

Mid Term Review of the UNDP-UNIDO/ GEF Project

"POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction" UNDP-GEF PIMS# 4833 / UNIDO SAP# 140288

Republic of Türkiye (TR)

TR Ministry of Environment and Urbanization United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Final Report June 2018

Prepared by:

Murat ÇEVİK, MTR Consultant Ankara, TÜRKİYE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author, MTR consultant Mr. Murat ÇEVİK , would like to express his gratitudes to UNDP Chemicals and Waste Cluster Lead Mr. Mahmut Osmanbaşoğlu, Technical Assistant Ms. Leyla Şimşek Çavuş, UNIDO Technical Coordinator Ms. Eylem Doğan for providing all relevant documentation for the MTR and their support in field visit organization and comments for the MTR Report.

Also thanks to General Directorate of Environmental Management Branch Director Ms. Bursev Artukoğlu for her inputs, comments, and time allocated for the meetings, and the relevant UNDP RTA, UNIDO project managers, Steering Committee members for their valuable comments and contributions.

Finally, major thanks to all of the local and national stakeholders interviewed, who provided critical responses for understanding many details of the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1. INTRODUCTION
- 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND
- 3. FINDINGS
- 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEXES:

- 1. MTR TERMS OF REFERENCE
- 2. MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX
- 3. SAMPLE INTERVIEW SHEET
- 4. MISSION ITINERARY, INTERVIEWS LIST and FIELD VISITS BRIEF NOTE (for MOEU)
- 5. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
- 6. CO-FINANCING TABLE
- 7. PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX
- 8. SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM
- 9. SIGNED MTR FINAL REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- EU : European Union EÜAŞ : Electricity Production Corporation GEF : Global Environment Facility IPA : Instrument for Pre-Accession IZAYDAS: İzmit Waste and Residue Treatment, Incineration and Recycling Co.Inc. MAP : Mediterrenean Action Programme MKEK : Machinery and Chemicals Industry Corporation (of TR) MLF : Multilateral Fund (for the Implemenation of the Montreal Protocol) MoEU : Ministry of Environment and Urbanization MoFAL : Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock MTR : Mid-Term Review NIP : National Implementation Plan PCB : Polychlorinated Biphenyl POPs : Persistent Organic Pollutants ToR : Terms of Reference
- UNDP : United Nations Development Programme
- UNEP : United Nations Environment Programme
- UNIDO : United Nations Industrial Development Organisation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose and Objective

TR Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, implements the full-sized "POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project (PIMS# 4833)", in cooperation with UNDP and UNIDO.

The purpose of the MTR for the Project is:

"to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results".

The MTR uses evidence-based, documented information, checked with the interviews and site observations, as well as review of the documentation on project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

Scope

The MTR assess the following four categories of project progress, in line with the Terms of Reference, and the specific Evaluation Framework.

- 1. Project Strategy (Project design, Project document, Results Framework)
- 2. Progress towards results (Progress towards outcomes analysis)
- 3. Project implementation and adaptive management (Management arrangements, Work planning, Finance and co-finance, Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, Stakeholder engagement, Reporting, Communications)
- 4. Sustainability (Financial, Socio-economic, Environmental, Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability)

Limitations of the MTR

The MTR Team, composed of a National Consultant, formed slightly different than similar MTR processes with an International and a National Expert. In general terms, MTR expert observed no critical limitation for conducting the MTR, in line with the ToR. The only issue is the relatively late start of the MTR process, which is almost a one year delay considering the actual mid-term and completion dates of the project. MTR Expert considered this issue and the field visit programme organized earlier then proposed, in consultation with the Project Team. Although some delays occurred in the timeline proposed in the MTR Inception Report by the MTR Expert, the process conducted within the contractual deadlines.

The MTR primarily covers the institutions and sites defined in the Terms of Reference. The close cooperation and interest of the UNDP-UNIDO Project Team, as well as the cooperative attitude of the stakeholders to the MTR is a crucial issue for the successful completion of the process. The approach of the relevant UNDP, UNIDO and MOEU managers and experts involved in the project in conducting the field visits and the preparation of this report are supportive and facilitated the process for the MTR mission and meetings successfully. Minor problems in the field and site visits solved in close coordination and cooperation with the Project Team and relevant stakeholder contact persons.

Approach and Methodology

A combination of three types of primary data collection and review techniques used in the MTR process: document review, stakeholder interviews, and site visits/observations.

The MTR expert reviewed key project documents of the the preparation and implementation phase, listed in Annex and shared by the project team, as the main sources of information, as well as some other documentation presented in the site visits by the stakeholders and project team.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. The MTR expert followed a collaborative and participatory approach, ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, beneficiary stakeholders/partners and government counterparts. The list of key stakeholders/institutions reviewed and interviewees identified in cooperation with the Project Team, for the stakeholder interviews and focus group meetings.

Interviews organized as face-to-face consultations and phone/skype interviews with the selected stakeholders who have project responsibilities, executing agencies, senior officials and task team, key experts and consultants involved in the relevant components of the project. A "semi-structured interview" method used, with a key set of questions referring the key points described in the "Scope" section of this report (Annex 5), in a conversational format. Additional discussions held as phone/Skype interviews with the project consultants and contractors as in order to get broader knowledge to assess the results of the implementation, as recommended by the stakeholders and the project team.

The project results and activities also checked/confirmed with observations on the project pilot sites. The sites visited for the MTR were selected in consultation with the Project Team considering the preliminarily defined locations in the ToR. These are the Merkim Site, İZAYDAŞ HTI Facility and Brisa in Kocaeli, ETI BAKIR Factory in Samsun, KARDEMİR in Karabük, ERDEMİR in Ereğli (Zonguldak), and İSDEMİR in İskenderun (Hatay).

Project Description

The **objective** of the Project is "to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through addressing POPs legacies including elimination of POPs Pesticide and PCB stockpiles, and initiating cleanup of associated POPs and chemical pollutant contaminated sites, as well as dealing with longer term PCB phase out consistent with the country's Stockholm Convention obligations, reducing U-POPs release in major industrial sectors, and providing targeted institutional, regulatory and technical capacity strengthening, all within a sound chemicals management framework".

The project, executed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, proposed to meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide stockpile consisting of pure HCH and associated high concentration POPs waste and PCB stockpiles as well as supporting assessment, cleanup and monitoring of priority POPs contaminated sites involving representative range of site contamination situations, remediation approaches and cleanup financing modalities.

The project also demonstrates the sustainable treatment of cross contaminated PCB transformer units by means of de-halogenation technologies, will provide technical assistance for setting up a national plan for treatment of PCB contaminated transformers, and will provide technical assistance for the establishment of BAT/BEPs among priority U-POPs emitting sectors.

Additionally the project support the qualification of needed hazardous waste infrastructure and national technical capability for the ongoing management of POPs and other chemical hazardous wastes as well as supporting the strengthening of institutional and regulatory capacity within an overall chemicals management framework.

Project aims to deliver five principle outcomes, defined as components, via achieving 18 outcomes defined under these components.

Component 1: Elimination of Current POPs Stockpiles and Wastes Component 2: Planning and Capacity Building for Environmentally Sound Management of Future PCB Stockpiles Component 3: Unintended POPs Release Reduction Component 4: Management Capacity for POPs Contaminated Sites Component 5: Institutional and Regulatory Capacity Strengthening for POPs and Sound Chemicals Management

Progress Summary

Project progress by components and outcomes are listed below, indicating level of progress by end of May 2018, based on the information provided from the project team.

Component 1: Elimination of Current POPs Stockpiles and Wastes

Outcome 1.1 Elimination of remaining POPs pesticide storage sites

1.1.1 Detailed site assessment, operational plans, EA, tender documents and contracting for Merkim POPs stockpile site and infrastructure removal **(completed)**

1.1.2 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of HCH POPs pesticides and associated clean up wastes from the Merkim site. **(under implementation)**

1.1.3 Demolition, removal and disposal of site buildings from the Merkim site followed by securing, containment, monitoring of the site pending remediation (to be initiated after completion of 1.1.2 by beneficiary)

1.1.4 Remediation of the Merkim site (to be initiated after completion of 1.1.3 by beneficiary)

1.1.5 Operational and safeguards training for hazardous waste and residual site clean-up (GEF financed phase completed, follow up being undertaken with implementation activities above)

1.1.6 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities on the Merkim site (**completed**)

1.1.7 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of consolidated obsolete pesticides from government agencies **(completed)**

Outcome 1.2: Elimination of high concentration PCBs and PCB contaminated equipment stockpiles and retiring equipment.

1.2.1 PCBs and PCB containing equipment stockpiles of inventory update identified in the PPG phase and negotiation of project period phase out agreements under MOEU regulatory orders as required **(completed)**

1.2.2 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of high concentration PCBs and PCB containing equipment. **(under implementation, completion Q3 2018)**

Outcome 1.3: Qualification of existing and developing national POPs destruction facilities.

1.3.1 Facility upgrade investment in materials handling, APC and monitoring infrastructure at the Izaydas (completed)

1.3.2 Test burns undertaken on representative POPs (PCBs and POPs pesticides) at the Izaydas (completed)

1.3 3 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities at Izaydas **(Ongoing by IZAYDAS)**

1.3.5 Review potential facilities licenced by MoEU during inception period for upgrading/qualification of existing national POPs destruction capability **(cancelled)**

1.3.6 Performance test operations completed on representative POPs (PCBs and POPs pesticides) at defined under item of 1.3.5 **(cancelled)**

1.3.7 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities (cancelled)

<u>Component 2: Planning and Capacity Building for Environmentally Sound Management of Future</u> <u>PCB Stockpiles</u>

Outcome 2.1: Implementation of national PCB regulations

2.1.1 Technical annex and guidance documents to the existing PCB regulation developed **(completed)**

2.1.2 Capacity of the relevant authority for monitoring, measuring and reporting the implementation of the existing PCB regulation enhanced **(completed)**

Outcome 2.2: Systematic approach for the analytical determination of PCB in electrical equipment, labelling and inventory.

2.2.1 Training on PCB equipment identification and labelling. (completed)

2.2.2 Sampling and analysis of online or stored transformers for checking their contamination by PCBs. (in progress)

2.2.3. Update of the existing PCB inventory and identification of PCB containing equipment (in progress)

Outcome 2.3: Development and adoption of national PCB equipment phase out and retirement plan

2.3.1 Consultation with the main stakeholders from the power generation and distribution sector and large electricity customers to identify PCB management plan priorities and develop the PCB management plan. (to be initiated after the completion of 2.2.2 and 2.2.3)

2.3.2 Promotion of adoption and development of an implementation strategy for the PCB management plan implemented. **(to be initiated after the completion of 2.2.2 and 2.2.3)**

Outcome 2.4: Improvement of storage and maintenance of cross contaminated PCB equipment

2.4.1. Standards and Guidance Documents for prioritizing, maintenance, handling and storage of PCB contaminated equipment in use or under maintenance. (completed)

2.4.2. Adoption of physical or operational measures for preventing release of PCB or human exposure to PCB from equipment on-line, in use or stored. (completed)

Outcome 2.5: Determination decontamination technology for PCB contaminated transformers remaining in service and its pilot demonstration

2.5.1 Feasibility study concerning technological options for the treatment of transformers online or stored for maintenance. (completed) 2.5.2 Selection, procurement and testing of equipment for the treatment of PCB contaminated transformers. (completed)

2.5.3 Pilot demonstration of the treatment of PCB contaminated equipment (in progress)

Component 3: Unintended POPs Release Reduction

Outcome 3.1: Determination and verification on enterprise level of source and technology specific U-POPs emissions

3.1.1 Determination of current U-POPs emission factors in the iron and steel sector – sintering plants and/or EAF, non-ferrous metal industry (aluminum, copper and zinc production) and other priority sectors (in progress) 3.1.2 Training on PCDD/F sampling and analysis at industrial sites (completed)

Outcome 3.2: Provision of training and technical assistance on BAT/BEP for priority industrial sectors

3.2.1 Training on U-POPs inventory, sampling and analysis (completed) 3.2.2 Training of at least 50 technical professionals on BAT-BEPs in 10 priority industrial sectors (completed)

Outcome 3.3: Development of a national U-POPs release reduction plan

3.3.1 Assessment of the regulatory gaps with reference to SC requirement and EU-IPPC regulation and proposed amendments (completed) 3.3.2 Identification of areas with the highest priorities and cost/effectiveness in term of U-

POPs reduction (in progress) 3.3.3 Development of the national U-POPs release reduction plan with risk-based and

cost/effectiveness priorities. (in progress)

Outcome 3.4: Demonstration of BAT/BAT in industrial priority source categories

3.4.1. Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (sintering plants) (in progress)

3.4.2. Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (Electric arc furnaces) (in progress)

3.4.3 Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in non-ferrous metals sector (copper, zinc, aluminium) (in progress)

Component 4: Management Capacity for POPs Contaminated Sites

Outcome 4.1: Implementation of the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation"

4.1.1: Technical support provided for implementation and administration of the three primary systems under the regulation **(in progress)**

4.1.2 Technical support provided in developing mechanisms for financing contaminated site clean-up under the regulations **(completed)**

4.1.3 Stakeholder awareness and support in regulation and associated component system delivered (partially completed)

4.1.4 Training program development and delivery for site assessment including application of risk assessment (completed)

4.1.5 Training program development and delivery for remediation technology demonstration and selection **(completed)**

Outcome 4.2: Undertaking priority POPs contaminated sites assessments and clean up measures under the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation"

4.2.1: Funding initial site assessment, clean up design and technology option analysis for prioritized regulatory action (in progress)

4.2.2: Undertaking demonstration contaminated site clean ups using a pilot national contaminated sites funding mechanism (being initiated)

<u>Component 5: Institutional and Regulatory</u> <u>Capacity Strengthening for POPs and Sound Chemicals</u> <u>Management</u>

Outcome 5.1: Legislative framework updated and adopted consistent with Convention obligations

5.1.1 Harmonization of POPs related legislation and regulation with current SC obligations and relevant EU Directives. **(partially completed)**

5.1.2 Ratification/accession to the Rotterdam Convention completed and measures implemented **(in progress)**

5.1.3 Definition of long term capacity and market requirements for POPs and chemical waste management services (delayed)

Outcome 5.2: Strengthened technical capacity- including operational POPs monitoring, supporting analytical capability, and planning related research and development capability

5.2.1 Operational POPs monitoring and participation in the Global POPs network facilitated (in progress)

5.2.2 Qualification undertaken with additional laboratories for regulatory purposes related to POPS and contaminated sites activities. **(initiated after completion of 5.2.1)**

5.2.3 National POPs and chemicals waste management R&D program developed. (delayed)

Outcome 5.3 Development and implementation of modern tools for a national sound chemicals management framework

5.3.1 EU REACH regulatory framework and national PRTR developed (delayed)5.3.2 Training and web based information access programs on sound chemicals management using internationally available training modules and guidance materials developed. (delayed)

5.3.3 Delivered training on sound chemicals management to institutional and industry professionals and stakeholders. **(delayed)**

5.3.4 Delivered general chemicals management awareness materials to the general public in the form of information products and public events **(delayed)**

Outcome 5.4 Development of national programs for the provision of POPs and chemicals management technical assistance to developing countries as a donor country

5.4.1 Developed national program for approval and funding for POPs/chemicals management technical assistance (delayed)

Evaluation Ratings

The overall rating for the project is Satisfactory. Below table provides an overall summary of the evaluation ratings and brief description of the reasons, based on the progress in the project activities, as well as the responses from the stakeholder visits and site observations.

Measure	MTR Rating	Description
Project Strategy (Relevance)		Project design and strategy found to be relevant to the national priorities as well as institutional priorities of the executing and implementing agencies, partnering companies and other beneficiary stakeholders.
Progress towards	Objective: Satisfactory	Mid-term targets defined in the project

	results	Outcome 1: Satisfactory	document and results framework could not be
	(Effectiveness)	Outcome 2: Satisfactory	positively.
		Outcome 3: Satisfactory	Delays in some key activities such as the
		Outcome 4: Satisfactory	sample collection process for PCBs, and need
		Outcome 5: Satisfactory	for a reasonable time for the complete elimination/disposal of the waste considering the time required for the identification, collection, analysis, disposal and reporting requires an extension to the completion date.
i	Project implementation and adaptive management	Moderately Satisfactory	Operational and financial management of the project, stakeholder ownership and engagement, as well as reporting processes observed to be satisfactory.
	(Efficiency)		Although the communication activities seem to delay, the progress with development of a communication plan and start of the informative activities evaluated as an improvement.
			The delays in the recruitment of the project staff and relatively long procurement cycles in the tender processes for the disposal of POPs stockpiles and sample collection processes for PCBs found to affect the completion date, which requires an extension of 12-18 Months.
	Sustainability	Likely	Regarding the involvement and progressive ownership of the beneficiary partners, executing and implementing agencies as well as the progress in the POPs related legislative and administrative processes, sustainability of the project in all means, observed to be satisfactory.

CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

MTR Expert concludes;

Overall management and implementation of the project found successful and satisfactory with good prospects of successfully achieving the project targets. These prospects can be enhanced by implementing partners with the recommended actions noted in in the Findings section of this report.

• Each component of the project has the capacity of an individual project that can also be developed, implemented and further developed independently.

- Project activities successfully implemented as a result of the close cooperation and coordination
 of the executing and implementing partners with beneficiary stakeholders up to mid-term review
 period.
- Executing agency, implementing agencies and the beneficiary stakeholders/participants observed to be involved to the project implementation progressively with a good cooperation and coordination,
- Project Management Team and key experts observed to be highly professional and successful in coordination of the project, with good relations and cooperation with beneficiary stakeholders/partners.
- The project has a strong potential to provide major global environmental benefits and best practices that enhance national development in chemicals management and which are replicable as best practices globally.

and recommends;

the successful implementation of the project can be improved considering the below recommendations.

- Project implementation should be extended a minimum of 12, preferably 18 months (project completion date as December 2020) considering:
 - \circ the delays in the PCB sample collection by the participants and the analysis process,
 - o completion of the BAT/BEP recommended investments
 - procurement cycle timelines extending the completion schedule for elimination/disposal activity
- Increase updating the beneficiary stakeholders/partners on the overall project activities and the progress periodically via e-communication tools,
- Expand, as practical, involvement of stakeholders and national experts/expertise from the relevant institutions, in the implementation of this and similar projects.
- The team and the key experts recommended to actively continue working in their positions, until the completion date, regarding the critical status of the project.
- More active communication with the stakeholders and public and updating them on the progress in the project would be beneficial.

EVALUATION/REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

TR Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, implements the full-sized "POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project (PIMS# 4833)", in cooperation with UNDP and UNIDO.

The purpose of the MTR for the Project is:

"to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results".

The MTR uses evidence-based, documented information, checked with the interviews and site observations, as well as review of the documentation on project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

Scope

The MTR assess the following four categories of project progress, in line with the Terms of Reference, and the specific Evaluation Framework.

- 1. Project Strategy (Project design, Project document, Results Framework)
- 2. Progress towards results (Progress towards outcomes analysis)
- 3. Project implementation and adaptive management (Management arrangements, Work planning, Finance and co-finance, Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, Stakeholder engagement, Reporting, Communications)
- 4. Sustainability (Financial, Socio-economic, Environmental, Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability)

Limitations of the MTR

The MTR Team, composed of a National Consultant, formed slightly different than similar MTR processes with an International and a National Expert. In general terms, MTR expert observed no critical limitation for conducting the MTR, in line with the ToR. The only issue is the relatively late start of the MTR process, which is almost a one year delay considering the actual mid-term and completion dates of the project. MTR Expert considered this issue and the field visit programme organized earlier then proposed, in consultation with the Project Team. Although some delays occurred in the timeline proposed in the MTR Inception Report by the MTR Expert, the process conducted within the contractual deadlines.

The MTR primarily covers the institutions and sites defined in the Terms of Reference. The close cooperation and interest of the UNDP-UNIDO Project Team, as well as the cooperative attitude of the stakeholders to the MTR is a crucial issue for the successful completion of the process. The approach of the relevant UNDP, UNIDO and MoEU managers and experts involved in the project in conducting the field visits and the preparation of this report are supportive and facilitated the

process for the MTR mission and meetings successfully. Minor problems in the field and site visits solved in close coordination and cooperation with the Project Team and relevant stakeholder contact persons.

Approach and Methodology

A combination of three types of primary data collection and review techniques used in the MTR process: document review, stakeholder interviews, and site visits/observations.

The MTR expert reviewed key project documents prepared during the preparation and implementation phase, listed in Annex, as the main sources of information, as well as some other documentation presented in the site visits by the stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. The MTR expert followed a collaborative and participatory approach, ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, beneficiary stakeholders/partners and government counterparts. The list of key stakeholders/institutions reviewed and interviewees identified in cooperation with the Project Team, for the stakeholder interviews and focus group meetings.

Interviews organized as face-to-face consultations and phone/skype interviews with the selected stakeholders who have project responsibilities, executing agencies, senior officials and task team, key experts and consultants involved in the relevant components of the project. A "semi-structured interview" method used, with a key set of questions referring the key points described in the "Scope" section of this report (Annex 5), in a conversational format. Additional discussions held as phone/Skype interviews with the project consultants and contractors as interviewees and the Project Team recommended, in order to get broader knowledge to assess the results of the implementation.

The project results and activities also checked with observations on the project pilot sites. The sites visited for the MTR were selected in consultation with the Project Team considering the preliminarily defined locations in ToR. These are the Merkim Site, İZAYDAŞ HTI Facility and Brisa in Kocaeli, ETI BAKIR Factory in Samsun, KARDEMİR in Karabük, ERDEMİR in Ereğli (Zonguldak), and İSDEMİR in İskenderun (Hatay).

2.PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

A summary of the project background shared in the inception report as below:

Recognizing the dangers of POPs, many countries began limiting or banning their production, use, and release. These efforts culminated in the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants that was adopted in 2001 and entered into force in 2004. More than 160 countries Parties to the Convention agree to eliminate or reduce the release of POPs into the environment. The Stockholm Convention focuses on POPs pesticides, industrial chemicals, and unintentional by-products of immediate concern.

Turkey has signed the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants on May 23rd 2001 and is approved by the Turkish Grand National Assembly as 5 871 numbered Law (14.04.2009, No.27200) then published on July 30th 2009 as approved by the Council of Ministers (30.07.2009, No.27304). The Convention officially is effective since January 12th 2010.

As stated by the Article 7 of the Convention, Turkey prepared the first NIP in 2004 to 2006 funded by GEF and revised it in 2010, submitted to the Stockholm Secretariat in 2011 which included initial 12 POPs issues of concern like uses, import, export, production, distribution in country and source related inventory, current stockpiles and its disposal options assessment, contaminated sites, POPs chemicals related infrastructure, legal instruments, monitoring, research and development capacity, monitoring system establishment and use.

The prepared plan was reviewed and updated, in accordance with the responsibilities to the Convention, by funding with GEF assistance along with UNIDO on capacity building between the years 2012-2013. The NIP Update process is conducted via following the Guidance for Developing a National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention.

Based on the analysis of the state of the NIP prepared under the umbrella of the SC, level of available POPs information, inventories and approaches to the solution, a broader document was prepared as a part of the EU project of the Technical Assistance for the Implementation of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Regulation. The title of this document is National Implementation Plan of the POPs management if Turkey (August 2014) and has two parts – (i) NIP as basic information, overview of country POPs problems and (ii) supporting information presented in the Annexes of the NIP.

The factual basis for Turkey's approach to the POPs issue is its NIP which defines the baseline situation in terms of POPs legacies and priorities related to on-going management of POPs issues. It demonstrates that like most comparable countries, POPs, while never produced in the country, were widely used particularly in the form of POPs pesticides (DDT, HCB, HCH) and PCBs primarily in imported electrical equipment. Similarly, the accelerated industrialization in the country results in a wide range of sources for unintended releases of POPs (U-POPs), particularly PCDD/F but also PCBs and potentially other POPs. However, Turkey generally responded to the increasing awareness of the risks associated with these substances in the same time frames as most developed countries by banning their import and new uses. In addition, it also initiated action on eliminating legacies after 2001 when it

became a signatory to the Stockholm Convention, although this was substantially accelerated after 2007 with the preparation of the NIP and its adoption by MoEU as the basis for priority regulatory action.

The project aims to contribute eliminating the main barriers defined in the project document as:

main barriers which presently exist in relation to eliminating POPs legacies and reducing POPs releases in Turkey as well as addressing hazardous waste and chemicals management issues generally are identified as the following:

Institutional barriers: Not withstanding Turkey's substantial progress in developing mature effective institutions to address environmental issues, the size and complexity of the country and its political environment inevitably create institutional barriers. At a policy level these primarily relate to maintaining the appropriate balance between sustaining the country's economic development priorities and social support systems with the increasingly evident need for greater attention to environmental protection generally and particularly dealing with environmental legacies. This demands significant coordination efforts particularly between MoEU and to some extent MoFWA with the primary economic planning authorities, particularly Ministry of Development. Coordination and communication respecting environmental legacy issues within the framework of the project, remains a periodic challenge across the various stakeholders, at the national level as well as downward through the provincial and local jurisdictional levels involved.. As discussed both above and below in the stakeholder analysis a number of other national ministries have a stake in the project's implementation and will have to be consulted and involved.

<u>Legal and regulatory barriers</u>: The reasonably well developed and developing regulatory framework governing the project and its scope generally facilitates the project's implementation. In the PCB and contaminated sites inventories limited implementation of regulatory measures may present barrier, The project will facilitate expediting this process. This will involve facilitating national PCB phase out plan and in the case of contaminated sites supporting the multiyear implementation cycle. In both cases, an issue that has arisen across MoEU departments that has and will continue to have to be managed is confidentiality of data such as inventories, a restriction that has to some degree inhibited development of project scope and could affect project effectiveness.

<u>Information and awareness barriers</u>: There is an increasing but still limited awareness among stakeholders on environmental legacy issues in Turkey. On the positive side private sector started to recognize historical legacies and deficits in environmental performance as reflected by a number of opportunities the project identified in all its components. Having said that in the Kocaeli Region the interests of the general population regarding pollution issues, HW stockpiles and the performance of processing facilities has been expressed and is noted by both municipal and enterprise officials. In both cases, increasing public information and understanding of solutions is considered important.

<u>Technical capacity and supporting infrastructure barriers</u>: As illustrated in the situation analysis on technical capacity above, there are a number of specific deficits in technical capacities that could present barriers to effective project implementation and achievement of its objectives. While the Project could be implemented using contracted international expertise in these areas, the opportunity also exists to use the project to foster development of sustaining expertise and infrastructure in the country through effective national/international partnerships, particularly with the private sector.

<u>Financial barriers:</u> Financial barriers to addressing the POPs issues are existing in most of the countries.; therefore, there are limitations to efficiently mobilize financial resources to deal with legacy issues. In some cases this is associated with assigning financial liabilities for historical HW stockpiles and contamination between current owners and those originally involved in their creation. Overall, Turkey has not developed a sufficient menu of economic instruments, particularly those involving public private partnerships or legal instruments governing environmental liabilities that have proven effective in addressing such issues in developed countries.

Project Description and Strategy

The **objective** of the Project is "to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through addressing POPs legacies including elimination of POPs Pesticide and PCB stockpiles, and initiating cleanup of associated POPs and chemical pollutant contaminated sites, as well as dealing with longer term PCB phase out consistent with the country's Stockholm Convention obligations, reducing U-POPs release in major industrial sectors, and providing targeted institutional, regulatory and technical capacity strengthening, all within a sound chemicals management framework".

The project, executed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, proposed to meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide stockpile consisting of pure HCH and associated high concentration POPs waste and PCB stockpiles as well as supporting assessment, cleanup and monitoring of priority POPs contaminated sites involving representative range of site contamination situations, remediation approaches and cleanup financing modalities.

The project also demonstrates the sustainable treatment of cross contaminated PCB transformer units by means of de-halogenation technologies, will provide technical assistance for setting up a national plan for treatment of PCB contaminated transformers, and will provide technical assistance for the establishment of BAT/BEPs among priority U-POPs emitting sectors.

Additionally the project support the qualification of needed hazardous waste infrastructure and national technical capability for the ongoing management of POPs and other chemical hazardous wastes as well as supporting the strengthening of institutional and regulatory capacity within an overall chemicals management framework.

Project aims to deliver five principle outcomes defined as components via achieving a total of 18 outcomes defined under these components. These outcomes with their respective activities listed below:

Component 1: Elimination of Current POPs Stockpiles and Wastes

Outcome 1.1 Elimination of remaining POPs pesticide storage sites

1.1.1 Detailed site assessment, operational plans, EA, tender documents and contracting for Merkim POPs stockpile site and infrastructure removal

1.1.2 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of HCH POPs pesticides and associated clean up wastes from the Merkim site.

1.1.3 Demolition, removal and disposal of site buildings from the Merkim site followed by securing, containment, monitoring of the site pending remediation

1.1.4 Remediation of the Merkim site

1.1.5 Operational and safeguards training for hazardous waste and residual site clean-up

1.1.6 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities on the Merkim site

1.1.7 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of consolidated obsolete pesticides from government agencies

Outcome 1.2: Elimination of high concentration PCBs and PCB contaminated equipment stockpiles and retiring equipment.

1.2.1 PCBs and PCB containing equipment stockpiles of inventory update identified in the PPG phase and negotiation of project period phase out agreements under MOEU regulatory orders as required

1.2.2 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of high concentration PCBs and PCB containing equipment.

Outcome 1.3: Qualification of existing and developing national POPs destruction facilities.

1.3.1 Facility upgrade investment in materials handling, APC and monitoring infrastructure at the Izaydas

1.3.2 Test burns undertaken on representative POPs (PCBs and POPs pesticides) at the Izaydas

1.3 3 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities at Izaydas

1.3.5 Review potential facilities licenced by MoEU during inception period for upgrading/qualification of existing national POPs destruction capability

1.3.6 Performance test operations completed on representative POPs (PCBs and POPs pesticides) at defined under item of 1.3.5

1.3.7 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities

<u>Component 2: Planning and Capacity Building for Environmentally Sound Management of Future</u> <u>PCB Stockpiles</u>

Outcome 2.1: Implementation of national PCB regulations

2.1.1 Technical annex and guidance documents to the existing PCB regulation developed

2.1.2 Capacity of the relevant authority for monitoring, measuring and reporting the implementation of the existing PCB regulation enhanced

Outcome 2.2: Systematic approach for the analytical determination of PCB in electrical equipment, labelling and inventory.

2.2.1 Training on PCB equipment identification and labelling.

2.2.2 Sampling and analysis of online or stored transformers for checking their contamination by PCBs.

2.2.3. Update of the existing PCB inventory and identification of PCB containing equipment

Outcome 2.3: Development and adoption of national PCB equipment phase out and retirement plan

2.3.1 Consultation with the main stakeholders from the power generation and distribution sector and large electricity customers to identify PCB management plan priorities and develop the PCB management plan.

2.3.2 Promotion of adoption and development of an implementation strategy for the PCB management plan implemented

Outcome 2.4: Improvement of storage and maintenance of cross contaminated PCB equipment

2.4.1. Standards and Guidance Documents for prioritizing, maintenance, handling and storage of PCB contaminated equipment in use or under maintenance.

2.4.2. Adoption of physical or operational measures for preventing release of PCB or human exposure to PCB from equipment on-line, in use or stored

Outcome 2.5: Determination decontamination technology for PCB contaminated transformers remaining in service and its pilot demonstration

2.5.1 Feasibility study concerning technological options for the treatment of transformers online or stored for maintenance.

2.5.2 Selection, procurement and testing of equipment for the treatment of PCB contaminated transformers.

2.5.3 Pilot demonstration of the treatment of PCB contaminated equipment (in progress)

Component 3: Unintended POPs Release Reduction

Outcome 3.1: Determination and verification on enterprise level of source and technology specific U-POPs emissions

3.1.1 Determination of current U-POPs emission factors in the iron and steel sector – sintering plants and/or EAF, non-ferrous metal industry (aluminum, copper and zinc production) and other priority sectors

3.1.2 Training on PCDD/F sampling and analysis at industrial sites

Outcome 3.2: Provision of training and technical assistance on BAT/BEP for priority industrial sectors

3.2.1 Training on U-POPs inventory, sampling and analysis

3.2.2 Training of at least 50 technical professionals on BAT-BEPs in 10 priority industrial sectors

Outcome 3.3: Development of a national U-POPs release reduction plan

3.3.1 Assessment of the regulatory gaps with reference to SC requirement and EU-IPPC regulation and proposed amendments

3.3.2 Identification of areas with the highest priorities and cost/effectiveness in term of U-POPs reduction

3.3.3 Development of the national U-POPs release reduction plan with risk-based and cost/effectiveness priorities.

Outcome 3.4: Demonstration of BAT/BAT in industrial priority source categories

3.4.1. Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (sintering plants)

3.4.2. Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (Electric arc furnaces)

3.4.3 Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in non-feeous metals sector (copper, zinc, aluminium)

Component 4: Management Capacity for POPs Contaminated Sites

Outcome 4.1: Implementation of the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation"

4.1.1: Technical support provided for implementation and administration of the three primary systems under the regulation

4.1.2 Technical support provided in developing mechanisms for financing contaminated site clean-up under the regulations

4.1.3 Stakeholder awareness and support in regulation and associated component system delivered

4.1.4 Training program development and delivery for site assessment including application of risk assessment

4.1.5 Training program development and delivery for remediation technology demonstration and selection

Outcome 4.2: Undertaking priority POPs contaminated sites assessments and clean up measures under the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation

4.2.1: Funding initial site assessment, clean up design and technology option analysis for prioritized regulatory action

4.2.2: Undertaking demonstration contaminated site clean ups using a pilot national contaminated sites funding mechanism

<u>Component 5: Institutional and Regulatory</u> <u>Capacity Strengthening for POPs and Sound Chemicals</u> <u>Management</u>

Outcome 5.1: Legislative framework updated and adopted consistent with Convention obligations

5.1.1 Harmonization of POPs related legislation and regulation with current SC obligations and relevant EU Directives.

5.1.2 Ratification/accession to the Rotterdam Convention completed and measures implemented

5.1.3 Definition of long term capacity and market requirements for POPs and chemical waste management services

Outcome 5.2: Strengthened technical capacity- including operational POPs monitoring, supporting analytical capability, and planning related research and development capability

5.2.1 Operational POPs monitoring and participation in the Global POPs network facilitate

5.2.2 Qualification undertaken with additional laboratories for regulatory purposes related to POPS and and contaminated sites activities.

5.2.3 National POPs and chemicals waste management R&D program developed..

Outcome 5.3 Development and implementation of modern tools for a national sound chemicals management framework

5.3.1 EU REACH regulatory framework and national PRTR developed

5.3.2 Training and web based information access programs on sound chemicals management using internationally available training modules and guidance materials developed.

5.3.3 Delivered training on sound chemicals management to institutional and industry professionals and stakeholders.

5.3.4 Delivered general chemicals management awareness materials to the general public in the form of information products and public events

Outcome 5.4 Development of national programs for the provision of POPs and chemicals management technical assistance to developing countries as a donor country

5.4.1 Developed national program for approval and funding for POPs/chemicals management technical assistance

Implementation Arrangements

As explained in detail in the Project Document; the project executed by Ministry of Environment and Urbanism (MoEU), in cooperation with UNDP and UNIDO, as implementing agencies. MoEU designated a senior official as the National Project Director (NPD) for the project, in line with GEF rules and guidelines.

The NPD is be responsible for overall guidance to project management to (i) coordinate the project activities among the project and other Government entities; (ii) check that the expenditures are in line with approved budgets and work-plans; (iii) facilitate, monitor and report on the procurement of inputs and delivery of outputs; (iv) review the Terms of Reference for consultants and tender documents for subcontracted inputs; and (v) supervise the reporting to UNDP and UNIDO on project delivery and impact.

A Project Board (PB) established at the inception of the project to monitor the project progress, to guide its implementation and to support the project otherwise in achieving its listed outputs and outcomes. It is chaired by MoEU and composed of the Ministry of Development (MOD), Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (GEF OFP), and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) as well as UNDP and UNIDO in their capacity of GEF implementing agencies' oversight and strategic guidance responsibilities. Other members (e.g. industrial associations, research institutes) invited by the decision of the PB on as-needed basis, however, by taking care that the PB remains operational by its size.



3. FINDINGS

Findings of the MTR compiled from the review of the project documentation, stakeholder interviews and site visits summarized below, in line with the evaluative questions provided with the ToR and compiled in the MTR Evaluative Framework of the MTR Inception Report, approved by the Commissioning Unit (Annex 2).

3.1. Project Strategy

Main question for the evaluation of the project strategy, which is mostly related to the "relevance" component of the evaluation, was defined as:

"to what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?"

a. Project Design

Project address and define focused and specificed actions for the improvement of the conditions and institutionsl capacities in the chemicals management, specifically POPs reduction, in line with the multilateral environmental agreements (Stockholm Convention) and national environmental legislation on environment and chemicals management

Project content and proposed results from the project, found to be relevant with the country needs and priorities in the environmental and chemicals management, public health and capacity enhancement in public and sectorial policies and strategies, as well as the relevant sectorial and institutional policy and programs of the beneficiary/participant stakeholders.

Assumptions developed in the project results framework found to be defined well, relevant to the project targets, detailed and realistic in the project development and inception period. The complementary and corrective actions organized and implemented in the project implementation by the executing and implementing partners, also observed to secure the potential negative impacts either proposed in the initial development process, reviewed in the inception period, or emerged in the implementation period.

b. Project Document

The project content and concept found to be developed and reviewed in line with the country priorities, relevant national (environment and chemicals) regulations, strategy and action plans (e.g. POPs NIP), conditions in the relevant sectors, based on the most up-to-date information exist in the project development period. Considering this existing information base, and the capacities of the executing and the implementing partners, the path developed for the project seems one of the most effective ways to achieve the results, and provide stakeholder contribution in a reasonable level.

The executing and implementing partners of the project, with some of the participating/beneficiary companies, has experience in developing and implementing GEF, EU and other internationally funded projects/programmes. Lessons learned from these experiences and other POPs related activities of the public institutions (e.g. EÜAŞ) and participants, also shared and used in preparation and implementation period.

The executing and implementing agencies mentioned the project as the improvement and complementing project for the NIP, EU-IPA and UNEP MAP funded POPs and chemicals management projects and national programs on environmental/waste and chemicals management, as well as ongoing programmes in MoEU (e.g. ozone, zero waste, etc.), MoFAL (pest management).

The results and lessons learned in this project also mentioned as the main input and baseline for the further planned studies in and pipelined projects in POPs and chemicals management, with the project partners (e.g. MoFAL)

The main party to the project implementation and proposed results is the executing party MoEU, is the main legal, administrative and operational government institution authorized in the field of environmental management, and the "owner" of the project on behalf of the Turkish Government.

Implementing agencies (UNDP & UNIDO) provide technical assistance for the management, M&E and financial management of the project. The participant companies and institutions, which are also the beneficiary stakeholders underline the project as an important initiative to improve cooperation and coordination between all relevant parties in chemicals and hazardous waste management, under the coordination of the MoEU.

Although the project propose and operate in pilot level, considering the coverage of the relevant sectors, beneficiaries indicate the project activities not only raise awareness for sectoral and institutional ownership, but also opened doors for active cooperation to achieve and enhance the outcomes from the project countrywide, that will ensure the improvement for the country ownership in chemicals and hazardous waste management.

The only issue not totally considered in the first half of the project implementation is the awareness of general public, to increase the ownership, which related activities were planned for the second half of the project. With the implementation of the communication activities, increase in the public ownership proposed to increase countrywide.

All beneficiary stakeholders are aware of the regulations on environmental management, both national and EU level, and the conditions they have to fulfill considering the national regulations Most of the companies interviewed, already either have an institutional environment and energy strategy or policy documents and internal regulations as a part of their institutional strategy.

Others also have some regulatory procedures, either defined institutionally or referring the existing national regulations. In general, companies aware of the proposed technical and operational capacity enhancement practices introduced with the project activities and interested to adapt these to their institutional policies and practices.

Active involvement of the stakeholders to the processes is one of the critical issues in GEF and similar internationally funded programs, reflecting similar responses from target groups. Although the project preparation process evaluate and include most relevant institutions based on the existing information and the stakeholder analysis, response to this question in MTRs by the institutions may be negative, mostly due to changes in the contact officers in some institutions, or the project developers may not share information about the process directly with the institutions but provide the information from other government records, due to the method used.

The participant/beneficiary stakeholders found to participate and contribute to the project design and its implementation, as well as the decision-making processes directly and indirectly, in the relevant technical processes, depending on the communication and cooperation with the project management.

Besides this, unless the baseline study for the project is well designed and strictly implemented, the inclusion of the all relevant institutions may fail and this may affect the results. In this project, this level of exclusion observed to be lower than average of similar projects, but still seem there is a need to review the all relevant institutions, and potential sectors based on the information gathered within the project timeline and considering the recommendations of the beneficiary stakeholders/partners for further actions on chemicals management.

The project does not focus on gender issues explicitly in the project document and its activities. But, chemicals and waste management issues is also a public health issue, that explicitly consider potential impacts on women, youth and vulnerable groups. Gender sensitive compilation of data, inclusion of women participants and experts to the activities, etc. referred in the project document.

c. Results Framework

Considering the status of the implementation compared to the project results framework, the progress evaluated successful, due to the good design of the project document, activities, indicators in the initial and inception process and active monitoring of the progress by the executing and implementing partners.

The progress in the project also have potentials to provide ground and cooperation opportunities for environmental management, developing innovative investment opportunities for the target sector companies, and improve public awareness on POPS and chemicals management that may result with an enhanced and widespread actions by citizens that contribute to the chemicals management.

3.2. Progress Towards Results

Main question for the evaluation of the project strategy, which is mostly related to the "effectiveness" component of the evaluation was defined as:

"to what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?"

The progress towards results matrix shared in Annex 7

3.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Main question for the evaluation of the project strategy, which is mostly related to the "efficiency" component of the evaluation, was defined as:

"Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?"

a. Management arrangements

Project overall management observed to be effective in general, especially regarding the responses from the beneficiary stakeholders, which are government institutions and private sector companies actively involved in the implementation.

This result mostly based on the close cooperation and communication between UNDP-UNIDO Project team, partner stakeholders and MoEU. All parties agree with the professional, effective, solution oriented, cooperative and hard working attitude of the project team is the main issue in solving any problem, emerged in the implementation processes.

Although delays occured in implementation, the project team, in cooperation and consultation with the MoEU, UNDP and UNIDO project managers and relevant beneficiary partners, found to actively organize to develop necessary actions and find solutions in cooperation with all parties, to achieve the proposed result with the activity.

All interviewees responded and commented positively on the cooperation and coordination for the successful management of the project activities, especially the professionalism and solution oriented attitude of the Project Team, executing and implementing partners (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO). The close cooperation and coordination established between UNDP-UNIDO and MoEU as the implementing parties, as well as their communication and cooperation improved within the implementation process observed to provide an efficient project management.

The main issues that project management may consider for more efficient management can be the periodical updating of all beneficiary parties on the project progress and achievements, and develop actions to increase the efficiency and timeliness of the procurement/tender procedures.

b. Work planning

The project PIF dated 2013, CEO Endorsement dated Dec. 2014, project document signed May 2015, and inception meeting held in 16 November 2015, MTR proposed for May 2017. Regarding these dates, as well as GEF, MoEU, UNDP & UNIDO processes, and the actual status of the activities, the project implementation found to start with a delay, and currently there is almost 1 year delay in implementation and MTR processes.

The reasons for this, found as the delays in the recruitment of the project staff and establishing PMU, restructuring in UNDP CO in UNDP side, tender processes, collection of the samples for PCBs due to field conditions and responses from the beneficiary stakeholders, and mentioned in PIR as the parliamentary elections in 2017,

The project management took necessary actions to overcome the possible impacts of such delays and could manage to compensate the delays. Considering the status of the implementation and the reasonable time required for the completion of the processes defined especially in components 1,2 &3, an extension of 12-18 months to the project

recommended by beneficiary/partnering stakeholders and the project team, also agreed by the MTR expert.

As per the discussions with the UNDP-UNIDO project team, and review of the key project documents (reports, neeting minutes, etc.),MTR expert observed the implementing partners highly consider and follow the results framework professionally, as a reference for the implementation and monitor the progress, conduct reporting and activities in line with the requirements of the project document and the relevant GEF and UNDP/UNIDO guidelines. This process conducted with the active involvement of the relevant officers of UNDP and UNIDO, to secure the compliance with the UN and GEF procedures, as required in the relevant guidelines.

c. Finance and co-finance

As the implementing agencies, with precious GEF co-funded project management experience, have established rules and regulations, as well as financial management systems, fund releases managed appropriately, allowing project management in budget related actions and decisions.

Overall financial management of the project, including the co-financing found in compliance with the established rules and procedures of the executing and implementing agencies, as well as the participant stakeholders.

According to the updated co-financing table, shared in Annex 6, the actual co-financing ratios change from 20% (Kardemir) to 133% (İZAYDAŞ). The most appreciated contribution mentioned as the contribution of MERKIM in Component 1. In the remaining project time, the proposed contributions from the beneficiary partners have the potential to increase, especially in-kind contributions and operational costs.

d. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Implementing agencies, UNDP and UNIDO use online corporate management and monitoring systems (ATLAS, SAP) that are used to support the management and monitoring of the project, especially in financial means.

The project found to use and improve the chemicals and waste monitoring system of MoEU, with the module developed for the database management for POPs, also used actively in the PCB sampling activities.

Additionally, some of the beneficiary stakeholders mentioned they have developed internal monitoring systems, and also connected to the interactive online system of MoEU for chemicals tracking, and some others mentioned benefiting from this experience they intent and propose to develop their own monitoring systems for chemicals and environmental data management, which can be a side contribution of the project activities.

e. Stakeholder engagement

Beneficiary/partnering stakeholders involved in the implementation confirmed the close cooperation with the Project team (UNDP&UNIDO) and responded positively about increasing interest and involvement to the project activities as a result of good cooperation. The only issue they comment is the delays in the response on some process and products of the activities by the Project Team, such as the updates on the PCB analysis, training and project progress reportings, etc.

Stakeholders with institutional policies for environment and energy (such as ISDEMIR, ERDEMIR as OYAK Holding companies, Turk Telekom, IZAYDAŞ, etc.), and involved in other EU, MLF or similar projects previously found more aware, committed, interested and more cooperative in implementation and shared their interest in using the results from the project in their further activities related to the environmental management.

Government institutions such as EUAS, MKEK and participating ministries (MoFAL,), have high level or awareness and information on the processes and regulations on POPs. They provide or have potentials to provide high level of contribution with their institutional experience and expertise, both in the implementation and for further improvement of the project results. In order to enhance such contribution, relevant key institutions should be visited periodically and actively included to task forces, steering committees and project development sessions more.

Provincial Directorates of MoEU has also involved in the implementation via participating to the trainings organized under project activities. Active involvement of the relevant staff of these directorates is crucially important for the success and further improvement and dissemination of the project outcomes to the local level. The key issue for the active involvement of the local staff is securing the continuity of the participation and assignment of the same staff to the processes, especially in priority regions and cities, although it does not seem so much possible in the existing staffing of the directorates.

Municipalities are also key parties for achieving proposed results from the project, but they are not actively involved in the processes, as the local level implementation mostly defined considering active involvement and operations of MoEU Provincial Directorates.

Beneficiary stakeholders interviewed in the field visits are aware of the project, mostly only the component they are involved in. Key issue in stakeholder contribution and understanding is their awareness of the whole project, its outcomes and further opportunities for its enhancement. The MTR Consultant recommends Project Team to consider this issue and provide information on the "big picture" to all stakeholders by using all available communication tools, and use this opportunity to access the network of the participant stakeholders.

Professional organisations and NGOs are also the key stakeholders, especially in the local level. In Kocaeli, as the main region for the implementation of the project activities, Kocaeli Chamber of Industry and Trade mentioned to be active and involved in the Merkim process since the problem raised in 1990s. Recently, as per discussions on Merkim Site, Chamber is well informed on the process and cooperatively supporting the activities of Merkim. The involvement of especially local and national environmental NGOs will contribute to communicating the POPs issue in a right way and increase awareness on the legal and technical processes.

f. Reporting

Based on the documents from the project team, reporting processes found to be in line with the GEF and UNDP-UNIDO procedures, as the implementing partners are experienced and well organized for such reporting processes.

In the interviews with the participant stakeholders, most of them mentioned that with the project they experienced a very useful learning experience enhanced their view and capacity on the chemicals management and project implementation, as well as improving skills in

operations and monitoring. Trainings and close cooperation with the project team and the consultants in the field mentioned as the main source of this experience.

Stakeholders mentioned; the technical processes used for the collection and analysis of the POPs conducted under the project, integrating monitoring of the chemicals and other similar processes to institutional operations, increased awareness on the gaps for a fully functional institutional and integrated environmental management system, as the main learning experiences that they plan to improve after the project completion.

g. Communication

All stakeholders emphasize the good practice in internal project communication especially with the project team and the MoEU, referring their accessibility and response to their requests in a reasonable time, except some delays in the provision of documents or response in some activities they conduct in the relevant components.

Considering the public awareness, the most critical issues found to be the communication of the Merkim site in previous years as a source of hazardous waste having potential local environmental releases and perceived threats to public health in Kocaeli. The Project Team working on communicating the progress, which is very important improvement provided by the project implementation, based on a communication plan, which is an important tool to support this project component.

There is an informative, well-designed project website (http://kalicikirleticiler.com) that can also be improved as a portal open to inputs from the partner stakeholders and selected sector users, in addition to some press releases by project partners. Other communication activities planned to start by mid 2018.

3.4. Sustainability

Main question for the evaluation of the project strategy, which is mostly related to the "sustainability" component of the evaluation, was defined as:

"to what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?"

a. Financial risks to sustainability

The project is a part of the implementation of POPs NIP and Action Plan, environmental management, health and safety, industry legislation and strategies of the Turkish Government, as well as the EU accession process.

This issue mentioned in the interviews especially with the government institutions and MoEU officer and executives. The further implementation of the project outcomes, found not to have critical sustainability problems, after GEF Funding, as there are government commitments and private sector investment opportunities for the further improvement of implementation

b. Socio-economic risks to sustainability

MoEU implements various programmes and projects countrywide for the environmental protection and management, in cooperation with various institutions and organizations, especially for public awareness. The local capacity and the improved cooperation of the MoEU and implementing partners, supported by the involved and informed sector institutions has

the opportunity to decrease any social or economical risks in the sustainability of the project outcomes, with a good communication with local institutions and organisations.

c. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The increased awareness and institutional strategies developed on health, safety and environment-energy of the private sector institutions, both the ones involved in the process and others in the target sectors, as well as the legislations improved in line with UN and EU regulations, provide ground for law enforcement and institutional references that decrease the risks for sustainability.

Also the capacity of the MoEU and beneficiary stakeholders to manage such risks evaluated as high and managed professionally.

Environmental risks to sustainability

The project focus on enhancing the capacity for chemicals and environmental management, so it is the main issue to secure the minimization of the environmental risks not only for the sustainability of the project but also for the public health.

The key issue in the project related to this topic seems to be the elimination of POPs waste stockpiles on the Merkim site, which is under implementation. Based on the field observations and interviews with the relevant officers, such risks found to be minimized and the capacity enhancement of the site owners and potentially IZAYDAS will decrease such risks, noting that work completed to date demonstrates how this can be achieved. Likewise the successful elimination of major PCB stockpiles demonstrates this for a higher risk POPs chemical, and more broadly the successful international qualification of IZAYDAS for destruction of POPs waste provides the country with sustaining capability in these areas.

3.5. Contribution to global environmental benefits and SDGs

The findings of the MTR shows the project implementation provides important contribution in regional and national level to the achievement of the SDGs in the country, in addition to the progressing contribution to the proposed GEBs in the Project Document.

The project is on track to exceed the target numbers with over 250 t of PCB based equipment, and 3,000 t of POPs pesticide waste eliminated (500 t to date), 2,000 t being tendered, and 500 t to follow.

Additionally, awareness on chemicals and hazardous waste management issues that relate to the public health, improved via training s and activities on site.

Considering the targets and the progress in implementation, Project evaluated to contribute to below SDGs:

SDG 3, SDG 6, SDG 11 and SDG 12 by elimination of the hazardous waste as an important threat to public health and water resources, and contributing the establishment of healthy conditions in urban areas,

SDG 12 and SDG 13, by providing BAT/BEP methodologies in production, that support sustainability and liveable environments in urban areas, also considering climate change

4.CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Conclusions

Overall management and implementation of the project found successful and satisfactory with good prospects of successfully achieving the project targets. These prospects can be enhanced by implementing partners with the recommended actions noted in in the Findings section of this report.

- Each component of the project has the capacity of an individual project that can also be developed, implemented and further developed independently.
- Project activities successfully implemented as a result of the close cooperation and coordination
 of the executing and implementing partners with beneficiary stakeholders up to mid-term review
 period.
- Executing agency, implementing agencies and the beneficiary stakeholders/participants observed to be involved to the project implementation progressively with a good cooperation and coordination,
- Project Management Team and key experts observed to be highly professional and successful in coordination of the project, with good relations and cooperation with beneficiary stakeholders/partners.
- The project has a strong potential to provide major global environmental benefits and best practices that enhance national development in chemicals management and which are replicable as best practices globally.

4.2. Recommendations

The successful implementation of the project can be improved considering the below recommendations.

- Project implementation should be extended a minimum of 12, preferably 18 months (project completion date as December 2020) considering:
 - \circ the delays in the PCB sample collection by the participants and the analysis process,
 - o completion of the BAT/BEP recommended investments
 - procurement cycle timelines extending the completion schedule for elimination/disposal activity
- Increase updating the beneficiary stakeholders/partners on the overall project activities and the progress periodically via e-communication tools,
- Expand, as practical, involvement of stakeholders and national experts/expertise from the relevant institutions, in the implementation of this and similar projects.
- The team and the key experts recommended to actively continue working in their positions, until the completion date, regarding the critical status of the project.
- More active communication with the stakeholders and public and updating them on the progress in the project would be beneficial.

ANNEX 1: MTR TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCES (ToR)

Location: UNDP Premises, Ankara Type of Contract: Individual Contract Post Level: National Consultant Languages Required: English and Turkish Duration of the Contract: 05 February 2018 – 01 June 2018 (up to a maximum of 25 man/days during contract validity)

Terms of Reference

National Consultant for UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review

1 Background and Context

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project (PIMS# 4833) and (UNIDO SAP# 140288) implemented through the UNDP-UNIDO/MOEU, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on the 21 May 2015 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; which can be found through the link: <u>http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf</u>

UNDP in collaboration with UNIDO and Ministry of Environment and Urbanization implements the project which objective is to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through addressing POPs legacies including elimination of POPs Pesticide and PCB stockpiles, and initiating clean-up of associated POPs and chemical pollutant contaminated sites, as well as dealing with longer term PCB phase out consistent with the country's Stockholm Convention obligations, reducing U-POPs release in major industrial sectors, and providing targeted institutional, regulatory and technical capacity strengthening, all within a sound chemicals management framework. The project is directed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. It will meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide stockpile consisting of pure HCH and associated high concentration POPs waste and PCB stockpiles as well as supporting assessment, cleanup and monitoring of priority POPs contaminated sites involving representative range of site contamination situations, remediation approaches and clean-up financing modalities. The project will also demonstrate the sustainable treatment of cross contaminated PCB transformer units by means of de-halogenation technologies, will provide technical assistance for setting up a national plan for treatment of PCB contaminated transformers, and will provide technical assistance

for the establishment of BAT/BEPs among priority U-POPs emitting sectors Additionally the project will support the qualification of needed hazardous waste infrastructure and national technical capability for the ongoing management of POPs and other chemical hazardous wastes as well as supporting the strengthening of institutional and regulatory capacity within an overall chemicals management framework.

2. Description of Responsibilities

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

Please see the detailed technical description of the MTR in Annex A.

3. Duration and Deliverables

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately over a time period starting from 5 February 2018 and ending on 01 June 2018. The number of days presented as 'estimated number of man/days to be invested' is indicative. Inputs, articulated in man/days, to be invested by the expert are based on UNDP's estimations. They are provided herein to facilitate provision of lump sum price proposals by the applicants. The expert will agree to produce the below deliverables to the satisfaction of UNDP and its partners. The ICs may invest less/more than expected number of days to finalize each output. The actual number of days invested will not change the amount of payments. For further detail please refer to the table illustrating the payment details below:

NO.	ACTIVITY	OUTPUT	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF MAN/DAYS TO BE INVESTED*	DUE DATE	PAYMENT**
1	Document review and preparation of Inception Report	Submission of draft MTR Inception Report**	3 days	09 February 2018	N/A
2	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission	Submission of final MTR Inception Report	2 days	15 February 2018	10%
3	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	Submission of minutes of the meetings for MTR mission	10 days	09 March 2018	N/A
4	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of	Initial findings presentation of the MTR	1 day	26 March 2018	N/A

	initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission	mission			
5	Preparing draft report	Submission of the draft MTR report	5 days	06 April 2018	30%
6	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR Inception report	Submission of the 2 nd draft MTR	2 days	20 April 2018	N/A
7	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	Submission of the Management Response	1 day	26 April 2018	N/A
8	Expected date of finalized MTR completion	Submission of final MTR report revised as per comments	1 day	01 June 2018	60%

* While the Consultant may invest less or more than the estimated number of man/days stated above, this shall not make any changes to the lump-sum payment amount.

- ** The payments stated in this column represent the corresponding percentage of the whole lump-sum payment amount for the respective Deliverable.
- *** Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

In cases where the expert may need to invest additional man/days to perform the tasks and produce the deliverables listed and defined in the present Terms of Reference, the expert shall do so without any additional payment.

The expert will be submitting the reports based Annex A, Detailed Description of the MTR Report.

All information should be provided in electronic versions. The expert shall be solely liable for the accuracy and reliability of the data provided, links to sources of information used. The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

4. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Turkey Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR expert.

UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of UNDP, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

Payments will be made against submission of the second, fifth and last deliverables in the contract by the IC and approval of such deliverables by UNDP.

The Individual Consultant will report to the UNDP Cluster Lead. All deliverables will be subject to approval of UNDP. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR expert to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

5. Place of Work and Guidance for Price Proposal

Place of work for the assignment is, home-based. It may be required that the Consultant will travel within Turkey. All travel, accommodation and living costs in duty station (home based) will be covered by the Consultant through inclusion of these costs in the price proposal. However, in case travel out of the duty station is needed, the travel and accommodation costs of these missions will be borne by UNDP. The costs of these missions may either be;

• Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant (Any assignment-related travel (economy class), accommodation (bed & breakfast) outside duty station will be arranged by the travel agency UNDP works with, when necessary, by receiving prior approval of UNDP) or

• Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table;

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	items before the initiation of travel
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	2- Submission of the
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	invoices/receipts, etc. by the
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.

• Covered by the combination of both options

6. Minimum Qualification Requirements

Education
• A Master's Degree in chemistry/chemical engineering, or other closely related field

General Professional Experience

• Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years

Specific Professional Experience

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to POPs/Chemicals and Waste
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Experience working in EECCA Countries
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Chemicals and Waste especially Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
- Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis is an asset
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
- Fluent written and verbal communication skills in English
- Excellent communication skills is an asset
- Demonstrable analytical skills is an asset

Notes:

- Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.
- Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.
- Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.
- Experience gained prior to completion of undergraduate studies is not considered professional experience.

7. Payments

The expert shall be paid in US\$ if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TRY through conversion of the US\$ amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer. The amount paid to the expert shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

Payments will be made within 30 days upon the approval of the corresponding deliverable and UNDP Certificate of Payment Form (COP) on a lump sum basis irrespective from the number of days invested by the expert for this particular deliverable.

If the deliverables subject to a payment are not produced and delivered by the expert to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the expert has invested man/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

ANNEX A

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF MTR PROCESS

1. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR expert will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR expert will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR expert is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, UNIDO Country Office and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Merkim A.Ş., İZAYDAŞ, Erdemir, İSDEMİR, Brissa, EUAŞ, KARDEMİR, ETI BAKIR, BEDAŞ, SEDAŞ, TURK TELEKOM, MOFAL, MOEU; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

Additionally, the MTR expert is expected to conduct field missions to Ankara, Kocaeli, Zonguldak, Hatay, Karabuk, Samsun, Istanbul, including the following project sites Merkim Site, İZAYDAŞ HTI Facility, PCB Owners in Kocaeli, KARDEMİR Factory, ETI BAKIR Factory, Zonguldak and Hatay.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see <u>UNDP Discussion Paper</u>: <u>Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results</u>, 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the <u>UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for</u> <u>Development Results</u>, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

2. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR expert will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

• Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-ofproject Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End- of- project Target	Midterm Level & Assessme nt ⁶	Achieve ment Rating ⁷	Justificat ion for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome	Indicator 1:							
1:	Indicator 2:							
Outcome	Indicator 3:							
2:	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be	Red= Not on target to be
	achieved	achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

• What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

• Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

• Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

• Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR expert will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR expert should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

The MTR expert will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project	N/A	
Strategy		
Progress	Objective	
Towards	Achievement	
Results	Rating: (rate 6 pt.	
	scale)	
	Outcome 1	
	Achievement	
	Rating: (rate 6 pt.	
	scale)	
	Outcome 2	
	Achievement	
	Rating: (rate 6 pt.	
	scale)	
	Outcome 3	
	Achievement	
	Rating: (rate 6 pt.	
	scale)	
	Etc.	
Project	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementation		
& Adaptive		
Management		
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project)

3. TEAM COMPOSITION

A National Independent Consultant will conduct the MTR. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Expert

- 1. PIF
- 2. UNDP Initiation Plan

- 3. UNDP / UNIDO Project Document
- 4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- 5. Project Inception Report
- 6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
- 7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- 8. Audit reports
- 9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
- 10. Oversight mission reports
- 11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
- 12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

- 13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- 14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
- 15. Minutes of the POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
- 16. Project site location maps

Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report⁹

- i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
 - Title of UNDP / UNIDO supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS#, UNIDO SAP# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR Expert
 - Acknowledgements
- **ii.** Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Project Information Table

⁹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table
- **2.** Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- 3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - **4.2** Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting

- Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology		
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?					
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)		
Progress Towards Report of the project been ac	sults: To what extent hat have been supported thus far?	ave the expected outcor	nes and objectives		
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?					
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?					

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹⁰

Evaluators/Consultants:

- 1.Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2.Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3.Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5.Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7.Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant:

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

(Date)

Signed at _____

(Place) on

Signature: _

^{10 &}lt;u>www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct</u>

MTR Ratings

Ra ob	Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)			
	Highly	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-		
6	Satisfactory	of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress		
	(HS)	towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".		
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-		
5	Satisfactory (S)	project targets, with only minor shortcomings.		
	Moderately	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-		
4	Satisfactory	project targets but with significant shortcomings.		
	(MS)			
	Moderately	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project		
3	Unsatisfactory	targets with major shortcomings.		
	(HU)			
n	Unsatisfactory	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-		
2	(U)	of-project targets.		
	Highly	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets,		
1	Unsatisfactory	and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.		
	(HU)			

R	Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)				
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".			
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.			
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.			
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.			
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.			
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.			

R	Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)			
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future		
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review		
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on		
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained		

MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:				
Commissioning Unit				
Name:				
Signature:	Date:			
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor				
Name:				
Signature:	Date:			

Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Expert to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR Expert response and actions taken

ANNEX 2: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology		
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?					
How the problem addressed by the project, and the underlying assumptions complies with the country needs and priorities?	Linkages to the national environmental policy, strategy and regulations	Project Documents, National Strategy and Action Plans, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Are the assumptions set for the project realistic? Do changes to the context to achieving the project results, that may have effect on the project and expected results defined well?	Coverage and quality of assumptions, content/defining of possible changes that may have effect on the project.	Project Documents, National Strategy and Action Plans, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Is the project relevant with the country priorities? Does it provide the most effective route towards expected/intended results?	Level of relevance and effectiveness of the action indicated by the executing, implementing, partnering institutions.	Project Documents, National Strategy and Action Plans, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Are the lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design?	Level of reference to the similar and previously implemented projects and their results in project document.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers and project team		
What is the level of country ownership?	Coverage of the administrative, political, social, technical, environmental priorities of the country.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
How the project relates with the institutional and sectoral priorities, especially of the participant companies?	Level of linking/referring to the institutional and sectoral priorities and strategies of the participant companies	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Do the relevant stakeholders involved in the project design and decision-making processes?	Level of participation and contribution by the government institutions, sector institutions, and participant companies	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Do the gender issues raised in the project design?	Inclusion of gender issues to the activities, referring to gender in project outcomes	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
How "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) the midterm and end-of-project targets are, in the results framework?	Level of coherence between project design and implementation approach,	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
How clear, practical, and feasible are the project's objectives and outcomes or components within its time frame?	Level of coherence between project design and implementation approach,	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Do progress in the project could catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's	Level and content of proposed and possible contribution to the participant companies defined in the project document and observed in	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key		

empowerment, improved	implementation.		stakeholders
governance etc) that should	Existence and use of a		
be included in the project	monitoring system/activities.		
results framework and monitored on an annual basis?			
Are there any effective	Existence and use of a	Project Document Relevant	Document Analysis, Interview
monitoring and improvement	monitoring and reporting	Project and Progress Reports,	with executing and
of broader development and	system/activities with sections	MTR Interview Notes	implementing agency officers,
gender aspects of the project	on overall sustainable		project team and key
?	development and gender		stakeholders
	topics.		
Progress Towards Results: T thus far?	o what extent have the expec	ted outcomes and objectives	of the project been achieved
What is the level of progress	Level of implementation in the	Project Document, Relevant	Document Analysis, Interview
made towards the mid-term	activities, compared to the	Project and Progress Reports,	with executing and
and end-of-project targets	approved project workplan.	MTR Interview Notes	implementing agency officers,
			project team and key stakeholders
			stakenolaers
Are there barriers in achieving	Level of progress up to MTR,	Project Document, Relevant	Document Analysis, Interview
the project objective in the	problems faced in the	Project and Progress Reports,	with executing and
remainder of the project?	developed for mitigation	WITK IIIterview Notes	project team and key
			stakeholders
How the project can further	Evistance of a natural and	Dreiget Degument Delevent	Desument Analysis Interview
expand its successful benefits?	plan for dissemination of	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports	with executing and
	results and experiences.	MTR Interview Notes	implementing agency officers,
			project team and key
			stakeholders
Project Implementation and	Adaptive Management: Has	the project been implemented	efficiently. cost-effectively.
and been able to adapt to	any changing conditions thu	is far? To what extent are p	roject-level monitoring and
evaluation systems, reportir	ng, and project communication	is supporting the project's imp	plementation?
is the project managed	Level of overall effectiveness	Project Document Relevant	Document Analysis, Interview
effectively? Are there any	of project management as	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports,	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and
effectively? Are there any changes occurred in	of project management as outlined in the Project	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers,
effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation?	of project management as outlined in the Project Document.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key
effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation?	of project management as outlined in the Project Document.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project	of project management as outlined in the Project Document.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview
How efficiently project managed? Is the managed	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports,	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers,
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP,	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
How efficiently project managed? Is the managed How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO)	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers
How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved.	Level of overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved.	Level of coverall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports,	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and key
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results framework as a management tool? Is the project financial	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team. Amount and cost-	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool? Is the project financial management cost-effective?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team. Amount and cost- effectiveness of funds spent	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool? Is the project financial management cost-effective? Are there any revisions in the fund allocations?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team. Amount and cost- effectiveness of funds spent compared to allocated budgets relevance of the	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool? Is the project financial management cost-effective? Are there any revisions in the fund allocations?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team. Amount and cost- effectiveness of funds spent compared to allocated budgets, relevance of the changes in allocation (if any)	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool? Is the project financial management cost-effective? Are there any revisions in the fund allocations?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team. Amount and cost- effectiveness of funds spent compared to allocated budgets, relevance of the changes in allocation (if any)	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
Is the project managed effectively? Are there any changes occurred in implementation? How efficiently project managed? Is the management transparent, qualified and cooperative? (MoEU, UNDP, UNIDO) Are there any delays occurred in project start-up and implementation? If yes, what are their causes and how they have been resolved. Is the work-planning processes results-based? Does it use results framework as a management tool? Is the project financial management cost-effective? Are there any revisions in the fund allocations?	Level of cooperation and participation of the stakeholders, internal coordination of the project management. Reporting of adaptive management. Reporting of adaptive management changes by the project management and shared with the Project Board. Level of compliance with the approved workplan, content and effectiveness of the responses. Level of compliance with the project document, relevant implementation guidelines and use of results framework by project management team. Amount and cost- effectiveness of funds spent compared to allocated budgets, relevance of the changes in allocation (if any) Quality and compliance of	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes Project Document, Relevant Project Document, Relevant Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team

appropriate and efficient, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding		MTR Interview Notes	implementing agency officers, project team
the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?			
Is the co-financing provided in line with the project document and relevant financial procedures? Are there any additional in- kind/in-cash co-financing?	Status and efficient use of co- financing	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Are there any monitoring tools developed and/or used in the project?	Existing monitoring tools currently being used and their effectiveness	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team
How is the cooperation and coordination with the stakeholders established and sustained?	Level of cooperation, coordination and partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders, level and content of their contribution to project activities.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
What is the level of the contribution by the local and national government stakeholders?	Level and context of support by local and national government stakeholders, with their involvement to project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
What is the level of the involvement and awareness of the stakeholders and public?	Level of stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributing to the progress towards achievement of project objectives	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Are there any lessons learned that the project management and stakeholders benefit for further implementation of the project results?	Level of lessons derived from the adaptive management process, documenting and sharing with key partners and internalized by partners.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
How is the internal project communication with stakeholders established and sustained?	regularity and effectiveness, inclusion of all stakeholders, feedback mechanisms, level of contribution to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
How is the external project communication with stakeholders and public established and sustained?	establishing proper means of communication to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (website presence, appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns, etc)	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes, Project Website, Awareness Materials	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Do the project and proposed results contribute to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.	Level of contribution to SDGs	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes, Relevant National and UN SDG Reports and Documents	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders
Sustainability: To what ext sustaining long-term project	ent are there financial, insti results?	tutional, socio-economic, and	l/or environmental risks to
Do the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the	Quality of the risks identified, compared to the results	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports,	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers,

ATLAS Risk Management Module and ratings applied are appropriate and up to date?	achieved so far.	MTR Interview Notes	project team and key stakeholders		
Ar there any availability of financial and economic resources once the GEF assistance ends ?	Level of financial contribution by the government and stakeholders referred In the project document and capacity of the participants observed/reviewed in MTR.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?	sufficiency of the level of stakeholder ownership to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained; Existance of sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project; lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?	Existence of the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		
Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?	Existence of required systems/ mechanisms for environmental management and monitoring.	Project Document, Relevant Project and Progress Reports, MTR Interview Notes	Document Analysis, Interview with executing and implementing agency officers, project team and key stakeholders		

ANNEX 3: SAMPLE INTERVIEW SHEET

Date, time, Venue	
Institution	
Interviewee(s)	
General Information	
Involvement of the beneficiary/participant to the project,	
activities conducted and planned, lessons learned, risks and	
mitigation actions, recommendations, etc.	
Project Strategy:	
To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country	
priorities, country ownership, institutional and sectoral	
priorities, strategies, etc. and the best route towards expected	
Program Towardo Docultor	
Progress Towards Results:	
To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of	
the project been achieved thus far?	
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management:	
Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively,	
and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To	
what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation	
systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the	
project's implementation?	
Sustainability:	
To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-	
economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term	
project results?	

ANNEX 4. MISSION ITINERARY, INTERVIEWS LIST and FIELD VISITS BRIEF NOTE (for MoEU)

MTR work plan designed considering the contractual deadlines and the availability of the partner/participant institutions. Regarding the dates referred in the project document and relevant project documentation, the MTR found to be in delay of almost one year. So, MTR Expert gave the priority to conducting field visits, soon after the preliminary meetings with the project team.

No	Component	Institution	Location
1	C1-UNDP	Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. General Management (EÜAŞ)	Ankara
2	C1-UNDP	İZAYDAŞ	Kocaeli
3	C1-UNDP	Brisa Bridgestone Sabancı Lastik Sanayi Ve Ticaret A.S.	Kocaeli
4	C1-UNDP	Merkim Endüstri Ürünleri A.Ş.	Kocaeli
5	C1-UNDP	Ereğli Demir ve Çelik Fabrikaları T.A.Ş. (ERDEMİR)	Ereğli/ Zonguldak
6	C1-UNDP	Akademi Çevre Danışmanlık	İstanbul
	C2-UNIDO		
7	C1-UNDP	İskenderun Demir Çelik AŞ (ISDEMIR)	İskenderun /
	C3-UNIDO		Hatay
8	C2- UNIDO	Türk Telekom A.Ş	Ankara
9	C2-UNIDO	MKEK, Production Management and Engineering Services Dep.	Ankara
10	C2-UNIDO	İstanbul Gübre A.Ş. (İGSAŞ)	Kocaeli
11	C2-UNIDO	Boğaziçi Elektrik Dağıtım A.Ş (BEDAŞ)	İstanbul
12	C2-UNIDO	Sakarya Elektrik Dağıtım A.Ş. (SEDAŞ)	Sakarya
13	C3-UNIDO	Karabük Demir Çelik AŞ. (KARDEMİR)	Karabük
14	C3-UNIDO	ETI BAKIR AŞ.	Samsun

List of Selected Beneficiary Stakeholder/Partners

Meetings and Field Visits Schedule

Date	Institution/Company	Participants	Туре
23.03.2018	Sakarya Elektrik Dağıtım A.Ş.	Bulut Yilmaz, Quality and Environment Expert	Phone interview
Friday	Boğaziçi Elektrik Dağıtım A.Ş.	Mehmet RABUŞ, Network Maint. Mng.	Phone interview
26.03.2018 Monday	Merkim / KOCAELİ	Ersan Kaynaş, General Director Şerife Erçel, UNDP National Project Expert	Interview
,	İZAYDAŞ / KOCAELİ	Muhammet Saraç, General Director Aysun Saraç, Environmental Mng. Sys.Chief Bircan Soysal, HSE Chief Gökhan Tilki, Environment Engineer Şerife Erçel, UNDP National Project Expert	Short interview with GD, Focus group with Project Team, Met Env. Engineer on site
	Brisa- Bridgestone/ KOCAELİ	Hüseyin Çavuşoğlu, HSE Manager Emel Özceylan, HSE Expert	Focus Group
	ERDEMİR / EREĞLİ	Ercan Ulucak, Energy Prod. & Dist. Manager Sinan Yazıcı, Electric Maintenance Engineer Yusuf Mutlu, Electric Maintenance Chief Eng. Okşan Tartanoğlu, HSE Manager	Focus group with energy team, interview with HSE Manager
27.03.2018 Tuesday	Karabük Provincial Directorate of Environment and Urbanization / KARABÜK	Nazan Şentürk, Provincial Director (Deputy) Dilek Eren, Chemist, PhD. Uğur Geliş, Environmental Engineer Gamze Atalay, Environmental Engineer	Interview with Deputy Manager, Focus group with experts.
	KARDEMİR A.Ş. / KARABÜK	Müge Cebeci, HSE Manager Merve Özdemir, Environmental Engineer Cansu Bulgurcu, Environmental Engineer	Focus group
28.03.2018 Wednesday	Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. GM (EÜAŞ) / ANKARA	Ayten Üğüten, Waste Management Chief Gökhan Kaya, Environmental Engineer Leyla Akpınar, Chemical Engineer	Focus group
	Türk Telekom A.Ş / ANKARA	Seyfi Tohumcu, Environmental Engineer	Interview
	MKEK / ANKARA	Zehra AKIN, Chief Environmental Engineer	Interview
	İGSAŞ	Sinan BÜYÜK, Electricity Maint.Plan.Chief Eng.	Phone interview
29.03.2018 Thursday	ETİ BAKIR A.Ş. / SAMSUN	Fatih Ekşi, Environmental Engineer Fatih Macit, Environmental Engineer	Focus group
30.03.2018 Friday	İSDEMİR/ İSKENDERUN	Cumhur Kocaman, HSE Manager Ayşe Çelik, HSE Chief Engineer Ramazan Kaya, Engineer (Erdemir Engineering) Necmettin Akgül, Engineer (Erdemir Engineering) Barış Şimşir, Engineer (HSE Branch) Uğur Demir, Engineer (Sinter Dept.) Serkan Çevik, Engineer (Sinter Dept.) Emir Akgül, Electric Distribution Department Turan Ahi, Electric Distribution Department Serdar Yıldırım, Elektrik Dağıtım Müdürlüğü	Focus group
02.04.2018	UNDP + UNIDO Project Team	Field visit evaluation meeting	Focus Group
Monday	Akademi Çevre	Uğur Işık, General Director Ufuk Işık, Deputy General Director Murat Pekcan, R&D and Project Manager	Phone - Focus Group
06.04.2018	UNIDO HQ-Vienna	Klaus Tyrkkö, Project Manager	Skype interview
Friday	Aprochim	Ömer Hallaç, Project Expert	Skype interview
09.04.2018 Monday	GEF Turkey Administrative Focal Point (MoFWA)/ ANKARA	Ziya Pala, Branch Manager Gül Tozoğlu, Expert Serpil Fatma Boncuk, Chief UNDP & UNIDO Project Team	MTR briefing for GEF Admin Focal Point and MoEU Chamicals
	MoEU GD of Environmental Management, Priority Chemicals Branch / ANKARA	Bursev Artukoğlu, Branch Manager	Management Department
	MoFAL Food and Control DG, Plant Protection Products Department / ANKARA	Yunus Bayram, Deputy DG Osman Arı, Working Group Coordinator Muammer Fidan, Engineer	Focus Group
30.04.2018	UNDP CCE Portfolio	Nuri Özbağdatlı, CCE Portfolio Manager	Phone Interview
7.5.2018	UNDP	Richard Cooke, International Expert	Skype Interview

GEF PIMS 4601: KOK Stoklarının Bertarafı ve KOK Salımlarının Azaltılması Projesi Ara Dönem Değerlendirme (MTR) Çalışması Saha Ziyareti Görüşme Değerlendirme Özeti Murat ÇEVİK, Bağımsız Değerlendirici - 12.04.2018

Değerlendirme Başlığı	Genel Tespit ve Değerlendirme Notları
PROJE STRATEJISI	 Görüşme yapılan tüm paydaşlar, proje ve faaliyetlerinin ulusal düzeyde, özellikle çevre yönetimi ve halk sağlığı öncelikleri açısından önem ve önceliğini vurgulamıştır.
Proje stratejisi ne ölçüde ülke, sektör ve kurumsal öncelikler, ülke (kurum- kuruluşların) sahipliği ile ilgili/ilişkili ?	 Paydaş kuruluşların faaliyet yürüttüğü ve bağlı işkollarında kaynak verimliliği ile çevre ve halk sağlığı açısından sağladığı katkılar çerçevesinde kurumsal çevresel ve sosyal sorumluluk hedeflerinin oluşturulması ya da mevcut olanların uygulanması bakımından önemli katkı sağladığı belirtilmiştir.
İzlenen yol/yöntem mevcut koşullarda en uygun yol mudur?	 Ayrıca, konuya özgü teknik ve yöntemlerin belirlenmesi, çalışanların ve uzmanların bilgi düzeylerinin geliştirilmesinin sağlanması ile de hem kurumsal ve işkolu düzeyinde bilgi ve eylem düzeyinde artış, böylelikle de ulusal hedef ve politikalara katkı sağlanacağı belirtilmiştir.
	 Kimi paydaşların, proje kapsamında yürütülen bazı faaliyetlerde yurtdışından hizmet temini yerine yurt içinden bu tür hizmetlerin temininin ve ilgili işkollarının bu kapsamda güçlendirilmesinin sağlanması yönünde değerlendirmeleri iletilmiştir.
	Bunlarla birlikte,
	 Paydaşların genel olarak projenin dahil oldukları bileşenlerinin ilgili faaliyetleri haricinde, projenin hazırlık süreci, genel amaç ve hedefleri, süreç ve sonuçları konusunda yeterli bilgiye sahip olmadıkları gözlenmiştir.
	 Kurum ve kuruluşların proje hazırlık sürecinden de başlayarak etkin katılımlarının ve ilgili konulardaki yurtiçi ve yurtdışı iyi uygulama örneklerinin değerlemdrilmesi ve yararlanmasının sağlayacak çalışma ve yöntemlerin gerekliliği dile getirilmiştir.
	 Paydaşların bir kısmı, mevzuatta belirlenen yasal süreleri olabildiğince değerlendirme eğilimlerini de belirtmiştir.
	 Ayrıca, ilgili işkollarında KOK lerin izleme ve raporlamasının zorunluluk ve yaptırımının bulunmaması nedeniyle yaygın bir katılım ve ülke düzeyinde sonlandırmanın zorlukları bulunduğu iletilmiştir.
SONUÇLARIN ELDESİ AÇISINDAN UYGULAMANIN GELİSİM	 Proje kapsamında paydaşların dahil oldukları faaliyetler çerçevesinde genel olarak yükümlendikleri hedeflere ulaşacak çalışmaları yürüttükleri bilgisi edinilmiştir.
DÜZEYİ:	Ancak;
Şu ana kadar proje hedef ve çıktılarının ne kadarına ulasıldı?	 Elektrik dağıtım faaliyeti yürüten paydaşların proje kapsamında temini gereken PCBli trafolardan örnek alınması çalışmalarının saha koşulları, denetimler, yeterli uzman insan kaynağı vs. gibi nedenlerden gecikmeler yaşandığı tespit edilmiştir.
	 Bu gecikmelerin telafisi için ilgili paydaş ve yüklenici şirket tarafından gerekli çalışmaların yapılmakta olduğu, ancak yığılma ve mevcut kapasite dikkate alındığında zaman ve nitelik açısından zorlanması riski bulunduğu tespit edilmiştir.
	 Ayrıca, proje uygulamaları ile eşzamanlı ya da bütünleyici olarak yürütülmesi gereken paydaş yatırımlarının tamamının henüz tamamlanmadığı, ancak 2019 yılı ortasına kadar planlanmış olduğu tespit edilmiştir.
	Bu çerçevede,
	 Proje uygulama süresinin 12 ay kadar uzatılmasının yararlı olacağı, bu süre içerisinde öngörülen nitelik ve kapsamda iş ve işlemlerin tamamlanmasının mümkün olacağı belirtilmiştir.
PROJE UYGULAMA ve YÖNETİMDE UYUM:	 Görüşme yapılan tüm paydaşlar, Proje Yönetimi (ÇŞB, UNDP, UNIDO), eitmen ve uzmanları ile her konu ve aşamada yakın ve verimli bir iletişim ve çalışma ortamı bulduklarını dile getirmişlerdir.
vroje verimii, maiiyet etkin ve değişen koşullara uyum sağlayacak şekilde mi uygulanıyor?	 Genel olarak paydaşların, projede taahhüt ettikleri eş mali ve ayni katkıların temininde zorlukla karşılaşmadıkları, hatta kimi durumlarda öngörülene ek katkılar sağladıkları tespit edilmiştir.

Projenin uygulamasını destekleyecek izleme ve değerlendirme sistemleri, raporlama ve iletişim etkinlikleri nasıl?	 Kurumsal-bütünleşik tesis yönetimine sahip paydaşların, idari, mali ve teknik izleme ve raporlama sistemlerine sahip oldukları ve bu sistemleri özellikle ÇŞB atık ve hava kalite izleme sistemleri ile bütünleşik olarak etkin bir şekilde kullandıkları tespit edilmiştir. Halihazırda bir iç izleme sistemi bulunmayan paydaşların, proje kapsamında dahil oldukları veritabanı örneğinden de faydalandıklarını ve izleme sistemi oluşturulması konusunda olumlu düşündüklerini belirtmişlerdir.
	Ancak,
	 Proje uygulamalarının, paydaşlar ve ilgil kuruluşlar ile dönemsel (aylık) ve etkinlik düzeyinde bilgilendirme ve iletişim çalışmalarının yetersiz olduğu tespit edilmiştir.
	 Bazı paydaşların, örnek raporları, gerikazanım için hazırlanan cihazların taşınması gibi konularda proje yönetiminden bilgi beklediği iletilmiştir.
	Belgelerin Türkçe olarak hazırlanarak iletilmesi konusu dile getirilmiştir.
SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİRLİK Projenin uzun vadeli sonuçlarının sürdürülmesi için mali, kurumsal, sosyo- ekonomik ve/veya çevresel riskler mevcut mu? (Paydaşlarda) Kurumsal olarak sonuçların geliştirilerek uygulanmasına yönelik bir strateji, plan ya da kurumsal ilkeler belgesi vs. mevcut mu?	 Proje faaliyetleri ile sağlanan teknik bilgi ve desteklerle birlikte, ilgili mevzuat kapsamında paydaşların yasal yükümlülükleri içerisinde bulunan KOK azaltım, geri kazanım ve bertaraf konularının paydaşlar tarafından güçlendirilmiş bir kapasite ve bilinç ile sürdürülmesi yönelimi tespit edilmiştir. Proje uygulamalarının paydaş kuruluşlarda yönetimler düzeyinde de farkındalık ve ilgi düzeyinin gelişmesine katkı sağladığı belirtilmiştir. Bu yönelim, kurumsal ilke, hedef ve stratejilerin yürütülükte olduğu paydaşlarda daha açık ve tanımlı bir şekilde görülmektedir. Bu düzeydeki paydaşların, olası riskleri ortadan kaldırmak amacıyla gerekli önlemleri alabilecek yönetsel, mali ve teknik kaynak, birikim ve olanaklara sahip oldukları tespit edilmiştir. Projede kimi paydaşların gönüllülük esasına göre katılmış olmaları ve görüşmeler esnasında belirtilen, aynı grup ya da yakın şirketlerde benzer yaklaşımların uygulanmasına yönelik yönelimlerin etkin yönetilerek hızlı bir yaygınlaşma potansiyeli bulunduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bununla birlikte, Ayrım yapmaksızın tüm proje paydaşları ile proje tamamlanması sonrasında yaygınlaştırma ve ulusal düzeyde çalışmanın yaygınlaştırma-uygulama sürecindeki olası tüm diğer kurum ve kuruluşların bu kapsamda bilgi ve teknik uygulama düzeylerinin güvenceye alınmasının büyük önem taşıdğı tespit edilmiştir.



ANNEX 5: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

List of Documents for review

entification Form (PIF)
is at Desument
ject Document
ironmental and social Screening Report
Report (with Workplan and MoM)
& 2017)
eports (2016-2017)
dits
ool Tables
ssion Reports, UNDP BtORs
onitoring Reports
ancial & Operational Guidelines
16 Annual Results Report for Turkey
f Steering Committee Meetings (2
e Location Maps
porting Matrix
erkim Site Assessment Reports
liverables
ogress Presentations
0

ANNEX 6: CO-FINANCING TABLE

GEF Agency UNDP Cash 100.000 88.000 %88 GEF Agency UNDP In-kind 270.000 150.000 %55 National Ministry of Environment Cash 1.160.000 460.000 %59 Ger Agency UNDP In-kind 1.850.000 1.100.000 %59 Government and Urbanization 1.850.000 9.290.000 %29.000 %2000 National Ministry of Forstry and Government Cash 9.290.000 9.290.000 %100 Government Matinistry of Food, Livestock Cash 120.000 %100 %000 Government Ministry of Food, Livestock Cash 10.200.000 7.200.000 %20 Private Sector Merkim Cash 3.748.000 750.000 %20 Private Sector EROEMIR In-kind 340.000 340.000 4000 Private Sector EROEMIR In-kind 340.000 340.000 70 Private Sector EROEMIR In-kind <t< th=""><th>Sources of Co- Financing</th><th>Name of Co- financer*</th><th>Type of Co- financing</th><th>Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US \$)/ Amt. at Pro- doc signing</th><th>Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)</th><th>Actual % of Expected Amount</th></t<>	Sources of Co- Financing	Name of Co- financer*	Type of Co- financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US \$)/ Amt. at Pro- doc signing	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
GEF Agency UNDO Cash 38.000 20.375 %54 GEF Agency UNDP in-kind 270.000 150.000 %55 National Ministry of Environment Cash 1.160.000 %60.000 %39 Government and Urbanization In-kind 1.850.000 9.290.000 %50 Government Ministry of Forestry and Government Cash 9.290.000 9.290.000 %100 Government Ministry of Food, Government Cash 120.000 120.000 %100 Government Agriculture and Livestock Cash 10.200.000 7.200.000 %200 National Ministry of Food, Government In-kind 30.000 700.000 %00 Private Sector Merkim Cash 3.748.000 750.000 %20 Private Sector ISDEMIR In-kind 430.000 200.000 %46.5 Private Sector ISDEMIR In-kind 430.000 24.000 10 Private Sector ISDEMIR In-ki	GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	100.000	88.000	%88
GEF Agency UNDP In-kind 270.000 150.000 %55 National Ministry of Environment and Urbanization Cash 1.160.000 460.000 %39 National Ministry of Environment and Urbanization In-kind 1.850.000 1.100.000 %59 Overnment and Urbanization Sepondo 9.290.000 9.290.000 %100 Government Ministry of Forestry and Government Cash 9.290.000 9.290.000 %100 National Ministry of Food, Government Cash 120.000 30.000 %100 National Ministry of Food, Government Cash 1.20.000 7.200.000 %20 Private Sector European Comission (EU Uvestock Cash 3.748.000 750.000 %20 Private Sector Merkim In-kind 430.000 40.000 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 3.748.000 30.000 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 3.748.000 30.000	GEF Agency	UNIDO	Cash	38.000	20.375	%54
National Government and UrbanizationCash n kinoal and Urbanization1.160.000460.000%39Government and Urbanization dovernment and UrbanizationIn-kind and Urbanization1.850.0001.100.000%59Government dovernment adriculture and LivestockCash adriculture and Livestock9.290.0009.290.000%100National Government Agriculture and LivestockMinistry of Food, Agriculture and LivestockIn-kind adriculture and adriculture and Livestock30.00030.000%100Others Private SectorEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash adviculture and adviculture and adviculture and adviculture and Livestock30.0007.200.000%40.0Private Sector Private SectorMerkim IBDEMIRCash adviculture adviculture adviculture and adviculture and Livestock30.000750.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR IDEMIRCash adviculture adviculture adviculture adviculture adviculture adviculture private SectorISDEMIR IDEMIR IDEMIR IDEMIRCash adviculture 	GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	270.000	150.000	%55
Government National National National Overnment and Urbanization and Urbanization and Urbanization and Urbanization National Government Arrival Forstry and UrbestockIn-kind Cash Schuler and Urbestock1.850.000 Schuler and Urbestock1.100.000 Schuler and Urbestock%59National Government UrbestockMinistry of Food, Agriculture and UrbestockCash In-kind1.20.0009.290.000 Schuler and Urbestock30.000 Schuler and Urbestock%100National Government UrbestockMinistry of Food, Agriculture and UrbestockIn-kind Agriculture and Urbestock30.0007.200.000 Schuler and Schuler and Urbestock%100OthersEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash In-kind3.748.000750.000%200Private SectorMarkim ERDEMIRCash In-kind340.000200.000%46.5Private SectorERDEMIR In-kindCash In-kind340.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIR In-kind1.748.00024.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIR In-kind1.748.00000Private SectorMESS In-kind1.0500.0000* 000Private SectorMESS In-kind1.750.0000**0Private SectorMESS In-kind1.763.0000**0Private SectorMESS In-kind1.500.000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering In-kind1.50.0000**0<	National	Ministry of Environment	Cash	1.160.000	460.000	%39
National GovernmentIn-kind1.850.0001.100.000%59GovernmentMinistry of Forestry ad CashCash9.290.0009.290.000%100GovernmentMinistry of Food, Agriculture and LivestockCash120.000120.000%100RovernmentAgriculture and LivestockCash120.00030.000%100National GovernmentMinistry of Food, Agriculture and LivestockIn-kind30.00030.000%100OthersEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash1.220.0007.200.000%20Private SectorMerkimCash3.748.000750.000%20Private SectorERDEMIRCash4.126.5354.126.535Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind430.000340.000Private SectorISDEMIRCash3.97.0006.845.745Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind49.00024.000Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind23.0000**0Private SectorICANDASIn-kind23.0000**0Private SectorICANDASIn-kind23.0000**0Private SectorICANDASIn-kind23.0000**0Private SectorMESSCash1.55.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind30.0000**0Private SectorNEN	Government	and Urbanization				
Government National OvernmentIndirstry of Forestry and Water AffairsCash Schell9.290.0009.290.000%100National GovernmentMinistry of Food, LivestockCash120.000120.000%100National GovernmentMinistry of Food, LivestockCash120.00030.000%100National GovernmentMinistry of Food, LivestockIn-kind30.00030.000%100OthersEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash10.200.000750.000%20Private SectorMerkimCash3.748.000200.000%46.5Private SectorEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)In-kind430.000340.000Private SectorRDEMIRIn-kind440.0024.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind1748.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind1748.0000*0*Private SectorIZAYDASCash3.397.0006*0Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1748.0000**0Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind155.000<	National	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	1.850.000	1.100.000	%59
National GovernmentMinistry of Forstry and Water AffairsCash9.290.0009.290.0009.290.000%100Government Agriculture and LivestockMinistry of Food, Agriculture and LivestockCash120.000120.000%100OthersEuropean Consison (EU IPA Program)Cash10.200.0007.200.000%200Private SectorMerkimCash3.748.000750.000%20Private SectorMerkimCash4.126.5354.126.535Private SectorERDEMIRCash4.126.5354.126.535Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind440.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind4.30.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind1.748.0000Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000Private SectorICAYDASCash1.050.0000*0Private SectorICAYDASCash3.370006*0Private SectorICAYDASIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNet Figineering LaboratoryIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNet Figineering LaboratoryIn-kind350.0000**0Private Se	Government	and Urbanization				
GovernmentWater Affairsomcomprice<	National	Ministry of Forestry and	Cash	9.290.000	9.290.000	%100
National Government Agriculture and LivestockCash ash120.000120.000%100Ministry of Food, Government LivestockIn-kind30.00030.000%100OthersEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash10.200.0007.200.000%70Private SectorMerkimCash3.748.000750.000%20Private SectorMerkimCash4.126.5354.126.535Private SectorENDEMIRCash4.126.5354.126.535Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind340.000340.000Private SectorISDEMIRCash3.397.0006.845.745Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind49.00024.000Private SectorIZAYDASCash3.337.0000*Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.75.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind330.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind330.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind350.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind350.0000*0Private SectorNE Regineering EnvironmentalIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNE Regineering EnvironmentalIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNE Regineering EnvironmentalIn-kind350.0000**0 </td <td>Government</td> <td>Water Affairs</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Government	Water Affairs				
Government Livestock Agriculture and Livestock In-kind 30.000 30.000 \$100 National Government Livestock Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock In-kind 30.000 \$200.000 \$700.000 \$700.000 Others European Comission (EU IPA Program) Cash 3.748.000 750.000 \$200 Private Sector Merkim In-kind 430.000 200.000 \$465. Private Sector ERDEMIR Cash 3.126.535 4.126.535 4.126.535 Private Sector ISDEMR Cash 330.000 340.000 1000 Private Sector ISDEMR In-kind 430.000 24.000 1000 Private Sector ISDEMR In-kind 1.748.000 24.000 1000 Private Sector IZAYDAS Cash 1.050.000 0* 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 1.050.000 0* 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 1.050.000 0** 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 1.55.000 0** 0 Private Sector SG Environmental Environmental 1n-kind 350.000 0** 0 Private Sector Nengineering Environmental	National	Ministry of Food,	Cash	120.000	120.000	%100
National GovernmentMinistry of Food, Agriculture and LivestockIn-kind30.00030.000%100OthersEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash10.200.0007.200.000%70Private SectorMerkimCash3.748.000750.000%20Private SectorMerkimIn-kind430.000200.000%46.5Private SectorERDEMIRCash4.126.5354.126.5351Private SectorISDEMIRCash305.000340.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIRCash3.397.0006.845.745%133Private SectorIZAVDASIn-kind1.748.00000Private SectorIZAVDASIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorICASSCash1.500.0000*0Private SectorICASSCash1.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSCash1.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind163.8935.278	Government	Agriculture and Livestock				
Government LivestockAgriculture and LivestockAnnumber LivestockAgriculture and 	National	Ministry of Food.	In-kind	30.000	30.000	%100
LivestockImage of the second seco	Government	Agriculture and	-			
OthersEuropean Comission (EU IPA Program)Cash10.200.0007.200.000%70Private SectorMerkimCash3.748.000750.000%20Private SectorKRDEMIRCash4.126.5354.126.5354.126.535Private SectorERDEMIRIn-kind340.000340.000340.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind49.00024.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind49.00024.00024.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind1.748.00000Private SectorIZAYDASCash3.397.0006.845.745%133Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.00000Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorCINAR Environmental EnvironmentalIn-kind230.000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorNEN E		Livestock				
Private Sector Merkim Cash 3.748.000 750.000 %20 Private Sector Merkim In-kind 430.000 200.000 %46.5 Private Sector ERDEMIR Cash 4.126.535 4.126.535 4.126.535 Private Sector ISDEMIR In-kind 340.000 340.000 24.000 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 3.397.000 6.845.745 %133 Private Sector IZAVDAS In-kind 1.748.000 0* 0 Private Sector IZAVDAS In-kind 1.748.000 0** 0 Private Sector MESS In-kind 1.788.000 0** 0 Private Sector MESS In-kind 233.000 0** 0 Private Sector CINAR Environmental In-kind 155.000 0** 0 Private Sector Artek Engineering In-kind 350.000 0** 0 Private Sector SGE Environmental In-kind 350.000 0** <	Others	European Comission (EU	Cash	10.200.000	7.200.000	%70
Private Sector Markim In-kind 430.000 200.000 %46.5 Private Sector ERDEMIR Cash 4.126.535 4.126.535 1 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 340.000 340.000 1 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 305.000 150.000 1 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 3.397.000 6.845.745 %133 Private Sector IZAVDAS In-kind 1.748.000 0 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 10.500.000 0* 0 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 10.500.000 0* 0 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 10.500.000 0* 0 0 Private Sector MESS Cash 355.000 0** 0 0 Private Sector Artek Engineering Environmental In-kind 350.000 0** 0 0 Private Sector NEN Engineering Laboratory <t< td=""><td>Private Sector</td><td>Merkim</td><td>Cash</td><td>3.748.000</td><td>750.000</td><td>%20</td></t<>	Private Sector	Merkim	Cash	3.748.000	750.000	%20
Initial Sector IRDEMIR Cash 4.126.535 4.126.535 Private Sector ERDEMIR In-kind 340.000 340.000 Private Sector ISDEMIR In-kind 340.000 240.000 Private Sector ISDEMIR In-kind 49.000 24.000 Private Sector IZAYDAS Cash 3.397.000 6.845.745 %133 Private Sector IZAYDAS In-kind 1.748.000 0 0 Private Sector MESS In-kind 500.000 0* 0 Private Sector MESS In-kind 233.000 0** 0 Private Sector CINAR Environmental In-kind 233.000 0** 0 Private Sector Artek Engineering In-kind 155.000 0** 0 Private Sector SG Senvironmental In-kind 350.000 0** 0 Private Sector NEN Engineering In-kind 155.000 0** 0 Private Sector NEN Engineering <td>Private Sector</td> <td>Merkim</td> <td>In-kind</td> <td>430,000</td> <td>200.000</td> <td>%46 5</td>	Private Sector	Merkim	In-kind	430,000	200.000	%46 5
Initial SectorENDEMIRIn-kind340.000340.000Private SectorISDEMIRCash330.000150.000Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind49.00024.000Private SectorIZAYDASCash3.397.0006.845.745Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000*Private SectorMESSIn-kind1.748.0000*Private SectorMESSIn-kind233.0000*0Private SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering Environmental LaboratoryCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering Environmental 	Private Sector	ERDEMIR	Cash	4 126 535	4 126 535	/010.5
Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 305.00 150.000 Private Sector ISDEMIR Cash 305.00 24.000	Private Sector	ERDEMIR	In-kind	340,000	340,000	
Private SectorISDEMIRIn-kind49.00024.000Private SectorIZAYDASCash3.397.0006.845.745%133Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000*0Private SectorMESSCash10.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSCash10.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorCINAR EnvironmentalIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSG Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind2.200.0000**0Private SectorSEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorFEDASIn-kind1.76.38935.278%20Private SectorFEDASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorFESASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorFEASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorFEASI	Private Sector	ISDEMIR	Cash	305.000	150,000	
Private SectorIZAYDASCash3.397.0006.845.745%133Private SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.0000*0Private SectorMESSCash10.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering Environmental EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind1.200.0000**0Private SectorGoASIn-kind1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind1.2801.99835.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind1.843.4780Private SectorTFSASCash6.52170***0Private SectorTFSASCash1.93.7790***0	Private Sector	ISDEMIR	In-kind	49,000	24 000	
Invice SectorIZAYDASIn-kind1.748.000O*OPrivate SectorMESSCash10.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorIGSASIn-kind1.200.0000**0Private SectorIGSASIn-kind1.200.0000***0Private SectorIGSASIn-kind1.283.9881.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind1.63.8935.278%20Private SectorTFASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0P	Private Sector	IZAYDAS	Cash	3 397 000	6 845 745	%133
Private SectorMESSCash10.500.0000*0Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind1.843.47800Private SectorTFSASCash1.139.7790***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.139.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.139.7790*** </td <td>Private Sector</td> <td></td> <td>In-kind</td> <td>1 748 000</td> <td>0.010.710</td> <td>/0100</td>	Private Sector		In-kind	1 748 000	0.010.710	/0100
Private SectorMESSIn-kind500.0000*0Private SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind233.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind1.200.0000**0Private SectorGontaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorJEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.483.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorISTMADENCash1.4000.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISTMADENIn-kind	Private Sector	MESS	Cash	10,500,000	0*	0
Initial SectorCINAR Environmental LaboratoryIn-kind2000000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorETIMADENCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMINE riber PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMINE riber PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMINE riber PlantCash14.000.0001.344.000%20 <td< td=""><td>Private Sector</td><td>MESS</td><td>In-kind</td><td>500.000</td><td>0*</td><td>0</td></td<>	Private Sector	MESS	In-kind	500.000	0*	0
Initial LaboratoryInitial LaboratoryInitial LaboratoryInitial LaboratoryInitial LaboratoryPrivate SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind176.38935.278%50Private SectorSEDASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorISIMR Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISIMR Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISIMR Sinter Plant <td< td=""><td>Private Sector</td><td>CINAR Environmental</td><td>In-kind</td><td>233,000</td><td>0**</td><td>0</td></td<>	Private Sector	CINAR Environmental	In-kind	233,000	0**	0
Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalCash375.0000**0Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorGSASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorISDENR Sinter PlantCash1.400.00010.500.000%20Private SectorISDENR Sinter PlantCash1.400.00010.500.000%75		Laboratory	in kind	233.000	Ŭ	U U
Private SectorArtek Engineering EnvironmentalIn-kind155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind2.801.0981.400.999%50Private SectorBEDASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.00.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.00.00010.500.000%75	Private Sector	Artek Engineering	Cash	375.000	0**	0
Invite SectorAnd Kerning Environmental EnvironmentalInvite155.0000**0Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75	Private Sector	Artek Engineering	In-kind	155,000	0**	0
Private SectorSGS Environmental ServicesIn-kind350.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.400.0001.0500.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75	Thrace Sector	Environmental		155.000	Ŭ	0
Number SectorServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialServicesInitialInitialServices <td>Private Sector</td> <td>SGS Environmental</td> <td>In-kind</td> <td>350.000</td> <td>0**</td> <td>0</td>	Private Sector	SGS Environmental	In-kind	350.000	0**	0
Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryCash155.0000**0Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorIGSASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75TOTAL84.664.583		Services		0001000	Ŭ	Ū
Private SectorNEN Engineering LaboratoryIn-kind90.0000**0Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75	Private Sector	NEN Engineering	Cash	155.000	0**	0
InterestionInteresting LaboratoryInteresting Private SectorInteresting LaboratoryInteresting Private SectorInteresting CashS0.000OOPrivate SectorBEDASIn-kind1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75TOTAI84.664.583	Private Sector	NEN Engineering	In-kind	90.000	0**	0
Private SectorContaminated Site HoldersCash1.200.0000**0Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75TOTAI84.664.583	The Sector	Laboratory		50.000	U	0
Hivate SectorEditaminated Site HoldersCashFi.200.000000Private SectorBEDASIn-kind2.801.9981.400.999%50Private SectorIGSASIn-kind176.38935.278%20Private SectorSEDASIn-kind4.438.5222.219.261%50Private SectorTFSASCash65.2170***0Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75TOTAI84.664.583	Private Sector	Contaminated Site	Cash	1 200 000	N* *	0
Private Sector BEDAS In-kind 2.801.998 1.400.999 %50 Private Sector IGSAS In-kind 176.389 35.278 %20 Private Sector SEDAS In-kind 176.389 35.278 %50 Private Sector SEDAS In-kind 4.438.522 2.219.261 %50 Private Sector TFSAS Cash 65.217 0*** 0 Private Sector TFSAS In-kind 1.843.478 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN Cash 1.193.779 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN In-kind 2.665.265 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN In-kind 2.665.265 0*** 0 Private Sector Kardemir Sinter Plant Cash 6.720.000 1.344.000 %20 Private Sector ISDEMIR Sinter Plant Cash 14.000.000 10.500.000 %75	Filvale Sector	Holders	Cash	1.200.000	0	0
Private Sector IGSAS In-kind 176.389 35.278 %20 Private Sector IGSAS In-kind 176.389 35.278 %20 Private Sector SEDAS In-kind 4.438.522 2.219.261 %50 Private Sector TFSAS Cash 65.217 0*** 0 Private Sector TFSAS In-kind 1.843.478 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN Cash 1.193.779 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN In-kind 2.665.265 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN In-kind 2.665.265 0*** 0 Private Sector Kardemir Sinter Plant Cash 6.720.000 1.344.000 %20 Private Sector ISDEMIR Sinter Plant Cash 14.000.000 10.500.000 %75	Private Sector	BEDAS	In-kind	2 801 998	1 /00 999	%50
Private Sector SEDAS In-kind 170:305 53:276 720 Private Sector SEDAS In-kind 4.438.522 2.219.261 %50 Private Sector TFSAS Cash 65:217 0*** 0 Private Sector TFSAS In-kind 1.843.478 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN Cash 1.193.779 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN In-kind 2.665.265 0*** 0 Private Sector Kardemir Sinter Plant Cash 6.720.000 1.344.000 %20 Private Sector ISDEMIR Sinter Plant Cash 14.000.000 10.500.000 %75	Private Sector		In-kind	176 389	35 278	%20
Private Sector TFSAS Cash 65.217 0*** 0 Private Sector TFSAS In-kind 1.843.478 0*** 0 Private Sector TFSAS In-kind 1.843.478 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN Cash 1.193.779 0*** 0 Private Sector ETIMADEN In-kind 2.665.265 0*** 0 Private Sector Kardemir Sinter Plant Cash 6.720.000 1.344.000 %20 Private Sector ISDEMIR Sinter Plant Cash 14.000.000 10.500.000 %75	Private Sector	SEDAS	In-kind	4 438 522	2 219 261	%50
Private SectorTFSASIn-kind1.843.4780***0Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75	Private Sector	TESAS	Cash	65.217	0***	0
Private SectorETIMADENCash1.043.4760Private SectorETIMADENCash1.193.7790***0Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75	Private Sector	TESAS	In-kind	1 843 478	0***	0
Private SectorETIMADENIn-kind2.665.2650***0Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75	Private Sector	FTIMADEN	Cash	1 193 779	0***	0
Private SectorKardemir Sinter PlantCash6.720.0001.344.000%20Private SectorISDEMIR Sinter PlantCash14.000.00010.500.000%75TOTAL84.664.583	Private Sector	FTIMADEN	In-kind	2 665 265	0***	0
Private Sector ISDEMIR Sinter Plant Cash 14.000.000 10.500.000 %20 TOTAL 84.664.583 583 583 583 564.583	Private Sector	Kardemir Sinter Plant	Cash	6 720 000	1 344 000	%20
TOTAL 84 664 583	Private Sector	ISDEMIR Sinter Plant	Cash	14.000.000	10,500,000	%75
			ΤΟΤΔΙ	84 664 583	_0.000.000	

* MESS company was excluded from project in the inception phase.

** The companies have not yet started their activities within the project.

***The companies informed there were not any PCB contaminated transformers in their facilities, thus not included into inventory

ANNEX 7: PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX

Yellow= On target to be achieved Indicator Assesment Key Green= Achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

Indicator(s)	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating/ Justification
Objective: Protection of he practice and standards, and Major legacy POPs stockpiles (POPs pesticides and current/pending PCB based based equipment) eliminated in an environmentally sound	 Baseline Level alth and environment throug d integrate POPs activities wit Globally significant large POPs pesticide stockpile remains without action beyond securing it and no more than token amounts being destroyed in the medium future. 900 t of existing PCB based equipment scheduled for export and elimination in 2014 	(self- reported) th elimination curre th national sound ch	 Nildterm Target nt POPs legacies, ensure long nemicals management initiati Removal and environmentally sound destruction of 2,800 t of POPs pesticides. Removal and environmentally sound destruction of at least an additional 200 t of PCB based equipment. Qualification of one 	er term capacity to mana ves. Restoration of former storage site for productive use	Progress in the activities for removal and environmentally sound destruction of 2,800 t of POPs pesticides and at least an additional 200 t of PCB based equipment. Qualification process of iZAYDAŞ HTI facility completed, for the environmentally sound destruction of POPs and POPs waste operating in Turkey	Achievement Rating/ Justification t with international Satisfactory
	 More than 500t of additional PCB equipment identified by MoEU as requiring phase out and elimination. No fully qualified national capability for destruction of POPs stockpiles in place. 		HTI facility for the environmentally sound destruction of POPs and POPs waste operating in Turkey		waste operating in Turkey	

A long term PCB phase out plan assuring compliance with SC requirements is in place and capacity is in place to eliminate PCB cross contamination in electrical equipment and plans are in place for phase out and elimination of remaining PCBs based electrical equipment.	 National inventory of PCB based equipment still being developed. Existence of PCB cross contaminated transformers identified but no systematic inventory identifying extent of the issue exists. No clear PCB phase out plan operational with respect to addressing remain PCB issues in accordance with the SC. No national capability available to treat cross contamination and retain such equipment in service. 	 Comprehensive inventories exist for remaining PCB based equipment and PCB cross contaminated transformers as a result of full implementation of the 2005 PCB regulations. A draft national PCB phase out plan is developed and under consultation for implementation Technology and business arrangements identified for the establishment of national commercial capability to treat cross contaminated transformers 	 A comprehensive PCB phase out Plan is in place and being implemented inclusive of hard financial commitments and time lines consistent with SC deadlines for phase out and elimination. Commercial capability in place and operational for treatment of cross contaminated transformers. 	Progress in the compilation of comprehensive inventories for remaining PCB based equipment and PCB cross contaminated transformers A draft national PCB phase out plan is developed and progress in its consultation for implementation Progress in Technology and business arrangements identified for the establishment of national commercial capability to treat cross contaminated transformers	Satisfactory
--	---	---	---	---	--------------

Implemented regulatory framework for addressing contaminated sites and action initiated on POPs contaminated sites	 Framework legislation covering contaminated sites in place but not yet implemented. No systematic action on identification and addressing POPs contaminated sites yet taken. No effective financing mechanism in place to support contaminated site legacy issues 	 Framework legislation covering contaminated sites in place but not yet implemented. No systematic action on identification and addressing POPs contaminated sites yet taken. No effective financing mechanism in place to support contaminated site legacy issues No effective financing mechanism in place to support contaminated site legacy issues Framework legislation is under implementation inclusive of delivery of awareness programs and initial reporting and data collection. Site assessment initiated on pilot sites. Initial training delivered to 50 technical professionals in site and risk assessment and remediation technology Site assessment and remediation technology 	Ily Progress in the development of the framework legislation site assessment initiated on pilot sites. Site assessment initiated on pilot sites. red to trainings on POPs, chemicals management and disposal, delivered to technical professionals in site and risk assessment and remediation technology nt, n and n nonitor on 3 sites 4 sites.	Satisfactory
Tracked and quantified continuing reductions in U- POPs release from major industrial sectors	 Although data on U-POP emission are available for some sectors, priority sector like I&S still lack of confirmed U- POP emission information and cost/effectiveness of BAT/BEP 	 Although data on U-POP emission are available for some sectors, priority sector like I&S still lack of confirmed U- POP emission information and cost/effectiveness of BAT/BEP Plants for the measurement of U- POPs emission identified. E-POPs measurement plan finalized. U-POP emission measurement starts in at least one third of the identified facilities. BAT/BEP demonstration completed. Potential redu U-POPs measure demonstration to the identified facilities. BAT/BEP demonstration completed. Potential redu U-POPs measure demonstration selected facilities. 	rement the Plants for the measurement of U-POPs emission identified. E-POPs measurement plan finalized. U-POP emission measurement conducted in identified facilities. BAT/BEP demonstration plan finalized and progress achieved in adapting in relevant sectors, including Kardemir and Isdemir facilities.	Satisfactory

Turkey can claim developed country status respecting POPs and sound chemicals management, with an institutional and regulatory framework fully harmonized with that of the EU and with including active participation as a donor and provider of environmental services to developing countries.	 Turkey has initiated a program targeting EU harmonization in this area. A growing technical and service provider capability in this area exists but is not fully capable of meeting international standards. No focused international technical assistance programs are in place in this area for developing countries. 		 Complete gap identification of all areas required for EU regulatory harmonization with respect to POPs, sound chemicals management and HW regulation generally. Initiation of planning for TA programs on POPs and chemicals management for developing countries. Active contributions to the Global PIOs monitoring network being delivered 	 Full EU regulatory harmonization achieved. Sustained compliance with the SC. Active programs for donor assistance in developing countries operational 	Progress in the gap identification of all areas required for EU regulatory harmonization with respect to POPs, sound chemicals management and HW regulation generally. Progress in the Initiation of planning for TA programs on POPs and chemicals management for developing countries. Active contributions to the Global PIOs monitoring network being delivered	Satisfactory
Component 1: Elimination Outcome 1.1. Elimination	of Current POPs Stockpiles a and infrastructure removal fro	nd Wastes	pesticide storage sites			
Elimination of 3,038 t of POPs pesticides and POPs waste from the Merkim site and its environmentally sound destruction, including 2,800 t during project implementation.	Elimination to date limited to approximately 500 t of POPs pesticides since 2007, including 238 t eliminated in anticipation of GEF support.		 All material on site packaged and removed either to interim storage or through to destruction Operational/ Safeguards training provided to 20 site staff. Informed neighbours and public on planned activities 	All POPs pesticides and POPs waste from Merkim site eliminated in an environmental sound manner	1.1.1 Detailed site assessment, operational plans, EA, tender documents and contracting for Merkim POPs stockpile site and infrastructure removal (completed) 1.1.2 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of HCH POPs pesticides and associated clean up wastes from the Merkim site. (Under implementation) 1.1.5 Operational and safeguards training for hazardous waste and residual site clean-up (completed)	Satisfactory

Building demolition, removal, contaminated soil, restoration and monitoring of the Merkim site	No action with respect to the site except for passive enterprise care and custody		 Building demolished and 4,000 t of materials removed and disposed of in a secure landfill Informed neighbours and public on planned activities 	 Site clean- up/remediation complete with 200 m3 of contaminated soil removed and disposed of in a secure HW landfill. Site restored and monitored 	 1.1.3 Demolition, removal and disposal of site buildings from the Merkim site followed by securing, containment, monitoring of the site pending remediation (to be initiated after completion of 1.1.2) 1.1.4 Remediation of the Merkim site (to be initiated after completion of 1.1.3) 1.1.6 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities on the Merkim site (completed) 	Satisfactory
Elimination of 35 t of obsolete pesticide stocks	Currently accumulating stockpiles of OPs in MoFAL custody		 Material packaged collected, by MoFAL for disposal by Project. 	OP delivered eliminated with	1.1.7 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of consolidated obsolete pesticides from government agencies. (completed)	Satisfactory
Outcome 1.2. Elimination	of high concentration PCBs an	d PCB contaminated	d equipment stockpiles and r	etiring equipment.	1	
Elimination of minimum of 200 t of existing and pending PCB based equipment stockpiles	Current PCB pending stockpiles available for elimination of approximately 650 t (excluding 900 t claimed elimination under UNEP/MAP project).		At least 200 t of currently/pending stockpiles exported for environmentally sound destruction	Additional stockpiles of equipment being phased out eliminated using savings and available resources as may occur	 1.2.1 PCBs and PCB containing equipment stockpiles of inventory update identified in the PPG phase and negotiation of project period phase out agreements under MOEU regulatory orders as required (completed) 1.2.2 Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of high concentration PCBs and PCB containing equipment. (in progress) 	Satisfactory

Outcome 1.3. Qualification of existing and developing POPs destruction facilities						
 Izaydas HTI facility fully qualified and permitted for POPs destruction inclusive of required upgrading and test burns. Existing HW infrastructure identified and GAP analysis undertaken Component 2: Planning an 	 Izaydas facility without proven capability to manage halogenated waste streams including POPs No creditable data base respecting existing HW management facilities and long term national requirements 	 Required facility upgrading to materials handling, storage, APC systems completed for commercial halogenated (POPs) waste market Test burn demonstrating capability to destroy POPs pesticides and PCBs completed and documented. Informed neighbours and public on planned activities and results Comprehensive catalogue of existing national HW capability and gap analysis available to national authorities 	Izaydas facility fully permitted and actively participating in the national and potentially regional market for POPs destruction.	 1.3.1 Facility upgrade investment in materials handling, APC and monitoring infrastructure at the Izaydas (completed) 1.3.2 Test burns undertaken on representative POPs (PCBs and POPs pesticides) at the Izaydas (completed) 1.3.3 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities at Izaydas (completed) 1.3.5 Review potential facilities licenced by MoEU during inception period for upgrading/qualification of existing national POPs destruction capability (cancelled) 1.3.6 Performance test operations completed on representative POPs (PCBs and POPs pesticides) at defined under item of 1.3.5 (cancelled) 1.3.7 Supporting public consultation for design, permitting for above activities (cancelled) 	Satisfactory	
Outcome 2.1. Implementation of national PCB regulations						

 Number of technical annex and guidance documents to the existing PCB legislation developed Number of PCB owners on role and duties in relation to PCB rules (sampling, labelling, reporting), gender disaggregated 	Missing technical guidance on how to comply with the regulation has low to poor technical enforcement	 3 Guidance document drafted. 10 PCB owners (powe generation and manufacturing industries) have a complete understanding of their role and duties. 	 Public control authorities have the capacity to monitor and verify compliance of PCB owners with the Turkey PCB regulation. 30 PCB owners (power generation and manufacturing industries) have a complete understanding of their role and duties. A guidance document on PCB regulation drafted in coordination between governmental and industrial stakeholders and adopted. 	2.1.1 Technical annex and guidance documents to the existing PCB regulation developed (completed) 2.1.2 Capacity of the relevant authority for monitoring, measuring and reporting the implementation of the existing PCB regulation enhanced (completed)	Satisfactory
Outcome 2.2. Systematic a Number of trained staff from industry on sampling, labelling, reporting, and prevention of cross contamination performed and certified Amount of sampling and analysis of transformers carried out Update of the PCB database with data on cross contaminated transformers.	 pproach for the analytical determi Industry managers and technical staff lack awareness and knowledge on PCB issue with specific reference to cross – contamination. Analytical data on PCB contaminated equipment still limited The PCB database established by the government does not contain information on PCB cross contaminated equipment 	ination of PCB in electrical equipment, lal At least one third of analytical data made available Industry managers an technical staff knowledgeable on the technical, environmental and financial aspect of cross-contaminated PCB equipment	 Industry managers and technical staff knowledgeable on the technical, environmental and financial aspect of cross-contaminated PCB equipment. A substantial set of analytical data made available and entered into the PCB database established by MoEU. 8000 transformers sampled and analysed 	2.2.1 Training on PCB equipment identification and labelling. (completed) 2.2.2 Sampling and analysis of online or stored transformers for checking their contamination by PCBs. (in progress) 2.2.3. Update of the existing PCB inventory and identification of PCB containing equipment (in progress)	Satisfactory

 Number of main industrial stakeholders from power generation and manufacturing industry consulted on PCB management plan priorities. PCB national management plan developed and adopted 	 A national plan for PCB management, with special reference with cross PCB contaminated equipment is missing No consultants on the topic 		• First draft of the country national plan completed	 A country national plan for the phase out or treatment of PCB contaminated equipment, including specific sub-plans for the largest industries (electric power companies and large electricity consumers) drafted agreed among stakeholders and adopted. 	 2.3.1 Consultation with the main stakeholders from the power generation and distribution sector and large electricity customers to identify PCB management plan priorities and develop the PCB management plan. (to be initiated after the completion of 2.2.2 and 2.2.3) 2.3.2 Promotion of adoption and development of an implementation strategy for the PCB management plan implemented (to be initiated after the completion of 2.2.2 and 2.2.3) 	Moderately Satisfactory – delay in activities
Outcome 2.4. Improvemen	t of storage and maintenance	e of cross contamina	ated PCB equipment			
 Number of standards and Guidance Documents for prioritizing, maintenance, handling and storage of PCB contaminated equipment on-line, in use or temporarily stored issued. Physical or operational measures adopted for preventing release of PCB or human exposure to PCB from equipment on- line, in use or store. 	 PCB contaminated transformers are not identified and therefore their management is weak. 		 The knowledge on the management of PCB contaminated transformers is available in form of standard guidance documents. Feasibility analysis of facility upgrade completed. 2 standard and guidance documents issued 3 companies adopting BEP 	 The knowledge on the management of PCB contaminated transformers is available in form of standard guidance documents; Facilities and methodologies for the environmentally sound temporary storage of PCB contaminated equipment are upgraded and available in the country. 5 standard and guidance documents issued 7 companies adopting BEP 	2.4.1. Standards and Guidance Documents for prioritizing, maintenance, handling and storage of PCB contaminated equipment in use or under maintenance. (completed) 2.4.2. Adoption of physical or operational measures for preventing release of PCB or human exposure to PCB from equipment on-line, in use or stored. (completed)	Satisfactory
Outcome 2.5. Determination of the feasibility of using decontamination technology for PCB contaminated transformers remaining in service and its pilot demonstration						
---	---	---	--	--	--------------	--
 Quantity of PCB contaminated equipment cleaned by technology demonstration, and demonstration reports released. Quantity of material recycled Value of recycled material Number of jobs created Quantity of CO2 emissions reduced 	Beside incineration and exporting for disposal of pure PCB transformers, there is no capacity in the country to decontaminated cross- contaminated transformers.	 Feasibility analysis completed. Technology tested and contract with technology or service provider signed. A feasibility study supported by technical and financial grounds to assess decontamination technologies completed. 	 A feasibility study supported by technical and financial grounds to assess decontamination technologies completed. A technology for treating cross- contaminated transformers which is compliant with the Stockholm Convention and economically viable is available in the country. At least 500 tons of low contamination PCB equipment treated USD 5 Mio material worth recycled. At least 10 jobs created 100,000 tons CO2 emissions reduced by replacement of old transformers by new equipment 	2.5.1 Feasibility study concerning technological options for the treatment of transformers on-line or stored for maintenance. (completed) 2.5.2 Selection, procurement and testing of equipment for the treatment of PCB contaminated transformers. (completed) 2.5.3 Pilot demonstration of the treatment of PCB contaminated equipment (in progress)	Satisfactory	
Outcome 3.1. Determination of source and technology specific U-POPs emissions						

 Determination and verification on enterprise level of current U-POPs emission factor – sintering plants and / or EAF Determination Determination and verification on enterprise level of current U-POPs emission factors - non-ferrous metal (Cu, Al, Zn) production Determination and verification on enterprise level of current U-POPs emission factors - non-ferrous metal (Cu, Al, Zn) production Determination and verification on enterprise level of current U-POPs emission factors for other priority sectors Number of companies adopting BEP Number of people trained on PCDD/F sampling and analysis 	 Methodology report for U-POPs emission factor At least one third of sampling and analysis carried out Training material for sampling and analysis of PCDD/F at the stack delivered Training material for sampling and analysis of U-POF at exhaust gase sampling an analysis of Correlated pollutants (chloring particulate matter) 5 factories adoptin BEP At least 10 laboratory staff trained on samplin and analysis of PCDD/F at industrial stacks 	f 3.1.1 Determination of current U-POPs emission factors in the iron and steel sector – sintering plants and/or EAF, non-ferrous metal industry (aluminum, copper and zinc production) and other priority sectors (in progress) Satisfactory 3.1.2 Training on PCDD/F sampling and analysis at industrial stites (completed) Satisfactory
Outcome 3.2. Provision of training and technical assistance on	BAT/BEP for priority industrial sectors	
 Number of people trained on U-POPs inventory. Number of people trained on BAT-BEP in priority sectors The awareness and knowledge on U-POPs and BAT/BEP is still low and need to be strengthened. 	 Training material prepared. At least 25 technical professionals trained on BAT-BEPs (gender disaggregated). Training on U-POPs inventory, sampling and analysis performed: Trainin of at least 50 technical professionals on BAT-BEPs (gender disaggregated). 	3.2.1 Training on U-POPs inventory, sampling and analysis (completed) Satisfactory 3.2.2 Training of at least 50 technical professionals on BAT- BEPs in 10 priority industrial sectors (completed) BAT-
outcome s.s. Development of a national of OF's release redu		

 Regulatory assessment report on U-POPs completed; Priority intervention areas identified. National U-POPs release reduction plan with risk based and cost-effectiveness priorities developed. 	 A U-POPs national reduction plan in Turkey is still missing, although the country is participating in initiatives aimed at implementing EU-IPPC like regulation. 	 Assessment of regulatory gaps. Preliminary identification of priority areas and release reduction priorities. 	•	Assessment of the regulatory gaps with reference to SC requirement and EU-IPPC regulation performed. Identification of areas with the highest priorities and cost/effectiveness in term of U-POPs reduction Development of the national U-POPs release reduction plan for priority sectors with risk- based and cost/effectiveness priorities.	 3.3.1 Assessment of the regulatory gaps with reference to SC requirement and EU-IPPC regulation and proposed amendments (completed) 3.3.2 Identification of areas with the highest priorities and cost/effectiveness in term of U-POPs reduction (in progress) 3.3.3 Development of the national U-POPs release reduction plan with risk-based and cost/effectiveness priorities. (in progress) 	Satisfactory
Outcome 3.4. Demonstrat	on of BAT/BEP in industrial priority source	ategories				

 Number of sectors in which BAT / BEP has been effectively demonstrated. Number of companies adopting BAP/BEP Amount of incremental investment made Quantity of mercury releases reduced Quantity of I-TEQ/a reduced Quantity of CO2 releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of 4.TEQ/a releases reduced Quantity of CO2 releases reduced Component 4:Management Capacity for POPs Contaminated Sites 	 -2 demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (sintering plants) completed. 2 demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (Electric arc furnaces) completed. -2 demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (Electric arc furnaces) completed. -2 demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the non- ferrous metal sector (copper, aluminium, and zinc) completed. 6 companies adopting BAP/BEP USD 30 Mio incremental investment 5 grams TEQ/a reduction 100,000 tons CO2 emissions reduced by BAT/BEP introduction 	3.4.1. Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (sintering plants) (in progress) 3.4.2. Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (Electric arc furnaces) (in progress) 3.4.3 Demonstration – assessment of BAT/BEP in non- ferreous metals sector (copper, zinc, aluminium) (in progress)			
Outcome 4.1. Implementation of the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation"					

and Point-Source Contaminated Sites Regulation passed but not implemented. is under implementation legislation is fully implementation provided for implementation inclusive impedentation implemented under implemented. No coordinated development of financing mechanisms beyond application of a simple polluter approach. is under inclusive of inclusive of financing mechanisms beyond application of a simple polluter approach. is under inclusive impedentation information systems. is under information study initiated is under information study initiated is under information study initiated is under information study initiated is under information study initiated is is under information study initiated is is is is is information study initiated is <t< th=""><th>es Regulation"</th></t<>	es Regulation"
--	----------------

Demonstration site assessment/clean up design completed and containment/remediati on/monitoring initiated on three priority contaminated sites Component 5: Institutiona	Action on cleaning up contaminated sites limited to fragmented initiatives driven primarily by individual enterprise initiatives.	4 regulatory site assessment/site specific technology study initiatives started Site assessment/clean up design completed on three priority sites	 4 regulatory site assessment/site specific technology study initiatives completed. Financial arrangements for clean-up in place for three priority contaminated sites. Containment/reme diation/monitoring initiated for three priority contaminated sites 	 4.2.1: Funding initial site assessment, clean up design and technology option analysis for prioritized regulatory action (in progress) 4.2.2: Undertaking demonstration contaminated site clean ups using a pilot national contaminated sites funding mechanism implementation (being initiated) 	Satisfactory
Outcome 5.1. Legislative fr	amework updated and adopte	ed consistent with Convention obligations.			
 Legal and regulatory framework governing POPs and HW import/export fully harmonized with EU standards and compliant with the SC. Detailed planning policy and action plan in place and under implementation for developemnt of a broadly-based POPs and chemicals waste mamagement infrastructure and services caability Outcome 5.2. Strengthened 	 Basic regulatory framework in place with gaps respecting EU harmonization, SC and Rotterdam, Convention compliance. Gaps in required infrastructure and services capability to support the above and no planning to address it. 	 Rotterdam Convention accession process completed, and requirement integrated/embed into national legislation and regulations. Gap analysis study on HW and POPs management infrastructure and services capability requirements initiated. 	 Turkey has a legal and regulatory framework for POPs and HW management fully harmonized with the EU and compliant with the SC and which supports provision of related services in the region. An endorsed policy and action plan in place and being acted on related to the development of comprehensive HW and POPs management infrastructure, tical capability, and planni 	5.1.1 Harmonization of POPs related legislation and regulation with current SC obligations and relevent EU Directives. (partially completed) 5.1.2 Ratification/accession to the Rotterdan Convention completed and measures implemented (in progress) 5.1.3 Definition of long term capacity and market requirements for POPs and chemical waste management services (delayed)	Satisfactory ment capability

 Multi-media POPs monitoring capability and active participation contribution to the Global POPs Monitoring Network Expanded qualification of private sector POPs analytical and monitoring service capability available to government and others. Action Plan initiated for national R&D capability related to POPs and sound chemicals management. 	 Comprehensive national POPs monitoring program limited to water basis and only fragmented monitoring of other media. Regulatory analytical capability restricted to a single state research agency which limits enforcement activities No targeted R&D programs related to POPs issues. 	 Active participation in the Global POPs Monitoring Network initiated Qualification and supporting training for expanded laboratory and monitoring capability initiated Planning process for development of a POPs R&D program initiated 	 Expanded and coordinated multimedia POPs monitoring programs in place and operational. 5 private laboratories and service providers qualified for regulatory work. POPs and chemicals management R&D program in place and financed 	 5.2.1 Operational POPs monitoring and participation in the Global POPs network facilitated (in progress) 5.2.2 Qualification undertaken with additional laboratories for regulatory purposes related to POPS and and contaminated sites activities. (initiated after completion of 5.2.1) 5.2.3 National POPs and chemicals waste management R&D program developed. [delayed] 	Satisfactory
Outcome 5.3. Development and implementation of modern tools for a national sound chemicals management framework					

 EU REACH regulatory framework for sound chemicals management adopted in Turkey Supporting chemicals management information system, training and an increased level of awareness respecting sound chemicals management 	 Developing but fragmented regulatory framework for sound chemicals management Limited information availability, awareness at the user and public levels respecting chemicals management 	 Development of a national chemicals profile and the REACH approach to chemicals management initiated. Supporting information management systems under development Training of 50 technical professions in sound chemicals management delivered. Zawareness events and products produced. National chemicals profile in place and adopted REACH approach to sound chemicals management adopted and operationalized in Turkey supported by an effective information management system Overall delivery of training to 100 technical and management professions in sound chemicals 2awareness events and products produced. Sawareness events and products produced. Sawareness events and products produced. 	Moderately Satisfactory – delays in the implementation
Outcome 5.4 Developmen	of national programs for the provision of	f POPs and chemicals management technical assistance to developing countries as a donor cour	ntry
 Turkey is delivering effective TA to developing countries related to POPs and sound chemicals management 	 No international TA programs in place related to environmental issues generally and POPs sound chemicals management in particular 	 A technical assistance plan matching national areas of expertise related to POPs/sound chemicals management with needs/opportunities in developing countries Nationally financed TA initiative being delivered in developing countries S.4.1 Developed national program for approval and funding for POPs/chemicals management technical assistance (delayed) 	Satisfactory

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹

Evaluators/Consultants:

- Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3.Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5.Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6.Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7.Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: Murat ÇEVİK Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at ANKARA on 15 March 2018

Signature:

www.undp.org/unegeodeofeonduct

ANNEX 8: MTR FINAL REPORT CLEARANCE FORM