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# Executive summary

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has commissioned an outcome evaluation of its Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio (IDG) for the Programming Period 2016-2020. The IDG outcomes are as following:

1. UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 2.1 By 2020 central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems with the full participation of civil society including the most vulnerable.
2. UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 3.1 Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms to enable equal and effective social, economic and political participation of women and girls by 2020.

The overall objective of UNDP’s work in Inclusive and Democratic Governance aims to contribute to strengthening governance processes and institutions that are responsive to citizens demands and universal norms. UNDP contributes to strengthening the independence of institutions, particularly judicial actor and national human rights mechanisms. UNDP addresses structural issues pertaining to the rule of law and human rights including with respect to gender, participation and accountability. Support is provided to the relevant institutions to enable improved access to justice and enhance the implementation of local administration reforms in line with the subsidiarity principle.

In order to achieve the objectives of and meet the IDG outcomes, the portfolio has initiated several projects: Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey (Legal Aid Phase I); Strengthening Transparency and Code of Ethics for Enhanced Public Confidence in Court of Cassation in Turkey; Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase I; Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of Ombudsman Institution; Integrity Assessment of Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality; Gender Mainstreaming in Çukurova Development Agency; Socio-economic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase II; Increasing Institutionalization and Broader use of the e-consulate system for increased efficiency in the service delivery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Phase II Project (e-consulate); Local Administration Reform Phase III; Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces (Phase III)and Enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees (Syrian and other nationalities) in Turkey.

**FINDINGS**

The implementation of the portfolio has suffered from profound changes in the context both in terms of systemic changes in government as well as new government partners for UNDP. The country has seen severe political, economic and social turbulence since 2016 with increasing political and social polarization and a recent economic slowdown with high inflation and low growth rates. Following the April 2017 referendum, the parliamentary system of government has been replaced with an executive presidency. State institutions have been fully redesigned with increased centralization and allowed additional powers to the Presidency. The functions of the Ministry of Development, UNDP’s main coordinating Ministry in Turkey were divided between the Ministry of Industry and the newly established Office of Strategy and Budget under the Presidency of the Government of Turkey. As a result, UNDP has during this evaluation period been working in a highly sensitive political and social environment.

Its work remains highly relevant both in normative and operational work. As a custodian of international norms and values, principles and agreements it has manoeuvred to remain relevant to support government in implementing the necessary institutional and technical reforms, including building government capacity. In addition, its work in demining, regional border management has proven that UNDP can support government in relevant security work responding to the challenges of the turbulent region, including support to refugees. Since the EU is the largest funder to the portfolio next to Sida and the government itself, it can implement operational and normative work.

The effectiveness of its operations has been hindered by the contextual changes describes above, including severe delays with some of the projects. In addition, government systemic changes have not been favourable to gender equality and human rights providing more challenges for UNDP to safeguard those principles and remain in dialogue. Despite the challenges, UNDP has stayed the course with a strong focus on building government capacity, supporting policy changes and preparing draft legislation to improve citizens’ rights, access to services and support government in its new constellation keeping the dialogue with government going. It has managed to exploit its past results, the niche it developed into second and third generations to achieve deeper reforms responding to the new context and political reality.

Its work with NGOs and the Parliament has lost track affecting important accountability functions while its pilots in integrity and gender mainstreaming have been welcomes but not sustained.

Most of the work is at a stage where sustainability remains weak depending on future donor resources as well as the potential new commitments from government which is preparing its 11th development plan. Given the contextual changes staff turnover has been high and, in some cases, capacity has been lost and needs to be rebuild. Also, UNDP itself has capacity challenges, for example, in the gender area where it cannot adequately improve its own work while also supporting government in a substantive way as well as mainstreaming gender in all their work.

There have been challenges with efficiency and mostly related to delays, which were mostly out of UNDP’s control due to the government changes, which in turn affected the time needed to achieve outputs and thus contribute towards the outcomes. Projects in Local Administration Reform and Civilian Oversight are just coming on board and may get sufficient traction before the Country Project Document ends. In terms of project outputs from the 13 projects four are in progress with results expected at a later stage; five are in green with the projects objectives mostly completed and three are in blue which have only just begun.

UNDP has continued to position itself strategically in terms of providing global expertise to government and other beneficiaries. Its pool of experts provides relevant and effective inputs both in terms of normative and operational work which remain relevant to Turkey as a High Middle-Income Country. Given the context UNDPs broker role will need to be exploited as an impartial institution that can assist government in meetings international standards and conventions. Nevertheless, it needs to avoid potential reputational damage at local levels where the pilots have been halted and the newly started projects have just begun.

While its partnerships have been effective and amical there is a danger that some of the work is undertaken in a rather fragmented way such as the pilots in gender mainstreaming and integrity. In other sectors, for example the justice sector, UNDP has been a critical broker to bring partners together achieving more holistic solutions to diverse problems, including reaching out to the sub national levels. Offering international expertise and tapping from a global pool of experts, including local experts, has provided important learning opportunities for government and UNDP. Such approach has increased UNDP status as a trusted partner and is an approach that could be replicated.

Monitoring and learning have been hampered by inadequate formulation of indicators both at outcome and output levels and prodocs are often lacking sufficient analysis and robust reflection both in terms of sequencing the work and how it could be implemented. SMART indicators have not been used and gender analysis or mainstreaming is too often absent. The latter has also been a capacity problem within UNDP itself.

Despite all the above, there is progress towards Outcome 2.1 but mostly affected by the changing circumstances in country while progress towards Outcome 3.1 is poor. It is too early to demonstrate impact, but it has laid important foundations in the new context and positioned itself to continue the work in the portfolio.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Most importantly, UNDO should stay the course and implement the next generation of projects while also seeking to secure follow up for the human rights institutions, expand the pilots and remain in dialogue with government (re)building capacity where necessary.

It needs to rebuild its partnership with NGOs and the Parliament to ensure that the accountability function with a new government system remains high on the agenda.

UNDP needs to urgently revive its Gender Strategy and write an action plan how it will implement this in house and in its projects. It should seek collaboration with some of the other UN agencies such as UNFPA and UN Women.

UNDP needs to consider whether the outcome 3.1 outputs could be more integrated in outcome 2.1. One way forward would be to determine which substantive projects would be related to both 2.1 and 3.1 in project design while cross cutting issues for gender need to be part of the entire portfolio.

UNDP needs to define its strategic entry points at national, sub national and local level given the new reality. While its engagement with government at national level will be critical it could explore whether work at the subnational and local levels could provide it with more traction and visibility. There may be more room to manoeuvre at local levels and engage around integrity, gender equality, human rights and social development and inclusion.

The preparatory work both in prodocs and other supporting documents need to be improved, including using SMART indicators, contribution towards government SDGs and analysis based on the current situation.

# Introduction

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has commissioned an outcome evaluation of its Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio for the Programming Period 2016-2020. This evaluation is both a summative and a formative evaluation with a considerable focus on learning. Summative in the sense that the end of the intervention is in sight (2020) and it will provide information about its value and impact. At the same time, it is formative focusing on operational issues and oriented towards identifying strengths and shortcomings. This is summarized in the Terms of Reference as:

“This interim evaluation will help the country office to understand whether the intended outcomes are still relevant or need an update (to be incorporated in the next programme period), as well as the actual development change created by UNDP’s development assistance throughout the programme period for the selected outcomes. UNDP will use this information for designing its future activities as well as communicating to its present and future partners including government agencies and donors”. [[1]](#footnote-1) For an overview of the Terms of Reference (ToR), see annex 1.

## 1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

At the country office level, UNDP uses and applies learning from monitoring and evaluation to improve the overall performance and quality of results of ongoing and future projects, programmes and strategies. Learning is particularly significant for UNDP support to the policy reform process, which is often innovative and faces frequent changes.

Evaluations are not seen as a one-time event but as part of an exercise whereby different stakeholders are able to participate in the continuous process of generating and applying evaluative knowledge. A monitoring and evaluation framework that generates knowledge, promotes learning and guides action is an important means of capacity development and sustainability of results.

The outcome evaluation seeks to:

1. Review the programmes and projects of UNDP contributing to the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio with a view to understand their relevance and contribution to national priorities for stock taking and lesson learning, and recommending mid-course corrections that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP’s development assistance;
2. Review the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected (both positively and negatively, contributing to and constraining the outcome;
3. Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and implementation arrangements have been effective for strengthened linkages between the outcomes (the nature and extent of the contribution of key partners and the role and effectiveness of partnership strategies in the outcome);
4. Provide recommendations for future country programme in the outcomes of the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio and particularly for better linkages between them.
5. Evaluate current actions and propose alternative actions which can increase the impact for development results.

## 1.3 Utilisation focus

This Portfolio Outcome Evaluation will help the Country Office (CO) to understand whether the intended outcomes are still relevant or need an update (to be incorporated in the next programme period), as well as the actual development change created by UNDP’s development assistance throughout the programme period for the selected outcomes. UNDP will use this information for designing its future activities as well as communicating to its present and future partners including government agencies and donors.

This evaluation is also very timely since the results of this evaluation will be used by UNDP Turkey and its government in preparing the United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and UNDP Country Programme for the years 2020-2025. UNDP will incorporate the findings of the evaluation, experiences and lessons learned, take recommendations into consideration while preparing the new Country Programme Document. This evaluation is also expected to bring recommendations regarding partnership strategies and to help better understanding of the impact that the portfolio creates.

## 1.4 The evaluation coverage

The evaluation covers all the outputs contributing to two outcomes:

Box 1: IDG’s contribution to Outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 2.1 By 2020 central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems with the full participation of civil society including the most vulnerable.  UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 3.1 Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms to enable equal and effective social, economic and political participation of women and girls by 2020. |

The ToR refer to the following programme outputs in support of the above outcomes:

Box2 IDG portfolio outputs

|  |
| --- |
| **In support of Outcome 2.1**  2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities  2.1.2. Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute and Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights awareness promoted  2.1.3. Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring  2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services  2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors  2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management  **In support of Outcome 3.1**  3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women’s rights and gender sensitive policies including local level  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making  3.1.4. National policies in support of women’s economic empowerment improved |

## 1.2 Evaluation approach and methodology

The evaluation was conducted in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards. The UNDP Outcome Evaluation guidance was also consulted. The work was conducted in three stages, including two visits to Ankara. The inception period reflects the preparation of the work in which documents were reviewed and the evaluation approach and methodology were drafted, followed by field visits guided by an evaluation questionnaire. Finally based on the different data collected, the analysis and synthesis took place to respond to the ToR questions. For an overview of the institutions and project teams met, see annex 2

## 1.3 Data collection

The evaluation responds to the objectives of the Terms of Reference using the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.

The data collection consisted of:

1. Document review (inception, progress and final reports of projects, output reports of activities, national and international reports and other policy documents). For an overview of documents consulted, see annex 3.
2. Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders based in Ankara and via Skype using an interview questionnaire responding to the evaluation criteria and the objectives of this evaluation.
3. Focus Group discussions with beneficiaries.

These data sets are used for triangulation: i) those who conceived the interventions (related UN agencies, UNDP, in close collaboration with Government, donors); ii) those who benefitted from the intervention (first and secondary beneficiaries) national, provincial and local authorities; and iii) those who supported the implementation of the intervention (donors, government, and other relevant persons such as experts and trainers). In addition, special rapporteurs reports, European Union progress reports and other documentation has been used in support of the evidence. The work was guided by an Evaluation Matrix reflecting the key ToR’s evaluation criteria. The portfolio is evaluated against the Sustainable Development Goals, the Country Development Strategy (UNDCS) and the Country Programme Document (CPD).

This report is organised following the ToR’s Evaluation Criteria. Additional questions and output and outcome analyses questions have been put under the relevant evaluation criteria sections with subheadings. Remaining questions - as was outlined in the Inception Report - have been added as separate chapters, for example, UNDP’s partnerships.

# The IDG Portfolio

The overall objective of UNDP’s work in Inclusive and Democratic Governance aims to contribute to strengthening governance processes and institutions that are responsive to citizens demands and universal norms. UNDP contributes to strengthening the independence of institutions, particularly judicial actor and national human rights mechanisms. UNDP addresses structural issues pertaining to the rule of law and human rights including with respect to gender, participation and accountability. Support is provided to the relevant institutions to enable improved access to justice and enhance the implementation of local administration reforms in line with the subsidiarity principle.

Currently, the IDG portfolio has about 27 staff as well as many short-term experts: (Demining: 5, Legal-aid: 3, Transparency in Judiciary: 1, Border Management: 5, E-consulate: 1, LAR III: 6, Civilian Oversight III: 6). The combined overall value of the IDG portfolio for 2016-2020 is estimated at USD 62,005,817, including LAR III and CO III and Euro 2.940,995, including IBM phase 2. The principal funding agency is the European Union.

As part of the evaluation effort, 13 projects have been reviewed. A considerable number of the projects are second or third generation projects. The Local Administration Reform III (LAR III) and Civilian Oversight III (CO III) which have just started go back a long way. These third-generation projects pick up work that was conducted before this IDG portfolio. Looking towards the future portfolio they are relevant in terms of composition of the portfolio and deepening earlier work undertaken by UNDP and its partners. LAR III and CO III both contributing to Outcome 2.1 and LAR III contributing to output 2.1.4 and CO3 to output 2.1.3 and 2.1.4.

Both projects have been affected by the changes introduced with the Presidential System and recently conducted local elections (31st March 2019). LAR III started in late 2018 and has, amongst others, gender mainstreaming, woman’s empowerment and participation in decision-making in its components and contributed to gender equality goals. Civilian Oversight III was contracted at the end of 2018 and introduces, amongst others, gender equality and women participation into local governance processes. These two projects therefore also contribute to outcome 3.1. All projects in the table below contribute to Outcome 2.1 while one specific project, Gender Mainstreaming in Çukurova Development Agency also contributed to outcome 3.1. Some components of the projects contributed to gender equality, combatting gender based sexual violence and other gender related objectives. This evaluation will not assess the contribution to outcome 3.1 as outcome level indicators or output level since this is outside the scope of the evaluation. This evaluation, however, will discuss relevant project outputs if gender equality issues are concerned.

Table 1: The IDG portfolio

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Projects and initiatives to be included in the Evaluation | | | Budget of the  Relevant Project | | Partners / Donors | | Relevant Country  Programme Output |
| Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey (Legal Aid Phase I) | | | USD 1,797,120 | | Union of Turkish Bar Associations, Ministry of  Justice | | 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities  3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women’s rights and gender sensitive policies including local level  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making |
|  | Strengthening Transparency and Code of Ethics for Enhanced Public Confidence in Court of Cassation in  Turkey | |  | USD 1,000,000 |  | Court of Cassation | 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities  2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making |
|  | Socioeconomic  Development through  Demining and Increasing the  Border Surveillance  Capacity at the Eastern  Borders of Turkey- Phase I | |  | USD  26,400,000 |  | Ministry of National  Defense TURMAC,  Ministry of Interior General  Directorate of Provincial Administrations  Department of Border  Management | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |
|  | Strengthening the  Institutional Capacity of  Ombudsman Institution | |  | USD 750,000 |  | Ombudsman Institution | 2.1.2. Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute and  Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights awareness promoted  3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women’s rights and gender sensitive policies including local level. |
|  | Integrity Assessment of Eskişehir Metropolitan  Municipality | |  | USD 12,000 |  | Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality | 2.1.5 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making |
|  | Gender Mainstreaming in  Çukurova Development  Agency | |  | USD 30,000 |  | Çukurova Development Agency | 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional  and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making  3.1.4: National policies in support of women’s economic empowerment improved |
|  | Socio-economic  Development through  Demining and Increasing the  Border Surveillance  Capacity at the Eastern  Borders of Turkey- Phase II | |  | USD  13,476,697 | • | Ministry of National  Defense TURMAC,  Ministry of Interior General  Directorate of Provincial  Administrations  Department of Border  Management | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |
|  | | Increasing Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and Greece  Project (IBM Phase I) |  | EUR 1,820,995 |  | Ministry of Interior  Directorate General for  Provincial Administrations,  Land Forces Command | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |
|  | | Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and the EU– Phase II (IBM Phase II) |  | EUR 1,120,000 |  | Ministry of Interior  Directorate General for  Provincial Administrations,  Land Forces Command | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |
|  | | Increasing  Institutionalization and Broader use of the e-consulate system for increased efficiency in the service delivery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs  Phase II Project (e-consulate) |  | USD 5,800,000 |  | Ministry of Foreign Affairs | 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services |
|  | | Local Administration Reform Phase III |  | EUR 5,449,904 |  | Ministry of Interior  Directorate General for  Provincial Administrations, Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, Union of Municipalities of Turkey | 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making |
|  | | Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces (Phase III) |  | EUR 5,400,000 |  | Ministry of Interior  Directorate General for  Provincial Administrations, Grand National Assembly of Turkey | 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services  3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making |
|  | | Enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees  (Syrian and other nationalities) in Turkey |  | USD 300,000 |  | Ministry of Justice, Union of Turkish Bar Associations | * + 1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities   3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women’s rights and gender sensitive policies including local level |

Table 2: Overview of outputs per outcome

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OUTCOME 2.1**  **By 2020 central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems with the full participation of civil society including the most vulnerable.** | **OUTCOME 3.1**  **3.1 Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms to enable equal and effective social, economic and political participation of women and girls by 2020.** |
| 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities | 3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women’s rights and gender sensitive policies including local level |
| 2.1.2. Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute and Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights awareness promoted | 3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making |
| 2.1.3. Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring | 3.1.4. National policies in support of women’s economic empowerment improved |
| 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services |  |
| 2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors |  |
| 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |  |

When looking at budgets and the output and outcome again, we note that the Demining and Border Management work (four projects) corresponds to one output only which is also unique to the portfolio in the sense that the European Union (EU) is the key donor next to the government of Turkey (GoT) and that this is a critical element in the EU accession process. (2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management). All projects in the portfolio serve the EU accession purpose and contribute towards it.

## 2.1 Objective of the IDG portfolio and focus areas

The overall objective of IDG Portfolio is to contribute to consolidating the gains made so far and to the advancement of governance processes and institutions that foster effective democratic governance and are adapted to and able to deliver on the public expectations for inclusiveness and participation. This objective is guided not only by UN values, but also by the Judicial Reform Strategy and 10th National Development Plan (NDP) objectives with regards to participatory, accountable and transparent governance processes at all levels, rule of law and access to justice, fundamental rights and freedoms.

The IDG Portfolio is composed of four program areas, which complement each other. Each program has a specific objective (purpose), which will collectively help the IDG Portfolio to progress towards the achievement of its overall objective, reinforce the rule of law, effective participation and citizen security.

Human Rights and Rule of Law Programme works towards the creation of an environment conducive to the rule of law and the enjoyment of human rights, which would support an inclusive, people oriented development agenda, through strengthening (a) the systems for access to justice and legal empowerment for people to have their voice heard, exercise their rights, challenge discrimination or hold decision-makers accountable, (b) the efficient functioning of the human rights mechanism, (c) anti-corruption efforts for efficient, responsive, transparent and accountable systems at both local, regional and national levels. It addresses structural challenges in the field of human rights and rule of law and advocating access to justice and redress for all with specific focus on disadvantaged groups. Therefore, the Programme addresses gender related needs and interests as well as needs of persons/groups faced with disadvantages and made vulnerable by circumstances.

Responsive and Accountable Public Administration Programme aims to foster more accountable and open governance in state institutions that provide effective and responsive public services to the people, through supporting (a) local administration reform and civic engagement for improvements in the access to basic services by individuals in their capacities as contributors to decision-making processes that are directly affecting their lives, (b) civilian and parliamentary oversight over the internal security system to ensure that security policies and practices are transparent and accountable to the wider population. The program also supports the full-fledged implementation of the international standards for transparency and accountability, UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC).

The Portfolio has a specific programme on women’s empowerment and gender equality but beyond that the gender focus cut across all initiatives related to IDG. Specific initiatives directly aim for women’s empowerment through their increased participation in decision making processes and recognition of their rights. Access to justice for women is one of the main pillars of the IDG under its human rights and rule of law programming and this includes but is not limited to interventions addressing improved legal aid practices and approaches for women and targeted interventions for victims of crime specifically victims of sexual and gender-based violence. Besides, initiatives on awareness raising on women’s human rights among the duty bearers and right holders as well as improvement of gender sensitive complaints handling mechanisms also have an impact on women’s empowerment and gender mainstreaming. In addition, targeted interventions for improved public service delivery at local, regional and national levels have a specific focus on equal access to opportunities and public services for men and women while paying attention to support equal participation of men and women into designing making processes

Border governance and management is a significant field that UNDP Turkey had started to engage in previous programming cycle with the launch of a demining programme in the Eastern borders of Turkey. The programmatic area on border management and demining started to grow both on a substantial and financial basis since 2014. Increased migration crisis and visa liberalization discussions also enhanced the importance of the topic for Turkey and EU. The link between security and development is a key underlying principle of a comprehensive approach to external conflicts and crises and complementary to the internal security policies, maritime security and others.

Based on the above and in line with EU’s policy in the field, current security capacity building efforts span across several policy areas including the establishment of effective, legitimate and sustainable institutions such as effective justice and security sectors, border management and coast guards. The approach is also recognized by the international actors, especially the EU, which focuses on building capacities of its partners to prevent and manage crises while reiterating that the borders in question represent some of the greatest security and developmental challenges for the wider region, and indeed for the entire EU. The current migration crisis on Europe’s southern and eastern flank is a reminder of the need to work collaboratively to build resilience of communities and institutions, including integrated border management capacities and initiation of governance approach. Within this framework and the changing context of the region with increased migration flux, border governance and management will continue to be a high priority area for UNDP IDG Portfolio.

Figure 1: Portfolio projects divided among the four focus areas

## 

## 2.1 Positioning of the portfolio in the (UNDCS), the United Nations Development Programme’s Country Programme Document (UNCPD), the 10th National Development Plan (NDP) and its contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The specific UNDCS outcome consist of the following:[[2]](#footnote-2)

Box 3: UNDCS outcome

|  |
| --- |
| By 2020, central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights, and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems, with the full participation of civil society, including the most vulnerable. |

**Rationale:** Turkey has made significant democratic reforms to harmonize its legislation with the EU and the European Convention on Human Rights as well as other Council of Europe conventions to which Turkey is a party. The right of individual appeal to the Constitutional Court has been recognized. Turkey has established a National Human Rights Institution[[3]](#footnote-3) and an Ombudsman Institution. Notwithstanding a democratic tradition, a maturing society and recent changes in the Constitution, issues related to the election system, democracy within political parties, access to politics, gender equality in political participation, accountability and transparency are areas that could be supported further taking into consideration the comparative advantage of the UN in Turkey.

The UN is best placed to support a comprehensive and coordinated approach of the relevant stakeholders to the implementation of recommendations made by various UN Human Rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) held in January 2015. From the same perspective, within the framework of the ongoing reform process in Turkey on rule of law, human rights and democracy, UN support will be sought as appropriate in pertinent fields in order to further develop institutional capacity and advance the reform measures. This includes strengthening oversight of implementation of international human rights recommendations and further accelerating compliance of constitutional/legislative/policy reforms and practices with international human rights standards. De-centralization is another area that provides scope for collaboration.

The Tenth Development Plan aims at a strong, diverse, pluralistic and sustainable civil society but arrangements for civil society participation in policymaking and monitoring need to be strengthened and institutionalized. With respect to human rights, the Tenth Development Plan speaks of enhancing human rights in the light of universal principles, and a strategy has been adopted to reduce the number of cases sent to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). With a view to ensuring the achievement of the Government’s targets in this area, the UN in Turkey will use its comparative advantage to contribute to Government efforts to promote access to justice and legal empowerment, anti-corruption, public/local administration reform with a focus on civic engagement and civilian and parliamentary oversight of the security sector.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The CPD for Turkey addresses the structural and intertwined challenges from a cross-cutting sustainable human development perspective, in line with the 10th National Development Plan priorities and in support of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with its ‘supremely ambitious and transformational vision’ envisages ‘a world of universal respect for human rights and human dignity, rule of law, justice, equality and non-discrimination’.[[5]](#footnote-5) The principles of the inclusive and democratic governance are highlighted under:

* SDGs 5: achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls:
* SDG 10: reduce inequality within and among countries;
* SDG 11: make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable;
* SDG 16: promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels[[6]](#footnote-6). The IDG Portfolio, in its all interventions, seeks means to mainstream the underlying targets of the SDGs and contribute to their achievement.

The 10th National Development Plan (10th NDP, 2014-2018) outlines Turkey’s national development priorities. It provides a human development-oriented framework for high, stable and inclusive economic growth (average GDP growth projected at 5.5%), with sound use of natural resources and strengthened fundamental rights and freedoms as well as more effective contributions to global and regional agendas. Turkey has made significant democratic reforms to harmonize its legislation with the European Union. It has recognized the right of individual appeal to the Constitutional Court. Turkey has established its national Human Rights Institution and Ombudsman Institution, which could be further strengthened in line with international norms together with ensuring accountable, transparent and responsive institutions and system integrity at all levels. The 10th NDP indicates that implementation of fundamental rights and freedoms, democratization and justice will continue. The plan also recognizes civil society as a sector for the first time, and aims to ensure that it becomes strong, diver pluralistic and sustainable. Arrangements for its participation in policy-making and monitoring need to be strengthened and institutionalized. The Plan also prioritizes women, youth and persons with disabilities’ access opportunities and participation in economic and social life. It acknowledges the need for improvement and sustained progress in women’s participation in the labour market, decision making and violence-prevention. [[7]](#footnote-7)

## 2.2 Contextual changes affecting the portfolio.

Turkey has gone through severe political, economic and social turbulence since 2016. The outlook for the country has been rapidly changing since the failed coup in July 2016, with increasing political and social polarization, and a recent economic slowdown with high inflation and low growth rates. Following the April 2017 referendum, the parliamentary system of government has been replaced with an executive presidency. Presidential Decrees and decisions have been issued to fully redesign State institutions, with increased centralization and allowed additional powers to the Presidency. The recent restructuring of State institutions has brought certain challenges and opportunities at the same time.

During the state of emergency, which was introduced in response to the failed coup and extended for seven times (it ended in July 2018), approximately 200,000 government officials were dismissed from service (including the cancellation of work permits), 228,000 people detained in the purges and 174 media organizations closed/restricted.[[8]](#footnote-8) Given the high number of detainees and restrictive measures adopted during the state of emergency, human rights situation in Turkey has remained a matter of concern for the international community. Several measures to ensure security of the State were adopted through an Anti-Terror Law after June 2018, which allows retaining significant components of the state of emergency rules.

Turkey hosts the largest refugee population in the world and has demonstrated strong national ownership of the Syria Crisis Response. Turkey’s development has been challenged by regional differences in terms of development and unemployment for many years. Labour force in the provinces which are densely populated by Syrians, particularly border provinces in Southeast Anatolia Region and metropolitan cities such as Istanbul and Izmir, have been struggling with higher unemployment and/or non-agricultural unemployment rates than overall country.[[9]](#footnote-9) For instance, while the overall unemployment rate and non-agricultural unemployment rate of Turkey in 2017 has been measured as 10,9% and 13% respectively, the rates in Southeast Anatolia Region as 17% and 20,8%, in Istanbul as 13,9% and 14%, in Izmir as 14% and 15,1%. [[10]](#footnote-10)

Even though refugees have overall been generously hosted in Turkey, recent surveys are indicating the fragility of the social cohesion between Syrians and Turkish host communities. At the same time, there is an increase in acknowledgement and understanding that Syrians may not return soon. In 2014, 55% of Turkish nationals thought that most/all refugees would return, now 70% think that all/most will stay.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Turkey is a Higher Middle-Income Country, whose Human Development Index (HDI) rank moved up eight ranks between 2012 and 2017, at the high human development category. However, there are still disparities and inequalities at many fronts and the developments in last 5 years caused the development challenges to be much more complex.

Unique is also the significant support from the EU. The EU Facility aims to support the implementation of the EU-Turkey Joint Action Plan agreed on 29 November 2015 and the EU-Turkey Statement of 18 March 2016.[[12]](#footnote-12) A first phase of the Facility for an amount of EUR 3 billion was launched in 2016 and was successfully contracted by end 2017 through 72 projects within the humanitarian and development strands of the Facility. In July 2018 a Decision was adopted by the Commission to mobilize an additional EUR 3 billion envelope to continue supporting the humanitarian and development needs of refugees and host communities in Turkey.

UNDP has during this evaluation period been working in a highly sensitive political and social environment as well as an economic slowdown in the country. The polarized social and political environment had a negative impact on consensus-based policy/decision processes facilitated by UNDP. For example, issues related to human rights, the rule of law and gender equality have been negatively affected. The elections during the last four years slowed down the portfolio’s work and caused implementation delays and often working with new entities who are not familiar with UNDP’s mandate and work.

Most significantly, the functions of the Ministry of Development, UNDP’s main coordinating Ministry in Turkey were divided between the Ministry of Industry and the newly established Office of Strategy and Budget under the Presidency of the Government of Turkey. The newly established Office is responsible, among others, for preparing, monitoring implementation, assessment, and if needed amending or proposing amendments to Turkey’s development plan, presidential programs, medium term programs, medium term fiscal plans, sectoral plans and other programs within the scope of the fundamental goals and purposes determined by the President. Due to the recent changes in the structure of the former Ministry of Development, the 11th NDP of the country still needs to be approved and published as a main reference document for projects to be developed within the Portfolio.

# Key findings

## **3.1 Relevance**

### 3.1.1 Relevance of outcomes to UNDP’s mandate, to national priorities and to beneficiaries’ needs

The IDG portfolio is both relevant to UNDP’s mandate and priorities and responds to beneficiaries needs. Both operational work and normative work are combined in the portfolio. Moreover, all the work is relevant to Turkey’s accession to the EU.

The IDG portfolio is highly relevant to the Tenth National Development Plan. In particular, the combination of normative and operational work in the portfolio – and thus responding to different outcomes - put UNDP in a position to offer support across different government entities, supporting reforms, including policy and legal work as well as introducing pilots while the context was rapidly changing. (human rights, transparency, access to justice and legal empowerment, anti-corruption, public administrative reform, civic engagement and oversights of the security sector). The portfolio responds to both UNDPs focus on sustainable development as well as democratic governance and peace building. Moreover, the Agenda 2030 for sustainable development is the leading principle in support of the SDGs. The portfolio responds directly to four SDGs (5, 10,11 and 16). Both the Tenth National Development Plan and the Agenda 2030 provide a human development-oriented framework to which the portfolio responds.

The country context has changed considerably since 2016 and further with the introduction of the Presidential System with a redesign of ministries and their mandates. Although this has not changed the relevance of UNDPs work in Turkey, the government’s norms and values and interest in some of UNDP’s normative work has declined. Considering the working areas of IDG Portfolio, it has, for example, become more difficult to address gender equality and human rights both as a cross cutting issue and in terms of addressing these issues substantively in projects.

While Turkey has ratified international agreements and conventions, its policies and practice do not meet the requirements yet. A substantial number of interviewees claim that its interest is low in working towards these international norms and standards. For example, government prefers to speak about gender justice instead of gender equality; this is reflected in the project design in the sense that although gender equality is an integral part of the activities, in practice partners may prefer to use the governments’.

The portfolio is very diverse with beneficiaries at national, sub-national and local levels. In addition, some specific institutions such as the Ombudsman Institution and the Union of Turkish Bar Associations have been supported in close collaboration with government institutions. This diversity reflects a strategic choice relevant to the four focus areas of the portfolio as well as support to the different levels of government. While the recent changes imply a more centralised system of government UNDP’s relevance remains at all levels of government (policies, regulations, procedures) and key institutions.

The changes at the national level have had a considerable impact on UNDP’s work since they have affected the main partner and beneficiary structures of UNDP. The abolishment of the Ministry of Interior (MoI) created two separate structures: now the Presidency Strategy and Budget Office of the Presidency is the main partner of UNDP while its former beneficiary (the General Directorate of Regional Development and Structural Adjustment) has moved to the Ministry of Science and Industry. The MoI General Directorate of Local Administrations, which has been a long-term established partner of UNDP in Local Administration Reform projects and in the fields of local governance and gender empowerment in decision making, was also abolished within MoI and part of its team transferred to the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU). A new General Directorate (GD) for Local Administrations has been established at MoEU with limited capacity in project implementation and no history of knowledge produced at former LAR Projects with UNDP. In MoI only GD Provincial Administrations has remained a continuing partner (IBM Phase I and II, LAR III and Civilian Oversight III).

The fragmentation increased the number of beneficiaries in LAR III together with Union of Turkish Municipalities and created management bottlenecks for project implementation in the field of local governance. More importantly, due to the changing of ministry personnel after the coup attempt as well as the continuous high turnover of staff within ministries but especially at MoI brings out the loss of already created capacities, knowledge and project outputs institutional memory. This situation negatively affects the added value created by UNDP through various successfully implemented projects before this portfolio, including the policy support provided. Although it does not affect the mandate of UNDP and the IDG portfolio it meant that often all work had to be started from scratch.

Another negative affect of recent government changes and high turnover of managers and staff are the delays in finalization of project documents and initiation of project implementation. LAR III was finally signed in 2018 after several years of delay and the same is the case for Civilian Oversight Phase III also signed in late 2018. In such cases trade-offs were made; redesign would take very long and thus the original plan was pursued. It has been suggested that the different components may be less relevant after the government changes. In addition, the topic has become more sensitive and needs to fit the Presidential System. These two projects are third-generation projects and given the new context may have redundancies in terms of UNDP’s previous work and that of other donors. In such cases relevance may be limited while there is no obvious solution. Many suggest that a ‘wait and see’ approach may be the best way forward, including donors.

The Demining and Integrated Border Management Projects are usually not UNDP’s main line of work. The work has been presented as socio-economic development and border governance which makes them part of UNDP’s mandate within IDG Portfolio while all agree that this labour and financial intensive work is really about security and border governance both for Turkey and the European Union. UNDP has, however, managed to position itself as a relevant partner both in terms of mobilising expertise, building government capacity and working towards international conventions such as the Ottawa Treaty on land mines.[[13]](#footnote-13) In this case its capacity building and governance experience is most relevant.

UNDP’s support to the rule of law, access to justice and legal aid have been relevant both in terms of strengthening institutions, supporting policy and legal work as well as introducing ethical principles, and access to justice, including for Syrian refugees and improved quality of legal services, including with a gender lens. Its relevance has been particularly strong in bringing different partners on board across the sector to jointly work on common themes and improve government and the legal system to better respond to citizen’s needs.

### 3.1.2 Relevance of the selected outcomes given the country context and needs, and UNDP’s niche

The selected outcomes are relevant both in terms of normative and operational work. They are also relevant to Turkey in terms of adhering to international treaties and conventions that it ratified, the Accession Process to the EU and the Acquis[[14]](#footnote-14), and the regional security situation since Turkey hosts more than 3.5 million Syrian refugees. Since the coup attempt, the introduction of the Presidential system, the dismissal of hundreds of civil servants, including prosecutors and judges, and the changes in government, UNDP’s relevance is becoming more critical and notably its normative work. The EU rapport of 2016 expresses concerns about the violation of human rights after the coup attempt, the backsliding of the public service and the judiciary. Freedom of expression has been reduced and NGOs subject to restrictions.[[15]](#footnote-15) All projects in the portfolio respond to the challenges to the extent possible while building new partnerships and creating trust.

The outcomes remain highly relevant to Turkey.

Most significant is UNDPs long presence in Turkey and UNDP’s contribution to inclusive and democratic governance over decades. This is, amongst others, evidenced by the second and third generation projects and long-term present donors such as the EU and Swedish International Development Agency Sida. Its long-term approach through second and third generation projects with capacity building across components to strengthen government functions and public services often in relation to international norms and standards means that it can stay the course also in times when changes are not in favor of reaching its goals.

It has also built up considerably long-term partnership such as with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of the Interior. While it is considered impartial and neutral it can play a broker role among different parties, break down administrative silo’s and can respond to the country’s development needs in politically sensitive areas. It has built up trust with national and multilateral partners which has often translated into projects that have contributed to changes in legislation and policies. Observers refer to UNDPs global network of expertise, guidance and trust as its added value.

One could argue that the relevance of both outcome 2.1 and 3.1 is in fact increasing given the centralisation of power, the systemic changes that have been introduced in government since the Presidential elections, and the normative work (human rights and gender equality) that has come under pressure.

## **3.2 Effectiveness**

## 3.2.1 The extent to which the intended impacts been achieved or are expected to be achieved

The portfolio shows mixed signs in terms of achieving results. There are internal as well as external reasons for this. Internally, prodocs differ in terms of definitions of results, outcomes, indicators and measuring progress. When discussing progress, the lack of indicators either qualitative or quantitative is significant and most often indicators are substituted with activities such as setting up a committee or organising a meeting. For example, the prodoc of Transparency in Judiciary is entirely activity based. While completing activities contributes to progress in processes it does not tell us anything on whether these contributed to results. In addition, the focus may change along the way e.g. demining changes geographical area, the indicator needs to be revised due an increased number of people or the indicator is not helpful. Nevertheless, the narrative in the progress reporting provides the best written source to collect evidence on the progress made in relation to the output. In some cases, the reporting is substantive (legal aid) while in others it provides limited information (e-consulate). Also delays (demining, border management, local administrative reform) have hindered effective implementation.

At a higher level, the output indicators also provide challenges: in most cases the targets are ambitious. It must be noted, however, that these were formulated while not all the contextual changes had materialised. Often unclear definitions such as a ‘body’ for Regional Border Management (RBM): it is not clear whether this is a management unit in an Agency or Ministry or a stand-alone organisation. Also, the baselines and targets are problematic since there is no way of verifying the baseline or assessing the target as a percentage or ratio of the goal. In this way it is impossible to assess whether a target has a realistic number. The number of mines removed is relevant if the total number of mines is known and in the context of meeting the Ottawa convention how much progress Turkey is making while for security reasons the number of square meters released is more relevant for both security purposes (the border can be effectively controlled) or the released land can be used for other purposes. The e-governance system is not included while here baselines and targets could easily be formulated using the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time- Bound) indicators and this could be part of public administration reform. The lack of formulating indicators based on the SMART principles is significant.

## 3.2.2 The extent to whether the outcome indicators chosen are sufficient to measure the outcomes

The outcome indicators can only be achieved to the extent that the outputs have been achieved and logically relate to the outcome indicators. As described above the outputs have considerable internal issues while the context has also had an impact on the implementation of the work. The Legal-Aid Phase I Project is the single project that has reflected on the indicators during progress reports using the SMART indicators guidelines and show how the different components interrelate. In this sense the sequencing may also be challenging. For example, performance monitoring on legal aid only makes sense if training has been completed and management information systems work. This assumes that components and their activities have a logical sequencing. This can be challenging in implementation when goods and services need to be procured, planned activities are postponed, and the sequencing becomes distorted.

Across the portfolio there have been challenges with collecting reliable data as baselines. Many interviewees have doubts about the quality of the data provided by the Turkish Statistical Agency while many Ministries and Agencies refuse to share data. In some cases, projects estimated numbers have a baseline but in the course of the work it was realised that this may have been not as accurate as expected. This has contributed to providing estimates based on a ‘reasonable guess’. An additional issue is that such estimates may undermine assumptions and a well reflected risk assessment.

UNDP may have been ambitious and in some instances, it could be argued that setting the bar high is in line with an international agreement or standard, for example the Paris Principles.[[16]](#footnote-16) Formulating a target such as “Ombudsman Institutions and NHRI restructured in line with best practices and international standards, International Coordinating Committee accreditation” is not incorrect but likely not to be achieved in one UNDP country cycle.

The most common issue among the indicators for outputs and outcomes is that they are not SMART. In addition, projects and the portfolio do not have an underlying Theory of Change (ToC) which could guide the work. Monitoring and assessing progress towards to objectives is limited.

For an overview of the achievement of the outcome indicators, see annex 4. This annex describes the progress towards the indicators

### 3.2.3 The extent to which sufficient progress has been achieved vis-à-vis the outcomes as measured by the outcome indicators

The portfolio with its 13 projects in various sectors as well as its cross sectoral support, including normative work has made reasonable progress towards outcome 2.1 and limited progress towards 3.1. This judgement must be put into context since the progress is significantly affected by the context both in terms of systemic government and governance changes as well as substantial delays. Moreover, changes have occurred that cannot be measured in terms of how the original intended objectives have been affected also due to the lack of SMART indicators.

While some projects had good results thereby contributing to the outcomes (Legal Aid Phase I, Transparency in Judiciary, Access to Justice for refugees; e-consulate) the outcomes could not be achieved due to: i) significant changes in the context; ii) as a result of significant delays; iii) additional work that needs to be undertaken to make progress and thus second and third generation projects which are being introduced (LAR III and CO III); and iv) monitoring and evaluation which is poor and thus assessing progress towards the outcome is limited.

Perhaps the most critical contribution towards both the outcomes is that UNDP had to adapt quickly to the changing circumstances without losing sight of the outcomes continuing its efforts despite the many hurdles that occurred. This kind of resilience is a quality that is needed to safeguard UN principles and UNDP´s mandate and normative work while the country´s changes are often not considered positive towards an inclusive and democratic governance system. Achieving the outcomes implies focussing on systemic changes that are not in favour of reaching the outcomes while also dealing with the immediate, often unfavourable symptoms.

For an overview of progress towards the outcomes as per outcome indicators see annex 4. This annex demonstrates the level of achievement. Most indicators make progress, but it demonstrates that the progress is varied while for LAR III and CO III it is too early to tell. The gender mainstreaming and integrity projects have not made any significant progress.

## 3.2.4 The main factors (positive and negative) that have/are affecting the achievement of the outcomes: the extent to which these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome

The changing country context has affected the implementation of the portfolio: there has been a continuous structuring within the government through ministries (which are main partners of UNDP) since 2016, including the recent introduction of the Presidential System which led to significant changes for UNDP. New partnerships had to be established, both sides had to get familiar and adjust with the restructuring and new Presidential System. This affected the time required for contracting, starting and implementing projects while at the same time staff turnover in government was high.

Due to the internal restructuring of the country, EU accession process has slowed down. Further, government priorities changed notably in the human rights and gender equality areas posing risks to meeting the EU accession requirements and international treaties and conventions. The situation led to considerable delays for pipeline projects to be initiated. UNDP, however, initiated exploratory work with the NHREI and its newly appointed Board. The deepening of reforms needed in the justice sector and the need to continue expanding activities in the security and governance areas, including demining and border management remain a priority for Turkey and the EU.

Given the context, UNDP´s work at decentralised levels is promising and increasing in relevance since LAR III, CO III, the pilots in gender equality and integrity provide opportunities to focus on different levels of government where beneficiaries and local institutions are welcoming the support and where the systemic changes in government are less affected. This work is expected to contribute significantly to outcome 2.1 and to enhance capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring; strengthening local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services and support awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors. It could be argued that while focus on national institutions remains critical for introducing reforms in support of inclusive and democratic governance more traction on progress may be achieved at lower levels of government. This is also confirmed by other UN agencies which suffer from the same contextual changes and the shift to lower levels of government is part of their revised strategy.

## 3.2.5 The extent to which UNDP contributed to gender empowerment/ gender equality

UNDP’s Gender Equality Strategy is the main document which defines the way how UNDP addresses gender equality and women’s empowerment in different support areas of UNDP. The strategy follows the CPD and UNDP Strategic Plan in which gender mainstreaming is identified as a crosscutting issue: a sole output is dedicated to gender equality, but it is also mainstreamed within all other CPD outputs. In line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD for Turkey prioritizes women’s participation to labour market, women’s participation in decision-making processes and elimination of Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV). With a macro level approach, UNDP mainstreams gender equality and women’s empowerment within all its interventions. Reducing discrimination and enhancing gender-sensitive policymaking through development of inclusive gender-responsive tools are the main goals of the UNDP Turkey CPD. In this respect, strengthening national gender equality machinery and its extension to the local level, targeting regions of greatest inequality are main goals. [[17]](#footnote-17)

In order to strengthen its capacity to achieve strong gender equality results, UNDP in Turkey has applied to the Gender Equality Seal (GES) Programme. GES is a corporate certification process that recognizes good performance of UNDP Country Office (CO) units to deliver gender equality results and at the same time serves as a learning platform to help the COs to establish baselines, fine-tune strategies, address gender gaps, and showcase the impact of interventions for gender equality. UNDP received the silver seal in 2016 thus at the beginning of the portfolio period. The seal recognition had a positive effect on UNDP’s staff.

Box 4: Turkeys rankings in gender equality

|  |
| --- |
| Turkey ranked **71 out of 155 countries**, according to the 2014 Gender Inequality Index and ranked **64 out of 156** **countries** in the 2018 in the same index.[[18]](#footnote-18) The World Economic Forum's Gender Gap Index in 2015[[19]](#footnote-19) Turkey ranks **130th among 145 countries and 130 out of 149 countries** in 2018.[[20]](#footnote-20) |

The Gender Strategy reflects the challenges in Turkey in terms of effective implementation is particularly restricted because of the ideological structure that determines gender relations and gender-based structures of the society. The dominant gender ideology in Turkey is patriarchal as it is in most countries in the world. Patriarchal gender ideology is embedded in the current political context, which is very much dominated by an increasing conservatism. Increasing conservative approach within the political discourse strengthens the already existing patriarchal gender stereotypes, which have a negative impact on gender equality in many spheres of life.’[[21]](#footnote-21) Many people interviewed confirmed this worrying trend which makes it more and more challenging to properly target interventions, maintain a dialogue and include relevant analysis and responses in projects and implementation.[[22]](#footnote-22) The Country Office has only one gender expert who supports all the different portfolios as well as help with screening prodocs. Portfolio based gender experts seems as a need. While the Gender Strategy is strong and well developed, its implementation requires a team of experts to better mainstream the strategy within the projects of different portfolios. [[23]](#footnote-23)

Considerable effort has gone into training UNDP staff, developing a screening tool for project development and implementation and a gender analysis tool for projects, the gender equality and mainstreaming in prodocs still needs improvement. Staff turnover in UNDP, amongst others, has also contributed to the watering down of a gender focus.

Both in public and in government gender equality have been under severe pressure and it has become more difficult to incorporate gender equality in documents and implementation. While government will formally acknowledge the relevance of gender equality, the term has changed to gender justice and the agenda resorts under the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Affairs. The President emphasizes women's roles as mothers, wives and caretakers – a “pro-family” approach that caters to his electorate. Decline in Government ‘s commitment to gender equality has a risk of negatively affecting UNDP’s systemic application of its own gender strategy.

Moreover, a considerable number of beneficiaries consider gender equality as a rights-based issue. Thus, for example the Union of Turkish Bar Associations responded positively to women’s rights in the legal aid phase I project (more heavily in the pipeline Phase II) and translated this to their member Bars and trained members, but it did not reflect on its own potential shortcomings in gender equality in their association, their members and the Bars in Turkey. This ‘deviation’ implies that gender equality needs to be understood beyond a rights-based approach and needs to be accompanied by analysis, policies and procedures that improve gender equality in beneficiaries’ organisations. There are considerable opportunities since a significant portion of judges are women in Turkey.

UNDP has not capitalised on the potential to work with UN Women or other UN organisations in gender equality. The needs are high while the response is low.

Out of Five Results Groups, UNDP chairs the Results Group on Human Rights and Democratic Governance and Inclusive Growth/Environmental Sustainability. There is limited evidence that gender equality is among the priorities and how entry point could be formulated to engage with government and beneficiaries and undertake more joint work.

In IDG Portfolio, one project has contributed to gender empowerment in the Çukurova Development Agency (CDA) while the Legal Aid Phase I Project and Joint Programme on access to legal aid by refugees have also contributed to this objective. The Joint Programme supports the establishment of Judicial Support and Victims Services Directorates of the MoJ at seven pilot courthouses, the new phase of legal aid II project will establish seven violence prevention centers in seven pilot local bar associations both of which will support gender empowerment.

The Development Agency has benefitted from institutional and individual capacity building in gender mainstreaming and formulating strategic objectives for its regional plan. In addition, a strategy and action plan for gender mainstreaming in policies and programmes of the CDA was developed. The support has contributed to a significant level of awareness and some self-initiated actions in response to the recommendations such as the appointment of a focal point. While gender sensitivity has been introduced, more is needed to create an in depth understanding of gender equality, mainstreaming and a ‘point of no return’. The Agency is motivated and acknowledges that it cannot continue its own. The work came to a standstill about two years ago.

In the field of border management gender equality has not really been applied. There is a strong stance on the fact that women cannot serve in these harsh environments with limited facilities and that – while it is not forbidden to serve in these areas[[24]](#footnote-24) – it is unlikely that women would be motivated.

In the programme area of public administration reform, newly initiated projects of LAR III and Civilian Oversight III together with expected pipeline project in civic engagement will provide considerable room and ground for gender empowerment in decision-making and monitoring processes both at local level.

## 3.2.6 Factors that influenced the differences in participation, benefits and results between women and men

Most prodocs include requirements that include a disaggregated level of participation from women, men or in participation to activities or events and mostly training. This information, however, appears to be reported upon since it can demonstrate that women have participated in an event relevant to them. There is, however, never any follow up what this information means in the context of the work, whether it has an impact on gender equity or whether such data contribute to the objectives to be achieved.

In the case where the participation of men and women is the topic of the project, the inclusion of women or men is treated from a substantial perspective. For example, the projects of access to justice and legal aid made clear that mostly women seek legal aid and is often related to domestic violence. In such cases the training has been well targeted to lawyers who gained knowledge on gender-based violence and on the beneficiaries. Legislative changes were introduced in support of this target group and a hotline was created.

## 3.2.7 UNDP’s ability to develop national capacity in a sustainable manner (through holistic, participatory and gender–sensitive approach, building and strengthening institutional linkages, transparency and accountability, exposure to best practices in other countries, south-south cooperation)

Building national capacity runs through all the interventions in this portfolio. Considerable efforts have been undertaken to asses capacity, develop various strategies to address gaps and shortcomings and build units in government to make the capacity building effort sustainable. This has only been partially achieved.

Two key issues emerge: i) high staff turnover in most of the government institutions and to some extent also in UNDP itself: ii) in some cases you need capacity to build capacity and thus will it take more awareness raising and a sensitive approach to (for example, MoEU and NHREI) convince government staff at higher levels what is needed to make progress on both operational and normative work.

As mentioned earlier the gender equality and gender mainstreaming remains challenging in projects where government is somewhat hostile to work with the normative concepts and comply with international agreements.

UNDP is appreciated for its global network of expertise and the opportunities that it can provided to learn from other countries. Such efforts are appreciated but beneficiaries point out that it has been challenging to find relevant learning examples. In IBM, for example, the exposure to Finland was useful but the scale of border control issues (smuggling) was not comparable to what the Turkish Land Forces face across their borders.[[25]](#footnote-25) Equally in the integrity work, La Paz was provided as a case study, but the beneficiaries did neither recognize the issues nor found the solutions helpful.

On South-South cooperation there is no significant partnership, but two projects and their organisations have expressed interest in sharing their experience based on the results achieved with the support of UNDP and start working with other countries in the region, the Maghreb and Sub Saharan Africa. Given UNDPs global network, there are opportunities to demonstrate what ministries and local organisations are capable of in terms of sharing their experience and helping other countries to reach the same levels of service delivery to citizens. These are the E-consulate project and the Union of Turkish Municipalities.

## 3.2.8 UNDP’s ability to respond to changing circumstances and requirements in capacity development

Given the changes in the context, delays and other implementation issues, UNDP has managed to stay the course and deliver as best as it could despite the changes in demining, border management, access to justice and legal aid, transparency in judiciary, capacity development of the Ombudsman Institution, and the e-consulate support. Two projects are just coming on stream, LAR III and CO III while the support in gender mainstreaming in the Development Agency and Integrity in the Municipality have come to a halt. On balance, therefore, the responsiveness is somewhat uneven. For the latter two follow up interventions would have been justified in order to maintain momentum, not lose the investment and use opportunities that beneficiaries are motivated and show ownership. Moreover, the fact that these two pilots are not at national level provide opportunities to test the water beyond the pilots organisations at local levels.

## 3.2.9 The extent to which different outcome definitions feed into each other and possible synergy between these.

The two outcome definitions are mutually reinforcing and outcome 3.1 could be referenced in all the work under outcome 2.1. either in the project; in the sector; in the beneficiary’s organisations and with a view of the ultimate beneficiaries in mind which is the ultimate objective of outcome 3.1. The challenges described in, for example, the gender equality section above highlights the issues at government level but at the same time addressing these systematically has failed.

The strength of outcome 3.1 lies in the ability to address the rights of women and girls across all the work in outcome 2.1 and thus combine operational and normative work from a substantive perspective and from a gender equality perspective. Outcome 3.1. has few projects or results because no follow-up actions and new replication projects have been developed or expected by potential beneficiaries due to the changing priorities in the period. The project supporting the Development Agency is doing the right thing and is doing it right, but the work and expected results remain incomplete.

# **Efficiency**

### 3.3.1 The extent to which outcomes derive from efficient use of resources

There is limited evidence that resources have been used inefficiently but there is anecdotal evidence that beneficiaries organise events against a lower price than those that have been rewarded contracts through UNDP’s procurement. While this has not been systematically reported it has resulted in questions from the beneficiary. This in turn could lead to questions from those who finance the work.

In some cases, goods and services that have been procured result in a lower estimate of services than was originally intended. For example, the demining of the number of mine fields. Delays have also occurred due to seasonal weather issues and delays in teams arriving. For border management it has been challenging to get participants in time to training sessions. While UNDP has put in efforts to mitigate such issues in an ad hoc manner it led to frustrations with the beneficiaries and the donor.

The main efficiency issue has been the delays in both signing prodocs and implementation of activities. Most of these delays are related to the restricting processes following the Coup attempt and the subsequent events. For example, SIDA’s support to the Ombudsman was delayed for one year after the Coup attempt and the focal point dismissed. Projects that have suffered considerably are demining; local administration reform and civilian oversight.

There are also two projects, Local Integrity in Eskishir Municipality and Gender Mainstreaming in Cukurova Development Agency that came to an end without any follow up while the foundations for the work have been successful. The lack of follow up means that the original investment is under pressure in terms of the capacity built while the ownership and motivation from the beneficiaries remains. With a delay of two years before any subsequent actions are taken the work has come to a halt and beneficiaries are not able to continue the substantive work without UNDP support. This is regretful in the sense that these are important pilots that focus on a subnational and local level and thus away from the national arena where so much could be gained in normative work.

UNDP has also experienced turnover among its staff which resulted in delays of managing projects.

### 3.3.2 The extent to which UNDP has contributed to the outcomes versus that of its partners

The extent to which UNDPs contribution to the outcome can be attributed to UNDP alone is limited in the sense that for all projects government plays a key role in implementation. The Demining and Integrated Border Management work is more of a standalone intervention and jointly with government the results have been achieved even if the indicators were not met. In other projects (except for the Development Agency, the Integrity work at the municipality and e-governance) beneficiaries benefit from other support as well. Related to UNDP’s niche its capacity building focus is the main contribution leading to changes in legislation, policies and declarations. Its technical work contributes to partners improved knowledge and skills and if the environment is conducive moves up to the level of political decision making. The latter remains difficult since the changes after 2016.

## **3.4 Sustainability:**

## 3.4.1 The extent to which benefits/activities continue after the programme cycle

A considerable number of projects in the portfolio will have immediate follow up, including e-consulate, demining, border management and legal aid while some are just coming on board as second or third generation projects, including support to the NHREI; LAR III and CO III. The small projects on gender mainstreaming and local integrity would require follow up since these came to an abrupt halt in 2016/2017. While resources have been secured for those that have immediate follow up and the ones that come on board, there is less certainty for others such as Transparency in the Judiciary. The only project that can be considered closed is the support to the Ombudsman Institution, but the question remains open whether more needs to be done to all human rights institutions in the country, including supporting NGO’s to make progress towards the Paris Principles.

Both the operational and normative work remains ‘work in progress’ with limited budget lines from government. Moreover, the recent economic downturn may make it more difficult for government to set priorities that meet the UN’s work.

## 3.4.2 The prospect of the sustainability and replicability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome

The key challenge is how government will continue to set its policy priorities within existing budget lines that would secure partial or complete continuation of the work reflecting the forthcoming 11th National Development Plan. The EU is the main contributor to demining; border management and public administration reform. SIDA has financed and continues to finance Legal Aid and has supported the Ombudsman. Government has financed the e-consulate work and Transparency in Judiciary, is contributing to demining and is financing new units that oversee demining such as TURMAC. It is unlikely that government will come forward with considerable financing for any of these projects. The sustainability must also be understood in terms of goals identified such as EU accession and meeting international conventions, norms and standards.

There is a high level of unpredictability whether Turkey will meet the Paris Principles for its NHREI, whether it will adhere to the Istanbul Declaration on the Transparency in the Judicial Process or whether it will be able to clear all landmines by 2022 in order to meet the  Ottawa Treaty to Ban Anti-Personnel Landmines. In many instances the international norms and standards equal the European Union accession criteria thus sustainability would also imply the extent to which the government can and is willing to move in meetings such standards.

The gender mainstreaming and integrity work are pilots which are not well advanced and are not sustainable without further assistance. Neither can these be replicated at this stage since the progress is too limited.

Some projects have included e-learning and train-the-trainers elements, but it is too early to tell whether these mechanisms will work and whether government would be willing to help to ensure that these remain relevant and effective.

Work in the justice sector continuous and bringing different actors together has worked very well. This approach may be replicated at subnational and local levels (BARs, municipalities) but it could also be replicated in other sectors. This would also improve the function of the sector as a whole.

# 3.5 Degree of Change

## 3.5.1 The positive or negative, intended or unintended changes brought about by UNDP’s intervention in these outcomes

Outcome 2.1

The degree of change is limited due to the events since 2016 and in some cases the government has changed things significantly; for example, the creation of the NHREI with a new board means that UNDP needs to start over again. Similar efforts will be required for restructured ministries which are the main beneficiaries of public administration reform. Plus, progress on gender equality is hindered by a conservative stance by government on this topic.

UNDP has continued the pace despite delays and changes in government structures and foundations have been established.

As a result of capacity building interventions, there is a high level of awareness created to introduce behavioural change and skills improvement through support in the Rule of Law, Access to Justice, Legal Aid, Transparency and Ethics in the Court of Cassation, Demining and Border management. This foundation provides a solid basis for the next generation of support.

The prodocs, output and outcome indicators are not SDG proof. There is, however, preparatory work done in the framework for SDGs which will help to make prodocs and components SDG proof in the next cycle.

The outcome indicators have not been met in demining, border management but the contribution from UNDP and government to demining and border management are a start to create basic routine management, institutes and procedures to ultimately meet the Ottawa convention.

While the UNDP gender strategy is excellent, implementation in house and in projects has not improved. The policy and related tools are not used systematically.

Gender mainstreaming and integrity in the public sector at subnational and local levels set an example but need urgent follow up to expand and sustain the efforts.

UNDPs intervention in legal aid resulted in additional work between the UTBA and UNHCR on refugee rights. This was unexpected and a result of UNDP focus and assistance.

Academics who assisted UNDP in the legal sector are using the material developed in their curriculum teaching students and thus shaping future professionals in this field.

The Istanbul Declaration is a unique result; the challenge remains in making sure the signatories, including Turkey adhere to it.

The e-governance support continuous with excellent upwards results: the unit in charge has about 100 staff and is considerable unit within the MFA.

UNDP’s support to public administration reform with more transparent and accountable institutions, and participatory decision-making mechanisms at local level has been significant with former Local Administration Reform and Civilian Oversight phases. Although there has been a considerable time gap and loss (and/or scattering of) of all former capacity, processes and memory of former phases, the newly started third generation projects are expected to scale-up the former efforts.

The challenges in terms of meeting the outcome indicators is also related to the fact that monitoring and progress reports differ considerably in reporting on substance and quality

There are too few results to comment on outcome 3.1.

## 3.5.2 The key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome

Firstly, the context has not been favourable to inclusive and democratic governance since the coup attempt in 2016. The centralisation of power has had a reverse effect on UNDP’s long-standing support to decentralisation; service delivery; human rights, gender equality, it supports to the justice sector and more recently its operational work in demining and International Border Management. The delay of LAR III and CO III means that these projects have started in less favourable circumstances and that there is a level of control since the Budget Office of the President has become UNDPs key interlocutor and approval mechanism.

Some key features stand out in terms of UNDPs contribution to the Outcome and the four focus areas:

1. Its work in demining and border management was originally focussed on socio-economic development which has gradually become a security challenge for the Turkey and The EU as well as the region. While socio-economic development may still be a long-term goal, the security issues has become the main goal. Turkey as a signatory to the Ottawa convention has an overambitious objective of clearing all mines in Turkey by 2022.[[26]](#footnote-26) This is unrealistic and to achieve this is a Herculean task. The government will have to ask for an extension on the treaty again. While only a small part of the total number of mines has been removed and land released the questions emerges whether UNDP after Demining III will continue to manage this process – also depending on the resources available. GoT will have limited budget so the long-term goal may meet serious challenges and security treats will continue notably from the borders with Iran and Iraq.
2. In the Rule of Law and Human Rights focus, UNDP has made significant contributions while the Human Rights institutions remain weak in a volatile environment where meeting international standards and conventions appear not a priority. The environment for advocacy with NGOs, support to the Parliament and other critical checks and balances organisations require significant more support and in fact with the NHREI UNDP is starting again, cautiously.
3. Public Administration Reform has had limited contributions to the outcome due to delays except for the e-governance work. The integrity work has been useful and laid ground for more work but there are no results yet that contribute to the outcome.
4. Women Empowerment had one small project, good as a starting point but no results that have made a difference. In this area gender equality has – like the overall human rights agenda – suffered due to the changing context and the NHREI just coming on board.

# The extent to which the outcome is achieved, or progress has been made

As discussed above there is progress towards outcome 2.1 and to 3.1 there is limited progress. UNDP, however, has put relevant and effective foundations in place to accelerate progress in third generation projects.

# 5. The extent to which UNDP made significant contributions in terms of strategic outputs

The contributions to the outputs have been determined based on progress towards indicators as well as key achievements. See Annex 5 for an overview. This annex has been prepared to collect all the work done in order to reach the outputs and collect evidence since indicators were not always identified, the course of the work changed while progress towards the outputs has been made based on the implementation of activities.

In some cases, more work was undertaken than originally identified. At the same time, changes that occurred within projects and have at times led to achieving more than the output indicators formulated. For example, more people were trained or support to legislation was provided that was unforeseen. In terms of project outputs from the 13 projects four are in progress with results expected at a later stage; five are in green with the projects objectives mostly completed and three are in blue which have only just begun. Based on this overview on balance there is reasonable progress towards the outputs.

Table 3: progress towards achieving project objectives through projects.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | **Focus Area** | **Status** | **Achieved** | **Partially Achieved** | **Not Achieved** | **Too soon to tell** |
| **Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey** | Rule of Law | Completed,  Moving into phase II |  |  |  |  |
| **Strengthening Transparency and Code of Ethics for Enhanced Public Confidence in Court of Cassation in Turkey** | Rule of Law | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Socioeconomic development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase I** | Border  Management | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of Ombudsman Institution** | Rule of Law | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Integrity Assessment of Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality** | Public Administration Reform | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender Mainstreaming in Çukurova Development Agency** | Women Empowerment | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase II** | Border  Management | Ongoing |  |  |  |  |
| **Increasing Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and Greece Project** | Border  Management | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Increasing Institutionalization and Broader use of the e-consulate system for increased efficiency in the service delivery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Phase II Project** | Public Administration Reform | Continuous, on schedule |  |  |  |  |
| **Enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees (Syrian and other nationalities) in Turkey** | Rule of Law | Completed |  |  |  |  |
| **Local Administration Reform III** | Public Administration Reform | On-going |  |  |  |  |
| **Civilian Oversight** | Rule of Law | On-going |  |  |  |  |

Given the earlier discussion on prodocs and indicators it is impossible to come to a complete assessment of achieving the outputs. The green areas are where UNDP has made most progress, but more work is needed. Yellow sections indicate that the work is ongoing and continue. The two delayed projects have not progressed enough in time to give a judgement. For a summary of key achievements in random order see Annex 5.

# 6. UNDP’s partnerships

## 6.1 The appropriateness and effectiveness of UNDP’s partnership strategy

UNDPs engagement with partners has been overall quite effective. In IDG Portfolio, partnerships have continued in first instance based on previous work with government. The new system has, however, brought changes in government structures and civil servants. For example, in the judicial sector many were replaced as well as in other sectors which meant that partnerships had to be renewed and UNDP had to rebuild trust and engagement. The same is the case for oversight institutions such as the NHREI which has a new Board appointed by the President. UNDP’s first intervention was to organise informative and consultative sessions to increase the knowledge of NHREI experts on the UN Human Rights System, the requirements of the Paris Principles and the accreditation process and what the new activities may be carried out as a non-accredited institution. Among the best examples of effective partnerships are the Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, the Court of Cassation, The Union of Turkish Bar Associations the Ombudsman Institute, the Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Union of Municipalities of Turkey. It must also be noted that UNDP has made good use of available and relevant academic expertise for its projects. An obvious advantage is that there are no language barriers and that experts are recognized in their own field.

UNDP’s work with NGO’s was less visible and not pro-active. It is not clear whether this is related to the changes in Turkey since the failed coup attempt. Some have pointed to the fact that there may be risks for NGOs to work in particular areas relevant to UNDPs work such as gender equality and human rights.

## 6.2 UNDP’s capacity regarding the management of partnerships

IDG Portfolio has broadened its partnerships to include not only the national and local governments, but also research institutions, line ministries, donors, and other UN agencies. In this regard, projects of the Portfolio have been cooperating with the following key partners in achieving development results.

* Presidency Office of Strategy and Budget (former Ministry of Development)
* Turkish Grand National Assembly
* Ministry of Foreign Affairs
* Ministry of Interior
* Ministry of Defence
* Turkish Land Forces Command
* Ministry of Justice
* Ministry of Environment and Urbanization
* Court of Cassation
* Union of Turkish Bar Associations
* Ombudsman Institution
* National Human Rights and Equality Institution
* Union of Provinces
* Union of Municipalities of Turkey
* Development Agencies
* Municipalities
* Other UN Agencies (UNFPA, OHCHR, UN Women, UNHCR)

All UNDP Turkey projects are developed in close cooperation with the Strategy and Budget Department of the Presidency Office. All UNDP’s projects are implemented in cooperation with one or more implementing line ministries. UNDP has long standing partnerships with the majority of its partners at all levels since projects have been developed over various CDPs. The government also contributes to some of the projects such as demining and e-governance. In this portfolio, the NGOs are more absent. It is not clear whether this is a result of the changes after 2016 but for some NGOs it may be a risk to work with UN organizations.

## 6.3 UNDP’s ability to bring together various partners across sectoral lines

UNDP in the legal aid project has been successful in bringing different partners together in a single sector which have been working for many years in a silo fashion. Representatives from the Judiciary, Ministry of Justice, UTBA, NGOs and other stakeholders consider it UNDP´s contribution to improved collaboration resulting in relevant and good project results. The meetings held and trainings provided have contributed to achieving the outputs while also breaking down the silos. UNDP has managed to overcome the scepticism of some and managed to engage partners constructively both in terms of facilitator and providing expertise and international comparative advantage. This has been beneficial to UNDP in terms of guidance on complex processes that are imbued with political hurdles.

The work with the NHREI – which is about to start - and the Ombudsman calls for a closer look at how UNDP can enhance complementarity in terms of pushing the organisations towards the Paris Principles. While the support to the Ombudsman has been effective the question remains, what needs to be done to ensure that both organisations step up their efforts, strengthen their mandates and meet international norms and standards, including the Paris Principles.

The work on Demining and Integrated Border Management has explicit linkages yet the work has been undertaken as separate projects with little interaction in terms of the interdependence between them; the sequencing of activities and the option to exploit collaboration among government entities.

The projects on integrity and gender mainstreaming constitute another relevant element in terms of targeting another level of government (there are 26 Development Agencies which cover one or more provinces) and there are different levels of municipalities, including Metropolitan Municipalities. These topics are now stand-alone project but within governance framework these could also be combined. Moreover, these topics also fit the LAR III and CO III projects where gender and integrity are part of these projects. In the context of the recently held local elections and the central power base of the ruling partly severely challenged, the governance agenda at local level may be more open to a set of changes, including social development, gender equality, improved services to disadvantaged groups.

# 7. UNDP’s positioning

## 7.1 UNDP’s strategic positioning and comparative advantage

During the portfolio UNDP has positioned itself strategically in terms of providing global expertise to government and other beneficiaries. Its pool of experts provides relevant and effective inputs both in terms of normative and operational work. While the portfolio is and remains relevant, the implementation has been challenging which can undermine UNDPs position in terms of being able to deliver in time and in some instances with a sense of urgency. In particular donors may be dissatisfied which needs attention since HMICs have not that many donors to choose from and effective positioning as a preferred partner can be undermined.

UNDP has also been a broker in sensitive areas in normative work and it is cautiously approaching the Human Rights Institutions pursuing an open dialogue in a politically sensitive area. Given the context UNDPs broker role will need to be exploited as an impartial institution that can assist government in meetings international standards and conventions.

UNDP has been a trustworthy partner for most government entities in providing the services required and responding to the 10th NDP but, in some instances, projects have come to a halt. The latter can cause reputational damage to UNDP and undermine experiments and innovations that could work at sub-national and local levels.

The oversight role by NGOs, Parliament and others have not been that significant during this period and this could harm UNDP’s balanced approach and perception by those institutions that inclusive and democratic governance needs to have checks and balances.

UNDP’s position is invisible in terms of promoting the sustainable development goals (SDGs) in the portfolio while the Agenda 2030 is relevant to Turkey. UNDP’s position as a key contributor to meeting the SDGs may not be acknowledged while it has the capacity, knowledge and expertise to manoeuvre in political sensitive areas.

## 7.2. UNDP’s role in an Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC)

What is leading is the need to support the government in meeting international norms and standards and Turkey being a signatory to most of the international agreements and conventions. Many UMIC suffer from profound inequalities in income, fundamental rights and access to basic services and Turkey is no exception. UNDP’s role is critical in being the custodian of these fundamental rights and advocating for and supporting government in meeting these norms and standards.

UNDP’s neutral broker role facilitates the discussions on sensitive and controversial issues, and it will need to exploit all the room there is to engage government in the area of governance, decentralization, human rights and rule of law.

UNDP has a high degree of flexibility and can offer expertise relevant to its partners from a global network, including from other countries and contexts.

## 7.3 UNDP’s support for the inclusive and democratic governance and its contribution to the attainment and understanding of the SDGs

The Government of Turkey has started preparing a new National Development Plan for 2019-2023 and to intends to integrate the SDGs into the national agenda. A stock-taking analysis to determine the current status of the SDGs in Turkey was undertaken and UN Agencies have provided their contribution by full participating in this stock-taking analysis meetings and provided its collective comments on the draft stocktaking analysis report.

The UN staff from different UN Agencies participated in 21 of the 43 ad-hoc committees and 9 of the 32 working groups’ works and used this opportunity to increase awareness on the SDGs and support the SDGs’ integration into the new plan. The adoption of the new NDP was postponed until to 2019.[[27]](#footnote-27)

At the higher level the SDG discussion is unfolding and once the new Plan has been approved UNDP can work more constructively on assessing how the portfolio contributes to the SDGs.

UNDP’s contribution has therefore been at a strategic level and joint with other UN agencies.

UNDP was the chair of the results group Democratic Governance and Human Rights and the Working Group on the 2030 agenda.

The Unions of Turkish Municipalities is assessing SDGs at their level and this may provide a relevant entry point for LAR III.

# Best and worst practices

The two projects (Development Agency, Gender Mainstreaming) that have come to a halt since 2017 are not a good practice. Beneficiaries and those who support them do not really understand why the work has been aborted. The work as just beginning, beneficiaries were highly motivated, and experts well placed to move forward.

Good practices include the work UNDP has done with the MoJ and the UTBA in terms of breaking down silos and bringing people together. This has motivated the different actors to work together, be less suspicious and work towards results together. These kinds of practices can help UNDP capitalize on its work in the next stages and possibly accelerate or expand its work.

For the Court of Cassation, the gathering of the main actors in the justice sector has been unique and well appreciated. Using local academic expertise has been critical to achieving the results. The use of academic, local resources strengthens the perception that Turkey has excellent local expertise that can help the governance agenda move forward.

Learning has been limited due to unfished work at the subnational and local levels. However, learning has been significant in the justice, demining and border management sector. For the latter the European examples were not relevant.

# Conclusions

UNDP Turkey has managed to stay the course in challenging circumstances determined by the changes after the coup attempt and a declining interest of government of UNDP’s normative work. Its IDG Portfolio remains relevant and relevance increases in the new context where systemic changes to government have been made. The continuation of third generation projects can deepen the must needed reforms, contribute to effective policy making and learning in attaining the outcomes.

UNDP has made good progress in most projects despite delays in most cases beyond its control. In some cases, projects were seriously delayed or not followed up.

Measuring progress has been hampered by irrelevant or weak indicators; progress reports have therefore been limited in monitoring progress effectively.

UNDPs contribution to capacity and institution building has been considerable despite the challenges mentioned above. The sustainability of this effort is not yet secured.

Delays have been frequent and could undermine the timely deliverable of objectives and could frustrate both donors and beneficiaries.

Gender equality in terms of implementing UNDP’s excellent policy remains behind expectations and decreases UNDP’s opportunities to engage government constructively. The human rights institutions remain fragile not meeting the internationally agreed principles.

Despite the many uncertainties UNDP’s contribution in the justice and demining sectors are positive and provide a solid base for further work.

On balance the governance work tends to focus mostly on the national actors which can be justified given the changing circumstances. At the same time the focus on oversight bodies and checks and balances have stayed behind.

# Recommendations

## 8.1 Recommendations for the existing portfolio

There is a pipeline list of projects that has just started and will extend or enlarge the portfolio.

Box 5: Extension and new projects in the IDG portfolio

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EXTENSION** | **RECENTLY STARTED OR ABOUT TO START** | **NEW** |
|  | Local Administration Reform III |  |
|  | Civilian Oversight III |  |
|  | Support to the National Human Rights and Equality Institution (NHREI) |  |
| Legal Aid II |  |  |
| Demining III |  |  |
|  |  | Civic Engagement |
| Border Management II |  |  |

The above leaves some projects without any follow up: i) Transparency in Judiciary; ii) The Çukorova Development Agency, iii) the Local Integrity at Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality; and v) the Capacity Building of Ombudsman Institution. This is about half the portfolio while the financial investment has not been high.

1. Given the new reality that UNDP needs to work with, it is highly recommended that it stays engaged in the human rights institutions and supports these in a constructive, capacity building fashion that opens dialogue. While the Ombudsman Institution has a considerable number of donors, the question to be answered is whether UNDP can support it in a complementary way to the NHREI. Both these institutions form the benchmark for adhering to human rights and UNDP´s normative work.
2. To the extent possible, UNDP needs to engage and rebuild its partnership with NGOs that are relevant across the portfolio and to the sectors its supports. The same is the case for other institutions such as the Parliament. Given the changes in the context the room for NGOs may be limited and increasing transparency and holding government to account remains a key principle to inclusive and democratic governance.
3. The projects that have come to a stand still need to be reconsidered. Given the recent local elections it is recommended that these single pilots are introduced in more than one agency or municipality. This would enhance inter-organisational learning, better use of resources (trainers and workshops) and potentially cross-fertilization across the subjects (integrity and gender mainstreaming could also be introduced in both) and the regions. It would enhance learning and more comparative results across organisations. An additional advantage is that UNDP would work at sub national and local level where the appetite for critical democratic principles and human rights may be more favourable.

Figure 2: The amended IDG portfolio

## Recommendations for gender equality and social inclusion

UNDP needs to urgently revive its Gender Strategy and write an action plan how it will implement this in house **and** in its projects. Gender screening must be mandatory for projects, including gender mainstreaming in components and relevant indicators for measuring progress. It should work more jointly with some of the other UN agencies such as UNFPA and UN Women. Both have expressed interest and given their local focus UNDP may be able to make more progress at that level considering the challenges at national level. In this context, LAR III; CO III and Civic Engagement could profit from extra support when it comes to gender equality, including the engagement of NGOs. One way would be to organise open seminars with GoT, NGOs and others to discuss topics and invite lecturers or some other low-level activity to engage in a dialogue. The approach to the NHREI and the way UNDP worked in the legal sector could set an example.

UNDP needs to consider whether the outcome 3.1 outputs could be more integrated in outcome 2.1. One way forward would be to determine which substantive projects would be related to both 2.1 and 3.1 in project design while cross cutting issues for gender need to be part of the entire portfolio.

## 8.3 Recommendations for the future portfolio

It is likely that some of the current projects will form the basis of the future portfolio. This is unpredictable given the unknown priorities of government (11th NDP) and the available government budgets now that the economy is in turmoil. It also depends on the biggest donor to the portfolio the EU.

Irrespective of the above it is recommended that:

1. UNDP stay the course in second and third generation projects and consider building further at generation four: keep donors and beneficiaries on board based on progress made and the far-reaching international goals, norms and standards, conventions and agenda’s.
2. UNDP needs to define its strategic entry points at national, sub national and local level. Given the context an appropriate mix has worked very well in Legal Aid I, for example, and LAR III is expected to introduce reforms at local level. This will provide it with visibility and options to engage in sensitive topics that may be better received at lower levels of government. For the human rights agenda, it needs to stay engaged with the human rights institutions at national level such as the MHREI and the Ombudsman. Its first approach to introduce human rights at the NHREI has worked well and the dialogue with the top of the bureaucracy will be critical to remain engaged. Similarly, it can capitalize on the work completed in the justice, demining and border governance sectors. There is momentum now that results are visible, capacity has been built to a significant extent and government has appreciation for UNDP.
3. Given the results of the recent local elections may provide UNDP with opportunities to engage around integrity, gender equality, human rights and social development and inclusion. Such pockets of ‘good governance’ at subnational and local may set an example, facilitate partnerships and create advocacy for internationally agreed norms and standards.
4. UNDP needs to revive its partnership with NGOs, Parliament and other oversight bodies at all levels and across the portfolio.
5. Consider undertaking more joint work in close collaboration with other UN agencies to meet the SDGs. More joint work among different portfolios within UNDP is another pathway for the future.
6. Improve the development of prodocs with SMART indicators and more analysis based on the current situation. Include SDG analysis and contribution towards government SDGs goals. The latter is particularly relevant since the introduction of the Presidential System and the subsequent changes in government: how can such changes be turned into opportunities?
7. Support the e-consulate work in promoting its work abroad and consider an exit strategy for UNDP now that the work is reaching a level where government should be able to manage this process internally.
8. Develop and Theory of Change for the portfolio that also feeds into and supports the new CPD. This could help to get a clearer picture on how focus elements interrelate and how gender equality and human rights-based approaches could be included in all the projects.

# Lessons Learned and further reflections

1. UNDP can stay the course based on trust it has built over decades: it can adapt to new circumstances such as a changing context with new political realities. At the same time, it may not lose sight of smaller projects in the IDG portfolio equally relevant to achieving the outcomes. This risk needs to be mitigated. At the same time a fast-changing environment can put UNDP at risk in its work and what it would like to achieve. Its risk analysis for the portfolio may be helpful but it needs to take a pro-active stance on changes that undermine its normative work. This means that at the highest level the dialogue needs to be maintained and engagement may not falter.
2. The new UNDP partners are not yet fully operational in the sense that some decisions within government must still be taken. UNDP must be cautious not to follow the potential fragmentation in government thereby risking project design fragmentation in beneficiaries and partial results.
3. The portfolio is not clearly related to other portfolios. The recommendations include a suggestion to develop a Theory of Change. This may be useful for other portfolios as well in order to get a good grip on government partners and beneficiaries and target interventions at the highest levels of government, including at subnational and local levels.
4. The recommendation to define entry points for UNDP at different levels of government needs to be discussed within the wider UN system since the government and governance changes affect all UN programmes and agencies. This requires strategic considerations also in response to the governments’ new National Plan once it has been approved. The focus could be on the ‘coalition of the willing’ within government meaning those who are in favour of reforms and are willing to understand the roles and responsibilities of government in response to UNDP’s normative work. Most of its project beneficiaries have not changed which could also be a critical target group to further build on.
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# Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Outcome Evaluation of Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio

1. BACKGROUND

In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Turkey Country Office, an outcome evaluation will be conducted to assess the impact of UNDP’s development assistance in the Practice Area of Inclusive and Democratic Governance (IDG).

The proposed evaluation will evaluate the IDG Portfolio against the relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Country Development Strategy (UNDCS) and the following country programme outcomes and outputs as stated in the Country Programme Document (CPD) for Turkey both covering the period 20162020.

IDG and UNDCS/CPD Outcomes

UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 2.1 By 2020 central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems with the full participation of civil society including the most vulnerable.

UNDCS/CPD OUTCOME 3.1 Improved legislation, policies, implementation and accountability mechanisms to enable equal and effective social, economic and political participation of women and girls by 2020.

RELATED COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS

2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities

2.1.2. Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute and Ombudsman enhanced and human rights awareness promoted

2.1.3. Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring

2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services

2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors

2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management

3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women’s rights and gender sensitive policies including local level

3.1.2. Policies improved for promoting equal participation of girls and women in decision making

3.1.4. National policies in support of women’s economic empowerment improved

**IDG and National Development Priorities (10th National Development Plan)**

The 10th National Development Plan (10NDP, 2014-2018) outlines Turkey’s national development priorities. It provides a human development-oriented framework for high, stable and inclusive economic growth (average GDP growth projected at 5.5%), with sound use of natural resources and strengthened fundamental rights and freedoms as well as more effective contributions to global and regional agendas. Turkey has made significant democratic reforms to harmonize its legislation with the European Union. It has recognized the right of individual appeal to the Constitutional Court. Turkey has established its national Human Rights Institution and Ombudsm Institution, which could be further strengthened in line with international norms together with ensuring accountable, transparent and responsive institutions and system integrity at all levels. The tenth NDP indicates that implementation of fundamental rights and freedoms, democratization and justice will continue. The tenth NDP also recognizes civil society as a sector for the first time, and aims to ensure that it becomes strong, diver pluralistic and sustainable. Arrangements for its participation in policymaking and monitoring need to be strengthened and institutionalized. The Plan also prioritizes women, youth and persons with disabilities’ access opportunities and participation in economic and social life. It acknowledges the need for improvement and sustained progress in women’s participation in the labor market, decision making and violence-prevention.

**IDG and SDGs**

While approaching and responding to the structural challenges, IDG Portfolio bridges linkages with the Sustainable Development Goals mainly on peace, justice and strong institutions (SDG 16), gender equality (SDG 5), reduced inequalities (SDG 10) and sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11).

**UNDP’s work in Inclusive and Democratic Governance**

The overall objective of UNDP’s work in Inclusive and Democratic Governance aims to contribute to strengthening governance processes and institutions that are responsive to citizens demands and universal norms. UNDP contribute to strengthening the independence of institutions, particularly judicial actor and national human rights mechanisms. UNDP address structural issues pertaining to the rule of law and human rights including with respect to gender, participation and accountability. Support is provided to the relevant institutions to enable improved access to justice and enhance the implementation of local administration reforms in line with the subsidiarity principle.

Women empowerment is at the core of UNDP’s initiatives. Incorporation of gender mainstreaming to all interventions is a priority for the democratic governance technical assistance.

In addition, Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio is also heavily contributing into the Syrian Crisis Response, in line with the resilience approach within the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan, complementing the efforts of the Government in the areas of inclusion and social cohesion.

IDG Portfolio has broadened its partnerships to include not only the national and local governments, but also research institutions, line ministries, the private sector, donors, and other UN agencies. In this regard, projects of the Portfolio has been cooperating with the following key partners in achieving development results:

* Presidency Office of Strategy and Budget (former Ministry of Development)
* Turkish Grand National Assembly
* Ministry of Foreign Affairs
* Ministry of Interior - Ministry of Defense
* Turkish Land Forces Command
* Ministry of Justice
* Ministry of Environment and Urbanization
* Ministry of Labour, Social Services and Family
* Court of Cassation
* Union of Turkish Bar Associations
* Ombudsman Institution
* National Human Rights and Equality Institution
* Union of Provinces
* Union of Municipalities of Turkey
* Development Agencies
* Municipalities
* Private Sector
* Other UN Agencies (UNFPA, OHCHR, UNWomen, UNHCR)

The subject of this outcome evaluation will be the programs and projects implemented within the framework of Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio, through the approaches mentioned previously, which can be summarized as below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Projects and initiatives to be included in the Evaluation | Budget of the  Relevant Project | Partners / Donors | Relevant Country  Programme Output |
| • Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in  Turkey | • *USD 1,797,120* | • Union of Turkish Bar Associations, Ministry of  Justice | 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| • | Strengthening Transparency and Code of Ethics for Enhanced Public Confidence in Court of Cassation in  Turkey | | • | *USD 1,000,000* | • | Court of Cassation | 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities    2.1.5. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors |
| • | Socioeconomic  Development through  Demining and Increasing the  Border Surveillance  Capacity at the Eastern  Borders of Turkey- Phase I | | • | USD  26,400,000,00 | • | Ministry of National  Defense TURMAC,  Ministry of Interior General  Directorate of Provincial Administrations  Department of Border  Management | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |
| • | Strengthening the  Institutional Capacity of  Ombudsman Institution | | • | USD 750,000 | • | Ombudsman Institution | 2.1.2. Capacities of the National  Human Rights Institute and  Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights awareness promoted |
| • | Integrity Assessment of Eskişehir Metropolitan  Municipality | | • | USD 12,000 | • | Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality | 2.1.5 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors |
| • | Gender Mainstreaming in  Çukurova Development  Agency | | • | USD 30,000 | • | Çukurova Development Agency | 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional  and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services  3.1.4: National policies in support of women’s economic empowerment improved |
| • | Socioeconomic  Development through  Demining and Increasing the  Border Surveillance  Capacity at the Eastern  Borders of Turkey- Phase II | | • | USD  13,476,697,50 | • | Ministry of National  Defense TURMAC,  Ministry of Interior General  Directorate of Provincial  Administrations  Department of Border  Management | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders  and integrated border management |
| • | | Increasing Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and Greece  Project | • | EUR 1,820,995 | • | Ministry of Interior  Directorate General for  Provincial Administrations,  Land Forces Command | 2.1.6. Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management |
| • | | Increasing  Institutionalization and Broader use of the e-consulate system for increased efficiency in the service delivery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs  Phase II Project | • | USD 5,800,000 | • | Ministry of Foreign Affairs | 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional  and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services |
| • | | Enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees  (Syrian and other nationalities) in Turkey | • | USD 300,000 | • | Ministry of Justice, Union of Turkish Bar Associations | 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better  access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities |

In addition to assessing the overall result and development impact of the above-mentioned projects, this evaluation will also take into consideration the impact of these programs on gender equality.

**2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

The scope of the projects and programs that are held in the scope of this evaluation can be summarized as:

* All Projects of Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio

The evaluator will visit selected project sites in 7 provinces to meet the local stakeholders and beneficiaries including central administrations/ministries, local administrations, local NGOs, women and youth, local authorities etc.

The evaluation shall assess the following for each outcome in the 2016-2020 programming cycle in this portfolio:

* Relevance: Are the outcomes relevant to UNDP’s mandate, to national priorities and to beneficiaries’ needs? (Relevance to UNDP’s country programme)
* Effectiveness: Have the intended impacts been achieved or are they expected to be achieved? Do different outcome definitions feed into each other and is there a synergy in between? Is the outcome achieved or has progress been made to achieve? Has UNDP made significant contributions in terms of strategic outputs?
* Efficiency: To what extent do the outcomes derive from efficient use of resources? And to what extent UNDP has contributed to the outcomes versus that of its partners?
* Degree of Change: What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended changes brought about by UNDP’s intervention in these outcomes?
* Sustainability: Will benefits/activities continue after the programme cycle?

For each of the selected outcomes on Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio, the outcome evaluation shall respond to the questions below:

**Outcome analysis**

* Whether the selected outcomes were relevant given the country context and needs, and UNDP’s niche? (relevance)
* Whether the outcome indicators chosen are sufficient to measure the outcomes? What other SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) indicators can be suggested to measure these outcomes?
* Whether sufficient progress has been achieved vis-à-vis the outcomes as measured by the outcome indicators? (effectiveness)
* What are the main factors (positive and negative) that have/are affecting the achievement of the outcomes? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?
* To what extent did UNDP contribute to gender empowerment/ gender equality?
* What are the factors that influenced the differences in participation, benefits and results between women and men?
* In this programme period, how did UNDP position itself strategically or did UNDP have a comparative advantage? If yes, how were these reflected in achieving the results? Any recommendations for future programming?
* What does the evaluation reveal in terms of UNDP’s role in an Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC) environment? Did UNDP add value in such an environment, could it build a niche?
* How has the UNDP’s support for the inclusive sustainable growth positively contributed to the attainment/understanding of the SDGs?

**Output analysis**

* Are the UNDP outputs with the project corresponding projects under each outcome relevant to the outcome?
* Has sufficient progress been made in relation to the UNDP outputs?
* Were the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link outputs to outcomes or is there a need to establish or improve these indicators? If so, what are the suggestions?
* What are the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?
* What are the recommendations for the existing portfolio?
* What are the lessons, especially pertaining to gender equality and social inclusion, and directions for future programming?

**Output-outcome link**

* 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)

* What are the key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome? (e.g. piloting new systems and practices, support for policy study and research, support for innovation)
* UNDP’s ability to develop national capacity in a sustainable manner (through holistic, participatory and gender–sensitive approach, building and strengthening institutional linkages, transparency and accountability, exposure to best practices in other countries, south-south cooperation); UNDP’s

ability to respond to changing circumstances and requirements in capacity development;

* What is the prospect of the sustainability and replicability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome (what would be a good exit strategy for UNDP)?

All the above evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

* Human rights
* Gender Equality
* Capacity development
* Institutional strengthening
* Innovation or added value to national development
* South-South Cooperation

**Purpose of Evaluation:**

At the country office level, UNDP uses and applies learning from monitoring and evaluation to improve the overall performance and quality of results of ongoing and future projects, programmes and strategies. Learning is particularly significant for UNDP support to the policy reform process, which is often innovative and contains uncertainties.

Evaluations are not seen as a one-time event but as part of an exercise whereby different stakeholders are able to participate in the continuous process of generating and applying evaluative knowledge. A monitoring and evaluation framework that generates knowledge, promotes learning and guides action is, in its own right, an important means of capacity development and sustainability of national results.

The outcome evaluation seeks to:

* Review the programmes and projects of UNDP contributing to the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio with a view to understand their relevance and contribution to national priorities for stock taking and lesson learning, and recommending mid-course corrections that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP’s development assistance;
* Review the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected (both positively and negatively, contributing and constraining) the outcome;
* Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and implementation arrangements have been effective for strengthened linkages between the outcomes (the nature and extent of the contribution of key partners and the role and effectiveness of partnership strategies in the outcome);
* Provide recommendations for future country programme in the outcomes of the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio and particularly for better linkages between them.
* Evaluate current actions and propose alternative action which can increase the impact for development results.

This interim evaluation will help the country office to understand whether the intended outcomes are still relevant or need an update (to be incorporated in the next programme period), as well as the actual development change created by UNDP’s development assistance throughout the programme period for the selected outcomes. UNDP will use this information for designing its activities as well as communicating to its present and future partners including government agencies and donors.

This evaluation is also very timely since the results of this evaluation will be used by UNDP Turkey and its government in preparing the United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and UNDP Country Programme for the years 2020-2025. UNDP will incorporate the findings of the evaluation, experiences and lessons learned while preparing the new Country Programme Document. This evaluation is also expected to bring recommendations regarding partnership strategies and also to help better understanding of the impact that the portfolio creates.

**Methodology or Evaluation Approach:**

The outcome evaluation will include the following key activities:

* Evaluation design and workplan (to be shared with UNDP Turkey before start of the evaluation)
* Desk review of existing documents
* Briefing with UNDP Turkey
* Field visits
* Interviews with partners
* Drafting of the evaluation report
* Debriefing with UNDP Turkey
* Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)

Though the evaluation methodology to be used will be finalized in consultation with the UNDP Turkey Country office, the following elements should be taken into account for the gathering and analysis of data:

* Pre-assessment of data availability
* Desk review of relevant documents including Country Programme Document (CPD), UNDP Turkey Strategy Documents, reports of relevant flagship projects, etc.
* Discussions with the Senior Management and programme staff of UNDP Turkey
* Presentation of an inception report and discussion of the content with UNDP management and partners
* Interviews: with key partners and stakeholders both at central and field levels.
* Focus group discussions: within UNDP and external parties both at central and field levels. Gaining consensus on key issues.
* Participation and providing guidance to Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio Outcome Evaluation Meetings
* Field visits to select key projects, if necessary
* Regular consultation meetings with the UNDP staff, project staff and senior management as appropriate
* Ensure that the evaluation will be as quantitative as possible.
* It is expected that the evaluation expert will work closely with the Portfolio Manager of UNDP Turkey Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio.

This Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (UNEG 2007) and the evaluators must describe, in the inception report, the procedures they will use to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of their sources (e.g. measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing, for example, provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; protocols to ensure anonymity/confidentiality.)

**3. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**

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

The Consultant will report to IDG Portfolio Manager. The Portfolio Manager will establish the first contacts with the government partners and project staff. The expert will then set up his/her own meetings and conduct his/her own methodology upon approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report.

**4. DELIVERABLES**

The key evaluation deliverables include: a work plan with timeframe, documented records of all interviews and observations after the inception report. First draft with PPT to present the findings. Final evaluation report after reflecting UNDP and relevant stakeholders’ comments.

Key deliverables: Evaluation Inception Report. An inception report should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. It should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: a) proposed methods, b) proposed sources of data, and c) data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

Draft evaluation report. A comprehensive engendered analytical report that should, at least, include the following contents:

* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the evaluation methodology
* An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the outputs and the outcome-output linkages;
* Analysis of salient opportunities to provide guidance in the upcoming country programme cycle;
* Key findings (including best and worst practices, lessons learned)
* Conclusions and recommendations, including suggestions for future programming.
* Annexes: TOR, field visits, people interviewed particularly women, documents reviewed, etc.

Final Evaluation report. A combination of all previous reports, incorporating the comments and feedbacks from UNDP and key stakeholders. Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events.

The Consultant shall be responsible for preparation and submission of the following deliverables (reports) listed in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Deliverables** | **Estimated duration to**  **complete**  **(working/days)** | **Target Date for Submission**  **to UNDP for**  **Approval** | **Review and**  **approvals required** |
| * Desk review and list of reviewed documents * Evaluation framework and work plan | Inception Report and Presentation of the Framework | 7 | 7 March 2019 | IDG  Portfolio  Manager,  UNDP  Turkey |
| * Meetings with stakeholders * Field visits/data collection * Summary of main findings | Draft Evaluation Report | 16 | 4 April 2019 | IDG  Portfolio  Manager,  UNDP  Turkey |
| * Debriefing with UNDP Turkey * Finalization of the evaluation report   (incorporating comments received on first draft) | Final Evaluation Report | 12 | 22 April 2019 | IDG  Portfolio  Manager,  UNDP  Turkey |
| **Maximum Total Number of Working/Days** | |  | **35 days** |  |

Each and every activity to be conducted by the Consultant is subject to UNDP approval. Each step shall be conducted upon approval of the previous step by UNDP.

Number of days to be invested for each deliverable may change but the total number of days worked by the individual contractor cannot exceed 35 days for this assignment (i.e for submission of the deliverables) as defined in the ToR.

**Reporting Language:** The reporting language should be in English.

**Title Rights:** The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

Evaluation Expert will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP. S/he will specifically undertake the following tasks:

* Lead and coordinate the evaluation mission,
* Design the detailed evaluations scope, methodology and approach,
* Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of evaluation - Draft, communicate and finalize the evaluation report as per the comments from UNDP.

**5. MINIMUM QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

The expected qualifications of the expert are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General Qualifications | General Professional Experience | Specific Professional Experience |
| * Minimum master’s degree in economics, business administration, political sciences, law, or any other social sciences * Proficiency in English is required * Advanced degree   (doctorate) on relevant field is an asset | * Minimum eight (8) years of professional experience in at least four of the following fields: governance, rule of law, human rights, access to justice, local administrations and   reform policies, gender empowerment, programme  management, programme evaluation is required   * More than ten (10) years of general professional experience will be considered as an asset * Previous experience in preparation of programming documents including CPDs will be considered as an asset | * At least three (3) similar evaluation assignment completed within the last five (5) years experience in conducting evaluations, * Minimum three (3) years of experience on results-based management evaluation and/or participatory M&E methodologies or approaches * Previous experience in working with UNDP, the civil society, government authorities and local administrations will be an asset. * Previous working experience in   Turkey and/or Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) countries will be an asset. |

**Notes:**

. Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.

. Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.

. Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.

. Female candidates are encouraged to apply.

**6. TIMING AND DURATION**

The Assignment is expected to start in 20 February 2019 and be completed by 22 May 2019. The Individual Consultant is expected to allocate 35 working days throughout the contract duration as per the Deliverable Table in Section 4.

**7. PLACE OF WORK**

Place of work (duty station) for the assignment is home-based. There will be *missions to Ankara and selected project sites*. All travel related costs (cost items indicated below) of these missions out of the duty station (economy class flight ticket and accommodation in 3 or 4 star hotel) will be borne by UNDP. Approval of UNDP is needed prior to the missions is needed. The costs of these missions may either be;

* Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
* Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
* covered by the combination of both options

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

**8. PAYMENTS**

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of the corresponding deliverable by

UNDP on the basis of actual number of days invested in that respective deliverable and the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the consultant and approved by the responsible Portfolio Manager.

The total amount of payment to be affected to the Consultant within the scope of this contract **cannot exceed** 35 days throughout the contract validity. The consultant shall be paid in US$ if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TL through conversion of the US$ amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the consultant to the satisfaction of UNDP as approved by the responsible Portfolio Manager, no payment will be made even if the consultant has invested working/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Expected delivery dates of the reports will be finalized by UNDP during the Briefing Meeting that will be conducted upon contract signature.

The amount paid to the consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

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

9. ATTACHMENTS TO TOR

1. Evaluation Report Outline

**Attachment 1 to TOR: Evaluation Report Outline**

i. Title and Opening page:

* Name of the evaluation intervention
* Time-frame of the evaluation and date of the report
* Country of the evaluation intervention
* Names and/or organizations of evaluators
* Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
* Acknowledgements

Table of contents – Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page reference.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

ii. Executive Summary

* Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the projects, programs, policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
* Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
* Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
* Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

1. Introduction
   * + Purpose of the evaluation
     + Scope & Methodology
     + Structure of the evaluation report
2. Description of the intervention
   * Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
   * Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
   * Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.
   * Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
   * Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
   * Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
   * Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.
   * Describe the context of the social, political, economic, environmental and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
   * Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).
3. Outcome Results
   * Overall results (attainment of objectives)
   * Relevance
   * Effectiveness & Efficiency
   * Country ownership
   * The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).
   * Sustainability
   * Impact
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the outcome/programs/projects
   * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits
   * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
   * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
5. Annexes
   * + ToR for the evaluation
     + Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview groups, observation protocols, etc) as appropriate
     + Itinerary
     + List of persons interviewed
     + List of supporting documents reviewed

# Annex 2 List of people met

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Function** | **Organisation** |
| Sezin Üskent | IDG Portfolio Manager | UNDP |
| Seher Alacacı Arıner | ARR, Programme | UNDP |
| Gökçe Bayrakçeken | Gender Advisor | UNDP |
| Zeliha Ünaldı | Programmes Manager | UNWOMEN |
| Zeynep Başarankut Kan | ARR, Programme | UNFPA |
| Zeliha Aydın | UN HRRoL expert | UN |
| Sertaç Berber | Project Associate | UNDP e-consulate project |
| Allan Poston | Project Manager | UNDP Demining Project Team |
| Özlem Yılmaz | Project Administrator | UNDP Demining Project Team |
| Ahmet Doğanay | Field Coordinator | UNDP Demining Project Team |
| Sedat Has | Field Coordinator | UNDP Demining Project Team |
| Evrim Yarımagan | Project Administrator | UNDP Border Management Project Team |
| Bahar Erdoğan | Project Associate | UNDP Border Management Project Team |
| Ufuk Ekici | Head of the Department of Information Technologies for | Ministry of Foreign Affairs, e-consulate project |
| Ferhat Emil | Former key expert of LAR2 and CTA of LAR3 Projects | UNDP LAR III Project Team |
| Sema Aksoy | Expert | UNDP SILA Phase I ILAP Inception Project Team |
| Musa Toprak | Expert | UNDP SILA Phase I Team |
| Col.Mesut Ekren | Director | TURMAC |
| Ezgi Kaşkaval Okyay | Expert | National Human Rights and Equality Institute |
| Gökçe Bahar Öztürk | Investigation Judge | Ministry of Justice |
| Sevilay Karagöz | Investigation Judge | Ministry of Justice |
| Gülfem Kıraç Keleş  Murat Kodaz | Head of the Department | Union of Turkish Municipalities |
| Ramazan Gürkan | Head of the Department | Ministry of Justice, Department of Victims’ Rights |
| Murat Yalkın | Director International Relations and EU Centre | Union of Turkish Bar Association |
| Banu Buyurgan | Expert | UNDP Transparency in Judiciary Project Team |
| Prof. Gulriz Uygur | Expert | UNDP Transparency in Judiciary Project Team |
| Ramazan Karataş | Border Security Head of Branch | Land Forces Command |
| Ertan Zibel | Unit Director | Çukurova Regional Development Agency for gender mainstreaming project through Skype |
| Seher Gündüz  Mustafa Avcı | Expert | Ministry of the Interior |
| Mehmet Ali Küçükçavuş | Expert | Ombudsman Institute |
| Prof. Ömer Faruk Gençkaya | Expert | UNDP Local Integrity Project Team |
| Prof. Yıldız Ecevit | Expert | Çukurova Regional Development Agency for gender mainstreaming project |
| Mr. Eran Evren  Ms. Hale Kargın | Municipal staff | Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality |
| Isabelle Tascan | Team Leader | UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub |
| Özgür Tek | National Programme Officer | SIDA |
| Ulrich Rainer | Programme Manager | EU |
| Chiara Biscaldi | International Relations Officer | EU |
| Mustafa Saldırım | Deputy SG - Judge | Court of Cassation |
| Gözde Hülagu | Center Director | Court of Cassation |

# Annex 3: Documents Reviewed

1. IDG Portfolio documents:

* Legal Aid I: prodoc, progress reports
  + Output assessment Support To The Improvement Of Legal Aid Practices For Access To Justice For All In Turkey
  + UTBA Strategy and Road Map
  + SILA training documents’
* Transparency in Judiciary
  + Prodoc Court of Cassation
  + Progress Reports
  + Training Documents
  + Ethical Principles
  + CoC publications
  + Transparency strategy
  + Ethical Principles
* Demining Phase 1
* Prodoc and Action Plan
* Final Report
* Ombudsman
  + Prodoc
  + Progress Reports
* Integrity Assessment
  + ACT methodology
  + Workshop reports
  + Training materials
* Gender Mainstreaming in Cukurova
  + Prodoc
  + Workshop reports, including recommendations
* Demining Phase II
  + Prodoc and Plan of Action
  + Progress Reports
* IBM Phase 1
  + Prodoc
  + Feasibility Report
  + Training Needs Assessment
  + Progress Reports
* MFA E- Consulate
  + Prodoc
  + Progress Reports
* Enhancing Access to Justice
  + Note on the assistance and signed agreement
  + Pip New Plan
* Local Administration Reform III
  + Prodoc
  + Inception Report
* Civilian Oversight
  + Prodoc

1. CDP UNDP 2016-2020
2. European Union Progress Report 2016, 2018
3. EU 20180817-revised-indicative-strategy-paper-2014-2020-for-turkey
4. Ipa\_ii\_mtr\_follow\_up\_table\_16032018 pre accession report 2014- 2016
5. SDG 2030 Agenda
6. Human Development Reports 2016, 2017, 2018
7. Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical Update
8. Briefing note for countries on the 2018 Statistical Update Turkey
9. UNDPs Cooperation and Added Value in Its Areas Of Engagement In Turkey version 3 2018
10. Turkey Country Brief 2018
11. 10th National Development Plan, Republic of Turkey, 2016 -2018
12. UNDP’s Contribution in 11th NDP Preparation Process
13. Democratic Governance and Human Rights status of progress. April 13, 2018. No author.
14. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,

Report on the impact of the state of emergency on human rights in Turkey, including an update on the South-East January – December 2017

1. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Report on the human rights situation in South-East Turkey July 2015 to December 2016
2. Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, List of issues in relation to the initial report of Turkey (2018)
3. List of Issues prior to reporting to the Committee against Torture
4. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment on his mission to Turkey
5. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression on his mission to Turkey\*
6. Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women Concluding observations (2016) CEDAW/C/TUR/CO/7
7. Committee against Torture Concluding observations (2016) CAT/C/TUR/CO/4
8. Committee on Migrant Workers Concluding observations (2016) CMW/C/TUR/CO/1
9. Gender Strategy 2017
10. Gender Analysis Court of Cassation
11. Gender Screening Document
12. 2018 04 13 Democratic Governance and Human Rights
13. Strategic Summary of Coordination Results 2018 UNDP
14. UNDP CA Report 2016
15. UNDCS 2017
16. National Human Rights and Equality Institute: training materials; concept on training, concept on prevention, workshop report; NPM recommendations, thematic and annual report.
17. Updated Risk Analysis IDG 29.08.2016

**Annex 4: Review of Outcome Indicators**

| **Indicator** | **Indicative Country Outputs** | **Project + Focus** | | | **Results per indicator** | | **Green = met**  **Yellow= in progress**  **Red= not completed**  **Blue = initial stage or under preparation** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 2.1.1.**  Functional mechanisms with budget and staff in place for stakeholder involvement in reporting and implementation of treaty bodies, special procedures, Human Rights Council recommendations and other international commitments  Baseline:  No functional participatory mechanism in place  Target:  A participatory mechanism in place | **2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities.**  **Indicator: Number of individuals, particularly those facing vulnerabilities with access to high quality legal aid, disaggregated by sex.**  **Baseline: 30.000 (women) + (35.000) men**  **Target : 50.000 (women) + (50.000) men** | **Rule of Law**  Consisting of two parts  1. Support to the improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey  2. Enhancing Access to Justice and Legal Aid for Refugees in Turkey.  2. Access to justice and legal aid for refugees Rule of Law  Access to justice and legal aid for refugees | | | Legal Aid I is not appropriately captured in this indicator while considerable work has been concluded.   * Increased quality of services through training * Performance criteria developed for legal aid * Automation system completed: 7 regions consulted * Six regional meetings held to enhance cooperation among lawyers offering legal aid and NGOs * Draft Legal Aid Legislation Framework prepared * Strategy Paper and Roadmap developed for UTBA * Improved collaboration between UTBA and MoJ * Budget increases for CCP lawyers providing legal aid (estimated increase is 30%)   No data available: legal aid statistics weak and the MoJ numbers and the NTBA are different.  Intermediary results:   * quality needs assessment report and a training programme for the legal aid needs of and services for those groups. Lawyers provided with a specific training programme to approach those groups as well. * Bar Association members trained * Fees for pro bono support increased by 30% * Good cooperation with NGOs * 83% of the applicants are female with most complaints related to violence * Many complaints heard and registered, but numbers not known also due to pro bon work which is not registered. | |  | |
| **Indicator 2.1.2**  Percentage of recommendations emanating from United Nations human rights (treaty bodies, special procedures, Universal Periodic Review (2015), convention of the Elimination of All Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) implemented  Baseline: 0  Target:4 | **2.1.2 Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute (NHRI) and Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights promoted.**  **Indicator 2.1.2.1** Human Rights machinery strengthened with complementary mandates and maintaining compliance to international standards; NHRI accredited  **Baseline**: Mandates intersect, not accredited  **Target:** Ombudsman Institutions and NHRI restructured in line with best practices and international standards, International Coordinating Committee accreditation | | Ombudsman project.  UNDP provided capacity development of NHREI with trainings and capacity assessment exercise that started June 2019.  (see below) | | EU report 2018:   * NHREI not functional, secondary legislation missing. * Capacities limited * Ombudsman only deals with complaints against public administration. * Ombudsman increased its number of applications in 2017 to 17131 ( 3 times as many as the average in the previous 4 years. Examined 14700 cases; 422 recommendations. Public administration acted upon 65% * Limited powers of Ombudsman * Remained silent on HR abuses in the South East | |  |
| 2.1.2 Capacities of the National Human Rights Institute (NHRI) and Ombudsman enhanced, and human rights promoted.  Indicator 2.1.2.1  Effectiveness of the National Preventive Mechanism for monitoring human rights standards in places of detention.  Baseline: NHRI newly assigned as National Preventive Mechanism with limited capacity  NHRI restructured at local and national for its role. | **Indicator 2.1.2.2**  Effectiveness of the National Preventive Mechanism for monitoring human rights standards in places of detention.  **Baseline:** NHRI newly assigned as National Preventive Mechanism with limited capacity  **Target**:  NHRI restructured at local and national level for its role. | | No active project yet but will start in 2019.  Joint OHCHR programme on human rights will be delayed until 2020 due to EU programming preferences | * Cabinet degree (nr?) establishing National Preventive Mechanism * Name Changed to National Human Rights and Equality Institute. * In 2017 11 Board members selected and appointed: 3 by the President and 11 by Cabinet. * Does not meet Paris Principles or EU acquis. (EU report, 2016) * The NHREI does not have complaints role at the moment, but its mandate was extended to cover equality issues as well as National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) * EU report 2018: It has the mandate to investigate ill- treatment and torture upon application or ex office. | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.2.3.**  Existence of mechanisms for participatory monitoring of implementation of recommendations on international human rights mechanisms.  **Baseline:**  Reform Action Group (UPR) ad hoc platforms (CEDAW), Violence monitoring committee.  **Target**: Platforms for engagement of all relevant actors in monitoring and reporting in place | | Legal Aid Phase I  Enhancing the Capacity of Legal Aid Lawyers to Provide Services to Disadvantaged Groups | CEDAW (HRCHR website) no change  UPR 2015 (before portfolio date)  **Legal Aid:**  Two legislations were prepared in consultation with UTBA and ministry of justice and officially submitted for review responding to CEDAW “  b) Adopt necessary legislative amendments to explicitly criminalize domestic violence so as to enable the prosecution and punishment of perpetrators”.  They are still in the approval process.  **CEDAW:** Ensure that refugees and asylum-seekers, in particular women, are informed about the national referral mechanisms for victims of sexual and gender-based violence and how to access formal justice mechanism.  **UNDP:** training to raise awareness among lawyers about obstacles of refugees to access to justice and improve their skills and positive changes on their behavior on approaching refugees while providing legal aid support.  c) Vigorously monitor protection orders and sanction their violations, as well as investigate and hold law enforcement officers and judiciary personnel accountable for failure to register complaints and issue and enforce protection orders;  **UNDP:** performance criteria’s and model over legal aid practices in Turkey, in line with EU and UN standards will be prepared and 7 regional meetings were conducted in Turkey in October-November 2018. | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.2.4**  Presence of NHRI systems for fast and efficient response to the rights violations of individuals at different age and gender  **Baseline:**  No specific complaints handling system  **Target:** Efficient complains handling system, with gender and age disaggregated data. | | Ongoing support to NHREI, a capacity building project is expected to start in 2020 | NHREI has a complaints mechanism. | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.2.5** Number of young men benefiting from on-line learning and awareness raising systems on human rights-based approach.  **Baseline** 10.000 million  **Target**: 20.000 million | | No information | No information | |  | |
| **Indicator 2.1.3**  Percentage of the targets of the new judicial reform strategy to promote and protect the rights of specific groups (women, youth children) achieved  **Baseline: 0**  **Target: 4** | **2.1.3 Enhanced Capacity of Civil Society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring**  **Indicator 2.1.3.1:** Number of civil society proposals influencing local/national decision making, policies and/or proposals  **Baseline 15**  **Target 30** | | Projects are at the initial stage. Civic engagement is at the pipeline, expected in 2020. |  | |  | |
|  | **2.1.4 Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanism for participatory, accountable and transparent services** | |  |  | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.4.1:** Inclusive mechanisms for citizens engagement (age/gender sensitive) in planning and service delivery of development agencies  **Baseline:** Development Agency Boards in place  **Target:**  Inclusive composition / functioning of development agency’s boards | | **Project at the pipeline** | Focus was on ***one*** development agency. Project on hold for two years.  Training on gender mainstreaming provided  Focal point appointed. Board and Head of Agency continue to show interest. | |  | |
|  | **2.1.4.2**  **Number of gender strategies/action plans budgeted and implemented by local institutions and line ministries** | | Projects are at the initial stage |  | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.4.3:** Number of local administrations (city councils), including from least developed regions applying open government, transparent and representative participation approach  **Baseline 30**  **Target 60** | | LAR III related activities are at the initial stage |  | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.4.4:**  Number of information technology-based service delivery models adopted, including within local administration  **Baseline 13**  **Target 26** | | LAR III related activities are at the initial stage |  | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.4.5:** Number of local level civilian oversight mechanisms over internal security forces in place  **Baseline 8**  **Target 81** | | Civilian Oversight III related activities are at the initial stage. |  | |  | |
|  | **2.1.5 Institutions and Systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption across sectors** | |  |  | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.5.1:** Number of adopted measures and inter-agency coordination to mitigate corruption risks and strengthen integrity systems  **Baseline: 2**  **Target: 5** | | Pipeline project for Local Integrity Systems. | Focus was on ***one*** municipality. Project on hold for alternative funding  Training on integrity provided  Continued interest. | |  | |
|  | **2.1.6 Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management** | |  |  | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.6.1:** Number of mines removed  **Baseline:** 0  **Target:** 222.000 (out of 227,558) | | Demining I and II | As of September 2018, around 33.000 mines were cleared, and the capacity of the National Mine Action Authority has been enhanced to fulfil its mandate for humanitarian demining in line with Ottawa Convention. | |  | |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.6.2:**  Existence of Integrated capacities for border management in line with EU International standards  **Baseline:** IBM not in line with IBM principles  **Target:** New body for RBM in place | | IBM I and II | No ‘body’ as such established but  Phase I 250 staff completed risk analysis training. Training extended to staff from the Eastern regions. Number of trained staffs exceeded. Suggested ‘impact’ that 35% of staff has significant increase in skills and applies these.  Support of UNDP to humanitarian border governance in Turkey has been extended with the targeted capacity development activities for the Land Forces Command staff working in Greek and Bulgaria borders of Turkey  IBM Phase II ongoing | |  | |

# Annex 5: Outputs Achievements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project name** | **Key achievements summary during evaluation period** |
| **Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey (Legal Aid Phase I)** | * Increased quality of services through training * Performance criteria developed for legal aid * Automation system completed: 7 regions consulted * Six regional meetings held to enhance cooperation among lawyers offering legal aid and NGOs * Draft Legal Aid Legislation Framework prepared * Strategy Paper and Roadmap developed for UTBA * Improved collaboration between UTBA and MoJ * Budget increases for CCP lawyers providing legal aid (estimated increase is 30%) |
| **Strengthening Transparency and Code of Ethics for Enhanced Public Confidence in Court of Cassation in Turkey** | * Preparation and adoption of the Code of Ethics * Establishment of the Ethics Advisory Committee * Time limitation on the response mechanism for a complaint * Judges and Prosecutors trained on the code of ethics (400) * Adoption by 30 High Courts around the World and increased to 50 of the Istanbul Declaration on Transparency in the Judicial Process and its effective implementation measures In line with the international human rights /rule of law framework adopted by the UN * CoC submitted the Declaration and Measures to ECOSOC for universal consensus * Communication Strategy for CoC’s role in transparency developed * High level ownership and collaboration among different partners in the judicial system |
| **Socioeconomic development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase I** | * All activities under the Integrated Border Management and capacity development for TURMAC components have been successfully completed. * Clearance unit established in TURMAC and capacity building specialist * Study visits for IBM * 800 people (= 5% of the total of personnel) trained in total with turnover of staff between 2-4 years (posting at border is for 2 years mostly). Staff are employed around that ‘walls. Land border = 2949 km, including rough and mountainous areas were posting is under harsh circumstances. |
| **Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of Ombudsman Institution** | * All activities completed including HRBA booklet produced * Contribution to increased performance – despite not meeting the Paris Principles. Overall increase of the complaints/recommendations ration: 2018: 17.585 complaints and 2498 recommendations. |
| **Integrity Assessment of Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipality** | * Action Plan developed but not implemented * Training on integrity completed * Focus on Human Resources to improve recruitment and appointment (3000 employees) * Code of ethics developed * Project in stand-by mode |
| **Gender Mainstreaming in Çukurova Development Agency** | * Training provided on gender mainstreaming * Development Agency followed up on the recommendations, but more is needed * Focal point in DA appointed * Project in stand-by mode |
| **Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey- Phase II** | * 831,550 m2 of land released and 12,630 mines destroyed in compliance with the national mine action standards in 2018 * Total number of mines removed 38.000 * TURMAC staff trained, amongst others, on mine action data system. High turnover of staff at TURMAC (4 directors in 2 years). They are military staff not necessarily mine expertise. F * TURMAC fully funded by GoT * TURMAC has a strategy with priorities * Global Mine Action Strategy 2018 * 517 staff trained on IBM; 100 advanced level training on IBM and migrants rights * Land release estimated at 10.000.000 out of 160.000.000 M2. |
| **Increasing Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and Greece Project (IBM Phase I)** | * Security Roadmap developed 2016 * E-training modules under development which would increase the total number of staff trained * Training of trainers under development * Turnover of staff is high focus on incoming trainees for life long effect 250 trainees completed risk management: skills and knowledge increase |
| **Increasing Institutionalization and Broader use of the e-consulate system for increased efficiency in the service delivery of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Phase II Project** | * The total number of users increases with 80 percent in 2018 * Used in more than 50 countries world wide * Requires specialized IT knowledge and maintenance which UNDP provides through recruitment of these experts outside of the civil service. Technical innovations will remain on the global agenda and will continuously need to be updated or introduced in the MFA. * Increases transparency and access to government services to citizens abroad |
| **Enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees (Syrian and other nationalities) in Turkey** | * Needs and services assessed in 7 pilot provinces and courthouses where Judicial Support and Victims Services Directorates established by MoJ * Training programme designed for judges, prosecutors, support staff and lawyers * Awareness raising programmes and information campaigns designed both for refugees and justice sector actors |
| **Local Administration Reform III** | * Inception Period completed * Expert teams established * Preliminary analysis started for local governance modelling and mechanisms for better services delivery at local level including legislation drafting working group of municipalities |
| **Civilian Oversight III** | * Inception Period completed * Preliminary analysis conducted in pilot provinces of Phase I and II to understand the functioning of Local Prevention and Security Boards of citizens and stakeholders * Expert teams established |
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