terneiskiy region	s. Ternei	2 project	\$2 856.64	Reconstruct park area; create museum exposition, carry out teaching sessions on Russia-France friendship
	s. Svetlaya	1 project	\$1 428,32	Open a sports hall
Khabarovskiy region	s. Anastasevka	1 project	\$1 428.32	Turn adolescents and youth away from harmful habits by opening a social guest

Grant No.	Name of Grant Project	Location	Grant cost	Primary project activities
				house
	s. Sikachi-Alyan	1 project	\$1 530.34	Conduct a contest for the best design of the house in traditional style
	s. Rakitnoe	1 project	\$1 428,.2	Provide repairs for sports facility
	s. Malishevo	1 project	\$1 428,.2	Construct a sport facility
	s.Galkino	1 project	\$1 428.32	Develop and open creative workshop
	s. Druzhba	1 project	\$1 428.32	Establish area/capacity for better garbage disposal, carry out cleaning activities in settlement
Amurskiy region	s. Sanboli	1 project	\$1 307.11	Construct a sports facility.
	s. Forel	1 project	\$1 438.52	Construct a sports facility.
	s. Dukhin	1 project	\$1 438.52	Construct a park area
	s. Elban	2 projects	\$2 877.04	Develop a sports hall; develop a park area
	s. Bolon	1 project	\$1 438,52	Build a stadium
			\$42 128,49	

As the Program came to an end and funding was decreased, non-focus settlements were unable to make the transition to focus settlements. Nevertheless, the RCs in these areas gained experience in project administration and interacting with regional institutions of self governance. RCs also were able to receive additional funding from regional authorities and entrepreneurs, as well as administer municipal and local grant programs.

The total number of projects implemented under the MuCAP was 172. The total amount of the grant funding was \$636,828.43.

Work with settlement and regional institutions of self governance was a part of the training for settlement chiefs and employees of the regional administrations.

It was important to include settlement chiefs in the Program. The chiefs who were involved in the development work became members of the rural organizations (with some exceptions), attended work meetings, and participated in Program activities. Although the regional government employees did not join settlement organizations, they participated in work meetings, attended general program activities. Some government workers volunteered for the Program.

On April 6, 2007, a seminar for 31 participants (settlement leaders, government employees, etc) took place in Topolevo. The GH hosted the training. At the seminar, the local administration shared its experiences in working with an active population, supporting initiatives, and working with state entrepreneurs. According to the feedback from seminar participants, activities similar to the seminar were important to create relationships between the Administration and public. Many rural leaders decided to follow the example of the chief of Topolevo and start working with initiative groups who received grants under the “blind” grant round.

Employees of the Amurskiy, Khabarovskiy, Ussuriskiy, and Terneiskiy regional administrations participated in the internship program in Tula. From 1-4 April 2008, the fund Sustainable Development and Russian Academic Center for State and Municipal Management organized a seminar, Basics of Municipal Management. Participants learned about the legislative basis for local self governance and designed a pilot project on structures of municipal formation. They also reviewed the economic basis of local self governance, followed by a Q and A session. Participants visited and learned about the experience of the most successful municipal developments in Tula region. The seminar helped the Program group to improve relationships with government authorities in the target regions and receive funding through municipal grants.

Details on the municipal grant program were provided above (under Objective 3.2).

GH worked closely with local editors and journalists to ensure media support of MuCAP.

On 16 December 2006, a training seminar for journalists, the Role of Media in Public Initiatives and Civil Society, took place at the hotel Voskhod in Khabarovsk. Fourteen journalists attended the training, participating in instructional and discussion sessions. At the seminar, journalists learned about the Program. After the seminar, publishers competed for the right to provide informational coverage of the Program. Additionally, journalists received invitations to work meetings, conferences, forums, and other MuCAP events.

Regional newspapers provided detailed coverage of many Program events. In order to select media partners, the Program organizers announced a two-stage contest. During the first stage, publishers competed for the right to provide informational coverage of the Program. Eight newspapers from seven regions, including two applications from the Amursk region of Khabarovskiy krai, I.P. Babicheva/*Amurskiy Vestnik* newspaper and LTD Noviy Amursk, and the *Noviy Amursk* newspaper participated in the contest. Program experts selected the following winners:

Target region	Newspaper
Khabarovskiy	Selskaya Nov'
Lazo	Nashe Vremya
Amurskiy	Amurskiy Vestnik
Nikolaevskiy	Amurskiy Liman
Terneyskiy	Vestnik Terneya
Ussuriyskiy	Kommunar
Pozharskiy	Pobeda

The Program signed contracts with all newspapers mentioned above. The size of the awards were established during the second stage of the contest, and depended on the level of information support each newspaper could provide. Expert committees of RC and Program employees selected winners based on the criteria provided in the RFA (total volume of publication, relevance, quality, etc). The table below provides information about awards made each year:

Place	Award Amount (USD)	Wining Publication	Award Amount (USD)	Wining Publication	Award Amount (USD)	Wining Publication
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3 (7 months)	
I	4,000	Pobeda	1,500 each	Pobeda and Vestnik Terneya	2,000	Vestnik Terneya

2	3,000	Nashe Vremya	N/A	N/A	1,500	Pobeda
3	2,000	Vestnik Terneya	2,000	Amurskiy Vestnik	1,000	Selskaya Nov'
4	1,000	Selskaya Nov' and Amurskiy Liman	1,000	Nashe Vremya	675 each	Amurskiy Liman and Nashe Vremya
5	900	Amurskiy Vestnik	900	Selskaya Nov'		
6	800	Kommunar	800	Amurskiy Liman		

The total award pool was 26,250 USD. For detailed results on the media and PR program, please refer to *Goal 4: Engaging local interested groups in local development*.

In addition, MuCAP organized a competition for independent journalists. Journalists from krai and regional publishing houses participated in the contest. In the first year, the contest was part of the “Our Rights” Program. In the contest’s first year, 18 journalists received awards, followed by 12 more journalists in the second and third years.

Collaboration with businesses.

The Program worked with businesses indirectly, as collaboration with businesses was not included in the Program’s goals. However, entrepreneurs participated in local Program work and supported the Program’s initiatives. The first portion of this report (Goal 3.2) provides detailed information about the Development Fund of South Primorye created by the Rinda RC and LTD Terneylis in the Terneysk region.

III. Informational Sessions

Informational and training sessions presented basic information about the MuCAP project, GH work, and development of civil society in rural areas in general. At the beginning of the year, rural organizations, RCs, settlement leaders, and regional municipal workers participated in a survey to determine if an introduction session was necessary. The survey results showed a strong need for trainings. Based on the survey data and additional research information, GH designed a series of training events.

Trainings were available to all beneficiary groups of the Program, including rural organizations, settlement leaders, employees of regional administrations, and media representatives. RCs and trainers received education at network meetings and specialized trainings. A complete description of the training program was provided earlier in this report.

Using the skills acquired at MuCAP events (network meeting, specialized trainings, etc), the trainers were able to host trainings for rural organizations. Each trainer had a work plan for the rural organizations. Education was one of the most important components of the plan. However, trainers alone could not provide all necessary training sessions needed.

The Program supported Educational Centers.

As a follow-up of the settlement development plans study, on 29 January, the GH announced a competition among educational centers. The study showed that rural organizations needed additional training in the following areas:

1. Improvement of the quality of public services provided by rural cultural institutions. Successful engagement of the rural populations in cultural activities;
2. Development of the tourism industry in rural areas;
3. Improvement of management skills including knowledge of NGO registration, local self-governance institutions, and cooperatives; reporting requirements and procedures; registration with tax and

RussRegistration authorities; establishment of financial and administrative policies; installment of organizational orders; production of technical and accounting reports on projects through the online consulting system; and others;

4. Supply of informational support to rural initiatives;
5. Establishment of a new agro technology in agricultural cooperatives;
6. Public NGOs engagement in local municipal policies; and
7. Organization of anti-alcohol/drug/violence campaigns.

The Expert Committee approved 6 of 11 applications, giving priority to NGO applicants. The total amount of award for these activities was \$47,358. The grantees conducted the following activities:

1. The NGO Lad organized the training, Education and Preparation of Specialists to Implement Municipal Strategies for Socio-Economic Development of Territories (Rural Tourism), in the settlement of Bichikha, Khabarovskiy krai. Nineteen representatives of rural organizations attended the training. Participants learned of mechanisms to support local handmade souvenirs industry and to establish a tourist-friendly environment. They also developed a draft business plan for a rural tourist agency and received a legal consultation on the registration and clerical regulations for tourism-related businesses. As a result, several handcrafting businesses werelaunched in Krasniy Yar and Plastun markets, the settlement Sikachi-Alyane developed a plan for the expansion of local tourism, and a recreational zone in Izvestkoviy went under reconstruction.
2. The instructional center Info-SAM (Pervocvet) provided IT training to rural organizations. IT is important for representatives of rural media, including newspapers, television stations, and others. “Public reporters” received basic journalism skills. Some 27 people participated in three trainings. As a result, newspapers were launched in 13 focus settlements. Additionally, activists from Svetlogorye created a rural television channel and organizers from Mukhen opened a video studio.
3. Fifteen people from 15 focus settlements attended the seminar, “Current Issues in the Rural Integrated Development of Settlements, Protection of Environment and Natural Resources at the Municipal Level.” The National Environmental Community Center from Khabarovskiy krai hosted the seminar. Participants received recommendations on solutions of complex socio-economic and environmental issues.
4. The educational center Vladivostok Community for Child Support conducted a two-day seminar on the economic development of rural settlements. Seventeen participants from 14 focus settlements attended the event. The seminar presented information on the development of small collective factories for agricultural and livestock products, small household services, and handcrafted souvenirs. The Director of the Center, O.V. Petruk, shared his experience in developing rural areas.
5. The Youth Union (Elban) and Vzlet (Khabarovsk) conducted three seminars for youth and settlement organizations that actively work with youth. Some 48 people participated in the seminars. The seminar focused on expanding methods that can be used by public organizations to engage youth in social work. At the training, young representatives from the focus settlements



ABOVE: Final Conference of the MuCAP Program

learned about public communication mechanisms and various youth organizations. Participants presented ideas on establishing partnerships and creating social projects, including organization of public events focused on social issues. Attendees learned about the basics of project work and developed pilot projects that were implemented during the three years of the Program. As result, a youth parliament was established in Dobropolye, and a larger number of youth were engaged in MuCAP work in Lazo and Nikolaevskiy regions.

6. The center Ecodal in Khabarovsk provided consulting services to rural organizations that wanted to register as public organizations. The center conducted a seminar on bookkeeping practices for an organization of 15 people and developed a detailed electronic manual for directors and accountants of public organizations. The Program and Ecodal helped to register 14 new NGOs.

Based on the number of settlement media projects and the success of the Info-SAM instructional center, Pervocvet received a target grant to continue in the third year of the Program. The amount of the grant was 9,000 USD.

In total, seven projects from six educational centers received 56,358 USD. The centers trained 141 people.

Although educational centers primarily worked with rural organizations, they were also able to increase the professionalism of RC employees and settlement leaders.

To improve cross-sector collaboration, sessions on the social partnership of rural activists, settlement leaders, deputies, municipal workers, entrepreneurs, journalists took place in each focus region. Cvetkova R.F. and Kazakova M.V. competed in the tender for trainers. Both applicants were selected to conduct training on social partnerships. Kazakova conducted trainings in 5 regions, and Svetkova conducted trainings in two regions. These trainings helped settlement organizations to improve relationships with the regional administration. RCs were mediators in these relationships.

At the beginning of the second Program year, focus settlements created settlement development plans. On 12 October 2007, the forum Collective Work of Residents for Settlement Development took place in Vyazemskiy, Khabarovskiy krai. The main goal of the Forum was to determine development strategies and share information. The other objective of the Forum was to show the strength of collective work in developing the economies of the settlements. 192 people attended the Forum sponsored by the Program, the Administration of Vazamskiy region, and other resources. Representatives from all the focus settlements, journalists, Khabarovskiy krai municipal workers, and activists from Primorskiy krai attended the Forum. Participants learned about effective ways to solve problems through organized public effort (committees, cooperatives, etc).

To support rural organizations, trainers and RCs that drafted development plans in November 2008, a training session was conducted on the role of social partnerships during the implementation of strategic plans. The training program was adapted to address specific goals and the nature of each settlement organization. The training took place on February 15-16 in the settlement of Bichikha. S.N. Yurkova, the Director of the Russian Center for Government and Municipal Contracts based in Moscow, lead the training. RCs, settlement leaders, and regional government employees attended the training. Participants received a strategic development plan and formed a number of draft development plans.

Furthermore, rural organizations, RCs, and trainers exchanged their experience at the Second NGO Forum of the Khabavskiy krai on 23 October 2008 and at the Final Conference of the MuCAP Program on 30-31 May 2009. Some 98 people from target regions participated in the Second NGO Forum, and 125 people attended the Final Conference. Such events helped to establish networking and intersectional partnerships.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

The MuCAP Program was unique because unlike previous municipal development programs, MuCAP established a strong consistent partnership with rural settlements. GH used all available information to implement the MuCAP Program, adapting previous experience to the needs of rural settlements. The primary Program accomplishment was the degree of public engagement in self-governance work at the municipal level (up to 15% of the population). The Program was able to demonstrate the importance of civil society development, create relationships between the public and the government, and encourage future independent civil work.

The Program did not rely on rural intelligentsia, although rural intellectuals participated in the Program's activities. Rather, the Program was reliant on the population as a whole, particularly on the middle aged working class (30-50 years). Without the participation of the working class, long-term projects, such as investments in collective enterprises, would not have been completed. The Program, in turn, would not have had such a strong impact without such projects.

Investment projects to create collective enterprises were the main element of MuCAP. Experience proved that the best results were achieved through the support of collective initiatives, rather than independent entrepreneurship and private farms (such as self-sustainability, anti-crisis support for entrepreneurs, and projects on agricultural development). Initially, these enterprises were included in the rural development projects, but later became self-sustainable.

Another unique feature of the Program was the fact that the population engaged in the activities was gender balanced. Generally speaking, there were an equal number of men and women involved in the MuCAP activities, but women were more active and men often occupied less active positions. The gender balance formed organically without additional efforts by GH or RCs.

GH viewed training and dissemination of experience as equally important technical components. Work with rural activists was the primary goal of MuCAP. RC trainers worked consistently with focus settlements and invited representatives of rural organizations to activities outside of trainings. Trainers administered project work in settlements and helped to achieve specific results.

The Program had a strong PR campaign. Despite the fact that the Program only worked with three settlements in each region, the MuCAP was well known in all target regions as result of extensive media coverage. GH magazine, *Municipal Communities and Alliances*, distributed in the target and non-target regions of the Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy krajs, was very popular. The success of the PR campaign made it easier for GH to achieve pragmatic goals and objectives.

A massive exchange of experience between urban and rural non-profit sectors was also a part of the Program. Rural organizations learned about the methods and strategies of urban NGOs, which allowed them to increase the level of public engagement in self-governance. GH did not expect that two-thirds of the rural organizations would obtain NGO status as an outcome of the Program.

MuCAP also formed a strong practice of intersectional collaboration and partnership. Program relationships with rural organizations and the Administration of Khabarovskiy krai were most productive. Through these relationships, GH was able to receive government funding. The government started to co-sponsor activities. The idea of complete government funding of GH was discussed throughout the duration of the Program. As a result, at the end of 2009, the Governor of Khabarovskiy krai, Shporta V.I., and the Ministry of Economic Development and External Communications developed a krai-wide target program called "Public Engagement in Decision Making at the Local Level for Urban and Rural Settlements of Khabarovskiy Krai in 2010-2012." The Duma evaluated the program in December 2009. According to the program design, non-profit initiatives would be at the core of the program.

In May 2009, MuCAP underwent an external analysis. Experts of InA-Centr from Novosibirsk concluded the following:

“All elements of the MuCAP Program were effective. Its success was achieved primarily because of its complex strategies for the development of coalitions. For the first time, development strategies for regions/settlements supported all sectors of the populations (residents, businesses, and the administration).” One government employee used the following to describe the Program: “complexity -- economic and public work was tied together.” This thought was supported by one activist who said: “I liked the complexity and diversity of the Program. I have never been involved in such a well thought out program. Usually, we try to solve a single problem: environment, human rights, social, or other. MucAP addressed problems in a complex way with a focus on developing rural settlements as a whole.”

The Program showed the importance of comprehensive development planning and the significance of the connection between different public, private, and government sectors. Overall, MuCAP presented a new social strategy focused on the complex socio-economic development of rural settlements, small towns, and regions.

ATTACHMENT 2.A – MuCAP PROGRAM TARGETS AND RESULTS ACHIEVED

Illustrative indicators	Indicator definition and unit of measurement	Baselines	Lifetime Targets	Achieved results
Goal 1. Building up the communities, which through joint efforts of all their members, participatory mechanisms, and multisectoral cooperation achieve economic development and sustainability.				
Objective 1 and 2: Identify community leaders and empower different initiative groups to transform to development groups.				
Result: 1.1: Increasing number of citizens is taking action to improve their lives.				
Number of civic initiatives and active citizens who prioritize and address community needs in the focus regions on a regular basis.	Civic initiatives are defined as concrete improvements initiated by citizens.	N/A	No less than 200 initiatives	239 initiatives address priority issues
		N/A	No less than 10% of population involved into community development activity.	63,269 persons
Number of initiative groups and development groups unite for addressing community needs.	Community leaders form initiative groups for the life of their projects. Afterwards, these groups transform to development groups, which are defined as a group of community leaders, which take action to improve community live on a constant basis.	N/A	No less than 55 initiative groups unite for addressing specific issues.	207 initiative groups
			23 development groups	47 development groups
Qualitative examples of public participation in various democratic processes.	Participation of initiative and development groups in public hearings, public forums, local assemblies, and designing strategic development plans.	Few people in settlements participate in public hearings.	No less than 30 initiative and settlement active groups participate in democratic processes.	56 initiative groups
				88 development groups
Result 1.2: Settlements development is under systematic basis formed by settlement active groups.				
Qualitative examples of using system approaches for stimulating population and developing development processes	System approaches are concepts and plans of strategic development. Examples are the cases of concept and plans development on settlement and raion levels and adoption of documents (targeted, investment and other programs , and etc.), providing opportunity for sustainable	System approach based on own resources and population’ potential, is no used on one of the level starting	23 focused settlement active groups developed and implement settlement development concepts. No less than 5 targeted municipal programs on stimulating population and supporting	42 settlement active groups formed settlement development concepts

Illustrative indicators	Indicator definition and unit of measurement	Baselines	Lifetime Targets	Achieved results
	development using own resources (budgets, business, , population) and population potential	from settlement level (municipal)	economical basis of local self-governance	

Objective 3: Development of small-size businesses in the focus settlements.

Result 3.1. Improved well-being of population through operation of different (collective) businesses established by Program

Number of investment projects and infrastructure enterprises created to improve overall well-being of the focus communities.	Investment project is a business project supported by the program, local business and population; during its implementation, jobs can be created, or new services provided to meet the needs of the population, municipal governments, and businesses.	Local citizens, municipal governments and businesses need new jobs and quality services	15 investment projects developed and launched	15 investment projects developed and launched
--	--	---	---	---

Objective 4: Raising awareness of the local development processes among local stakeholders.

Result 4.1. Community development activities and accomplishments are commonly and positively reported in local and regional printed media.

Number of media reports covering Program activities and disseminating positive experience in other regions.	Local media reports about Program progress over life of the project.	Reports on citizens' and civic organizations' initiatives are extremely rare, by minimum newsbreaks	No target	722 publications in raion press, Internet, radio, TV
	New journal is published by Green House to report about Program achievements and best practices.	N/A	10 issues	10 issues

Goal 2. Strengthened role of resource centers as community leaders linking communities, local government, and civil society organizations in the focus regions.

Objective 2.1. Enhance the professional level of resource centers through training and practical activities.

Result 2.1. Resource centers enhance their professional level and provide professional services valued both by community and government.

Illustrative indicators	Indicator definition and unit of measurement	Baselines	Lifetime Targets	Achieved results
Number of members resource centers receiving trainings.	RCs get valuable knowledge and skills through participating in internships and trainings.	N/A	Members of all resource centers participate in internships and trainings	86 members
Number of resource centers' clients receiving their services on a regular basis.	Local resource centers provide consultations, trainings, and technical assistance services to different groups.	N/A	No less than 70 clients by each RC	256 clients for each RC on average
Goal III. Eliminating barriers existing between local SCO's and government for addressing community needs.				
Objective 3.1. Organizing alliances of development group in the focus regions.				
Result 3.1. Development groups unite in alliances to consolidate their efforts for community development, attracting common and new resources				
Number of development group alliances, which consolidate their efforts for addressing community needs in collaboration with raion and settlement governments.	Alliance is a partnership formed by development groups to address common strategic goals.	No alliances operate in communities.	No less than 6 acting alliances solving community issues	14 alliances uniting development groups in raions
Objective 3.2. Generate local resources for support of community development				
Result 3.2. Resources of businesses and municipal governments along with community resources and labor are attracted for community development				
Total amount of local resources generated in the communities with an increasing share of local government.	Local government develops specific target programs to co-finance community development projects.	The process started in Pozharsky raion (Primorskiy Krai), where a target program is being developed.	5 targeted programs with total funding in 60000 USD started its operation in communities.	15 programs
	Total amount of local resources raised by project implementers disaggregated by contribution type and source of funding.	Work for community development is	No less than 50% of in-kind funds and no less than 20% of cash from local budgets.	86,580 USD attracted to 92,000 USD grant funds. Grantees' contribution share is

Illustrative indicators	Indicator definition and unit of measurement	Baselines	Lifetime Targets	Achieved results
		not popular among the public but needed by municipal governments and local citizens themselves		<p>2:1 toward received grants funds. Funds of 3 municipal grants programs and Fund for Northern Primorye Development</p> <p>6,000 USD attracted for Plastun settlement foundation for development. 15,000 USD attracted for target raion programs. Charitable Development Fund of Northern Primorye is working for 3 targeted raions.</p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – MuCAP LIST OF PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED IN FOCUS SETTLEMENTS DURING TWO STAGES

Region	Settlement	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities
		Stage 1			Stage 2		
PRIMORSKIY KRAI							
Pozharskiy region	s. Nagornoe	3 projects	\$15 310	Lay out 1200 meters of winter water piping to provide water for approximately 40% of the settlement population; build school yard garden; establish communal pasture, sell hay to settlement residents with a discount from 30% to 95%.	2 projects	\$11 000	Create a zone of culture/ leisure for settlement residents; complete 2 stages of laying 1 km 620 meters of winter water pipes, Bring water to 95% of population
	s. Pozharskoe	2 projects	\$15 300	Create pavement slab shop, extensive use of products; build stadium.	1 project	\$11 000	Create a space for the manufacturing of pavement supplies
	s. Svetlogor	3 projects	\$15 000	Open a sports club Athlete; construct a children's park; create settlement informational center, organize broadcast of regional television programs and settlement newspapers.	2 projects	\$13 200	Carry out repairs of settlement stadium; Open a culinary shop
	s. Krasniy yar	1 project	\$9 980	Create a center for the revival of Udegeskoi culture and crafts, open a shop for national clothes and souvenirs.	1 project	\$7 700	Carry out competition for best gable houses in the national style. Improve 30 houses and yards
Nikolaevskiy region	s. Innokentevka	2 project	\$6 612	Organize a cultural center of Nivkhs (minority ethnic group in	1 project	\$4 738	Conduct a competition for the best façade of houses in the

Region	Settlement	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities
		Stage 1			Stage 2		
				Russia); construct a settlement sports facility.			national style. Repair number of residents' houses.
	s. Krasnoe, s. Chnirakh	1 project	\$9 911	Complete the 1st phase of the fitness center construction project.	1 project	\$6 352	Complete 2 stages, open settlement fitness center, and organize territories.
	s. Mago	1 project	\$11 579	Accomplish the 1st phase of the project to open a municipal service center	1 project	\$7 883	Implement 2 stages, open center for municipal services provision. Repair houses. Create 5 jobs.
Terneiskiy region	s. Amgu	1 project	\$13 000	Open wood working shop.			
	s. Ust-Sobolevka	2 projects	\$13 594	Open a farm; open a settlement fitness center.	2 projects	\$10 990	Organize collective sheep farming. Create 4 jobs; construct a center of sports and rest, create sports field.
	s. Plastun	1 project	\$16 450	Organize a production of bricks and create mechanism of grant support for a tile shop.	1 project	\$15 485	Begin circulation of settlement newspaper "Plastunskii herald",
Ussuriskiy region,	s. Korfovka	1 project	\$15 000	Organized a peasant farm, produce feed for cattle.	2 projects	\$17 000	Open a village cultural house; build pig farm, organize collective ownership
	Aleksee-Nikolskaya territory	1 project	\$9 591	Plant a fruit and vegetable garden.			
	Dobropolye micro-region	2 projects	\$12 699	Establish a development center for Dobropolya residents, carry out number of activities; organize children's soccer club, build a soccer field, and host sport events.	1 project	\$10 000	Create youth parliament, organize youth training, conduct competitions of youth projects, and implement 2 projects designed by the parliament

KHABAROVSKIY KRAI

Region	Settlement	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities
		Stage 1			Stage 2		
Khabarovskiy region	s. Bichikha	2 projects	\$14 548	Clean and landscape yards in the Russian national style; create souvenir and commercial products, form a point of tourist attraction.	1 project	\$14 800	Organize gallery of arts and crafts, a center of tourist attraction in Bichikha settlement
	s. Korsakovka	1 project	\$5 059	Eliminate illegal dumping, and install containers for waste management, clean village property, and improve village center.			
	s. Roshino	1 project	\$2 364	Revive a 2 story cultural house, open a social guest house.	1 project	\$8 890	Revive 1 story cultural house. Open a training hall
	s. Korsakovskoe , s. Krasnorechenskoe	1 project	\$2 490	Construct a sports hall.			
	s. Mirnoe	4 projects	\$10 638	Create a recreation area; Construct children's play area; establish a recording studio; and open a cultural information center of the village	1 project	\$10 996	Open a center for social development.
	s. Zaozerno	1 project	\$12 000	Open center for providing municipal services to the population. Create 12 jobs.			
Lazo region	s. Mukhin	4 projects	\$12 800	Develop settlement newspaper "Mukhin herald"; construct children's central square; create sports hall; conduct competition on best playground.; create 4 playgrounds	3 projects	\$12 110	Open video studio; create pavement supplies manufacturing shop; create youth club "Zaneitik", conduct cultural activities
	s. Sidima	1 project	\$13 000	Accomplish phase 1 of	2 projects	\$12 822	Complete 2 stages in the opening

Region	Settlement	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities	No of projects	Grant cost	Project activities
		Stage 1			Stage 2		
				constructing a settlement cultural house			of a settlement cultural house; open a social guest house for preschoolers.
	s. Durmin	2 projects	\$12 865	Create sports club, carry out number of sporting activities; work towards opening a shop on millwork and housing repair	2 projects	\$8 000	Complete 2 stages and open wood working and house repairs shop; begin distributing settlement newspaper
Amurskiy region	s. Litovka	3 projects	\$10 000	Open a social guest house for the elderly and children; open a sports facility; conduct repairs on the façade of the cultural house, observe holiday “day of the village”			
	s. Isvestkovie	3 projects	\$12 030	Opening a center of arts and crafts; construction of the hockey rink, organize sports oriented holiday; creating tourist leisure area	1 project	\$ 12 000	Carry out second stage of construction of a tourist recreation zone
	s. Vosnesenskoe	1 project	\$7 471	Build a sports center and a dock for public river shuttle.	1 project	\$ 6 056	Conduct a competition between projects on building sports yards. Build 3 yards
Total:			\$269 990			\$182 966	

FISCAL REPORT (for entire project)

Budget Line Items	Current CA Budget	Total billed	Difference
A. Personnel and Benefits	\$823,481	\$713,961	-\$109,520
B. Travel	\$184,103	\$126,894	-\$57,209
C. Equipment	\$17,402	\$18,907	\$1,505
D. Supplies (ODCs and Activities)	\$343,958	\$343,984	\$26
E. Contractual	\$260,850	\$230,113	-\$30,737
F. Subgrants	\$2,258,042	\$2,287,715	\$29,673
Subtotal Direct Costs	\$3,887,836	\$3,721,575	-\$166,261
G. Indirect Costs	\$561,012	\$541,296	-\$19,716
H. Cost Share	\$133,000	\$141,812	\$8,812
TOTAL	\$4,581,848	\$4,404,683	-\$177,165