External Evaluation

Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress Programme (LEAP)

TUR 98 002

March 2006

Hanna Ruszczyk
Consultant
Executive Summary of External Evaluation for the LEAP Programme

Introduction
Turkey is undergoing a remarkable period of change. The economy grew by almost 26% over a three year period, growth reaching 10% in 2004, putting Turkey among the fastest growing countries in the world. According to the UNDP’s Global Human Development Index for 2005, Turkey is part of the Medium level Human Development Group (number 94 out of 177 countries). Absolute poverty in Turkey is low but there are significant regional disparities. Almost 28% of the population is living close to the food and non-food poverty line. Poverty among women is also a significant problem.

Description of the evaluation methodology
For the purpose of this external evaluation of the LEAP Programme for the period 2000 - 2005, a desk review of documents was conducted. Field visits to three provinces (Erzurum, Kars and Ardahan) were conducted on February 12 - 18, 2006. All other meetings were held in Ankara on February 20 – 23, 2006.

Analysis of the environment
Regional disparities and poverty are issues that the Turkish Government is addressing as a national development challenge. In the 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2001 – 2005), they incorporated poverty reduction into national planning. Alleviation of the significant regional disparities has been part of the national development goals for forty years. In recent years, research on the income levels of different regions has broadened the focus on regional disparity beyond southeastern Anatolia. While 33.9% of the population in the Eastern Anatolian region was employed in agriculture in 2003, the share of the sector in Gross National product was only 12.6%. Rural poverty is very visible. There have been few other donors working in the Northeast.

LEAP Programme outcome, the output, output targets
The Linking Eastern Anatolia Programme (LEAP) is fully inline with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework Results Matrix for Turkey 2006 – 2010. It strives to reduce poverty by creating jobs, generating incomes, providing better services of health and education and reducing the impact of poverty. The Linking Eastern Anatolia Region to Progress Programme has a budget of approximately 2,900,000 USD. The Swiss government contributed 2,200,000 USD, the UNDP contributed 500,000 USD and the Ataturk University contributed 200,000 USD.

Phase I of the LEAP Programme was implemented from 2001 until 2003. Phase II of the LEAP Programme has been implemented from 2004 and is expected to finish in June 2006. The project’s intended output according to the Project Document Phase II is stated as ‘Integrated regional development in Eastern Anatolia focused on employment generation and increased income for vulnerable groups, promotion and strengthening of local capacities for self development and improvement of access to basic social services.

The LEAP Programme is nationally executed by the Ataturk University in Erzurum. It consists of three main components: the Participatory Rural Development Component
began in 2001 and has been contracted out directly to a Turkish NGO called SURKAL (Sustainable Rural and Urban Development Association), Entrepreneurship Support Component and Tourism Development in Coruh Valley Component. Both of these components are implemented directly by the Ataturk University, LEAP’s Project Coordination Unit.

**Participatory Rural Development Component**
The output target that the component is addressing is “Multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms established for increased human and institutional capacity and models tested for increasing the access of rural poor/vulnerable populations to basic services”. SURKAL utilized 1,000,000 USD for the period 2001 – 2005. SURKAL was very dedicated to the Project and SURKAL clearly had the respect of the people they had assisted. They focused their activities in 20 villages, part of 6 districts in three provinces (Erzurum, Kars and Ardahan).

SURKAL introduced participatory methods for decision making through the concept of District Development Councils (DDCs). The six DDCs are comprised of local key actors. The DDCs focused on local economic development, social and environmental development as well. Based on the needs that the District Development Councils expressed, SURKAL provided support. They implemented a wide range of training activities. They trained over 3,300 people (40% women – majority in the nutrition and family planning courses). Parallel to the training activities, SURKAL organized and showcased demonstration projects primarily in the agricultural sector.

**Impact**
A significant impact of the Participatory Rural Development Component is the formulation of the District Development Councils and then the subsequent institutionalization of the DDCs into non governmental organizations. The component also helped to create other topic based organizations that have the capacity and willingness to continue working to better their situation.

At least 2.6 million USD in income was generated by the rural communities as a direct result of this component. The Brucella Vaccinations for cattle resulted in over 1.3 million USD of income for the small scale farmers. The various trainings for fodder crops, grazing and fertilizer usage in soil resulted in over 700,000 USD in income generated for the farmers. Silage production resulted in 280,000 USD. The income generated from bee keeping training amounted to over 315,000 USD for the bee keepers. The component should have focused more efforts on introducing value added elements to agricultural commodities rather than placing the emphasis on cattle.

**Sustainability**
The DDCs will continue working in the areas of local economic development and social development in the future. They are the sustainability of the work started by SURKAL. SURKAL fulfilled a role that normally belongs to the agricultural extension services of the Ministry of Agriculture in regards to training farmers on basic farming techniques,
improving agricultural output as well as vaccinating cattle against brucella. Efforts need to be made to raise the awareness of the Ministry of Agriculture.

**Entrepreneurial Support Component**
The output target that the component is addressing is “Increased entrepreneurial, productive and institutional capacity of the region’s SMEs and entrepreneurs, and their empowerment in the regional development process”. This component began in 2003 and has been directly managed and implemented by the Project Coordination Unit. One Entrepreneurial Support Center began its activities on Jan 1, 2003 in the facility of the Ataturk University in Erzurum, and the second Entrepreneurial Support Center was established in Bayburt in 2005 in partnership with the Bayburt Chamber of Commerce.

The Erzurum Entrepreneurial Support Center provided a range of services (consulting, training, information services, support for developing business plans for banks) to the SMEs in sectors that are relevant to the local economy. They organized a variety of workshops and training programs that were demand driven from the companies. The Center also dedicated resources to analyzing the business environment, some sector specific surveys, and other research that was requested by the community. The Erzurum Center was instrumental in establishing and strengthening several business related NGOs. In Bayburt, the center is sector specific to marble and stone. This sector is the most promising in the region.

**Impact**
The Entrepreneurial Support component through the two business centers established has helped to generate income by improving business capacity in the region and improving the visibility of the business community in their provinces. The Entrepreneurship Support Component had significant impact in building the capacity of non governmental organizations, private sector companies and the public sector to strategize, and develop proper proposals for funding by the European Union. The Component trained over 400 people from business support organizations, the academics, private sector, the public sector and other civil society organizations on project cycle management. Subsequently, the Center supported organizations and companies in the process of drafting their proposals. This will have long term impact on the community overall.

**Sustainability**
The Ataturk University will continue the financing of the Entrepreneurial Center in Erzurum. In Bayburt, the Bayburt Chamber of Commerce is committed to continuing the efforts of the LEAP Programme and will finance the salary of the consultant. Many civil society organizations were established or strengthened with the support of this component.

**Tourism Development Component**
The output target that the component is addressing is “Potentials of the region for rural tourism promoted, increased income through sustainable rural tourism activities”. This component began in 2003 and has been managed by a component coordinator under the supervision of the Project Coordination Unit. The focus is on the Coruh Valley
especially Yusufeli, Kilickaya and Ispir). Significant resources were dedicated to understanding the natural resources to be found in the Coruh Valley. A variety of training programs have been implemented for tourism related businesses and organizations. Over 1,000 people were trained under this component. Efforts were made to work with the emerging NGOs in the area in order to strengthen their capacity to focus on sustainable rural tourism.

**Impact**

It is early to assess the impact. The Tourism Development component introduced the concepts of sustainable tourism development and the need for community ownership into the vocabulary of the population at large, community leaders and government officials. There is a wealth of information gathered about nature and tourism potential for the valley. Citizens are aware that the valley can provide some income generation for them in the long term if tourism is managed properly. The Dam project that will submerge Yusufeli and the surrounding area in the medium term (ten years) does impact the potential development of the valley in some manner.

**Sustainability**

The biggest weakness of this component is sustainability. There is not a clear exit strategy. There are three non governmental organizations that have been either established with the support of the LEAP Programme (in Ispir and Yusufeli) or have been strengthened (in Kilickaya) but none are in a position at the present time to carry on the activities started by the component in a focused manner.

**Key Findings for the LEAP Programme**

**Best Practices**

- The LEAP Programme had committed staff that was very interested in decreasing regional disparities and in increasing potential for income generation. The participants of the LEAP Programme were grateful for the participatory approach, appreciated the long term focus of the programme as well as the financial and technical support.

**Impact**

- The concept of civil society and the power of collective action were demonstrated through the three components. Human capital potential increased significantly through the LEAP Programme. Numerous Civil society organizations were created and or strengthened in many different communities and with different areas of focus. LEAP taught people how to think strategically and how to apply for funding from donors.
- 5,000 people were trained during the implementation of the LEAP Programme. At least 30% of the training activities participants were women. Over 7 million Euros in proposals were submitted to various donors with the direct support of the LEAP Programme (decisions are pending regarding financing). At least 1 million USD has been received in donor financing for proposals submitted with the direct support of the LEAP Programme.
• Income generation potential enhanced in all main three of the components to varying degrees. In the Rural Development Component, people were taught how to improve the situation regarding cattle and more importantly, in small training events and demonstrations, they were taught how to diversify their income base away from the cattle. At least 2.6 million USD in income was generated by the rural communities as a direct result of this programme. (1.3 million USD from the Brucella vaccination, 700,000 USD in fodder crop production, 315,000 USD from honey production and 280,000 USD in silage production).

Sustainability
• The most important mechanism for sustainability of the initiatives begun in the LEAP Programme is the District Development Councils that were created under the Rural Development Component. These DDCs are transforming themselves into formal non governmental organizations that will continue to focus on the economic and social empowerment of their communities.
• Other NGOs that have been established and or strengthened by the LEAP Programme will also be part of the exit strategy and sustainability of the LEAP Programme. The programme has built and strengthened the capacity of civil society to address issues in the economic and rural development fields.

Lessons Learned
• Minimal synergies. The three components were kept separate and distinct from each other. Duplication of activities between components occurred.
• Irregular involvement of the Steering Committee. Lack of proper monitoring and evaluation. LEAP Programme lacked indicators of achievement, measurable targets.

Strategy advice for future interventions
Participatory models for community development and capacity building:
The most important features to be considered in a future intervention are the participatory model for community development that has been created within the Rural Development component implemented by SURKAL of the LEAP Programme as well as the capacity building components in both the Rural Development component and the Entrepreneurial Support component. This has been the overriding tremendous success of the LEAP Programme.

Creating value added in a changing environment:
The UNDP has the opportunity to build on the credibility and experience it has gained in the development of local Government and Civil Society Organizations in Northeastern Anatolia. Until now, it has been the most visible donor and overall has been very successful in meeting the needs of various groups. The work that has been done thus far through LEAP has created a platform for supporting policy dialogue in the area of rural development, regional development by focusing on utilizing participatory methods in planning, and Ministry of Agriculture policy towards work with farmers.

Possibilities for future interventions:
1. Build on Community development, participatory methods in rural areas in the East. Give communities ideas regarding tools for income generation,
entrepreneurial development, and possibly social and environmental issues (a menu of options). Allow the community via the district development council (to be established under the new intervention) to choose the area of intervention. Allocate x amount of money per community (village or district).

2. Build on initiatives already started in the LEAP Programme’s rural development component and focus exclusively on strengthening income generation tools. Take the best practices (green houses, bee keeping, and any others that are effective) and bring the initiatives to a more sophisticated level of business development throughout the remaining project duration.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the project has had significant impact on the Northeastern Anatolian region of Turkey. The LEAP Programme has been relevant to the national priorities, beneficiaries’ needs and to the UNDP’s mandate. Elements of the LEAP Programme show promise of longer-term development impact (participatory community development, capacity building and diversification of income in rural areas).
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Ataturk University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDC</td>
<td>District Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOĞBESBİR</td>
<td>Erzurum Organic Agricultural Products and Animal Breeding Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Southeast Anatolia Regional Development Agency Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIDEM</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial support and guidance centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>Linking Eastern Anatolia Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCU</td>
<td>Project Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGEM</td>
<td>Center for Advancing University and Business Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Small and Medium sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>State Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAP</td>
<td>Social Risk Mitigation Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURKAL</td>
<td>Sustainable Rural and Urban Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Introduction**

Turkey is undergoing a remarkable period of change. The economy grew by almost 26% over a three year period, growth reaching 10% in 2004, putting Turkey among the fastest growing countries in the world. According to the UNDP’s Global Human Development Index for 2005, Turkey is part of the Medium level Human Development Group (number 94 out of 177 countries).

Turkey has experienced two severe financial crises over the last decade, one in 1994 and one in 2001. As a consequence of these financial crises, the Turkish economy suffered a serious contraction. A wide range of structural reforms that cover almost all areas of economic life have been implemented to achieve macroeconomic stability. The efforts in this area rest on three pillars: public sector reform, financial sector reform and enhancing the role of the private sector.

Absolute poverty in Turkey is low but there are significant regional disparities. Almost 28% of the population is living close to the food and non-food poverty line. Poverty among women is also a significant problem. According to Household Budget Surveys, there are consistently higher levels of poverty among women. Poverty is also an impediment to the achievements of Millennium Development Goals such as universal primary education, reduction of infant and maternal mortality rates.

Labor force participation and employment rate, particularly of women is low in Turkey as well as education and productivity levels of the labor force. On the other hand, unemployment rate, share of agriculture in employment and informal employment are high. Labor force participation rate was 48.3% in 2003 compared to the EU average of 70%. Only 27% of women participated in the labor force. Unemployment rate in Turkey rose to 10.5% in 2003, while the unemployment rate in the non-agricultural sector was 15%. The unemployment rate among the young educated population declined to 27.8% in 2003.

It is very important to provide an employment oriented and stable growth environment for reducing unemployment with pro-poor strategies. To reach this end, policies aimed at addressing the problems encountered in the labor market especially among women and youth, implementation of active employment policies in order to increase employment while enhancing the skills of the labor force, supporting entrepreneurship and SMEs which have high capacity to create new jobs, and achieving rural development based on creating jobs and increasing income must all be supported.

**Description of the evaluation methodology**

For the purpose of this external evaluation of the LEAP Programme for the period 2000 - 2005, a desk review of all the documents listed in Annex 1 was conducted. Field visits to three provinces (Erzurum, Kars and Ardahan) were conducted on February 12 - 18, 2006.

---

1 This section of the report has made extensive use of the Country Evaluation Assessment of Development Results Turkey 2004 and the Turkey and the Millennium Development Goals Report 2005.
All other meetings were held in Ankara on February 20 – 23, 2006. Please review Annex 2 for a full listing of meetings held.

**Analysis of the environment**

Regional disparities and poverty are issues that the Turkish Government is addressing as a national development challenge. In the 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2001 – 2005), they incorporated poverty reduction into national planning. The plan declares: “the main principle is to implement economic and social policies in harmony, which are aimed at increasing economic growth, eliminating absolute poverty, alleviating relative poverty and approximating the income for the poor segments to the average welfare level”.

Alleviation of the significant regional disparities has been part of the national development goals for forty years. For example, there has been a special regional agency created for the Southeast Anatolian region. In recent years, research on the income levels of different regions has broadened the focus on regional disparity beyond southeastern Anatolia. As a result more attention is now also paid to East Anatolia and the Black Sea region.

The UNDP has played a role both in highlighting poverty as a social problem and in transforming the Turkish Government’s regional development approach from infrastructure projects to programmes and policies that are more ‘human development’ friendly.

According to the 2003 State Institute of Statistics survey, the East and Southeastern Anatolian Regions have a lower income (13.4%) than their share of the population (23.5%) warrants. While 33.9% of the population was employed in agriculture in 2003, the share of the sector in Gross National product was only 12.6%. Rural poverty is still very visible.

There have been few other donors working in the Northeast. A short description follows.

1. EU has three programmes:
   A. Regional Grant Programme (currently reviewing proposals submitted for financing)
   B. İŞKUR Project contains two components: The first is for temporary employment for the poor by municipalities and governorates for environmental cleaning or small scale construction such as market place, recreation sites. The second component is targeting SMEs to encourage additional employment.
2. German Technical Assistance (GTZ) has been in the region since 2004 with a project for energy saving through isolation in buildings.
3. Social Risk Mitigation Project of the World Bank executed by the Turkish government through Social Aid and Solidarity Foundation.
LEAP Programme outcome, the output, output targets
The Linking Eastern Anatolia Programme is fully inline with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework Results Matrix for Turkey 2006 – 2010. This project addresses National Priority 2 (By 2010, social and economic policies for poverty and disparity reduction implemented effectively and quality basic social services reaching vulnerable groups ensured). The relevant country programme outcome is 2.1 (Pro-poor policies developed through partnership with the civil society and private sector for social and economic development at all levels of society to achieve the MDG targets for all).

The relevant country programme outputs are:
2.1.6 (Increased integration of SMEs in national and global value chains through entrepreneurship and business development services, clustering, use of appropriate technologies and vocational training),
2.1.7 (Local level poverty initiatives implemented including micro-finance with civil society and private sector partnership for social and economic empowerment of the poor),
2.1.8 (Rural development and productivity models, including organic farming techniques and agro-industrial innovations piloted in less developed regions).

The Linking Eastern Anatolia Region to Progress Programme is a human development project focusing on the Northeast of Turkey. The project’s intended output according to the Project Document Phase II is stated as ‘Integrated regional development in Eastern Anatolia focused on employment generation and increased income for vulnerable groups, promotion and strengthening of local capacities for self development and improvement of access to basic social services.

The Output Targets for the LEAP Programme are:
1. Multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms established for increased human and institutional capacity and models tested for increasing the access of rural poor/vulnerable populations to basic services,
2. Increased entrepreneurial, productive and institutional capacity of the region’s SMEs and entrepreneurs, and their empowerment in the regional development process,
3. Potentials of the region for rural tourism promoted, increased income through sustainable rural tourism activities,
4. New partnerships built with a view to enhance the impact of the program.

The government’s Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) and its relevant area based human development GAP/GIDEM model carried out in cooperation with GAP RDA and UNDP was utilized in developing the foundation of the LEAP Programme. The entrepreneurial support component was included in the LEAP Programme due to its success within the GAP. Some of the other social initiatives of the LEAP Programme also followed the example of GAP.

The Linking Eastern Anatolia Region to Progress Programme was developed in 1998 utilizing preparatory assistance funds and financing was found in 2000. The project document was signed in May 2000. The total budget is approximately 2,900,000 USD.
The Swiss government contributed 2,200,000 USD, the UNDP contributed 500,000 USD and the Ataturk University contributed 200,000 USD. Phase I of the LEAP Programme was implemented from 2001 until 2003. Phase II of the LEAP Programme has been implemented from 2004 and is expected to finish in June 2006.

The original project support document is vague and is open to interpretation regarding areas of intervention for the programme. It does not contain indicators of achievement. In 2004, the project document was revised to reflect the updated project scope and focus. The project was renamed ‘LEAP-Phase 2’.

The LEAP Programme is nationally executed by the Ataturk University in Erzurum. It consists of three main components: the Participatory Rural Development Component began in 2001 and was contracted out directly to a Turkish NGO called SURKAL (Sustainable Rural and Urban Development Association), Entrepreneurship Support Component and Tourism Development in Coruh Valley Component (both of these components began as a result of decisions made at the first steering committee meeting held in March 2001). Both components are implemented directly by the Ataturk University, LEAP’s Project Coordination Unit.

**Participatory Rural Development Component**

The output target that the component is addressing is “Multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms established for increased human and institutional capacity and models tested for increasing the access of rural poor/vulnerable populations to basic services”. SURKAL utilized 1,000,000 USD for the period 2001 – 2005.

**Activities completed**

1.1.1 Fully operational District Development Councils, Project Boards, farmers’ organizations, and youth centers built in selected pilot areas;
1.1.2 Analytical studies on the existing situation in social environment and economical context carried out; findings with possible solutions to diagnosed problems shared with policy/decision makers and stakeholders;
1.1.3 Farmers trained in both traditional and non-traditional agriculture, improving their practices and techniques for more efficient production and higher income;
1.1.4 Local initiatives supported with the aim of building sustainable models on traditional/non-traditional income generating activities.

**Relevance**

The Rural Development Component of the LEAP Programme has been very relevant to the UNDP mandate and to the national priorities of alleviating poverty and regional disparities. It has been tremendously successful in meeting the basic and developmental needs of the beneficiaries (villages and districts, farmers, farmers' organizations and to some extent women and youth).

**Effectiveness**

SURKAL, the implementing organization for this component, was very dedicated to the Project and the staff was very committed to the work and to the communities that they
SURKAL clearly had the respect of the people they had assisted. They focused their activities in 20 villages (please refer to Annex 3 for the complete list) which were part of 6 districts in three provinces (Erzurum, Kars and Ardahan). The target groups in terms of priority were poor households, small farmers, women, unemployed youth, and farmers' organizations.

SURKAL utilized the first year to conduct baseline surveys of the communities and to build trust with the communities. They introduced participatory methods for decision making through the concept of District Development Councils (DDCs). The six DDCs are comprised of local key actors including but not limited to the village head (muhtar), health center representative, public education center representative, farmers, district directorate of agriculture representative and a representative of SURKAL. The DDCs focused on local economic development, social and environmental development as well.

Based on the needs that the District Development Councils expressed, SURKAL provided support. They implemented a wide range of training activities (please refer to Annex 3 for the complete list) ranging from Approach to Development and Basic concepts in Development to Soil Management and Use of Fertilizer, Meadow, Pasture and Fodder crops, Animal Care and Feeding, to Family Planning and Hygiene as well as how to prepare project proposals for other donor projects. They trained over 3,300 people (40% women – majority in the nutrition and family planning courses).

Parallel to the training activities, SURKAL organized and showcased demonstration projects. These pilot demonstrations ranged from Brucella Vaccinations for cattle (over 5,500 animals were vaccinated under this component resulting in 50% decrease in miscarriages), Triticale Cultivation (it has a high protein content and can become an important fodder crop which the villages are lacking) to the development of green houses for vegetable growing as a source of nutrition for the families and long term as an income source. Please refer to Annex 3 for the complete list of demonstrations and equipment purchased). SURKAL also organized and conducted various research activities on topics such as the situation of agricultural cooperatives, and water resources and fishing potential.

Efficiency
The component utilized the resources efficiently overall. The component had 14 equivalent staff working on the rural development component full time. The staff was efficiently utilized. The remainder of the resources were utilized for research activities, for training programmes (economic and social development), and for demonstration projects in the areas of increasing productivity in agriculture, increasing household incomes, providing additional sources of nutrition in the family diet and introducing new production techniques (Silage production, Triticale, Hungarian vetch culture among others).
Impact

A significant impact of the Participatory Rural Development Component is the formulation of the six District Development Councils and then the subsequent institutionalization of three DDCs into non governmental organizations. The component also helped to create other topic based organizations that have the capacity and willingness to continue working to better their situation. The people learned that it is more effective to work together to achieve a common goal that will impact many lives than it is to work alone.

SURKAL built and strengthened the capacity of other NGOs. For example, an organization of hunters converted into a Society of Wild Life Preservation in Senkaya. SURKAL has been able to support NGOS in drafting and receiving over 670,000 USD in grant money (5 proposals). Over 259,000 EUROs in grant funds (5 proposals) is pending approval.

At least 2.6 million USD in income was generated by the rural communities as a direct result of this component. The Brucella Vaccinations for cattle resulted in over 1.3 million USD of income for the small scale farmers. The various trainings for fodder crops, grazing and fertilizer usage in soil resulted in over 700,000 USD in income generated for the farmers. Silage production resulted in 280,000 USD. The income generated from bee keeping training amounted to over 315,000 USD for the bee keepers. There were other sources of income generated though only the largest are mentioned above.

The component should have considered focusing more efforts on diversifying sources of income for the rural communities and other vulnerable groups away from the strong local emphasis on cattle - animal husbandry, artificial insemination, and fodder crops for the cattle. Organic agriculture could have been promoted in a stronger manner. Honey production and vegetable production should have been promoted more. Support from the component should have been provided in introducing value added to the raw food products produced.

Youth centers were established in all the districts to give youth the opportunity to meet with each other and to utilize computers free of charge. Youth can utilize special programs to prepare for their university exams and play chess. The youth centers are one of the few outlets for youth in the communities. It is unclear who will manage the youth centers long term and who will finance the overhead and maintenance of the youth centers.

Sustainability

The DDCs will continue working in the areas of local economic development and social development in the future. They are the sustainability of the work started by SURKAL. Their role will develop and evolve over time to meet the needs of the local realities utilizing participatory planning methods. The farmers will continue to improve their farming techniques due to the education provided under the component.
Under the framework of this project, SURKAL fulfilled a role that normally belongs to the agricultural extension services of the Ministry of Agriculture in regards to training farmers on basic farming techniques, improving agricultural output as well as vaccinating cattle against brucella. Some of the Project activities (the technical training programs for farmers and the agricultural demonstrations) will not be continued after the project finishes. They should be though - by the Ministry of Agriculture. This function of building the capacity of farmers in very basic skills is extremely needed. Efforts need to be made to raise the awareness of the Ministry of Agriculture concerning this issue.

**Entrepreneurial Support Component**

The output target that the component is addressing is “Increased entrepreneurial, productive and institutional capacity of the region’s SMEs and entrepreneurs, and their empowerment in the regional development process”. This component began in 2003 and has been directly managed and implemented by the Project Coordination Unit. It is unclear how much money was allocated for this component. The actual expenditures for the period 2003 – 2005 amount to 410,000 USD.

Activities completed

1.2.1. Business Development Center fully operational to serve Erzurum NUTS 2 Region as a model for similar structures in the region;
1.2.2. The stakeholders are trained to have a better understanding of the region’s potential and business/financial/investment opportunities;
1.2.3. Support to local initiatives provided with the aim of increasing the entrepreneurship potential;
1.2.4. Consultation/information services provided to the SMEs of the region to increase their access to financial resources.

Relevance

The Entrepreneurial Support Component of the LEAP Programme has been relevant to the UNDP mandate and to the national priorities of alleviating poverty and regional disparities. It has been successful in meeting the needs of the beneficiaries (SMES in Erzurum and Bayburt, as well as other business oriented NGOs in the region).

Effectiveness

The PCU tried to manage the Entrepreneurial Support Component in the manner most suitable to the local environment. The PCU implemented all of the activities that were expected. They focused their activities on the EU NUTS 2 Erzurum Region which includes Erzurum province, Bayburt province and Erzincan province. One Entrepreneurial Support Center began its activities on Jan 1, 2003 in the facility of the Ataturk University in Erzurum, and the second Entrepreneurial Support Center was established in Bayburt in 2005 in partnership with the Bayburt Chamber of Commerce.

The Erzurum Entrepreneurial Support Center provided a range of services (consulting, training, information services, support for developing business plans for banks) to the
SMEs in sectors that are relevant to the local economy. They organized a variety of workshops and training programs that were demand driven from the companies.

The Center also dedicated resources to analyzing the business environment, some sector specific surveys, and other research that was requested by the community. The Center trained a group of trainers on project cycle management. Subsequently, over 400 people were trained. Originally, the Erzurum Entrepreneurial Support Center had a staff of four but at the present time, there is one consultant remaining. The Center did not charge the clients for any of the services provided.

In Bayburt, the center is sector specific to marble and stone. This sector is the most promising in the region. The LEAP Programme was instrumental in the establishment of the Association of Marble and Stone companies. The Center has a very good working relationship with the Chamber of Commerce, the governor’s office and the Association of Marble and Stone companies. There is one consultant working in the Center.

Efficiency
The component utilized the resources in accordance with the demands and needs of the community.

Impact
The Entrepreneurial Development component through the two business centers established has helped to increase the knowledge in the community by financing various research papers relevant to the business communities. The centers have supported businesses to generate new sources of income through the provision of consultancy services. The centers have also improved the visibility of the business community in their provinces.

The Entrepreneurship Support Component had significant impact in building the capacity of non governmental organizations, private sector companies and the public sector to strategize, and develop proper proposals for funding by the European Union. The Component trained over 400 people from business support organizations, the academics, private sector, the public sector and other civil society organizations on project cycle management. Subsequently, the Center supported organizations and companies in the process of drafting their proposals. This was a tremendous effort and will have long term impact on the community overall.

The Entrepreneurship Support Component supported the development of various other organizations. For example, the Component supported the establishment of the Erzurum Women’s Entrepreneurs Association in a variety of ways. The Association was also supported in implementing a Project to foster female Entrepreneurship.

The component also dedicated resources to strengthen the Erzurum Organic Agricultural Products and Animal Breeding Association. As a contribution to the initiatives / project of the NGO, organic certification was provided by the LEAP Programme, promotional material and other types of support were given as well. The Association supports
thousands of farmers in the cultivation of organic wheat which is being sold to the Municipality of Istanbul.

The Erzurum Entrepreneurial Center has provided services to approximately 600 individual entrepreneurs and civil servants. Project Design was carried out for 85 entrepreneurs. Various types of studies were conducted for 68 companies. Pre-feasibility studies for new investment ideas for 20 applicants were completed. Support was provided for the establishment of 6 companies and civil society groups. 13 web-sites and brochures were prepared for Civil Society Groups and Companies. 5 searches for International customers were conducted.

**Sustainability**

The Ataturk University has finalized all the legal and administrative work that was necessary in order for the Entrepreneurial Center in Erzurum to be absorbed by the University. It will be located within the College of Engineering. The person working in the Center for Advancing University and Business Relations (SIGEM) is already being financed by the Ataturk University. It is unclear at the present time, what will be the focus of the SIGEM long term and what type of relationship will be established with the Erzurum Chamber of Commerce. In Bayburt, the Bayburt Chamber of Commerce is committed to continuing the efforts of the LEAP Programme and will finance the salary of the consultant.

SMEs, Business support organizations, CSOs, have been empowered in the regional development process by learning to think strategically and by learning how to write proposals that meet the needs of their constituents and meet the requests of the donor.

**Tourism Development Component**

The output target that the component is addressing is “Potentials of the region for rural tourism promoted, increased income through sustainable rural tourism activities”. This component began in 2003 and has been managed by a component coordinator under the supervision of the Project Coordination Unit. It is unclear how much money was allocated for this component. The actual expenditures for the period 2003 – 2005 amount to over 500,000 USD.

**Activities completed**

1.3.1. Improved presence of the project and stronger institutional structure at the NGO, CSO and community level ensured in the selected activity sites;

1.3.2. Information collected and organized on actual and potential features and activities on the local tourism;

1.3.3. Potential local tourism activities supported to promote sustainable economic activities and job opportunities;

1.3.4. A Master Plan with emphasis on Tourism Development in Erzurum NUTS II Region completed in cooperation with SPO, Yildiz Technical University and LEAP Program.
Relevance
The Tourism Development Component of the LEAP Programme has been relevant to the UNDP mandate and to the national priorities of alleviating poverty and regional disparities. It has created awareness regarding sustainable rural tourism development with the beneficiaries (communities at large, private sector, and public sector in the Coruh Valley especially in Yusufeli, Kilickaya and Ispir).

Effectiveness
The Tourism Development Component Coordinator was committed to the Tourism focus of the component. Significant resources were dedicated to understanding the natural resources to be found in the Coruh Valley. Research was carried out in a systematic manner on the flora, fauna, birds, butterflies, medieval Georgian Churches, possible trekking routes, in order to collect information on tourist assets and to compile inventories. A wealth of information has been compiled. Very professional promotional material (various brochures, numerous postcards, posters, calendars, and maps) have been produced as a result.

A variety of training programs have been implemented for tourism related businesses and organizations on topics such as Tourism English, House keeping and food-drink, Hygiene Training, Development of Trekking (how to mark new trails and how to be a guide), Rafting Training (how to be a Rafting guide and addressing safety issues), as well as Protecting Tourism and Nature and Cultural values. Training on Project cycle management was also carried out. Over 1,000 people were trained under this component.

Efforts were made to work with the emerging NGOS in the area in order to strengthen their capacity. The Component brought private sector and public sector representatives to France and to other regions in Turkey to learn how to organize rural tourism. The Component Coordinator traveled to various international tourism fairs to promote the Coruh Valley and its assets. Numerous events were organized to raise the tourism level in the valley.

Efficiency
The component utilized the resources to create awareness regarding sustainable rural tourism development in accordance with the demands and needs of the community.

Impact
The component has not been in existence for a long period of time. It is early to assess its real impact. The Tourism Development component introduced the concepts of sustainable tourism development, the need for community ownership and participation into the vocabulary of the population at large, community leaders and government officials. There is a wealth of information gathered about nature and tourism potential for the valley. Citizens are aware that the valley can provide some income generation for them in the long term if tourism is managed properly.

The component has built capacity via the training programs mentioned above and other training activities in almost 1,000 people (30% women).
The Dam project that will submerge Yusufeli and the surrounding area within ten years does impact the potential development of the valley in some manner.

**Sustainability**

The biggest weakness of this component is sustainability. There is not a clear exit strategy. The communities have learned about sustainable rural tourism development and are beginning to consider tourism development as a job creation and an income generation tool. There are three non governmental organizations that have been either established with the support of the LEAP Programme (in İspir and Yusufeli) or have been strengthened (in Kilickaya).

None of the NGOs are in a position at the present time to carry on the activities started by the component in a focused manner. The NGOs in İspir and Yusufeli are comprised primarily of young individuals who are interested in outdoor sports. The NGO in Kilickaya is comprised of retired community leaders. Due to the remoteness of Kilickaya, it would be difficult to expect them to focus on a larger geographic area. Efforts need to be made to develop the capacity of the NGOs so that they have a vision and detailed work plan in place in order to carry on the activities started under this component.

**Other initiatives**

The output target that the Other Initiatives component is addressing is “Local initiatives supported with the aim of building sustainable models on traditional/non-traditional income generating activities”. It is unclear how much money was allocated for this component. The actual expenditures for the period 2003 – 2005 amount to almost 300,000 USD.

**Activities completed**

1.4.1. Partnership built with a major private sector initiative in the region to support the model of contractual farming;
1.4.2. Partnership with Social Risk Mitigation Projects to facilitate the implementation of social assistance schemes.

Several other activities were financed under this component that were not detailed in the Project Document for Phase II of the LEAP Programme. These include:

**Relevance**

These other initiatives have been generally relevant to the UNDP mandate and to the national priorities of alleviating poverty and regional disparities as well as to the beneficiaries.
Effectiveness
The PCU considered it necessary to get engaged in some development activities that had a limited scope. These limited interventions seemed helpful in contributing to capacity building for development in the region.

SRAP (Social Risk Mitigation Projects). This WB Programme was executed by government through Social Aid and Solidarity Foundation. The LEAP Programme supported many “groups of farmers” in their project design and formulation. The Entrepreneurship Support Component has also helped small artisans for their project preparation. Total number supported is 15, 11 of whom received approval and were implemented.


ICT Development
A networking laboratory within the University and individuals capable of establishing networking connections in both public and private sector was created (Networking Academy).

Natural Gas Labour Force Building in 2003
Trained the trainers who subsequently trained individuals how to manage natural gas facilities. Up to the present time, 200 qualified people have found employment due to the training.

Agriculture
Training materials were produced (2,000 copies each of the four fodder crops namely alfalfa, seinfoin, trifoilum and silage corn) for the extension activities of the College of Agriculture of the Erzurum University. In cooperation with the College of Agriculture, support was provided for the establishment of a sample cherry orchard in the Pashali village of Şenkaya District. In conjunction with the Agriculture Faculty a seed and silage production and demonstration in Kars took place. There were other activities as well.

Artificial Insemination Campaign
The campaign was initiated by the Governorate of Erzurum. It involved the artificial insemination of 15,000 cattle in Erzurum. PCU provided financial support for training activities and printing of training material.

Master Plan
Master Plan Study was carried out in cooperation with Yildiz Technical University of Istanbul and the Provincial Governorates of Erzurum, Erzincan and Bayburt. The study is one of the first such studies in the Country.

Investment Areas Field Study
A proper investment area study was conducted in coordination with the College of Economic and Administrative Sciences in Erzurum NUTSII region in 2005.

**Efficiency**
These small projects were dispersed and were indirectly related to the main 3 components of the project.

**Impact**
Some of the projects had minimal impact on creating sustainable traditional and non traditional income generating activities (the output target of the project). The more removed the initiatives were from the main 3 components, the lower the likelihood of significant impact. The initiatives were done in parallel to the 3 components, not synergetic.

**Sustainability**
Varies. Some initiatives will be carried on such as the organic farming, the natural gas labour force building. Others need on going financing.

**Key Findings for the LEAP Programme**

**Best Practices**
- The LEAP Programme had committed staff that was very interested in developing the communities and regions in the most appropriate ways feasible to decrease regional disparities and to increase potential for income generation.

**Impact**
- The concepts of civil society and the power of collective action were demonstrated and strengthened through the three main components. The LEAP Programme gave people the hope to influence their own lives. The people are no longer just waiting for a government handout. The communities learned how to organize themselves (in the Rural Development and the Entrepreneurial Support components). They learned the power of working as a team.

- Human capital potential increased significantly through the LEAP Programme. Numerous Civil society organizations were created and or strengthened in many different communities and with different areas of focus.

- 5,000 people were trained during the implementation of the LEAP Programme. At least 30% of the training activities participants were women. Over 7 million Euros in proposals were submitted to various donors with the direct support of the LEAP Programme (decisions are pending regarding financing). At least 1 million USD has been received in donor financing for proposals submitted with the direct support of the LEAP Programme.

- Income generation potential enhanced in all main three of the components to varying degrees. In the Rural Development Component, people were taught how
to improve the situation regarding cattle and more importantly, in small training
events and demonstrations, they were taught how to diversify their income base
away from the cattle. At least 2.6 million USD in income was generated by the
rural communities as a direct result of this programme. (1.3 million USD from
the Brucella vaccination, 700,000 USD in fodder crop production, 315,000 USD
from honey production and 280,000 USD in silage production.)

- People were taught where to go to access information that can help them and their
  communities or organizations. The capacity to access EU funds was a
tremendous achievement on the part of the LEAP Programme. LEAP taught
people how to think strategically and how to apply for funding from donors.

- The participants of the LEAP Programme were grateful for the participatory
  approach, appreciated the long term focus of the programme and the length of
time given to support them both financially and technically.

- Women began to very slowly participate in society through project participation,
demonstration projects and training activities. In the green houses supported by
the Rural Development Component, women put pressure on their spouses to sell
the vegetables produced. Some women began home based work (creation of
dolls) that was subsequently sold in various districts. They are becoming slowly
economically more independent from their husbands.

Sustainability
- The most important mechanism for sustainability of the initiatives began through
  the LEAP Programme are the District Development Councils that were created
under the Rural Development Component. These DDCs are transforming
themselves into formal non governmental organizations that will continue to focus
on the economic and social empowerment of their communities.

- Other NGOS that have been established and or strengthened by the LEAP
Programme will also be part of the exit strategy and sustainability of the LEAP
Programme. The programme has built and strengthened the capacity of civil
society to address issues in the economic and rural development fields. There is
ownership of ideas, developed capacity to think long term on the part of these
civil society organizations. They are willing to work partnership with other
members of society. The public sector, initially very skeptical and hesitant is now
viewing the NGOs in a more favourable manner.

Lessons Learned
- Northeastern Anatolia has a different governing structure than the Southeastern
  Anatolia region. The Northeast does not have a regional development agency
such as GAP that has the responsibility for overall development of the region and
who has the mandate to work directly with the relevant line ministries. The basis
for replicating the GAP model was missing. The project should have had a more
focused and limited range of actions. The LEAP Programme should not have offered the whole range of support from income generation tools to social services.

- Difficult working conditions. Geographic area was large and the adverse weather conditions make traveling difficult under the Rural Development Component and the Tourism Development Component.

- Minimal synergies. The three components were kept separate and distinct from each other. There were minimal amounts of information sharing, minimal cross fertilization of ideas, lack of utilizing skills and strengths of each component to support the other components. There were possibilities to work together in the areas of entrepreneurial development focusing on basic business skills in the rural areas (for income generation). The participatory methods of SURKAL could have been utilized for the tourism component in order to significantly strengthen the low human capacity of the communities in the Coruh Valley where the Tourism component was functioning. This was not followed up due to the understanding of the PCU that the components were to be working in different geographic areas.

- Duplication of activities. Organic farming was introduced through the rural development component, through the entrepreneurial support component and through the other initiatives component. Artificial insemination was introduced through Rural Development component and through the other initiatives component.

Strategic Management
- Irregular involvement of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee only met two times in the life of the project (2000 – 2006). The Steering Committee was not regularly given written updates on the status of the LEAP Programme.

- Lack of proper monitoring and evaluation even after LEAP’s steering committee and UNDP’s evaluation office in the Country Assessment of Development Results highlighted this as a weakness of the LEAP Programme.

- LEAP Programme lacked indicators of achievement, measurable targets. All development programmes especially those which aim to pilot innovative approaches need to be monitored and evaluated against baseline benchmarks to determine whether they are indeed models that are sustainable and replicable.
Recommendations for LEAP Programme implementation for the remainder of the project life.

Management

- LEAP Programme needs to immediately adjust work plans with concrete budget allocations focusing on capacity development of the local stakeholders (DDCs, and NGOs):
  1. Reallocate funding to support a business oriented focus in the income generating activities under the Rural Development Component, streamline activities under Entrepreneurship Support Component and significantly consolidating activities under the Tourism Component.
  2. Building capacity of the key NGOs who will continue some of the activities begun with LEAP’s support and
  3. Assessing the impact of all the components. This is a time consuming process but very relevant.

- Advocacy work with the national government as a result of LEAP initiatives needs to be done. Ministry of Agriculture in relation to Brucella and the Agricultural Extension Services. Discussions with the SPO regarding participatory methods for regional development initiatives. Ministry of Culture and Tourism for sustainable tourism development.

- Best Practices conference targeting the government, other development actors possibly with a short film and success stories print material (brochure).

- Working session between the NGOs supported by LEAP in the different components. All should come together and share their best practices, successes, issues overcome. This will help to strengthen the social capital in Eastern Anatolia.

Rural Development Component:

- Do not repeat successful demonstration projects for a second or third wave of participants. There is minimal benefit to the LEAP Programme by dedicating funds to repeat demonstrations (for example brucella vaccinations or giving more greenhouses to additional families) at this phase of the project life.

- This year, add value to the successful demonstration projects by focusing on real income generation. Not activities that are subsistence oriented.

- Focus on teaching people basic business development skills in the rural areas serviced by SURKAL. Start your business training. Need to build capacity of people on how to make economic decisions on their own.

- Support financially the District Development Councils that have transformed into formal NGOs. They are the sustainability of the LEAP Programme. Ensure that they have the basic infrastructure to function (office equipment, computer, printer, copy machine). Consider giving seed capital for the NGOs. With a limited
budget (3,000 USD or 5,000 USD) allow them to decide how to best implement their work plans for the year.

- Make a decision who will receive the assets of the Youth Centers.

**Entrepreneurial Support Component**
- Focus on a select few organizations to support this year. Do not disperse resources and efforts.
- Do not commission any additional research papers. Consolidate activities.
- Support the rural development component with entrepreneurial development activities.

**Tourism Development Component**
- Focus on building capacity within the communities to continue the initiatives started. Research the possibility of introducing Local Agenda 21 to the communities.
- Limit spending in Yusufeli since the new Dam will submerge the town completely in 10 years or so.
- Focus Component efforts on sustainability. Significant resources have been spent to understand the natural assets of the region but efforts will be lost if people are not found to utilize the information. Decide who will manage/utilize the information.
- Do not initiate any new activities. Do not utilize time on attracting new tourism clients by attending international trade fairs. Do not spend time taking a leading role in mobilizing funds for sports events. Let others do it.
- Support financially the NGO(s) that can realistically carry on the work started under the Tourism Component. Most likely it is the NGO in Ispir. It is the only likely exit strategy for this component. Ensure that the NGO(s) have the basic infrastructure to function (office equipment, computer, printer, copy machine). Consider giving seed capital for the NGO(s). With a limited budget (3,000 USD or 5,000 USD) allow them to decide how to best implement their work plans for the year.

**Other initiatives Component**
- Do not finance any other initiatives.

**Strategy advice for future interventions**
The project as a whole does not have the potential to survive and be scaled-up. The way in which the project was structured and implemented should not be replicated. Three
components in three different geographic areas not in coordination with each other are not appropriate.

**Participatory models for community development and capacity building:**
The most important features to be considered in a future intervention are the participatory model for community development that has been created within the Rural Development component implemented by SURKAL of the LEAP Programme as well as the capacity building components in both the Rural Development component and the Entrepreneurial Support component. Involving different members of society to work together for the common good of the community. This has been the overriding tremendous success of the LEAP Programme.

The Northeast Anatolia is representative of other less developed regions in Turkey. Actions taken in the Northeast have a higher chance of replication in other economically depressed regions. Given the fact that Regional Development Agencies will become part of the organizational fabric of Turkey in the immediate future following the EU model it is important for the UNDP to support the emerging voice of civil society.

**Creating value added in a changing environment:**
The UNDP has the opportunity to build on the credibility and experience it has gained in the development of local Government and Civil Society Organizations in Eastern Anatolia. Until now, it has been the most visible donor and overall has been very successful in meeting the needs of various groups. The LEAP Programme built the capacity of CSOs, the private sector and the academics to access EU funds. Empowering communities to think strategically regarding how best to utilize the significant EU financial resources in terms of human development not just infrastructure projects should be included in future interventions.

The work that has been done thus far through LEAP has created a platform for supporting policy dialogue in the areas of rural development, regional development by focusing on utilizing participatory methods in planning, and Ministry of Agriculture policy towards work with farmers.

**Possibilities for future interventions:**
1. Build on community development, participatory methods in rural areas in the East. Give communities ideas regarding tools for income generation, entrepreneurial development, and possibly social and environmental issues (a menu of options). Allow the community via the district development council (to be established under the new intervention) to choose the area of intervention. Allocate x amount of money, 20,000 USD? per community (village or district). The selection of the communities involved in the new project could be done on a competitive basis. Qualitative criteria and some minimal financial contribution would be required. It would be a filtering out process for the communities who are not ready to work together.
2. Build on initiatives already started in the LEAP Programme’s rural development component and focus exclusively on **strengthening income generation tools**. Take the best practices (green houses, bee keeping, and any others that are effective) and bring the initiatives to a more sophisticated level of **business development** throughout the remaining project duration.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the project has had significant impact on the Northeastern Anatolian region of Turkey. The LEAP Programme has been relevant to the national priorities, beneficiaries’ needs and to the UNDP’s mandate. Elements of the LEAP Programme show promise of longer-term development impact (participatory community development, capacity building and diversification of income in rural areas). The impact of the initiatives will extend beyond the geographic area if efforts are taken in the area of advocacy during the remainder of the project life.
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ANNEX 1
Desk Review

Documents reviewed
1. UNDP/Ataturk University Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress Program (LEAP) (TUR98/002) Project Document
2. UNDP/Ataturk University Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress Program (LEAP) (TUR98/002) Project Document Phase 2
3. UNDP/Ataturk University Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress Program (LEAP) (TUR98/002) Progress Report 2000 – 2004
4. UNDP/Ataturk University Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress Program (LEAP) (TUR98/002) Information Bulletin 2005
5. 2005 Work Plan for LEAP
8. Entrepreneurship Component Work Plan-2005
10. Rural Development Component Progress Report-2005
11. Entrepreneurship Component Progress Report-2005
12. PCU Other Development Initiatives Progress Report 2005
13. Tourism Component Progress Report-2004
15. Tourism Component Budget Request for 2006 6 months
16. Tourism Component Budget Request for 2006 12 months
18. Table of training events organized and costs associated during 2002 – 2005 for the Rural Development Component
19. Trial, Demonstration and Pilot Projects implemented by the Rural Development Component
20. Cost sharing agreement with Aydin Dogan Foundation
22. Country Evaluation Assessment of Development Results Turkey 2004
23. New Poverty in Turkey 2003
24. Turkey and the Millennium Development Goals 2005

Websites visited
1. UNDP.org.tr
2. Surkal.org.tr
3. Dakap.org.tr
ANNEX 2
List of key persons met during the External Evaluation of the LEAP Programme
FEBRUARY 2006

12 February, 2006 Sunday
ERZURUM
1. Prof. Dr. Zia Yurttas, National Programme Coordinator, LEAP Programme

13 February, 2006 Monday
ERZURUM
1. Doc. Dr. Erol Çakmak, Programme Manager, LEAP Programme
2. Assoc. Prof. Ahmet Saltik, Executive Director of SURKAL
3. Mr. Mahmut Sevgi, SURKAL Project Manager for the Rural Development component of LEAP
4. Mr. Muhtarrem Karakus, SURKAL Project Field Coordinator
5. Mr. Sacit Bilici, Chairman of the Assembly of Erzurum Chamber of Commerce
6. Ms. Dilruba Memişoğlu, Advisor, Chamber of Commerce
7. Prof. Dr. Hanifi Saraç, Director of Pasinler Vocational School, (Natural Gas Labor Skills Dev. Project)
8. Mr. Murat Bingöl, Expert, Erzurum Entrepreneurship Center
9. Mr. Celalettin Güvenç, Governor of Erzurum

14 February, 2006 Tuesday
ŞENKAYA DISTRICT, ERZURUM PROVINCE
1. Mr. Görbil ÖZCAN, Mayor
2. Mr. Selami FIDAN, Headman of İkizpinar village, Head of Şenkaya Development Association, member of DDC
3. Mr. Dursun Ali FIDAN, Executive Chief of TEDAS, member of DDC, Head of Wildlife Conservation Association
4. Mr. Burçay İLGUN, Head of Wildlife Conservation Association, member of DDC and responsible for Wildlife Project
5. Ms. Sevim YILDIZ, SURKAL Local Development Agent
6. Ms. Ahmet PALA, Producer

SUSUZ DISTRICT, KARS PROVINCE
1. Mr. Akin AGCA, District-governor
2. Mr. Efkan ZARIC, Manager of HEM, Head of Cilavuz Development Association, member of DDC
3. Mr. Ayhan BULUT, Tradesman, member of DDC
4. Mr. Yavuz YAMEN, Director of Infrastructure of Municipality, member of DDC
5. Mr. Bayram MERAL, Head of Development Cooperative, Tradesman, member of DDC
6. Ms. Hurriyet ZARIC, member of DDC
7. Ms. Meltem YAGBAKAR, Local Development Association
8. 14 teenagers, 6 of them women, were interviewed in the Youth Center.

15 February, 2006 Wednesday
CILDIR DISTRICT ARDAHAN PROVINCE
1. Mr. Mulazim KARACAY, member of DDC, member of Cildir Lake Conservation Association
2. Mr. Tarik ASLANBAS, SURKAL Local Development Agent
3. Female young adults in the Youth Center

ONCUL VILLAGE ARDAHAN PROVINCE
1. Mr. Atif BULBUL, Head of Oncul Village
2. Ms. Elif DUDAK, Officer of Oncul Development Association
3. Mr. Murat KORKMAZ, Head of Ocul Development Association
4. Mr. Nuri DUDAK, Director of Project board
5. Mr. Yasar COMERT, Vegetable Producer
6. Ms. Meltem DEMIR, Vegetable Producer
7. Conversations took place with 25 men and 15 women (in two separate meetings) taking part in the project activities.

YUSUFELI DISTRICT, ERZURUM PROVINCE
8. Kenan Bayraktar, Tourism Coordinator for LEAP Programme
9. Bruno Philip, Tourism Consultant for LEAP Programme

16 February, 2006 Thursday
YUSUFELI DISTRICT, ERZURUM PROVINCE
1. Mr. Cahit Çelik Yusufeli District Governor
2. Mr. Tuncay Polat Yusufeli Nature Association
3. Mr. Cumhur Bayrak Yusufeli Nature Association
4. Mr. Tolga Miran Yusufeli Nature Association

KILICKAYA VILLAGE, ERZURUM PROVINCE
5. Ms. Zeliha Yikic Kilickaya Culture and Tourism Association, Project Coordinator
6. Mr. Turan Akinci, Chairman, Kilickaya Culture and Tourism Association

17 February, 2006 Friday
ISPIR DISTRICT, ERZURUM PROVINCE
1. Mr. Ziya Polat, Ispir District Governor
2. Mr. Osman Çakir, Mayor of Ispir
3. Mr. Uğur Aktaş, Choruh Nature Association
4. Mr. Ali Yalçın, Choruh Nature Association
5. Mr. Kamil Tutucu, Choruh Nature Association
18 February, 2006 Saturday
ERZURUM
1. Ms. Zekiye Çomaklı, Chairman of ER-KADIN (Erzurum Entrepreneur Women Association)
2. Mr. Cihangir Yıldız, Chairman of Bayburt Natural Stone and Marble Producers Association
3. Mr. Mete Emir, Director of Planning and Project Implementation of Bayburt Governorate
4. Mr. Önder Karaoğlu, Secretary General, Bayburt Chamber of Commerce
5. Mr. Aytek Turhan, Expert, Bayburt Entrepreneurship Center
6. Mr. Hüseyin Soydam, Vice Chairman of Erzurum Organic Agricultural Products and Animal Breeding Association (DOĞBESBİR)
7. Mr. Mesut Kağın, Communication Expert, Project Coordinator, DOĞBESBİR
8. Mr. Aytaç Sağlam, Agricultural Engineer, Project Coordinator, DOĞBESBİR

20 February, 2006 Monday
ANKARA
1. Ms. Yesim Oruc Kaya, UNDP Programme Manager
2. Ms. Berna Bayazıt, UNDP Programme Associate

23 February, 2006 Thursday
ANKARA
1. Mr. Ahmet Yaman, General Director, State Planning Organization
2. Mr. Nuri Duman, Assistant Planning Expert, State Planning Organization
3. Mr. Urs Beer, First Secretary, Swiss Embassy
ANNEX 3
Participatory Rural Development Component detailed information

Participatory Rural Development Component Geographic Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERZURUM</td>
<td>Şenkaya</td>
<td>İkizpinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaziler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aşağı Bakraçlı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olur</td>
<td>Olgun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eğlek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeşilbağlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARS</td>
<td>Susuz</td>
<td>Harmanlı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kırkpınar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ağziçık</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Azat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karakale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hacıhalîl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benliahmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDAHAN</td>
<td>Çıldır</td>
<td>Aşıksenlik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Öncül</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Akçekale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semîha Şakir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damal</td>
<td>Üçdere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eskikılıç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalenderdere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NAME OF THE TRAINING IMPLEMENTED UNDER THE PARTICIPATORY RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development Approaches and Training on Basic Concepts in Development</td>
<td>March 14th–16th 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Role of Women in Local Development and Training on Gender-balanced Development</td>
<td>May 2nd–8th 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training on Projects and Project Preparation</td>
<td>July 19th – 22nd 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training on Wildlife Conservation and Strengthening Local Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>October 5th–6th 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orientation Training of Local Development Agents</td>
<td>October 29th–31st 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Training on Soil Using and Use of Fertilizers</td>
<td>January 8th–10th 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Training on Family Planning and Hygiene</td>
<td>February 1st–2nd 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training on Natural Resources and Awareness Raising on Environment</td>
<td>March 17th–19th 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orientation Training of Local Development Agents</td>
<td>March 2nd-3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Training on Family Planning and Hygiene</td>
<td>April 17th–22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Role of Women in Local Development and Training on Gender-balanced Development</td>
<td>June 4th–6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Training on Beekeeping</td>
<td>June 11st–12st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Training on Pastures, Meadows and Fodder Crops</td>
<td>July 15th–16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Applied Training on Harvesting Pastures and Fodder Crops</td>
<td>July 15th–16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Soil Preservation and Use of Farm Fertilizers</td>
<td>October 24th–25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Training on Development Approaches and Basic Concepts in Development</td>
<td>March 1st – 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Training on Family Planning and Hygiene</td>
<td>April 4th–6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Applied Training for Primary School Students on Dental Health and Dental Care</td>
<td>April 14th–18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Training on Animal Diseases and Feeding</td>
<td>April 24th–25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Training on “Awareness on Nutrition and</td>
<td>May 5th – 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Training on Awareness Raising for Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td>May 6th 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Training on Awareness Raising for Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td>May 7th 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Training for students of Directorates of Public Training Centers on Nutrition, Hygiene and Family Planning</td>
<td>May 9th–13rd 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Applied Training for Primary School Students on Dental Health and Dental Care</td>
<td>October 4th–6th 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Computer Training</td>
<td>March 5th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Training on Project Preparation for SRMP and EU</td>
<td>April 4th–7th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Computer Training</td>
<td>April 16th–25th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Training on Natural Resources</td>
<td>April 20th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Computer Training</td>
<td>April 23rd 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Malched Strawberry Farming</td>
<td>April 30th–May 2nd 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Training on Greenhouse Farming</td>
<td>May 4th–6th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Computer Training</td>
<td>May 4th–28th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Training Topic</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Training on Pastures, Meadows and Fodder Crops</td>
<td>June 2nd–3rd 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Training on Beekeeping</td>
<td>June 4th–25th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Training on Pruning, Watering in Malched Strawberry Farming</td>
<td>June 16th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pruning in Cherry Orchards</td>
<td>June 17th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Training on Greenhouse Farming</td>
<td>June 24th–25th 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Training on Animal Diseases and Feeding</td>
<td>June 27th–28th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Training on Greenhouse Farming</td>
<td>July 7th-8th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Planting winter vegetables</td>
<td>October 5th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Training on Establishing NGOS and Preparing Regulations</td>
<td>August 3rd–4th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Soil Using and Sewing Winter Wheat and Triticale</td>
<td>October 3rd–4th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Training on Gender-balanced Development</td>
<td>November 22nd-24th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Training on Gender-balanced Development</td>
<td>December 1st 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Training on Project Process Management and Project Preparation for the EU</td>
<td>December 9th–10th 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Examples from the Fund Organizations and Implemented Projects in Turkey</td>
<td>December 11st 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on Awareness on Nutrition and on Population Planning</td>
<td>September 22nd-23rd 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DEMONSTRATIONS AND PURCHASING OF SUPPLIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Quantity-Units (da. times. etc.)</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pasture Improvement</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trial of Tiritcale Cultivation</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alfalfa Cultivation</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hungarian Vetch Cultivation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seinfoin Cultivation</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Enhancement of Crop Production</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Struggle against foreign weed in crop sowing areas</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Corn Silage</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fodder Crop seed production in Kars</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vetch Cultivation for Silage</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Silage Making</td>
<td>67 tonne</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Technical Crop Sowing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chickpea Cultivation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lentil Cultivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Brucella Vaccination</td>
<td>5574</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Construction of Trough to procure drinking water for animals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Planting Saplings and Afforesting Land at household and village level</td>
<td>12340</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Studies in fruit growing</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Establishment of covered walnut garden</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Establishing garden for short cherry</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establishing area for mulched strawberries</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Covered Horticulture Studies</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Earthquake Resistant House Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Field Study Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Trout Studies</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Purchase of Silage Making Machine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Purchase of Seed Drill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Purchase of Fertilizing Spray Machine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. INTRODUCTION

Background

Starting with 2001, UNDP made a strategic shift towards results based management where monitoring and evaluation systems focus on the results and outcomes as opposed to activities and deliverables. This approach relies on the need to measure/monitor development impacts on people’s lives, realizing that well managed projects with successful deliverables does not always mean that the outcomes will be positive for people’s lives. With this new approach, M&E systems have a focus on outputs rather than inputs. Results based management helps UNDP programming to be more strategic, focused and relevant in a decentralized environment.

The results based management system is based on a cycle that involves elements such as strategic planning, results-based budgeting, performance measurements/indicators and performance M&E. The chain of results can be visualized as follows:

This frame illustrates the relation between project inputs/activities, outputs and development impacts. It can be assumed that project outputs can be achieved with the project implementation and involvement of project partners while outcomes can only be achieved by mobilizing the interest of external parties, i.e. different level of partnerships.

UNDP in the global scale does its programming through a multi-year funding framework (MYFF) as a basis to secure a predictable and growing stream of core resources in return for results towards selected, strategic goals. The first MYFF was presented in September
1999, covering the period 2000-2003. It consisted of two parts: a strategic results framework and an integrated resources framework. Since its introduction, a much stronger results-orientation has entered into the way UNDP has planned for, and reported on, its achievements. It heralded the introduction of results-based management in UNDP.

**UNDP Turkey has also defined its MYFF Goals, Service Lines and Outcomes based on the country’s priorities and its mandates. MYFF-Turkey is attached to Annex 1.**

In addition, UNDP Turkey prepared its country programme document (CPD) covering the years 2006-2010. It may be found in Annex 2.

The evaluation is designed to be an output level evaluation, where the outputs/results achieved in a area based development project supporting local economic development in Eastern Anatolia Region of Turkey will be assessed. The project document for the Phase 1 (programme support document) and Phase 2 are attached for reference (Annex 3 and Annex 4). In addition, on the basis of the assessment, strategy advice on the future for the three components will be presented in the report.

The project/output to be evaluated (Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress-LEAP):

With the overall objective of reducing regional socio-economic disparities of Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions of Turkey, UNDP manages two area based development projects targeting promotion of local economic development. The project to be evaluated is the Integrated Rural Development in Eastern Anatolia, namely ‘Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress-LEAP’. The project is a NEX project, which is executed by Ataturk University based in Erzurum. The project started in 2001 with the main component of promotion of rural development in selected districts in Eastern Anatolia Region. The component has been implemented by an NGO Sur-Kal (Sustainable Rural and Urban Development Association). Based on a Steering Committee Meeting held in end-2001 and starting with 2003, two new components were added to the project, with the focus of local economic development. One component was private sector development in Eastern Anatolia and the third component was promotion of rural tourism as an income generating activity in Coruh Valley.

The project has recently been evaluated in the context of Assessment of Development Results (ADR) exercise carried out by Evaluation Office of UNDP HQs. The main purpose of ADR, as an outcome evaluation was to help UNDP Turkey in designing its strategy for enhancing its performance within Turkey’s national development priorities and UNDP corporate policies. This strategy is based on lessons learned over the past years of development programming in Turkey. LEAP project is covered under ‘Programmes Addressing Regional Disparities’, and the main findings are that the project is very carefully designed involving relevant stakeholders and national/international expertise, the low-cost project brings possibility for sustainability and that the procedures of monitoring and evaluation of outcomes are not established.
In 2004, the project document has been revised to reflect the updated project scope and focus and to reflect the new results based management system of UNDP. This project was named ‘LEAP-Phase 2’. The project’s intended output is stated as ‘Integrated regional development in Eastern Anatolia focused on employment generation and increased income for vulnerable groups, promotion and strengthening of local capacities for self development and improvement of access to basic social services. The results framework, with respect to the current country programme can be summarized as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Outcome:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-poor policies developed through partnership with the civil society and private sector for social and economic development at all levels of society to achieve the MDG targets for all. (CP Outcome 2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Outputs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increased integration of SMEs in national and global value chains through entrepreneurship and business development services, clustering, use of appropriate technologies and vocational training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local level poverty initiatives implemented including micro-finance with civil and private sector partnership for social and empowerment of the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rural development and productivity models, including organic farming techniques and agro-industrial innovations piloted in less developed regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Targets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms established for increased human and institutional capacity and models tested for increasing the access of rural poor/vulnerable populations to basic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased entrepreneurial, productive and institutional capacity of the region’s SMEs and entrepreneurs, and their empowerment in the regional development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Potentials of the region for rural tourism promoted, increased income through sustainable rural tourism activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New partnerships built with a view to enhance the impact of the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project is regularly monitored by the Project Manager and National Project Coordinator in Erzurum and periodically by the Programme Associate in UNDP Ankara office. The project’s progress report is prepared annually and the progress reports of the components are prepared on a semi-annual basis. In addition to that, Steering Committee meetings are another mechanism to monitor the progress towards the targets, search for potential partnerships and evaluate the overall impact. The last Steering Committee meeting was held in June 2004 and the next Steering Committee Meeting is planned in June 2005. Relevant governmental institutions, provincial governorates and relevant civil society organizations are members of the Steering Committee.
B. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION

The evaluation shall assess the following for all three components of the project:

- **Relevance**: Is the project relevant to UNDP’s mandate, to national priorities and to beneficiaries’ needs? (Relevance to UNDP’s country programme)
- **Effectiveness**: Have the project objectives been achieved or are they expected to be achieved? Do different components of the project feed into each other and is there a synergy in between?
- **Efficiency**: To what extent do the project outputs derive from efficient use of resources?
- **Degree of Change**: What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended changes brought about by the project intervention?
- **Sustainability**: Will benefits/activities continue after the end of the project?

The results of the outcome evaluation will be presented in the coming Steering Committee meeting as will be used for future programming in the project and to design the exit strategy.

C. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is expected to validate the output, extract lessons learned, and recommend future strategies particularly to feed into the future of the project.

The evaluation is expected to address the following issues for the whole project (with all of its three components i.e. participatory rural development, entrepreneurship/private sector development and rural tourism development):

- Has sufficient progress been made in relation to the UNDP outputs (*i.e. support to local economic development*)?
- What are the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?
- The extent to which the project contributed to other initiatives in the region in setting priorities, sharing lessons learned, mobilizing partnerships, etc.
- Analysis of outputs achieved in relation to the targeted beneficiaries, particularly those who live below the poverty line. Whether UNDP supported programme have increased their capacity to access resources.
- Assessment of whether gender aspect/gender mainstreaming has been focused sufficiently. Did women also benefit equally from the project and is there any activity/initiative targeting women’s socio-economic development?
- What has been the role of UNDP soft-assistance activities in helping achieve the outcome?
- Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective; UNDP’s capacity with regard to management of partnerships; UNDP’s ability to bring together various partners across sectoral lines to address environmental concerns in a holistic manner?
UNDP’s ability to develop national capacity in a sustainable manner (through exposure to best practices in other countries, other regions and participatory approach); UNDP’s ability to respond to changing circumstances and requirements in capacity development;

- What is the prospect of the sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome (what would be a good exit strategy for UNDP and the executing agency)

Propose a strategy for future interventions with priority areas and reference to future partnerships

D. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The key product expected from this outcome evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- An analysis of the environment including the latest developments in development assistance (this part may briefly mention other development projects targeting the region with possible impact of the project under evaluation in complementing these projects)
- An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the output, output targets with reference to three components and the partnership strategy (each component discussed in a separate section);
- Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned)
- Strategy advice for future interventions
- Conclusions and recommendations.
- Annexes: TOR, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

This report will be presented to the Steering Committee and the discussions (results achieved, established/potential partnerships, etc.)

E. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

Although it is generally the responsibility of the evaluation team to decide on the concrete evaluation methodology to be used, the following elements should be taken into account for the gathering and analysis of data:

- Desk review of relevant documents (project document with amendments made, progress reports, Meeting Minutes, work plans, any present evaluation donor-specific reports, etc)
- Discussions with the Project Management in Erzurum and programme staff of UNDP Turkey;
- Interviews with and participation of partners and stakeholders; and List in Annex 5)
- Field visits to key project sites.
- Consultation meetings.
F. REQUIRED SPECIFICATIONS

Evaluation will be carried out by one international consultant. The evaluation consultant should have at least ten years of local economic development experience, including business support services. He/she will be familiar with UNDP’s programming tools including MYFF, country programs, results based management, etc. S/he should have experience in regional development, knowledge of Eastern Anatolia Region is an asset.

The consultant will be responsible for:

- Managing the whole evaluation mission;
- Designing the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Reviewing documents;
- Conducting an analysis of the activities (business development services and capacity development activities provided, etc.)
- Conducting an analysis of the outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Conducting interviews with stakeholders (international, national, local, governmental, non-governmental, etc.)
- Finalizing the evaluation report.

The first section of the report will make an output/impact analysis of the three components and the overall project, which will be presented in the Section ‘Key Findings’. The next section will be a forward looking one, providing strategy advice on UNDP/Ataturk University’s regional development/local economic development work with potential resource mobilization opportunities. (Strategy advice and future interventions+Conclusions and Recommendations)

G. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Though the evaluation will be fully independent, UNDP and Ataturk University will be providing logistical and technical support. This will be in terms of personally attending to relevant meetings, providing translational services if necessary and logistical arrangements.

The activity and timeframe are broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation design and workplan</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of existing documents</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with UNDP, Ataturk University and project staff</td>
<td>1 day (in Erzurum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits and interviews with partners</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the evaluation report</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working Day:

10 days full in mission preparations for the mission Preparation of the evaluation report.

DSA payments out of the LEAP project.