

# Evaluation Report

## Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase II Project (ILAP II).

**Time frame covered by this report:** 01 June 2019 to 10<sup>th</sup> July 2021

**Date report submitted:** 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 (Final v3.0)

**Evaluator:** Richard H. Langan II  
New York

**UNDP Turkey**



**Project Title:** Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase II

**Project Number:** 00113501 (Proposal ID)

**Implementing Partner:** Union of Turkish Bar Associations

**Start Date:** 1 June 2019    **End Date:** 1 June 2022    **LPAC Meeting date:** 17 April 2019

### Brief Description

Based on the achievements and results of the “Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase I”, the Project aims to develop more coordinated, qualified, and systematic approach into legal aid practices in Turkey and build awareness on the operationalization of performance management tools and mechanisms to enhance the efforts to ease access to justice. This will be achieved through developing mechanisms towards gaps for better coordination and improving networks among legal aid service providers (Union of Turkish Bar Associations, Bar Associations, and lawyers), women NGOs and civil society, as well as increased capacity of lawyers through an online training. With the aim to develop a systematic and structured approach, the Project will implement pilot practices for specialized legal aid services towards gender-based violence victims. The Project will also address the implementation of the policy recommendations for improved legal aid services generated in Phase I and will further support the institutional needs of Bar Associations through the dissemination of performance criteria and evaluation mechanisms that are introduced to ensure an effective, coordinated and monitored legal aid system in Turkey.

### Contributing Outcomes

#### UNDCS OUTCOMES:

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.

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

#### CPD OUTPUTS:

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

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

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

Indicative Output(s) with gender marker<sup>1</sup>: GEN 3

<b>Total resources required:</b>	\$1.407.859,00	
	<b>UNDP TRAC:</b>	N/A
	<b>Donor (Sida):</b>	\$1.407.859,00
	<b>Government:</b>	N/A
	<b>In-Kind:</b>	N/A
	<b>Total GMS (%8)</b>	\$104.285,85
<b>Unfunded:</b>	N/A	

<sup>1</sup> GEN3 (Gender equality as a principle objective)

# Table of Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	V
INTRODUCTION .....	- 1 -
DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION .....	- 1 -
CONTEXT .....	- 1 -
THE PROJECT.....	- 3 -
EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES .....	- 6 -
EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS .....	- 6 -
LIMITATIONS .....	- 9 -
DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY .....	- 11 -
FINDINGS.....	- 12 -
RELEVANCE.....	- 12 -
EFFECTIVENESS .....	- 15 -
OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS.....	- 15 -
EFFECTIVENESS: RESULTS ACROSS THE PROJECT’S RRF .....	- 18 -
<i>Output 1</i> .....	- 19 -
<i>Output 2</i> .....	- 21 -
<i>Output 3</i> .....	- 25 -
<i>Output 4</i> .....	- 27 -
EFFICIENCY.....	- 28 -
SUSTAINABILITY.....	- 30 -
CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES .....	- 32 -
CONCLUSIONS .....	- 36 -
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	- 37 -
LESSONS LEARNED .....	- 39 -
ANNEX .....	- 40 -
A. “MAPPING OF BAR ASSOCIATION AND NGO/CSO COORDINATION FOR LEGAL AID” .....	- 40 -
B. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES .....	- 42 -
C. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS. ....	- 43 -
D. EVALUATION MATRIX. ....	- 46 -
E. FINAL LIST OF INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS INTERVIEWED OR CONSULTED. ....	- 54 -
<i>PROPOSED STAKEHOLDERS TO BE INTERVIEWED</i> .....	- 54 -
F. INDICATIVE QUESTIONS FOR STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED BY THE EVALUATION.....	- 56 -
G. LIST OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	- 60 -
H. SUMMARY OF ILAP II REGIONAL WORKSHOPS.....	- 61 -
I. TOR FOR THE EVALUATION. ....	- 62 -

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

ADM	Judicial Support Centers (MoJ/AGO)
AGO	Attorney General's Office
CCP	Code of Criminal Procedure
CEDAW	Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (U.N.)
CO	Country Office (UNDP)
COVID-19	Corona Virus Disease-19
CPD	Country Programme Document (UNDP)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EU	European Union
GBV	Gender Based Violence
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
ILAP	Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Project (UNDP)
IOM	International Office of Migration
IT	Information Technology
JRS	Judicial Reform Strategy (Turkey)
LGBTQ	Lesbian Gay Bi Trans Queer
LNOB	Leave No One Behind
LTA	Long Term Agreement
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoFLSS	Ministry of Family Labor and Social Services (former name)
MoFSS	Ministry of Family and Social Services (new name)
MoI	Ministry of the Interior
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
NCE	No Cost Extension
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PWD	Person with Disabilities
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals (U.N.)
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
SÖNİM	Women's Shelters of the MoFSS (MoFLSS)
TKDF	Federation of Women's Associations in Turkey
TÜBAKKOM	Turkish Women's Law Committee
U.N.	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDSC	United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UTBA	Union of Turkish Bar Associations
VAW	Violence Against Women
*VPC	*Violence Prevention Centers

*\*Note: The VPC were renamed "Bar Victims of Violence Support Centers" as of 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021 by decision of the Project's Steering Committee). Because the acronym VPC is used in numerous project and programmes documents of ILAP II, it has been retained for purposes of this evaluation report.*

## Executive summary

This Report presents the analysis, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) “Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase II” (ILAP Phase II) Project (“Project”).

The Project is funded primarily by Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) with a budget of \$1,407,859 US and covers the time June 2019 to 01 June 2022. The Project is administered by UNDP. The Ministry of Justice and the Union of Turkish Bar Associations (UTBA) are signatories to the project document. The Project’s central objective is to develop more coordinated, qualified, and systematic approaches to legal aid practices in Turkey and build awareness on performance management tools and mechanisms to enhance access to justice.

The Project is designed to address systemic issues facing Turkey’s legal aid system. Legal Aid for indigent defendants and victims in Turkey is granted to individuals via the Code of Lawyers (appointment of legal aid in civil and administrative matters); the Code of Civil Procedure, as amended (exemption of court fees for indigent persons upon application to the court) and the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP) (appointment of lawyers in certain criminal cases, as well as to victims of certain crimes). In Turkey, it is the Union of Turkish Bar Associations and local Bar Associations in Turkey’s provinces that coordinate legal aid and allocate lawyers to legal aid cases.<sup>2</sup>

### ILAP Phase II Overall Outcomes

<b>Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDCS/Country [or Global/Regional] Programme Results and Resource Framework:</b>
---

- |   |
|---|
| 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. |
| 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 Project’s Outcomes are serviced by **4 Outputs**:

ILAP Phase II Outputs
Output 1 - Enhanced Coordination Between Women NGO's, Civil Society Organizations, Lawyers and Bar Associations to Improve the Legal Aid System in Turkey.
Output 2 – Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations: Poppy Project practices
Output 3 – Enhanced Capacities of Lawyers Practicing Legal Aid Through a Tailor-made Training Programme
Output 4 – Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers

The Project seeks to achieve these Outputs by improving coordination and networks between legal aid providers (i.e., Union of Turkish Bar Associations, provincial Bar Associations, and lawyers), women’s NGOs and other CSOs. The Project also has capacity building and training outputs built-into its activities and outputs. It seeks to develop and pilot legal aid practices for improvement of services to GBV victims, women, and children and to develop performance criteria for Bar Associations. This

---

<sup>2</sup> Turkey has recently taken significant steps to enhance the availability of legal aid and access to justice, as reflected in the Judicial Reform Strategy of 2015-2020 that for the first time includes a focus on addressing the legal aid needs of vulnerable populations, including women and children. In addition, Turkey has recently undertaken amendments to its Code of Civil Procedure; created information desks about legal aid at selected court houses; created a website for legal aid; and implemented a “law and justice” course in its elementary schools. These reforms have taken place considering reports of the European Union (EU) that had criticized Turkey in the areas of fundamental rights, including the availability of means of legal defense and legal aid. The project coincides with the time of Turkey’s 11<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan (2019-2022).

includes the establishment of Violence Prevention Centers (VPC) (newly renamed as “(Name of Province) Bar Victims of Violence Support Centers) at 7 pilot locations: Denizli, Balıkesir, Samsun, Rize, Mardin, Antalya and Nevşehir.

### **Methodology and Limitations**

The Evaluation was conducted by a senior International Consultant hired by UNDP who has 23+ years’ experience consulting to UNDP, the U.N. and its affiliated agencies and other international organizations. The methodology adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The evaluation adopted an integrated approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support was triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on outcome and output indicators achievement, existing reports including UNDP reports, and donor reports, and stakeholder interviews. The Evaluation did not use focus groups or surveys, as surveys of training participants were already undertaken by UNDP. Also, for other outputs of the Project (i.e., VPCs at the 7 pilot Bar Associations) sufficient time has not yet elapsed to generate a pool of beneficiaries to be interviewed via a survey.

The Evaluation methodology comprised the following elements:

- Review documents (Desk Review).
- Online Interviews with key stakeholders including government line ministries, development partners, civil society, and other relevant partners through a participatory and transparent process (i.e., WhatsApp; Zoom; email; etc.).
- Triangulation of information collected from different sources/methods to enhance the validity of the findings.

The Evaluation collected data via document review and internet searches, as well as stakeholder interviews. These interviews took place via the Zoom online platform. UNDP agreed to supply the services of an outside vendor to organize the Consultant’s meeting schedule, arrange for simultaneous translation from English to Turkish and to monitor each meeting for any technical difficulties. Follow-up via email and/or WhatsApp occurred to obtain any data requested during the interviews. The use of these technologies permitted the Evaluation to take place remotely during a time when the COVID-19 pandemic and its travel restrictions are in place. The Evaluation made rough and unedited transcripts of all interviews with the “Transcribe” app.

The Evaluation has utilized a “traffic lights” system in its discussion of Findings against each of the Project’s Outputs and sub-outputs and stated in the RRF. This system is as follows:

For the Evaluation’s overall assessment of each of the DAC-OECD criteria of **Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency** and **Sustainability**, as well as cross-cutting elements such as **Gender and Human Rights**, the Evaluation has used the following “traffic lights”:

HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
------	--------	-----

The Evaluation's more detailed assessment of each of the Project's Outputs and sub-outputs under the Project's RRF, uses a system of more detailed "traffic lights. These are explained in the main body of the Evaluation Report.

<b>ACHIEVED</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that 100% or near 100% of the output has been achieved at the Project's midterm.
<b>ON TRACK</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that the output is substantially achieved and has good prospects for 100% implementation by the Project's end date and requires no adjustments.
<b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that the output is not yet substantially achieved and faces some risks and/or is delayed in some respect requiring attention from the Project and/or adjustments but is achievable by the Project's end date and within current funding levels.
<b>OFF-TRACK</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that the output yet, has not yet been able to be initiated, is significantly delayed to the point that it will not be possible to achieve by the Project end-date and/or will require significant readjustments and/or additional funding to achieve.

The limitations on this methodology included lack of availability of some women's NGO's/CSOs for interviews; and a lack of overall statistics on the trainings and number of clients seen at the VPCs. Internet connectivity in some geographic areas of the country may be limited causing delays in meetings and necessitating rescheduling.

## **Summary of Main Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations**

### ***Relevance***

**HIGH**

The design of ILAP Phase II Project Document and its Theory of Change appear to be highly relevant to Turkey's development agenda, legal reform strategies and current development context. The Project is designed to build upon ILAP Phase I, but with more narrowly focused outcomes and outputs focused on women, children and most vulnerable groups who have unmet legal aid and access to justice needs. Based upon its review of project documents and interviews with stakeholders, the Evaluation finds that the Project has strong support and approval of the Ministry of Justice, the UTBA, Bar Associations and members of civil society. Furthermore, the Project is relevant not only to Turkey's National Development Plan (NDP) and Judicial Reform Strategy (JRS), including court reforms, but also to the implementation of Turkey's existing human rights treaty obligations.

## Effectiveness

HIGH	MEDIUM
------	--------

The Evaluation found that the Project—despite the setbacks and delays experienced because of the global COVID-19 pandemic—managed to complete by midterm many activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 of the Project. Meanwhile, the Project on-track to complete Output 3 which it began implementing only in April 2021. As of June 2021, Output 4 is currently being prepared to be implemented during the remainder of 2021 and into 2022.

Overview of Progress at Project Mid-term		
Output	Overall Progress	Evaluation Assessment
Output 1 - Enhanced Coordination Between Women NGO's, Civil Society Organizations, Lawyers and Bar Associations to Improve the Legal Aid System in Turkey.	ACHIEVED	Sub-output 1.1. (Networking and coordination practices) is rated as <b>ACHIEVED</b> as against the Project RRF, but other aspects of networking and communication of the Project (See below) require further work.
Output 2 – Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations: Poppy Project practices	ON TRACK	Sub-output 2.1 and 2.2 (Tailor made trainings and ToT) are <b>ACHIEVED</b> ; Sub-outputs 2.3 (Infrastructure Support and Upgrading of Pilot Bar Associations) and 2.4 (Communication) are <b>ON TRACK</b> ; Sub-output 2.5 (Monitoring of Local Poppy Practices) is rated as <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b> .
Output 3 – Enhanced Capacities of Lawyers Practicing Legal Aid Through a Tailor-made Training Programme	ON TRACK	Sub-outputs 3.1 (Training needs assessment); 3.2 (Preparation of priority modules on legal aid); and 3.3 (Preparation of Software infrastructure for online training) are <b>ACHIEVED</b> . Sub-output 3.4 (# of training modules developed) is <b>ON TRACK</b> ; Sub-Outputs 3.5 (# of analysis reports) and 3.6 (# of lawyers issued training certificates for completion of the online training) are rated as <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b> .
Output 4 – Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers	OFF-TRACK	Sub-output 4.1 (International Study Visits to Best Practices) is <b>OFF-TRACK</b> . Sub-Output 4.2 (Implementation of Communication Plan for Awareness Raising on Performance Management and Automation System) is rated as <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b> . Sub-output 4.4 (Awareness raising among Bar Associations on performance management) is <b>OFF-TRACK</b> .

As of the Project's Midterm, it is the Evaluation's assessment that the Project's Overall Successes include the following: i) The Project's continued ability to convene the Bar Associations and UTBA around the issue of legal aid; ii) The Project's Dialogues and Networking; iii). The extent of the Project's involvement of civil society; iv) The extent of the Project's involvement of local and



municipal authorities; v) The Project’s design’s incorporation of the “Poppy Center” model best practices in the form of the “Guidelines” developed for the VPCs; and vi) The Project’s online ToT and “Tailor Made” trainings that reflect best practices.

These are all discussed in more detail *infra*, but the Evaluation attributes the Project’s success to date to several key factors including: i) UNDP’s decision to include a broad-base of stakeholders in the design of the Project and its communication with all stakeholders; ii) UNDP’s ongoing ability to adapt to the *force majeure* event of the global COVID-19 pandemic and political events in Turkey and its willingness to deploy remote technologies for this purpose; and iii) the Project’s overall design and its relevance to the Government of Turkey’s development agendas and strategic plans, as well as the needs of its end-beneficiaries (i.e., women) that has continued to ensure that the Project has received a high degree of political will from its Government partners (at both national and provincial levels), as well as enthusiasm from Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs in Turkey.

The groundwork has certainly been laid for a transferable model and lessons learned for establishing and capacitating the VPCs; structuring the Steering Committee; development of common “Guidelines” for the VPCs; networking opportunities for convening Bar Associations in conjunction with involving CSOs; and local officials. All are good practices and success stories that are potentially transferable to **other projects and partners. Beyond this, the way UNDP and the Project have adapted to the risks posed by COVID-19 (i.e., by deploying online technologies) and to political developments in Turkey, including changes to the Attorneys Law (i.e., by continuing to be a “neutral”/apolitical) are also examples of “best practices” that are potentially transferable to other projects. As stated elsewhere in this Report, it remains to be seen how effectively and efficiently the VPCs will perform on a day-to-day basis, responding to clients with diverse needs and legal issues.**

### *Efficiency*

HIGH

As of its midterm the budget allocation and expenditures for the Project were as follows: Total money transferred by Sida: USD 1,036,827.65; Total spent: \$434,842.72; Total Surplus: \$601,984.93; Average expenditure by budget: ≈ 42.00 %; Remaining Sida transfer: \$371,031.36; and Total project budget (project document): USD 1,407,859.00. Obviously, COVID-19 slowed the Project’s implementation rate. The remaining \$371,031.06 Sida transfer raises the issue of how this surplus should be allocated during the remainder of the Project’s original implementation period.

### *Sustainability*

MEDIUM

LOW

The Evaluation received indications from the MoJ that it is interested in scaling the VPCs, depending upon whether the seven pilot VPCs are successful. The UTBA also states that its goal is to scale-up the VPCs. The Project’s training materials, guidelines, reports of expert-consultants, and minutes from meetings of the Advisory Committee, Steering Committee and workshops provide some evidence that the decision-making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken to support the sustainability of the effects of the Project. All these outputs serve to move the VPCs in a direction of institutionalization and build the capacity of the legal profession to represent these types of clients.

As of the Project’s midterm, the verbal statements of stakeholders and documents all support continued sustainability. The true test will be how the VPCs are able to operate on a day-to-day

basis over the course of the coming 6 months to one year; and whether UNDP its partners can document the operations and processes of the VPCs, including gathering statistics. It is at this point, too early to make such an assessment. There are political risks facing the project and its Theory of Change, including the Turkish Government’s decision to withdraw from the Istanbul Convention. These are discussed in this Report.

### *Crosscutting Issues*

HIGH

The Evaluation found that the Project is fully in line with the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2021. The Project’s RRF and outputs are designed to mainstream gender. The Evaluation found that meetings, workshops, and trainings have maintained gender balance throughout the Project. Furthermore, the Project has successfully involved the participation of leading Turkish women’s rights NGOs/CSOs in the Project. These NGOs/CSOs expressed to the Evaluation that the Regional Meetings had been extremely valuable to them in terms of capacity building and networking and raised awareness on GBV. The Project has also adhered and incorporated a Human Rights Based Approach and supported the UN’s “Leave No One Behind” initiative as well as the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

### *Major Recommendations*

The Evaluation has made several Recommendations that appear at the end of this Evaluation Report. Chief amongst these are the following:

The Evaluation encourages UNDP to view the 7 pilot VPCs as a “Proof of Concept” with a view towards scaling-up the pilot VPCs to all of Turkey’s 81 provinces in a subsequent Phase III of the Project (or in a different project), with the strong backing of the MoJ. Part of this “proof of concept” should be contrasting how the 7 pilot VPCs have implemented (and improved upon) the original Poppy Project model. In fact, this process *should begin immediately* with the continuing collection of data and statistics that can inform M&E of the VPCs as they progress.

The Evaluation recommends that UNDP plan to conduct an expert in-depth mapping of how the VPC are operating in practice at the six-month point after the VPCs have begun accepting clients. This should be submitted by UNDP in final form to the Project’s Steering Committee by no later than end of Q1 2022.

The Evaluation urges UNDP to utilize the existing budget surplus and any NCE for the purpose of solidifying the impact of ILAP II and the effectiveness of the seven pilot VPCs before “scaling-up” these VPCs to additional provinces in Turkey. The Evaluation cautions UNDP and the Project from becoming overly ambitious at this point. Any new initiatives undertaken (including those resulting from a reallocation of the Project’s budget surplus), should be prioritized, and properly “scaled.

The Evaluation suggests that the Project utilize the remaining period of implementation to put systems in place for gathering statistics on referrals, clients, types of cases, severity of injuries, children, length of time between intake and resolution, ancillary services required (i.e., psycho-social support), etc. at the 7 Pilot VPCs.

The Evaluation recommends that if by the end of ILAP Phase II (including any NCE), an evidence-based analysis of the VPCs shows that have achieved “benchmarks” as a “proof of concept”, that UNDP and its Donor strongly consider continuing funding by way of a successor

**project (i.e., either ILAP Phase III or under a different perhaps innovative and expanded project); but with enhanced co-funding/budgetary commitments from the Government of Turkey and additional implementing partners beyond UTBA and MoJ.**

**The Evaluation recommends that the Project continue its support to trainings, including the planned Distance Learning System of the UTBA. In terms of the Projects Outcome 4, the Evaluation has suggested that UNDP may wish to consider exploring alternative approaches to performance management for legal aid and the VPCs if UTBA and Bar Associations cannot agree upon a common mechanism.**

---

The Evaluation is grateful to the many individuals who contributed their time and energy to this report, including making themselves available for interviews and supplying data and documents to the Evaluation. The Annex to the Evaluation includes a list of all stakeholders interviewed and the documents revised by the Evaluation as well as a copy of the Evaluation's Terms of Reference.

Richard H. Langan II  
New York

## **Introduction**

This is an independent Mid-term Evaluation of the Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase II Project (ILAP) that seeks to measure the expected results and specific objectives achieved until the mid-term of project duration against those stated in the Project and identifying the lessons learned which are relevant for the remaining portion of the project duration as well as to the planning, preparation and implementation phases of a possible subsequent project through the conduct of an evaluation mission.

The intended primary audience or users of the evaluation are UNDP, its donor Sida, the project signatories (the Turkey Ministry of Justice and the Union of Turkey Bar Associations) and the project's implementing partners (local Bar Associations, NGOs and CSOs), as well as other actors involved with legal aid in Turkey.

UNDP, Sida and the project's partners hope to gain insight and knowledge from the evaluation into where the project stands at its Midterm; the extent to which the project has contributed to solving the needs identified in its design phase; to measure and evaluate the project's degree of implementation, continued relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, contributions to gender and human rights; and prospects for the project's sustainability going forward. Furthermore, UNDP, Sida and the project partners hope to use the results of the Evaluation to adjust and prioritize the projects outputs and activities during the remaining period of its implementation; and laying the foundation for a possible continuation of the project in a subsequent phase. This includes the Evaluation's identification of best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability) and to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components.

The Project's design and intervention methodology are described in this report's sections on the Description of the Intervention and Evaluation scope and objectives.

The Evaluation report is structured to address OECD DAC evaluation criteria and respond to each of the evaluation questions contained in the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation. As described in more detail in this reports section on Methodology, the report includes information derived from interviews with key stakeholders, as well as a comprehensive review of all key project documentation, UNDP strategic documents and the Turkish Government's strategic development plans. This is further informed by the Evaluation's review of other publicly available sources such as reports of the European Union, international NGOs, and others. The report is designed to satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users to provide them guidance on how to adjust the project in the remaining period of implementation and to inform the design of a successor project or additional projects going forward.

## **Description of the intervention**

### **Context**

The Turkish legal system provides for legal aid in both criminal and civil matters via three main legislative enactments: The Code of Lawyers (that provides for the appointment of legal aid in civil and administrative cases); The Code of Civil Procedure, as amended (that provides for exemption from court fees upon application); and the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP)(that provides for the appointment of lawyers in criminal cases to defendants (Art. 150/1), as well as to victims and complainants)( Art 234).

The Union of Turkish Bar Associations (UTBA) and local Bar Associations in Turkey play a central role in the allocation of legal aid to beneficiaries both civil and criminal. In contrast to some other jurisdictions, in Turkey judicial authorities who conduct the investigation or prosecution lack the power to appoint defense counsel. These entities must formally request the appointment of defense counsel

from the bar—either by the authority that conducts the interview; or the judge who conducts the interrogation; or during the prosecution phase, upon request of the court. Thus, the role of the UTBA and Bar Associations in legal aid is paramount. Bar associations use automation systems to appoint lawyers. These systems are provided by the Union of Turkish Bar Associations or private firms.<sup>3</sup>

UTBA is an umbrella organization. Turkey has 81 provinces and there are 79 bar associations across the country. These bar associations are independent in their internal decisions making processes. They are extremely respected and powerful at the local level. The UTBA doesn't control the local bar associations but monitors their performance and elections and can suggest changes. In July 2020, the Turkish Parliament approved changes in the Attorney's Act permitting additional local bar associations to be formed in areas with large populations.<sup>4</sup>

Turkey has recently taken significant steps to enhance the availability of legal aid and access to justice, as reflected in the Judicial Reform Strategy of 2015-2020 that for the first time includes a focus on addressing the legal aid needs of vulnerable populations, including women and children. The new Judicial Reform Strategy of 2019-2023 continues to recognize that facilitating citizens access to justice is of paramount importance to the functioning of the judicial system and it endorses a "people-oriented" approach, enhanced communication mechanisms and a strengthened legal aid system; that is sensitive to the needs of vulnerable groups and strengthening the right to defense. Pursuant to these reforms, the Ministry of Justice's Judicial Support and Victims' Services Department undertook to implement measures such as the creation of Judicial Support Directorates and Judicial Interview Rooms.

In addition, Turkey has recently undertaken amendments to its Code of Civil Procedure; created information desks about legal aid at selected court houses; created a website for legal aid; and implemented a "law and justice" course in its elementary schools. The Ministry of Family and Social Services (MoFSS) has supported the establishment of Violence Prevention and Monitoring Centers (ŞÖNİMs) to provide support to victims of violence and monitor violence under Law 6284 to "Protect Family and Prevent Violence Against Women".

Turkey's judicial reform efforts have taken place within a context of Turkey's European Union (EU) Accession application and the EU's communications on EU Enlargement Policy, including those made between 2014 and 2020. These EU reports have been critical of Turkey in the areas of fundamental rights, independence of the judiciary, lengthy judicial review processes, availability of means of legal defense and legal aid.<sup>5</sup> Turkey continues to view EU Accession as an overall strategic goal, and this provides support for continued judicial reforms and strengthening legal aid. In cooperation with the EU, United Nations (U.N.) and other high-level international bodies, Turkey and its legal system have provided basic services to a large Syrian refugee population in Turkey.<sup>6</sup> Turkey's refugee population remains among the most vulnerable groups.<sup>7</sup> Civil Society Organizations in Turkey remain active and involved in public life—including providing legal aid to vulnerable groups, but human rights NGOs continue to face a challenging environment.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Source : ILAP Phase II Project Document pp. 5-6.

<sup>4</sup> The proposal of the Government to increase the number of bar associations caused enormous turmoil within Turkey's legal profession. Some members of the legal profession viewed the reforms as an attempt by the Government to dilute the influence of Turkey's largest established local bar associations. Lawyers demonstrated in opposition and 78 of 81 of the local Bar Associations signed a petition protesting enactment of the amendments and attempted to march on Ankara but were blocked by police. Nonetheless, Parliament approved and the changes to the law were published in the Official Gazette in July 2020. Tensions have lingered between the UTBA and the local Bar Associations since.

<sup>5</sup> See reports of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ).

<sup>6</sup> According to the EU Progress Report on Turkey 2020, "Turkey continues to host the largest number of refugees worldwide. According to Turkey's Directorate General of Migration, Turkey hosts 3,576,370 Syrian refugees with temporary protection status, some 100,000 Syrians with legal residency and 93,000 who have been granted citizenship. There are an additional 368,230 asylum seekers and refugees from countries including Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran and Somalia. In addition, in December 2019, 1,101,030 foreign nationals holding residency permits were present in Turkey, including humanitarian residence holders."

<sup>7</sup> EU Progress Report on Turkey 2020.

<sup>8</sup> See generally, EU Commission 2014 through 2020 report on Turkey, under the EU Enlargement Policy (i.e., "COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Turkey 2020 Report Accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions 2020 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy" [SWD/2020/355], et. al.

The EU has also noted that Turkey has relatively high rates of violence against women (VAW) and domestic violence.<sup>9</sup> A recent development impacting upon the rights of women victims of GBV and legal remedies available to them is Turkey's decision to withdraw from the Council of Europe Convention "on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence" (the "Istanbul Convention") (Treaty No. 210), signed on 11 May 2011. The "Istanbul Convention" is a landmark Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. The Convention also establishes a specific monitoring mechanism ("GREVIO") to ensure effective implementation of its provisions by the Parties.<sup>10</sup> The Government of Turkey denounced and formally withdrew from the Convention via a note verbal to the Council of Europe on 22 March 2021 and stating that it views Turkey's Constitution and domestic legislation as providing adequate protection against domestic violence and violence against women.<sup>11</sup> In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted the Turkish economy and increased challenges to women and vulnerable populations.<sup>12</sup>

According to reports of the EU, the global COVID-19 pandemic has also interrupted economic progress in Turkey since it had rebounded from a recession in summer 2018 and a sharp currency depreciation. By 2019 the country's current account balance had also begun to decline. Turkey's business and financial sectors have despite these challenges remained stable, but vulnerabilities continue to exist. The COVID-19 pandemic forced the Government to divert funds to the battle against the virus. Thus, there has been backsliding in administrative reforms.

## The Project

The UNDP "Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase II" (ILAP Phase II) Project builds upon the foundation laid by Phase I of the project. It has a project budget of \$1,407,859 US funded primarily by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and limited GMS funds for the period 01 June 2019 to 01 June 2022. The Project is administered by UNDP. The Union of Turkish Bar Associations is the primary implementing partner, with the inclusion of the MoJ and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) as additional project implementing partners and signatories. These entities are bolstered by the Project's Advisory Committee and a Project Steering Committee. The Project Document contains a Results and Resources Framework, Risk Log and Monitoring & Evaluation Log. A COVID-19 response plan was developed in the form of an Updated Risk Log for the Project in June 2020.

The Project supports UNDSC Outcome 2.1 (indicator 2.1.3) and the CPD Output 2.1.1 (Indicator 2.1.1.1.); UNDP's Strategic Plan 2018-2021; Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Goals 5 and 16 and their affiliated targets; the Government of Turkey's 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> National Development Plans; as well as the above referenced Ministry of Justice Strategic Plans. Additionally, the Project furthers Turkey's obligations to protect human rights and afford its citizens access to justice under the catalogue of international treaties to which Turkey has acceded, including the European Convention on Human Rights (i.e., Art. 6.3-c, *et. al.*) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (i.e., Art 14.3-d, *et. al.*) and multiple additional treaties.

Phase II's central objective is to develop more coordinated, qualified, and systematic approaches to legal aid practices in Turkey and build awareness on performance management tools and mechanisms to enhance access to justice.

---

<sup>9</sup> EU Commission 2018 Progress Report on Turkey.

<sup>10</sup> See Council of Europe Treaty Office, details of Treaty No. 201, available at, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/210> (last accessed 4 June 2021).

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.dailysabah.com/politics/diplomacy/turkey-has-all-means-against-domestic-violence-family-minister>.

<sup>12</sup> According to reports of the EU, the global COVID-19 pandemic has also interrupted economic progress in Turkey since it had rebounded from a recession in summer 2018 and a sharp currency depreciation. By 2019 the country's current account balance had also begun to decline. Turkey's business and financial sectors have despite these challenges remained stable, but vulnerabilities continue to exist. The COVID-19 pandemic forced the Government to divert funds to the battle against the virus. Thus, there has been backsliding in administrative reforms.

Phase II contemplates four main expected results:

- Result 1. (Coordination).
- Result 2. (System Development)
- Result 3. (Capacity Development)
- Result 4. Awareness Raising

The Project seeks to achieve this by improving coordination and networks between legal aid providers (i.e., Union of Turkish Bar Associations, provincial Bar Associations, and lawyers), women's NGOs and other CSOs. The Project also has capacity building and training outputs built-into its activities and outputs. It seeks to develop and pilot legal aid practices for improvement of services to GBV victims, women, and children and to develop performance criteria for Bar Associations.

Phase II was informed by the results of analysis conducted during an "Inception Phase" (at the end of Phase I) that analyzed gaps in the communication processes between bar associations and NGOs; identified locations for 7 Violence Prevention Centers (VPCs) in Denizli, Balıkesir, Samsun, Rize, Mardin, Antalya and Nevşehir.; and mapped needs for awareness raising about legal aid and available NGO/CSO providers operating in the field.

The VPCs are designed to act as legal aid support centers and offer counseling and assistance to individual victims of GBV. VPCs work with legal aid lawyers, CSOs and relevant public institutions at the local level including security forces, gendarmerie, provincial directorate of the Ministry of Health (MoH), governorates, district governorates, provincial director of migration offices, municipalities, chief prosecutors, and courts. The VPCs seek to adopt "Poppy Project" principals, including the provision of immediate point of service face-to-face legal aid counseling by volunteer lawyers to victims of GBV and domestic violence; and to provide referrals to social services CSOs and shelters supervised by the Ministry of Family and Social Services (MoFSS) when needed.<sup>13</sup>

The Phase I Needs Assessment Report cited Turkey's influx of refugees as a factor dictating a need for enhanced cooperation between NGOs, CSOs the UTBA, Bar Associations and lawyers. Phase II expands upon Phase I capacity building activities and aims to develop a well-defined training programme for legal aid lawyers. Phase II also seeks to develop and institutionalize performance criteria and evaluation mechanisms for legal aid lawyers. In addition, Phase II seeks to raise awareness of the UTBA's existing automated systems for the appointment of criminal defense lawyers (Code of Criminal Procedure appointed lawyers) that was developed with the support of Phase I.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Poppy Project is an initiative of the Ankara Bar Association begun in April 2011 designed as a mechanism to prevent domestic violence for women, children, elder population, persons with disabilities, LGBTQ, and refugees. Such services are rendered pursuant to Law 6284 to "Protect Family and Prevent Violence Against Women". Bar Associations involved in the initiative sign protocols with local municipalities and CSOs (i.e., such as Turkey's Federation of Women's Associations) to provide services. UNDP's ILAP Phase II Project essentially supports 7 pilot bar associations to adopt a "Poppy Project" model.

ILAP Phase II is comprised of the following Outcomes, Outputs, and Indicators:

### **ILAP Phase II Overall Outcomes**

<b>Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDCS/Country [or Global/Regional] Programme Results and Resource Framework:</b> 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. 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
<b>Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme [or Global/Regional] Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:</b> 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities 2.1.3. Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring 3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women's rights and gender sensitive policies including local level Indicative Output(s) with gender marker <sup>2</sup> : GEN 3

### **Project-level Outputs and Sub-Outputs (as of June 2020)**

*[Note: The original Phase II Project Document contained three Outputs. This was subsequently amended to provide for a fourth Output. In addition, the "Risks, Mitigation Measures and Assumptions" (Project Risk Log) of the Project Document were revised by the UNDP Project Team considering the COVID-19 pandemic].*

Outputs	Sub-Outputs
<b>Output 1 - Enhanced Coordination Between Women NGO's, Civil Society Organizations, Lawyers and Bar Associations to Improve the Legal Aid System in Turkey</b>	1.1 Networking and coordination practices
<b>Output 2 – Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations: Poppy Project practices</b>	2.1 Tailor-made Training Programme
	2.2 Trainings delivery (including ToT)
	2.3 Infrastructure Support and Upgrading of Pilot Bar Associations
	2.4 Communication and Outreach for each Pilot Bar Association
	2.5 Monitoring and Review of Local Poppy Practices (annual for 2020-2021)
<b>Output 3 – Enhanced Capacities of Lawyers Practicing Legal Aid Through a Tailor-made Training Programmes</b>	3.1 Training Needs Assessment for a tailor-made Online Training Programme on Legal Aid
	3.2 Preparation of Priority Modules on Legal-Aid for Online Training
	3.3 Preparation of Software Infrastructure for Online Training Programme
<b>Output 4 – Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers</b>	4.1 International Study Visits to Best Practices
	4.2 Implementation of Communication Plan for Awareness Raising on Performance Management and Automation System
	4.2.1 One-day National Conference
	4.2.2 Five Local Study Visits to Best Practicing Bar Associations



## **Evaluation scope and objectives**

According to its Terms of Reference, the independent mid-term evaluation seeks to measure the expected results and specific objectives achieved until the mid-term of project duration against those stated in the Project and identifying the lessons learned which are relevant for the remaining portion of the project duration as well as to the planning, preparation, and implementation phases of a possible subsequent project through the conduct of an evaluation mission.

The object of study for this evaluation is understood to be the set of components, specific objectives (outcomes), expected results (outputs), activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document(s) and in associated modifications made during implementation.

The midterm evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- To measure to what extent the project has contributed to solve the needs identified in the design phase until the mid-term of project duration.
- To measure project's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on expected results (outputs) and outcomes, against what was originally planned until the mid-term of project duration or subsequently officially revised.
- To measure the project contribution to the objectives set in the Country Program Document (CPD) of UNDP Turkey and United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS).
- To generate substantive evidence-based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability) and to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components.
- To evaluate progress against the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; and Crosscutting issues.

## **Evaluation approach and methods**

The Evaluation methodology adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The evaluation adopted an integrated approach involving a combination of data collection and analysis to generate concrete evidence to substantiate all findings. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support was triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on outcome and output indicators achievement, existing reports including UNDP reports and stakeholder interviews. The Evaluation did not use focus groups or surveys, as surveys of training participants were already undertaken by UNDP. Also, for other outputs of the Project (i.e., VPCs at the 7 pilot Bar Associations) sufficient time has not yet elapsed to generate a pool of persons to be interviewed via a survey.

The Evaluation methodology comprised the following elements:

- Review documents (Desk Review).
- Online Interviews with key stakeholders including government line ministries, development partners, civil society, and other relevant partners through a participatory and transparent process (i.e., WhatsApp; Zoom; email; etc.).
- Consultations with beneficiaries through online interviews.
- Triangulation of information collected from different sources/methods to enhance the validity of the findings.

In terms of Stakeholder/beneficiaries interviewed, a "Sampling methodology" of the Evaluation included contacting stakeholders at all levels (Government; UTBA; Bar Associations and women's NGOs/CSOs located in each of the 7 pilot locations) to ensure the widest geographic scope. Sampling was purposive and based on people UNDP identifies as interview rich respondents in relation to the evaluation questions. The Evaluation attempted to interview Bar Associations and women's

NGOs/CSOs in each of the locations that have a VPC supported by the Project. National level NGOs/CSOs were interviewed.

The following “Sampling Frame” illustrates examples of types of information derived from each category of stakeholders.

### Sampling Frame

Type of Stakeholder	Examples of information expected (*indicative only. Does not include all expected information)
UTBA	Overall project design UNDP’s convening role Quality of design of the project Ongoing levels of need Budget issues VPCs
Bar Associations	Quality of trainings Progress towards establishing the VPCs Legislative developments Communications Relationship between UTBA and Bar Associations The impact of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention on Law No. 6284. Types and #s of legal aid cases
NGOs/CSOs	The level of networks and referral mechanisms Information about Gender sensitivity at VPCs Types of issues and abuse faced by women in Turkey Effectiveness of communications between UTBA and the Bar Associations #s of women clients coming for legal assistance Evidence of +/- rates of VAW in Turkey Impact of COVID-19 on implementation Impact of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention. Quality of trainings and materials delivered by UNDP
UNDP, its Partners and Donor	Project management implementation issues Delivery rate Overall effectiveness and impact of the Project Sustainability

### Data Collection Tools

The Evaluation collected data via document review and internet searches, as well as stakeholder interviews. These interviews took place via the Zoom online platform. UNDP agreed to supply the services of an outside vendor to organize the Consultant’s meeting schedule, arrange for simultaneous translation from English to Turkish and to monitor each meeting for any technical difficulties. Follow-up via email and/or WhatsApp occurred to obtain any data requested during the interviews. The use of these technologies permitted the Evaluation to take place remotely during a time when the COVID-19 pandemic and its travel restrictions are in place. The Evaluation made rough and unedited transcripts of all interviews with the “Transcribe” app.

Interviews were in-depth, semi-structured interviews using Zoom. Semi-structured in-depth interviews are commonly used in evaluation. This method consists of a dialogue between evaluator and participant, guided by a flexible interview protocol, complemented by follow-up questions, probes and comments. Semi-structured interviews were selected because the method allows the evaluator to collect open-ended data, and explore participant thoughts, observations, and beliefs about an intervention. The evaluator addresses the evaluation questions and allows the evaluator to other data sources or validate findings through member checking (respondent feedback about research results).

For this Evaluation, questions were developed in advance the sequencing and wording of the questions modified by the evaluator to best fit the interviewee and interview context, with follow-up and probing questions dependent on the interviewee's responses. Interviews started with a context-setting question before moving to more in-depth questions. Data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously. Interviews also asked interviewees to supply additional documents when indicated. Where required, UNDP provided an interpreter familiar with the context.

Stakeholders interviewed included both men and women, national and regional actors and covered rural and urban geographic regions in Turkey. All measures were undertaken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants in line with the ethical guidelines of UNDP.

While some interviews included more than one interviewee, the fact that due to the COVID-19 pandemic the Evaluation was forced to conduct interviews remotely, in some instances precluded holding larger group meetings. This is a limitation of the interviews.

The Evaluation sought to answer all the Evaluation Questions posed by the Terms of Reference. The Evaluation used a variety of data sources including documents delivered to the Evaluation, internet sources and statistics maintained by the UTBA, Bar Associations and the Ministry of Justice. A transparent and participatory multi-stakeholder approach was followed for data collection from government partners, community members, private sector, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, etc. Evidence existed for every claim generated by the evaluation and data was triangulated to ensure validity to the extent possible.

UNDP opted for this Evaluation to be conducted from the Evaluator's home-base (New York), due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its related international and domestic travel restrictions.

### **Performance standards**

The Performance Standards used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions are the "Output Indicators" and "Target(s)" listed in the Project Document's RRF. In addition, because the RRF did not contain qualitative indicators for many of its outputs, the Evaluation has utilized the Project Document's articulation of the Project's Theory of Change and goals for each Output to compare what has been achieved at Mid-Term to what was planned/expected at the Project's design and initiation. The Evaluation developed its own evaluation questions for a few of the sub-outputs, based upon his knowledge of access to justice, legal aid, and human rights and international "best practices" pertaining to legal aid systems management, communication, advocacy, professional ethics for lawyers and client representation.

### ***Background information on the Evaluator***

*The Evaluator is a practicing lawyer, senior international development consultant and legal scholar with more than 23 years combined law teaching, law practice and international consulting experience. He is based in New York and is active in both the New York City Bar Association, the American Bar Association, and the International Bar Association. He has consulted to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies in more than 35 countries on project design, analysis, and evaluation. The Evaluator's professional biography is included in the Annex of this report.*

### ***Accessibility of data sources***

The Evaluation encountered no impediments to accessing stakeholders for interviews. UNDP hired an outside vendor to schedule a series of Zoom meetings between the consultant and stakeholders. The vendor monitored any connectivity or technical issues that arose during the interviews as well as provide for simultaneous translation from English to Turkish. In terms of data sources, the ability of the Evaluation to access data and records of stakeholders was limited and some data sources did not exist or had yet to be created (i.e., such as the performance monitoring system that was expected to be made operational by the UTBA and the data that was anticipated would be collected therefrom, which has apparently not occurred as of the Project's mid-term).

## **Resource requirements**

UNDP provided background materials for the Evaluation's review. UNDP and/or the relevant project partners facilitated meetings between the Evaluation and UNDP, UNDP's Partners, and other stakeholders. UNDP arranged translation services from Turkish to English when necessary. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Evaluation was conducted from Consultant's Home Base (New York), but Consultant is open to traveling to Turkey to conduct a final debrief with the UNDP Country Team if the situation allows.

## **Limitations**

The major limitations on this methodology were the amount of data, documents, and information available to the Evaluation for analysis; as well as the availability and abilities of stakeholders to participate in remote interviews.

It is the assessment of the Evaluation currently that all Phase II project Outputs were evaluable. It is noted that some activities planned for 2020 were delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its restrictions and may not have reached a stage where enough data is yet available to make any conclusions or recommendations for these delayed deliverables. A fundamental challenge of this Evaluation was to gather data on legal aid clients.

Another limitation was the lack of availability of some women's NGO's/CSOs for interviews; and a lack of overall statistics on the trainings and number of clients seen at the VPCs. Internet connectivity in some geographic areas of the country was limited causing delays in meetings and necessitating rescheduling.

## **Quality of the RRF**

The RRF contains outcome/ output indicators in some areas but is sparsely populated with detailed indicators in other areas. It was necessary for the Evaluation to formulate its own indicators for some output areas. Also, the Project partners did not collect sufficient data to date to service all indicators listed in its RRF (i.e., awareness raised on legal aid services due to public relation campaigns). The RRF also lacks Output Targets for all its Outputs. It does not fully reflect the Project's Theory of Change as articulated in the Project Document. Overall, the RRF can be viewed as a "lost opportunity" by UNDP to shape and guide the Project's implementation.

This said, no RRF can anticipate fully how a project will conform to its context and limitations that arise in the Project's implementation. UNDP supplemented the RRF with a risk log for the COVID-19 pandemic. In terms of this Evaluation, the lack of indicators in the RRF for some sub-outputs meant that the Evaluator had to supplement the Evaluation questions with some questions of his own. UNDP fully recognizes this as a "lessons learned" and informed the Evaluation that it will review the RRF in subsequent phases of the ILAP if approved.

The Evaluation suggests that portions of the RRF could be revised by the Project Steering Committee to take account of some of the challenges that the Project has encountered, particularly with regard Output 4 of the Project. (See this Evaluation's discussion of Output 4, *infra*).

### **Availability of baselines and monitoring data**

The Evaluation noted a lack of baseline and monitoring data for all outputs (i.e., number of monthly activity reports of the seven pilot bar associations). It is the assessment of the Evaluation that further data is required before the VPCs can be properly assessed and evaluated. It is noted that some activities planned for 2020 were delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its restrictions and may not have reached a stage where enough data is yet available to make any conclusions or recommendations for these delayed deliverables. A fundamental challenge of this Evaluation was to gather disaggregated data on legal aid clients.

### **Feasibility of attribution**

There are several factors that make attribution of results to ILAP Phase II somewhat difficult. First and foremost is the fact that Phase I of the project also included training and outputs that are similar in nature for legal aid. While ILAP Phase II is much narrower and more targeted in scope (i.e., focusing on women, violence against women/domestic abuse and children) it is difficult for some stakeholders to fully filter out which trainings were provided by Phase II only. This is true especially at the level of NGOs and CSOs who have benefited from trainings both under Phase I and Phase II.

Additionally, some of the Bar Associations already had strong pre-existing relationships with the civil society organizations within their provinces. Thus, it was difficult to measure UNDP's contribution or the contribution of the Project in this regard via its outreach activities and networks. This area was mostly assessed by the results of *qualitative interviews* and questions on the perception of the beneficiaries themselves. In addition, the relationship between the UTBA and Bar Associations has been strained in some cities during the 2020-2021 because of changes made to Turkey's "Attorneys Act". The extent to which networks have been improved between the UTBA, Bar Associations and NGO's/CSO's is hard to quantify.

Beyond this is the fact that there are other UNDP projects devoted to legal aid in Turkey. For example, the "Enhancing Access to Public Services and Recourse for Violence Against Woman (VAW) Survivors" project implemented by UNDP, MOJ, UTBA, and civil society organizations working in the field of women's rights and violence against women. This project had several outputs to ILAP Phase II, including supporting Bar Associations for improved legal aid service delivery and coordination. Another project also involving legal aid was the "Enhancing Access to Justice and Legal Aid for Refugees in Turkey" project that ended in December 2019. It focused on enhancing access to justice and legal aid for refugees and Turkey by capacity building awareness raising and training attorneys and other justice sector actors to deliver legal aid services.

The Evaluation found that UNHCR, UN women, and IOM each had legal aid related projects or initiatives-some jointly or in close cooperation with UNDP. These and other projects are listed on pages 34-36 of the ILAP Phase II project document. There are a total of 10 different projects listed in the Phase II project document that relate to addressing legal aid and women and or refugees. It is natural within this crowded space that interviewees may confuse what activities and outcomes are those of ILAP Phase II and what are those of other projects/partners delivering legal aid to women and refugees.

In addition, the UTBA and Bar Associations have also had their own projects related to legal aid and women victims of VAW and GBV. Foremost among these was the "Poppy Project" of the Ankara Bar Association in 2011. This project had many outputs that were *very similar* to the current project. In addition, MOJ has run its own training programs for courts and prosecutors in Turkey and on legal aid and the provision of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Civil Code. Beyond this is the fact that apart from donor-funded projects, the Bar Associations have a legal duty to provide legal aid and pre-existing practices (albeit informal and *ad hoc*) on providing legal aid. Most have informal relationships with NGOs/CSOs in their locations that predate the UNDP Project under evaluation and other donor interventions.

## Data analysis strategy

The data analysis strategy followed the same approach for the interviews and the desk review. The evaluator modified the data collection procedures and questions as the evaluation proceeded and maintained reflective memos throughout the data collection process. The general process for analyzing and interpreting the data was based on looking for patterns, identifying instances of agreement and divergent views based on the evaluation responses.

Analysis of evidence of gender mainstreaming was sought and included the extent to which gender expertise was part of the information and consultation inputs into Project formulation; how Project documents considered the potentially differential impact on men and women; how documentation reflected a gender mainstreaming approach.

The desk review included a review of risks and assumptions and pre/post training analysis of face-to-face training.

As is common in the development sector, assigning attribution to outcomes and higher-level outcomes and impacts was challenging. Especially for higher level outcomes there can be numerous intervening variables between the programme inputs and observed changes. Contribution analysis was used to address the extent to which it was reasonable to conclude outcome made a difference. This analysis was based on the logical framework, analysis of project documents and interviews and evaluating the extent to which the evidence was strong and logical where it was weak.

### ***“Traffic lights”***

The Evaluation has utilized a “traffic lights” system in its discussion of Findings against each of the Project’s Outputs and sub-outputs and stated in the RRF as a convenient “quick guide” for readers.

This system is as follows:

For the Evaluation’s overall assessment of each of the DAC-OECD criteria of **Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency** and **Sustainability**, as well as cross-cutting elements such as **Gender and Human Rights**, the Evaluation has used the following “traffic lights”:

<b>HIGH</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LOW</b>
-------------	---------------	------------

For the Evaluation's more detailed assessment of each of the Project's Outputs and sub-outputs under the RRF, the Evaluation uses the following "traffic lights":

<b>ACHIEVED</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that 100% or near 100% of the output has been achieved at the Project's midterm.
<b>ON TRACK</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that the output is substantially achieved and has good prospects for 100% implementation by the Project's end date and requires no adjustments.
<b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that the output is not yet substantially achieved and faces some risks and/or is delayed in some respect requiring attention from the Project and/or adjustments but is achievable by the Project's end date and within current funding levels.
<b>OFF-TRACK</b>	The Evaluation's overall assessment is that the output yet, has not yet been able to be initiated, is significantly delayed to the point that it will not be possible to achieve by the Project end-date and/or will require significant readjustments and/or additional funding to achieve.

## FINDINGS

### Relevance

**HIGH**

#### *Quality of Project Objective*

**The design of ILAP Phase II Project Document and its Theory of Change appear to be highly relevant to Turkey's development agenda, legal reform strategies and current development context.** The Project is designed to build upon ILAP Phase I, but with more narrowly focused outcomes and outputs focused on women, children and most vulnerable groups who have unmet legal aid and access to justice needs. Based upon its review of project documents and interviews with stakeholders, the Evaluation finds that the Project has strong support and approval of the Ministry of Justice, the UTBA, Bar Associations and members of civil society.

**The Project's Theory of Change appears logical and well framed. Each of its objectives seems to be realistic and measurable.**

The basic elements of the project's Theory of Change can be summarized as follows:

*ILAP Phase II is designed to further enhance the quality and access to legal aid services in Turkey through the development of a more coordinated, qualified, and systematic approach into legal aid practices, support the capacity building of legal aid providers and build awareness on the operation of performance management tools. If coordination is improved and networks expanded, access to quality legal aid services will be enforced and enhanced in Turkey. If "poppy project" principles are adopted and improved at the seven pilot bar associations, then women and vulnerable individuals will have access to justice through specifically trained lawyers. If online training materials are developed and*

*integrated into mandatory basic training for trainee lawyers in Turkey, then all new lawyers will have basic knowledge of provisions of legal aid for women, vulnerable groups and are better informed on domestic violence and applicable laws, regulations, and services available for these beneficiaries. If a performance management system is operational at the UTBA and Bar Associations for legal aid with clear performance criteria, then this will be a system that is in place to measure the quality of legal aid services.*

### ***The relevance of the Project's design to national priorities***

ILAP Phase II supports the United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) for Turkey (2016-2020): Outcome 2.1: 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. Indicator 2.1.3. (“% of the targets of the new Judicial Reform Strategy to promote and protect the rights of specific groups (women, youth, children) achieved (from 0% in 2016 to 4% by 2020”). As of this Evaluation UNDP is in the process of developing its new UNDCS (2021-2025) expected to be finalized by end of 2021, but will contain enhanced outputs for access to justice, human rights, most vulnerable groups, and women.

As further discussed in its project document, the Project is designed to support the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals 5 and 16, as well as Turkey's E.U. Accession Application and Negotiations (currently suspended by the EU Parliament over human rights and rule of law concerns).

ILAP Phase II supports the following outputs of the previous CPD (2016-2020) and the current CPD (2021-2025).

CPD 2016-2020 has the following outputs:

- 2.1.1. Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities
- 2.1.3. Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring
- 3.1.1. Capacities of national gender equality machinery strengthened to promote women's rights and gender sensitive policies including local level

CPD 2021-2025 has the following output:

- Output 4.2 Capacities and functions of judicial system, NHREI, Ombudsman Institution strengthened to expand access to justice and combat discrimination, with a focus on women and other disadvantaged groups

The project supports the above outputs of the CPD in that the seven pilot violence prevention centers represent and increased pathway for women victims of sexual and gender-based violence and others to gain access to justice and redress of legal issues impacting these vulnerable groups. The project and its networking activities have significantly enhanced the capacity of civil society actors to engage and plan both amongst themselves and their sister organizations, as well as to interact with Bar Associations who attended these networking events. The Bar Associations have continued to interact with the civil society actors regarding legal aid provision and vis-a-versa.

Nearly every single output of the project advances gender equality and the human rights of women and girls in some form-especially regarding redress for sexual based violence and domestic abuse. The project was informed by the input of the MoJ's special unit for gender-based violence. Beyond this, the project has included outputs for increasing the knowledge of women about their rights. Overall, the fact that the project includes amongst its partners the Ministry of Justice and the union of Turkish bar associations and has touched local government administration in the locations of the seven pilot violence prevention centers. The project contributes to building the capacities and functions of the



judicial system and expanding access to justice within this system for women and other disadvantaged groups. As stated elsewhere in this report the project supports Turkey's national development plan and judicial reform strategy.

***The extent to which the project contributed to Turkey's National Development Plan and Judicial Reform Strategy***

UNDP Turkey's Strategic Documents (CPD, UNDCS, etc.) and ILAP Phase II are each designed to support **Turkey's 10th National Development Plan (2014-2018)** Section 2.1.3.(c) Paragraph 188 Justice recognizes the importance of legal aid to a well-functioning judicial system, stating the objective: To improve the accessibility of justice, right of defense and judicial assistance will be enhanced.” **Turkey's 11th National Development Plan (2019-2023)** also includes objectives related to legal aid. [See Objective 2.5.1.1. on Justices Services that provides that the legal aid system will be rearranged ensuring that priority is given to vulnerable group in addition to other measures and reforms to promote fairness, equality of arms and access to justice].

**ILAP Phase II is highly relevant to Turkey's Judicial Reform Strategy (JRS) of 2015-2020 that includes objectives and targets for the legal needs of specific groups such as women and children; and Turkey's Judicial Reform Strategy (JRS) of 2020-2025 that contains even more details and robust targets for legal aid.<sup>14</sup>**

MoJ stressed to the Evaluation that one of its primary goals it to ensure that women have equal access to justice as victims per Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 234, which provides that victims of sexual assault crimes be afforded a lawyer from the UTBA/Bar Associations free of charge; but that the lawyers assigned by the Bar Associations are not always qualified to handle such cases (i.e., “best practices” in interviewing and communicating with women victims of VAW and GBV). The Project's trainings offer the possibility to improve the capacity of lawyers in Turkey for such cases.

**The 7 Pilot VPCs are viewed by MoJ and UTBA as an opportunity to institutionalize the legal aid process and add structure, oversight and incorporate best practices into the legal aid system in Turkey to afford women greater access to justice and human rights.** The MoJ believes that its “Judicial Support and Victim's Support Services Department” and the 7 pilot VPCs can synergize closely with each other. MoJ also indicated that the Project's relevance and effectiveness could be enhanced by working with the Judicial Support Centers (ADM) and the Forensic Interview Rooms supported by the MoJ and the Attorney General's Office (AGO).

ILAP Phase II's cross-cutting focus on gender (i.e., women victims of VAW and domestic abuse) is in line with all these strategic documents and UNDP's Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2021 and other documents. ILAP Phase II's other cross-cutting outputs for Conflict Reduction and the Environment are also relevant to the UNDP CPD, UNDCS and Turkey's NDP and Judicial Strategy. When women victims of domestic abuse and VAW have access to justice and effective legal aid, then they are more equipped to challenge this abuse and bring perpetrators to justice. The justice system fulfills both a corrective and a deterrent function (i.e., effective prosecutions deter others from committing such crimes).

**All stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation, including the MoJ, UTBA, Bar Associations and representative of NGOs/CSOs involved with the Project were unanimous in their assessment that ILAP Phase II is highly relevant to the needs of victims of domestic abuse and VAW, including women, children, LGBTQ, and the elderly.** The Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs state that the 7

---

<sup>14</sup> This was confirmed in the Evaluation's interview with a representative of the MoJ who stated that MoJ perceives that the Project's trainings, networking, support to legal aid and statistics are highly relevant to its JRS—especially those elements that pertain to legal aid, human rights, women, child rights, criminal law and, tangentially, court reform. JRS activity area 6 pertains to increased access to justice services and the quality of those services in Turkey—including sub-activity area 6.2 that pertains to support to legal aid for effective access to justice for citizens in Turkey; sub-activity 6.4(a) that pertains to achieving more effective protection of women's rights in the legal aid system. Also, apart from the JRS, the MoJ's “Human Rights Action Plan” Goal 6.3 discusses the effective use of remedies by women and access to legal aid. The MoJ strategies also envision a strong role for UTBA, which is a Project document signatory.

pilot VPCs are expected to allow these organizations to build upon legal aid practices that exist but are not yet formalized to the extent that they would constitute a true network.

**ILAP Phase II appears to have maintained a high level of political will on the part of the MoJ and UTBA (both signatories to the ILAP Phase II project document), as well as the local Bar Associations. A substantial level of enthusiasm exists amongst municipalities and local governates for the Project and the 7 pilot VPCs.**

For example, the MoJ points out that the Project is relevant not only to Turkey’s NDP and JRS, including court reforms, but also to the implementation of Turkey’s existing human rights treaty obligations. The Project has been implemented with a human-rights based lens and its outputs are all geared towards most vulnerable groups and women.<sup>15</sup>

**Overall, the Evaluation finds that the Relevance of the Project will continue to be enhanced by addressing the other two main problems and needs identified in the Project’s design: Awareness Raising on the performance management system and instituting better evaluation mechanisms.** These activities were not able to be taken forward during the COVID-19 pandemic and remained not implemented at the Project’s Midterm. According to UNDP Output 4 of the Project will be addressed during the remaining period of the Project’s implementation. [See below for a discussion of the specific activities contemplated under Output 4].

**UTBA and leaders of NGOs/CSOs perceive the Project to represent an unprecedented level of cooperation between Bar Associations and civil society around the topic of legal aid. ILAP Phase II is highly relevant to the needs of local communities in Turkey and victims of domestic abuse and VAW, including women, children, LGBTQ, and the elderly.** The 7 pilot VPCs are expected to build upon the existing legal aid practices of the Bar Associations but are not yet operational that they would constitute a true network amongst the VPCs themselves or among the Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs.

## Effectiveness

### Overall Effectiveness



**The Evaluation finds that to date, Phase II has contributed to solving several of the problems identified in the design phase of the Project and taking into consideration the “lessons learned” at end of ILAP Phase I.<sup>16</sup>**

**The Evaluation found that the Project—despite the setbacks and delays experienced because of the global COVID-19 pandemic—managed to complete by midterm many activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 of the Project. Meanwhile, the Project was laying groundwork for Output 3 which it began implementing only in April 2021. As of June 2021, Output 4 is currently being prepared to be implemented during the remainder of 2021 and into 2022. It is the assessment of**

<sup>15</sup> This assessment of the Project’s relevance was also voiced by UNDP and Sida in the Evaluation’s interviews with them. This is also evidenced by Project reports and Steering Committee meeting minutes.

<sup>16</sup> Phase I met some challenges in implementing an automated performance management system at the Bar Associations; developing performance criteria; developing a project website; and implementing better coordination mechanisms. At Phase I’s end, mainly four areas required further improvement for better legal aid services: coordination between stakeholders, building a coordinated system for services provision, enhancing the capacity of legal aid service providers and awareness raising on the performance management system and instituting better evaluation mechanisms. [Source: “Lessons Learned Report” Phase I]. The E.U.’s 2014 Progress Report on Turkey had previously identified these same challenges. ILAP Phase II’s Project Outputs and expected results and its Theory of Change seek to address these problems.

the Evaluation that UNDP project management continued to implement according to the Project's RRF despite these challenges.

UNDP management was able to deploy UNDP's comparative strengths and practice architecture in human rights, access to justice, rule of law and gender sensitivity to the Project. UNDP was also able to draw upon its experiences implementing several other UNDP projects with legal aid components, including the joint UNDP-UNHCR Project for Refugees discussed above.

***Key factors contributing the project's success or underachievement at Midterm***

As of the Project's Midterm, it is the Evaluation's assessment that the Project's Overall Successes include the following: i) The Project's continued ability to convene the Bar Associations and UTBA around the issue of legal aid; ii) The Project's Dialogues and Networking; iii). The extent of the Project's involvement of civil society; iv) The extent of the Project's involvement of local and municipal authorities; v) The Project's design's incorporation of the "Poppy Center" model best practices in the form of the "Guidelines" developed for the VPCs; and vi) The Project's online ToT and "Tailor Made" trainings that reflect best practices.

These are all discussed in more detail *infra*, but the Evaluation attributes the Project's success to date to several key factors including: i) UNDP's decision to include a broad-base of stakeholders in the design of the Project and its communication with all stakeholders; ii) UNDP's ongoing ability to adapt to the *force majeure* event of the global COVID-19 pandemic and political events in Turkey and its willingness to deploy remote technologies for this purpose; and iii) the Project's overall design and its relevance to the Government of Turkey's development agendas and strategic plans, as well as the needs of its end-beneficiaries (i.e., women) that has continued to ensure that the Project has received a high degree of political will from its Government partners (at both national and provincial levels), as well as enthusiasm from Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs in Turkey.

As of the Project's Midterm, it is the Evaluation's assessment that the areas of the Project requiring further improvement include the following: 1. The networking and referral systems envisioned by the Project need to become more institutionalized; 2. The Project needs to develop more detailed manuals and materials for practitioners; 3. The performance management system of Output 4, as well as the collection of data/statistics needs to be developed; 4. The justice and health care "chain" (local law enforcement; hospitals; etc. awareness) needs to become more involved in the Project and in legal aid networks; 5. The Project should advocate for the continued domestic enforcement of Law No. 6284, given Turkey's recent withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention; 6. The Project should hold discussions with the UTBA and MoJ surrounding remuneration for attorneys involved with VPCs; The Project should suggest reforms of Turkey's legal aid law as necessary to facilitate greater access to justice and legal aid for women and most vulnerable groups who are victims of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse; 8. The Project should continue to build-out the Project website, possibly adding a password accessed section for attorneys working at the VPCs.

***Good practices of the project that are transferable***

The groundwork has certainly been laid for a transferable model and lessons learned for establishing and capacitating the VPCs; structuring the Steering Committee; development of common "Guidelines" for the VPCs; networking opportunities for convening Bar Associations in conjunction with involving CSOs; and local officials. All are good practices and success stories that are potentially transferable to other projects and partners. Beyond this, the way UNDP and the Project have adapted to the risks posed by COVID-19 (i.e., by deploying online technologies) and to political developments in Turkey, including changes to the Attorneys Law (i.e., by continuing to be a "neutral"/apolitical) are also examples of "best practices" that are potentially transferable to other projects. As stated elsewhere in this Report, it remains to be seen how effectively and efficiently the VPCs will perform on a day-to-day basis, responding to clients with diverse needs and legal issues.

### ***The effect of COVID-19 measures on the achievement of project goals***

Overall, the COVID-19 pandemic negatively impacted the implementation rates of the Project (as reflected in the large budget surplus that exists as of June 2021). **At Mid-term, the project is effectively six to nine months behind “schedule”.** The COVID-19 pandemic caused UNDP to examine the Project’s associated risks more closely. A new Risk Log was drafted as a result. Beyond this, UNDP was forced to adapt to this new reality and the Project availed itself of online technologies to deliver workshops and trainings. This can be seen as a positive effect of the COVID-19 measures. Online events and course offerings hold the potential to be more inclusive (as they are not limited to the seating capacity of a physical site) and can be more easily scaled-up.

Stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation, including the women’s NGOs/CSOs, cite *unofficial and anecdotal evidence* that the incidence of VAW and domestic abuse of women has greatly increased during the COVID-19 pandemic. Also, those Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs that have “hotlines” for victims report increased numbers of callers during the pandemic. This reported “spike” in VAW/GBV and domestic abuse, if accurate, makes the Project even more relevant. The Project’s website has served as a source of knowledge and a reference for abused women.

### ***The extent to which the project created synergy/linkages with other projects and interventions in Turkey***

The Project was designed with clear synergies in mind and appears to have achieved some significant synergies by its Midterm. At a meta-level, the Project has synergized with the “Poppy Project” begun in 2011 by the Ankara Bar Association—despite the fact that Ankara Bar Association is not a member of the Project’s Advisory Committee. The guidelines for the 7 pilot VPCs developed by the ILAP Phase II expert-consultants appear to follow the “Poppy Center” model, but in a more enhanced form.

The Evaluation finds that the Project also appears to have synergized effectively with the existing legal aid programmes of Bar Associations at the 7 pilot locations. Several of these Bar Associations, had well-developed legal aid programmes prior to ILAP Phase I and ILAP Phase II. The same can be said for the NGOs/CSOs involved with the VPCs. The Evaluation found it difficult, however, to obtain statistics and data from the Bar Associations and NGO/CSO partners disaggregated by type of client and case.

The Project appears to have synergized with two other UNDP-U.N. projects in particular: i) the UNDP-UNHR Joint project that ended in December 2019; and ii) the UNDP VAW Project that began in January 2021 and is continuing currently with a budget of \$300,000. The Evaluation recommends that the Project continue to seek opportunities for cooperation between UNDP and other members of the UNCT—especially with U.N. Women. U.N. Women informed the Evaluation that it was open to such cooperation.

## Effectiveness: Results across the Project's RRF

Overview of Progress at Project Mid-term		
Output	Overall Progress	Evaluation Assessment
Output 1 - Enhanced Coordination Between Women NGO's, Civil Society Organizations, Lawyers and Bar Associations to Improve the Legal Aid System in Turkey.	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Sub-output 1.1. (Networking and coordination practices) is rated as <b>ACHIEVED</b> as against the Project RRF, but other aspects of networking and communication of the Project (See below) require further work.
Output 2 – Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations: Poppy Project practices	<b>ON TRACK</b>	Sub-output 2.1 and 2.2 (Tailor made trainings and ToT) are <b>ACHIEVED</b> ; Sub-outputs 2.3 (Infrastructure Support and Upgrading of Pilot Bar Associations) and 2.4 (Communication) are <b>ON TRACK</b> ; Sub-output 2.5 (Monitoring of Local Poppy Practices) is rated as <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b> .
Output 3 – Enhanced Capacities of Lawyers Practicing Legal Aid Through a Tailor-made Training Programme	<b>ON TRACK</b>	Sub-outputs 3.1 (Training needs assessment); 3.2 (Preparation of priority modules on legal aid); and 3.3 (Preparation of Software infrastructure for online training) are <b>ACHIEVED</b> . Sub-output 3.4 (# of training modules developed) is <b>ON TRACK</b> ; Sub-Outputs 3.5 (# of analysis reports) and 3.6 (# of lawyers issued training certificates for completion of the online training) are rated as <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b> .
Output 4 – Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers	<b>OFF-TRACK</b>	Sub-output 4.1 (International Study Visits to Best Practices) is <b>OFF-TRACK</b> . Sub-Output 4.2 (Implementation of Communication Plan for Awareness Raising on Performance Management and Automation System) is rated as <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b> . Sub-output 4.4 (Awareness raising among Bar Associations on performance management) is <b>OFF-TRACK</b> .

## Output 1

Output 1 - Enhanced Coordination Between Women NGO's, Civil Society Organizations, Lawyers and Bar Associations to Improve the Legal Aid System in Turkey.	
Sub-Output	Progress at Mid-Term
Output 1.1 Networking and coordination practices Output Indicator 1.1: Number of regional workshops Target: 2 regional workshops	ACHIEVED

### *Networking and coordination practices between NGOs/CSOs, Lawyers and Bar Associations (Output 1.1)*

As of the ILAP Phase II project design phase, a key issue was—Coordination—and the need to inform Bar Associations about the NGOs working in the field in their regions and their level of capacity.<sup>17</sup> The Project is designed to build upon the achievements and results of the “Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey” Phase I. As discussed in more detail below, **as of June 2021, and notwithstanding the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic in Turkey and significant political and legislative developments, the Project has managed to convene high-level stakeholders (i.e., the UTBA, MoJ and Bar Associations) around a common objective of enhancing networking and coordination of legal aid for women and vulnerable groups.**

**The Evaluation found that UTBA and leaders of NGOs/CSOs perceive the Project to represent an unprecedented level of cooperation between Bar Associations and civil society around the topic of legal aid. Yet there is room for improvement Bar Association coordination for legal aid has tended to occur rather *ad hoc* up until now. Although it is not apparent to the Evaluation that the envisioned coordination committees or “Bar Management Boards have yet been established by the Bar Associations. The Evaluation found evidence that coordination is nonetheless taking place at the Bar Associations specifically for legal aid and it *does appear* that each Bar Association has a clear focal point for the Project and the pilot VPCs.**

The Evaluation’s interviews with the Bar Associations could not find evidence of coordination committees or “Bar Management Boards” yet being established specifically for the 7 pilot VPCs; but it *does appear* that each Bar Association has its own “systems” for handling legal aid requests and clear focal points for legal aid within the Bar Association (and for the Project and each VPC). These are organized to varying degrees and include *ad hoc* mechanisms and coordination.

Bar Associations state that communication and coordination with the NGOs/CSOs remain largely *ad hoc* as of June 2021. All the Bar Associations seems to want to become more institutional, and they stress that the project was hindered and delayed due to COVID-19 and political events. The Evaluation recommends that UNDP and the Project examine in more detail how the Bar Associations are organizing “Bar Management Boards” per Article 6 of the VPC (SÖM) Directive drafted by the Project and annexed to the Project’s “Project Narrative and Financial Progress Report” (June 2019-June 2020). The Bar Associations all credit the Project for strengthening their contacts with civil society in Turkey.

**NGOs/CSOs interviewed by the Evaluation confirmed that as of June 2021, most communication and referrals between NGOs and the Bar Association remain *ad hoc* and based on informal (and often preexisting personal) contacts. The Evaluation found that these networking and coordination mechanism were operating in both directions (especially given the fact that the NGO/CSO lawyers are themselves members of the Bar Association and UTBA) albeit in an *ad hoc* manner. NGOs interviewed stated that they contact the Bar Associations when their clients require legal aid services. It is the impression of the Evaluation (based upon its interviews with**

<sup>17</sup> The Project’s design phase identified several needs and problems. These consisted of the need to develop a more coordinated, qualified, and systematic approach to legal aid practices in Turkey and build awareness on the operationalization of performance management tools and mechanisms to enhance access to justice. This was to be achieved by better coordination and improving networks among legal aid service providers to address high rates of VAW and domestic abuse of women in Turkey. This is principally to be affected by the Project’s establishment of 7 Violence Prevention Centers pilot locations lead by the UTBA in partnership with MoJ and seven local Bar Associations.

**the NGOs/CSOs and Bar Associations) that the NGOs could communicate with the Bar Associations within a more *formalized* structure. The VPCs are expected to add structure and uniformity to this process as well as increase access to justice for women.**

As of midterm, the Project is partnering with 20 NGOs/CSOs who are fully focused on working on women's rights and women's empowerment. Some of these NGOs such as the Turkish Women's Union and Woman Associations Federation of Turkey have strong relationships with Turkish cooperatives and trade unions (i.e., farmers and textiles workers, etc.) which can form part of a referral network. Sida also recommends involvement of more CSOs working on VAW, GBV such as Purple Roof, WWHR and KAMER, as well as other UN agencies like UN Women, UNHCR and UNICEF. **All NGOs/CSOs interviewed by the Evaluation state that they plan to refer cases and clients to the Project supported VPC in their respective regions.**

**The Project's design envisioned that there would be close cooperation between the 7 pilot VPC's and the existing network of shelters-violence prevention centers of the MoFSS called SÖNİM. Informally, the NGOs/CSOs and Bar Associations have working relationships with the MoFSS and regularly refer VAW/GBV clients in need of shelter to the SÖNİMs. It is too early to assess how the Project supported VPCs at the 7 pilot locations will operate in practice on a day-to-day basis vis-à-vis collaboration with the SÖNİM. It would greatly inform the Project to have input from the Ankara Bar Association as to how its Poppy Centers have interacted with the SÖNİM.**

*The extent to which public authorities and officials at the local level became involved in the networking and coordination practices of the Bar Associations*

According to the Evaluation's interviews (with UTBA, Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs), local officials have been very helpful in identifying locations for several of the VPCs. UTBA and NGOs/CSOs also stated that local officials have demonstrated significant political will to improve the legal aid services in their cities and provinces. MoJ and UTBA state that there were no problems or resistance experienced by the Project from local authorities and officials. The Evaluation confirmed that communication and cooperation routinely occur between Bar Associations, NGOs/CSOs and their municipalities.<sup>18</sup>

In terms of visibility, **the Project's website was significantly improved by Mid-term and in fact now forms an integral part of the VPC's and Project's victim outreach.** The website is dynamic and appears to incorporate practical information for victims of VAW and domestic abuse envisioned in the General Framework for the Project Website presented at the First Steering Committee Meeting in March 2020. The website includes contemplated elements providing victims with information about the Pilot Bar Associations and VPCs, including allowing victims to book an appointment or to report violence that they witness as discussed below. The website has the potential to promote the Project's visibility and sustainability.

According to UNDP, the visibility of the Project will be enhanced by Activity 2.5 when the Project begins implementing this activity at the end of 2021. To date, however, the Project has not issued any press releases of its own accord but has relied upon UNDP's Communications Department to filter information about the Project to the press due to the politically sensitive nature of some of the issues involved.

**The Evaluation found that more awareness-raising could be undertaken, with NGOs involved to educate local officials, doctors, police, mukhtars, citizens and NGOs about the Project.**

---

<sup>18</sup>Note: For some examples on how Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs manage and communicate for legal aid, including interactions with municipal and local officials, see, "Mapping of Bar Association and NGO/CSO Management, Coordination and Communication for Legal Aid" in the ANNEX to this Evaluation Report.

### ***Statistics on the number of legal aid referrals and case management***

It is far too early, for this Evaluation to make any findings about legal aid referrals because of the Project's support to networking and coordination practices. As of June 2021, the VPCs had not yet begun seeing enough "live" clients (or tracking these cases and statistics) to make any attribution possible between ILAP II's networking and coordination outputs and an increase in legal aid referrals. This is compounded by the fact that the incidence of VAW and GBV are perceived to have risen because of the COVID-19 pandemic and its restrictions on movement and economic activity within Turkey. UTBA, MoJ and UNDP's donor Sida, believe that more statistics are required on the VPCs and their operation.

## **Output 2**

<b>Output 2 – Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations: Poppy Project practices</b>	
Outcome Target: 7 Violence Prevention Centers established.	
<b>Sub-Output</b>	<b>Progress at Mid-Term</b>
<b>Output 2.1 Tailor-made Training Programme</b> <b>Output Indicator 2.1: # of trainees participating in trainings</b>	<b>ACHIEVED</b>
<b>Output 2.2 ToT Training Programme</b> <b>Output Indicator 2.2.: 70 trainees participated in ToT</b>	<b>ACHIEVED</b>
<b>Output 2.3 Infrastructure Support and Upgrading of Pilot Bar Associations</b> <b>Output Indicator 2.3: 7 pilot bars designed to implement poppy services (refurbished, equipped and organized).</b>	<b>ON TRACK</b>
<b>Output 2.4 Communication and Outreach for each Pilot Bar Association</b> <b>Output Indicator 2.4: Awareness raised in terms of legal aid services and Poppy practices through PR campaigns in 7 pilot bars</b>	<b>ON TRACK</b>
<b>Output 2.5 Monitoring and Review of Local Poppy Practices (annual for 2020-2021)</b> <b>Output Indicator: 2.5: Number of promotion materials and informative videos circulated for 7 pilot bars</b>	<b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ DELAYED</b>

### ***Tailor-made Training Programme (Output 2.1) and ToT Training Programme (Output 2.2)***

By 1<sup>st</sup> June 2021, the Project had completed its ToT and "tailor-made" trainings. The target group comprised those lawyers expected to participate in the 7 pilot VPCs, as well as additional members of the Bar Associations and others. UNDP, the Project, UTBA, Bar Associations, MoJ and Sida observed the trainings at various point.

Content for the online trainings were developed by the Project's expert consultant for ToT and tailor-made trainings.<sup>19</sup> In addition to the on-line trainings, UNDP developed and will deliver hard copies of the three training guidebooks to the Bar Associations and NGOs.

In total, according to figures supplied to the Evaluation by UNDP, \*244 lawyers received training (either ToT or tailor-made"), comprising 182 women and 62 men under RRF Activity areas 2.1 and 2.2. Approximately 70 lawyers received ToT trainings, and the balance (approximately 174 received "tailor-made" trainings. This would appear to approach expectations that were established by the Project that had estimated it could supply 70 lawyers with ToT trainings and 210 lawyers with "tailor-made"

<sup>19</sup> The expert benefited from discussions held during the 1st Regional Workshop on 10 March 2020, as well as from an earlier needs assessment conducted in May 2019 (under ILAP (SILA) Phase I). This feedback from the Bar Associations and NGOs indicated that the trainings should cover among other topics how to approach and interact with clients who are victims of VAW and GBV.



trainings.<sup>20</sup> The training curriculum covered national and international legislation, social services, gender equality, psychology, and educational techniques.<sup>21</sup>

**The Evaluation found that stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation including MoJ, UTBA and the NGOs/CSOs were highly satisfied with the trainings and felt that they were practice-oriented, interactive, and designed to equip lawyers with the knowledge and skills necessary to represent women, victims of VAW and GBV, domestic violence and cases involving children. The Bar Associations and UTBA informed the Evaluation that they have used the trainings in their work with women victims of VAW and GBV.<sup>22</sup>**

### ***Infrastructure Support and Upgrading of Pilot Bar Associations (Output 2.3)***

The Project facilitated the planning and establishment of VPCs at seven pilot locations, which has required the strong cooperation of local Bar Associations, municipal and local authorities and NGOs/CSOs. **As of mid-July 2021, six of the seven VPCs had become fully operational and were ready to accept clients. These are, respectively, Denizli, Samsun, Balıkesir, Mardin, Antalya and Rize.** The Evaluation confirmed with each Bar Associations, that these centers are expected to soon open their doors to legal aid clients via referrals from the Bar Associations, colleagues and NGOs/CSOs and local law enforcement and municipalities. The 7<sup>th</sup> pilot VPC in Nevşehir had been delayed but was expected to be installed in premises identified by the municipality soon.<sup>23</sup> The Evaluation also encourages UNDP and the Nevşehir Bar Association to closely monitor this situation.

Establishment of the VPCs was a highly collaborative endeavor between UTBA, local Bar Associations, UNDP, local authorities (mayors and Governors) and civil society organizations. In addition to a mapping exercise, UNDP developed “guidelines” for the VPCs in conjunction with its partners; and deployed its Project Manager to each of the seven field locations, despite the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic in order that this aspect of the Project was implemented in a manner consistent with the Project Document.<sup>24</sup>

### ***The extent of incorporation of the “Poppy Seed Center” model at the 7 pilot VPCs***

**At the Project’s mid-term it is somewhat difficult to fully assess the extent to which the 7 pilot VPCs are operating according to the Poppy Project guidelines.<sup>25</sup>** The outputs designed by the Project’s expert consultants (i.e., “VPC Guidelines” and “Gender Action Plan”) appear to the Evaluation to incorporate the “Poppy Center” model. Two of the expert consultants hired by the Project were intimately involved with the design of the Ankara Bar Association’s original “Poppy Center” and were able to draw upon this experience for the Project. Furthermore, stakeholders interviewed by the

---

<sup>20</sup> The figures supplied by UNDP were roughly confirmed by the Bar Associations during the Evaluation’s interviews. [\*Note: The Evaluation received a separate report from UNDP that stated that a total of 258 lawyers had received training under the Project].

<sup>21</sup> The Project had originally intended to deliver “live” trainings but was forced to adapt under the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic and deliver the trainings online. (Note: The Project has benefited from the experience of offering online trainings, which is helping influence its design of a new “distance learning” system for the UTBA discussed below under Output 3, expected to be established by December 2021).

<sup>22</sup> The Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs interviewed by the Evaluation expect that the trainings will benefit their lawyers’ work at the VPCs, enhance the professional nature of their work and abilities to act as a “bridge” between the VPCs (i.e., victims of VAW) and the courts and their knowledge of the “psychology” of violence and abuse. A few of the Bar Associations expressed the view to the Evaluation that the trainings could have been more in-depth and at a higher level of detail/sophistication in terms of their academic content.

<sup>23</sup> As of mid-June, only the VPC in Nevşehir was not yet operational due to delays in finding a building to house the center and install furniture and IT equipment. The Nevşehir Bar Association lacks space itself to house the VPC and has been in negotiations over the past year with the municipality to find a space, with the assistance of the Project. The Nevşehir Bar Association informed the Evaluation that UNDP was always accessible and supportive of this process and instrumental in facilitating negotiations with the municipality. A space was initially identified by the municipality, but the local municipal elections and change of mayor in Nevşehir have resulted in delays and the Nevşehir Bar Association lost that space. As of mid-July 2021, the new mayor is actively trying to find a new space for the VPC and the Project is closely monitoring the situation. Currently, all the furnishings and equipment have been delivered for the space and are waiting to be installed.

<sup>24</sup> The Project also interacted with the MoI, but as of Midterm has yet to convince the MoFSS to formally engage with the VPCs. Perhaps this will improve now that UNDP and its partners have agreed on a name for the VPCs that avoids confusion with the MoFSS SÖNİM.

<sup>25</sup> The VPC Guidelines (designed by the Project’s Gender Expert) were finalized in January 2020. UNDP held a first coordination meeting on 4 November 2019 where it presented the draft VPC Guidelines and collected feedback from representatives of the Bar Associations. Thereafter, UNDP conducted visits to the 7 pilot locations to finalize the infrastructure analysis and sites where the VPC were to be housed. Technical specifications (i.e., furniture; IT, etc.) for each of the 7 VPC were developed by the Project’s consultant and discussed and approved at the Project’s coordination and steering committee meetings. [Note: UNDP informed the Evaluation that this is an ongoing process to be informed by a GBV analysis NGOs and the municipalities for this purpose].

Evaluation including the UTBA, MoJ, Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs confirm that it remains the vision of the Project and its partners to run the VPCs according to “Poppy Project” principals.

**The Evaluation recommends that UNDP continue to try to involve the Ankara Bar Association in the Project.**<sup>26</sup> The Evaluation observes that the Ankara Bar Association (the originator of the Poppy Project model) has no official capacity or role in the Project. It was suggested to the Evaluation by Sida, UN Women and other Stakeholders that it would be extremely valuable for the Project to know how the Ankara Bar Association interacted with the MoFSS regarding the SÖNİM, as well as how the Ankara Bar Association utilized NGOs/CSOs on a day-to-day basis.

#### ***Communication and Outreach for each Pilot Bar Association (Output 2.4)***

##### ***The extent and quality of communication mechanisms between the CSOs and the Bar Associations***

The Evaluation found that the Project had met its targets for Activity 2.4 as of mid-term to the extent possible, given the restrictions of COVID-19 and delays in implementation. A Communication and Outreach Plan has been prepared for Activity 2.4 Project by the Project’s Communications Expert in the form of a Communication Framework along with Communication Elements within the Scope of Gender. In its interviews for the Evaluation, UTBA noted that the Project’s Communications Expert is well-connected with the largest trade union in Turkey and that the unions might serve as a mechanism to communicate the Project to women going forward.

**The Evaluation found that the Project website was operational as of September 2020 and that the Project has continued to make it more robust up to June 2021, containing information about the Project, the VPCs, the definition and characteristics of violence; information for victims about how to report violence and obtain legal aid and social assistance; and information for witnesses on how to report violence. The website is continually updated.**

The website also contains information and updates about key activities of the Project such as meetings of its Advisory Committee, as well as news. UNDP plans to continue to enhance the website during the remaining period of implementation of the Project. For example, a section of the website “Document Center” is not yet populated with documents as of June 2021.

**The Evaluation suggests that UNDP and the Project consider having a dedicated part of the website for the volunteer attorneys of the VPCs to report statistics on their cases (while protecting the confidentiality of their clients), network with each other and/or access research materials. This could be a password protected page available only to attorneys who volunteer their time to a VPC.**

**The Evaluation found that the Project had also produced various public relations materials in adherence to its Communication Action Plan. This enhanced the Project’s visibility.** For example, at the regional workshop, the Communication Expert prepared a news article to be added in the project website as well as a tweet and furthermore, a package that included documents regarding the activities of each participating NGO as well as an informative document about the project alongside visibility materials distributed to all participants for enhancing the knowledge and coordination between NGOs and with the project. Also, upon request, 100 more of these packages were sent to Denizli Women’s Rights Protection Association to be disseminated in Denizli. The Bar Associations anticipate that these measures will enhance visibility of the VPCs at national and provincial levels.

---

<sup>26</sup> UNDP’s donor Sida has repeatedly encouraged UNDP to bring the Ankara Bar Association to the table and UNDP has tried. UNDP has not, however, despite its best efforts, been able to convince its implementing partners UTBA and MoJ to include the Ankara Bar Association in the Project’s Advisory Committee, nor convince the Ankara Bar Association to participate in Project activities beyond its director giving a speech at the 1st Regional Workshop. This situation should be reevaluated by the Project following the long anticipated UTBA elections in fall 2021.

### ***Monitoring and Review of Local Poppy Practices at the 7 Pilot Bar Associations (Output 2.5)***

It is far too early for the Evaluation to fully assess the relevance of the VPCs towards the end-beneficiaries (i.e., women legal aid clients who are victims of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse, as well as other vulnerable groups). The Evaluation encourages UNDP to view the 7 pilot VPCs as a “Proof of Concept” with a view towards scaling-up the pilot VPCs to all of Turkey’s 81 provinces in a subsequent Phase III of the Project (or in a different project), with the strong backing of the MoJ. Part of this “proof of concept” should be contrasting how the 7 pilot VPCs have implemented (and improved upon) the original Poppy Project model. Such analysis can be better informed with more information from the Ankara Bar Association on how the Poppy Project at Ankara ultimately evolved over time, including its issues, challenges, methods, and successes.

Thus far, Project M&E appears to have come in the form of the Project’s 1st Advisory Committee Meeting (held in Ankara 10 March 2020), and its 1st Steering Committee (held in Ankara on 11 March 2020), as well as in the reports presented to UNDP’s Partners and its Donor Sida at these events (i.e., See, “Project Progress and Narrative Report” covering the period June 2019-June 2020; as well as minutes from the Advisor Committee meeting and Steering Committee meeting). UTBA believes that it will be necessary to conduct M&E of the VPCs once they have become fully operational for a period of months to assess if they are adhering to the “Poppy Practices” and whether or not “bottlenecks” exist in the system. (See above discussion of the Communication Action Plan). UNDP informed the Evaluation that it plans to conduct such monitoring at the end of 2021. As suggested elsewhere in this Report, the Evaluation encourages UNDP to begin this process immediately.

The Evaluation finds the VPC Guidelines developed by the Project to be solid and reflective of best practices relating to providing counseling and legal services to victims of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse, as well as the practical organization of the VPCs and their management. The VPC Guidelines establish how the Bar Associations are to staff and exercise supervision over the VPCs. It makes clear that the VPCs are to be governed by each Bar Association that is to appoint the lawyers, trainee lawyers and staff required for the VPC. Importantly the Guidelines also contain a section discussing violence and its forms, including physical violence, psychological violence, Sexual violence, and economic violence. Information is also provided as to how victims can access legal aid.

### ***Generating a data system for the Bar Association***

**As discussed above, the Evaluation finds that as of its midterm, the Project does not appear to have yet achieved laying groundwork for a data generating system for Bar Associations.** As of mid-July 2021, there is no disaggregated data yet available for clients at the 7 pilot VPCs. This is something that the Evaluation highly encourages the Project to design and make operational; but this appears, however, to be an extremely difficult output to achieve.<sup>27</sup>

### ***The Evaluation finds that monthly reporting by the Bar Associations to UNDP could be improved.***

As of the Project’s midterm, it does not appear that all the 7 pilot Bar Associations have followed a practice of submitting regular monthly activity reports to UNDP. This is likely due to the delayed implementation because of COVID-19 and the fact Now that the 7 pilot VPCs are capacitated, it is imperative that Bar Associations submit monthly activity reports, documenting the performance of the VPCs and referral, networking, and outreach mechanisms.

---

<sup>27</sup> UTBA informed the Evaluation that it previously attempted to gather detailed statistics from all Bar Associations about legal aid and found this to be extremely difficult. UTBA was ultimately unsuccessful in its attempt to gather comprehensive statistics on legal aid from all Bar Associations, despite its best efforts to do so. UNDP has obtained statistics from some of the Bar Associations for legal aid in years 2019, 2020 and 2021. *Disclaimer: UNDP obtained statistics from some of the Bar Associations for legal aid in years 2019, 2020 and 2021. This data is not comprehensive. The methodologies utilized by the various bar associations to collect this data were not supplied. The Evaluation cannot verify the accuracy of the data or its completeness. The Evaluation is not able to make any attribution to UNDP or the ILAP II in connection with this data. The ILAP II VPCs had no operational history as of the date of the Midterm Evaluation and data is not disaggregated by the 7 pilot VPCs or to be taken as an indication of the Project’s effectiveness. The data supplied does not include disaggregated data for gender, types of cases and issues, or the ultimate disposition/resolution of the cases.*

The Evaluation suggests that UNDP convene a meeting as soon as possible to discuss how to begin to collect data from all VPCs at the very beginning of this intervention and the VPCs operations, rather than wait till end of 2021. It is extremely important that UNDP begin to collect data from the very outset of operations to inform M&E.<sup>28</sup>

As discussed elsewhere in this Report, the Evaluation recommends that UNDP prepare to conduct an expert in-depth mapping of how the VPCs are operating in practice. This needs to occur at the end of 2021 or in early 2022. Such a mapping should reference the VPC Guidelines designed by the Project as a starting point and examine each VPC to assess how it is operating on a day-to-day basis and the extent to which it is adhering to the guidelines in practice; whether the lines of communication and referral networks are working as expected and to identify possible “bottlenecks” and problems within the system.

### Output 3

Output 3 – Enhanced Capacities of Lawyers Practicing Legal Aid Through a Tailor-made Training Programme	
Output Target: Lawyers capacities enhanced through developed training programs	
Sub-Output	Progress at Mid-Term
Output 3.1 Training Needs Assessment for a tailor-made Online Training Programme on Legal Aid Output Indicator 3.1: Number of needs assessment report	ACHIEVED
Output 3.2 Preparation of Priority Modules on Legal-Aid for Online Training Output Indicator 3.2: Number of training programs developed	ACHIEVED
Output 3.3 Preparation of Software Infrastructure for Online Training Programme Output Indicator 3.3: Number of desk reviews conducted	ACHIEVED
Output 3.4 Number of training modules developed for online trainings. Output Indicator 3.4: Number of training modules developed for online trainings	ON TRACK
Output 3.5 Number of analysis reports Output Indicator 3.5: Number of analysis reports	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ OR DELAYED
Output 3.6 Number of lawyers issued certificates for their completion of training programs Output Indicator 3.6: Number of lawyers issued certificates for their completion of training program	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ OR DELAYED

#### *The development, participation and assessment of ToT and other trainings (Outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3)*

The Project has developed curricula and materials for the lawyers who will ultimately lend their time to the several VPCs. Both an online Train-the-Trainer (ToT) course, as well as so called “Tailor Made” trainings were developed and delivered at all seven pilot locations by mid-June 2021 remotely. These outputs are discussed in more detail *infra*. According to UNDP the vision for the remaining implementation period of the Project is to expand this into a full-scale DLS of the UTBA via an LTA with Hewlett Packard Turkey, which is discussed in more detail *infra*.

As stated above, the Project began implementing Output only in April 2021. The Evaluation finds that the Project has managed to lay much groundwork towards achieving a Distance Learning System (DLS) for the UTBA that all legal aid lawyers (civil legal aid) and code of criminal procedure lawyers (criminal legal aid) can use for learning, with courses available online. (*i.e.*, *Outcome 3 of the Project Document (Activity areas 3.1-3.5)*), but still has much work to do.

<sup>28</sup> UNDP had envisioned that data would be a by-product of the performance management system (originally proposed to the UTBA and Bar Associations during Phase I of the Project), but the Bar Associations ultimately did not endorse or embrace such an approach during Phase I of the Project.

As of June 2021, the Project's Legal Expert had completed a Training Needs Assessment (TNA) of five subjects for training and modules of the UTBA DLS online training modules within the scope of Activity 3.1. The DLS will be initiated with five modules based upon the training needs assessment. The training will comprise a total of four or five modules devoted to topics such as civil rights, basic human rights, civil law, and criminal procedure. It is expected that the modules will also cover legal aid, gender equality and women's empowerment, social services, and psychological support, including how to approach victims of violence. These areas were originally contemplated in the Project's project document. Upon the approval of the Project Steering Committee, preparations for the development of priority models for pilot online-training are being initiated.

Continuing Legal Training is a huge need in Turkey. The UTBA informed the Evaluation that it estimates that there are 30,000+ lawyers, judges, police, and ministry officials who need training—especially sensitivity trainings on how to deal with victims of violence. UNDP has expressed the view that the DLS possibly could be used to support Turkey's National Action Plan on Combatting Violence Against Women via online trainings on combatting VAW, legal aid and gender equality in close coordination with the existing UNDP Violence Against Women Project.

According to UNDP, the DLS should be established by December 2021. A technical specification was prepared by UNDP's IT expert and a tender was advertised in April 2021 to determine the entity which will establish the IT of the distance learning system of UTBA. Per UNDP's existing LTA with Hewlett Packard Turkey, UNDP will procure a server for the UTBA to cope with the burden of the new distance learning system.

**UTBA informed the Evaluation that UNDP and the Project were very helpful with the tender to procure the necessary technical expertise and identify a vendor to provide these services to the Project. UTBA highly values the software and expects that the online training will help it capacitate new lawyers (Interns) each year. The UTBA confirmed to the Evaluation that it considers this to be extremely important, because UTBA currently lacks an established DLS. The DLS can be used to support Turkey's National Action Plan on Combatting Violence Against Women.**

**UTBA appears to have a high level of political will for implementing the DLS online training program as it is seen as a potential solution to UTBA's challenge of training many new lawyers entering the legal profession each year in Turkey. UNDP presented a budget to Sida for this at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Committee Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021.**

The Evaluation encourages UNDP support the UTBA and Bar Associations to develop a system of Continuing Legal Education either within the context of ILAP Phase III or a separate project in the future.

***Training modules, Analysis reports and issuance of training certificates (Outputs 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6)***

UNDP informed the Evaluation the five training modules are currently in development. Once the system is fully operational UNDP will need to ensure that its partners MoJ and UTBA and the Project prepare and submit analysis reports and document the number of lawyers issued training certificates for the completion of the online training programme. While these outputs are delayed, they are achievable by Project end.

## Output 4

<b>Output 4 – Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers</b>	
<b>Sub-Output</b>	<b>Progress at Mid-Term</b>
<b>Output 4.1 International Study Visits to Best Practices</b> <b>Output Indicator 4.1: Number of international study visits reports</b>	<b>OFF-TRACK</b>
<b>Output 4.2 Implementation of Communication Plan for Awareness Raising on Performance Management and Automation System</b> <b>Output 4.2.1 One-day National Conference</b> <b>Output 4.2.2 Five Local Study Visits to Best Practicing Bar Associations</b> <b>Output Indicator 4.2: None</b>	<b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED/ OR DELAYED</b>
<b>Output 4.3 Target: Awareness raised among bar associations in Turkey on performance criteria and evaluation mechanism</b>	<b>OFF-TRACK</b>

### *International Study Visits and Best Practices of the Project (Output 4.1)*

The Project envisions two international study visits, but it does not appear as of June 2021 that these will be able to take place during the remaining project period due to the lock downs associated with COVID 19 and international travel bans. The Evaluation encourages UNDP to explore possibilities for organizing online information exchange sessions with international partners as substitute for the planned international study visits if the study visits are not able to take place due to COVID-19 restrictions.

### *Implementing the Project's Communication Plan; The One-day National Conference on Legal Aid and Five Local Study Visits to Best Practicing Bar Associations (Output 4.2)*

The Evaluation finds the draft Communications Guidelines for the Project to be well-designed. By the Project's Midterm, several communications had been issued by the Project. The Project should probably strengthen its PR campaigns, press releases and social media footprint and visibility of events going forward with target audiences in mind. The Project's online trainings could be made more extensive via the Project's website.

### *The status of the performance criteria and evaluation mechanisms and awareness among Bar associations (Output 4.3)*

Output 4.3 of the ILAP II is yet to be achieved as of the Project's Midterm. It covers the development of the performance criteria for the legal aid lawyers and how to measure the performance of the legal aid lawyers.

As mentioned above, the Project attempted to introduce a performance management system in Phase I but did not achieve the expected results. UNDP had envisioned that its performance criteria would be used for all local bars in all provinces, but this proved to be unrealistic, given how relatively autonomous the Bar Associations are from one another and the UTBA.

UNDP informed the Evaluation that Phase II of the Project will attempt to re-introduce the Performance Management system (Under Outcome 4) during the remaining implementation period of Phase II. The Evaluation takes note of the fact that some Bar Associations still seem resistant to being accountable to UTBA and do not yet appear to have much political will for a performance management system. This was made clear in some of the interviews held by the Evaluation.

Thus, the Evaluation suggests that UNDP and the Project's Steering Committee consider rethinking Output 4; perhaps backing-away from calling this "Performance Management" and rather implementing something that is more acceptable to the Bar Associations would be an option.

Unfortunately, ILAP Phase II may continue to experience resistance to implementing uniform performance criteria that are standardized, evaluated with standardized criteria. Thus, it may be necessary for the Project to adapt to this situation and approach each Bar Association individually. Based upon its interviews with Bar Associations, it appears that some of the Bar Associations already have their own approach to performance management internally.

## Efficiency

HIGH

### *UNDP's Management Model, Work Methodologies, and practices*

The Evaluation's interviews with UNDP's project partners confirm the value of UNDP's apolitical operations and management. The Project was able to continue to function and facilitate cooperation between UTBA and Bar Associations notwithstanding political events that occurred in 2019-2020, when the Government of Turkey and Parliament approved changes to Turkey's Law on Attorneys that altered the number of local Bar Associations and their elections and the COVID-19 pandemic.

UNDP management was able to deploy UNDP's comparative strengths and practice architecture in human rights, access to justice, rule of law and gender sensitivity to the Project. UNDP was also able to draw upon its experiences implementing several other UNDP projects with legal aid components, including the joint UNDP-UNHCR Project for Refugees discussed above.

It is the finding of the Evaluation based on its interviews with various stakeholders and other sources, that the Bar Associations likely would not have convened as a group, nor met with UTBA on this issue as frequently in the absence of such an intervention. Beyond this, NGOs/CSOs most certainly wouldn't have been included to such a large extent in networking events attended by UTBA, MoJ, Bar Associations and other members of civil society. Civil society stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation team noted that this level of involvement of civil society in an initiative of the UTBA was unprecedented.

UNDP used several work methodologies during the project with its implementing partners to increase the efficiency of the Project and its activities. First, UNDP was able to take advantage of online platforms such as Zoom to conduct meetings; arrange conferences and online trainings and engage with consultants despite the challenges and risks posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. UNDP engaged a tech communications vendor to facilitate remote online trainings and meetings (including those held for this Evaluation). UNDP's vendor was able to arrange diplomatic-level professional translators to be on all calls where translation from Turkish into English and other languages was required. The permitted Project planning, monitoring and evaluation and management functions to continue despite the restrictions of COVID-19.

Another work methodology that UNDP used was to deploy its Project Manager to the seven pilot Bar Associations and VPCs during a time when travel was made difficult due to the COVID-19 restrictions. UNDP's Project Manager travelled to each of the seven pilot locations to ensure that implementation was moving forward in the most efficient manner possible, despite the challenges and delays of the pandemic.

### *Managerial obstacles faced*

As discussed at various points throughout this report, the Project faced administrative, financial and managerial obstacles as a result of the following events that were not foreseen at the Project's design stage: i) the COVID-19 global pandemic declared in March 2020; ii) proposals by the Turkish Government and changes enacted to the Attorneys Law during spring and into the fall of 2020; and iii)

the Turkish Government's decision to withdraw from the "Istanbul Convention" that occurred in March 2021.

These global, political, and legislative events caused challenges for UNDP as an organization. It is the assessment of the Evaluation that UNDP project management continued to implement according to the Project's RRF despite these challenges. The Project RRF was supplemented in mid-2020 to include risk and mitigation factors resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. UNDP has continued to be able to convene all stakeholders, despite political and legislative developments<sup>29</sup>

### ***Rate of Project Budget Execution and funding issues***

As of its midterm the budget allocation and expenditures for the Project were as follows: Total money transferred by Sida: USD 1,036,827.65; Total spent: \$434,842.72; Total increased: \$601,984.93; Average expenditure by budget:  $\approx$  42.00 %; Remaining Sida transfer: \$371,031.36; and Total project budget (project document): USD 1,407,859.00. Obviously, COVID-19 slowed the Project's implementation rate. The remaining \$371,031.06 Sida transfer raises the issue of how this surplus should be allocated during the remainder of the Project's original implementation period. Steering Committee received several suggestions at its 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting including, using the funds to support the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Regional meetings and additional meetings; and a new idea from UTBA that the surplus be used to fund additional lawyers to take on more GBV and VAW clients and cases and/or opening three additional pilot VPCs at additional locations.

This raises the additional question of whether UNDP's Donor (Sida/Swedish Embassy) should agree to a No Cost Extension (NCE) of the project equal to an additional 6-months to 9 months. This had apparently not been finalized as of mid-July 2021; however, the Evaluation strongly recommends that Sida consider a NCE for the Project with the following objectives: i) allow time for the VPCs to become fully operational in terms of rendering legal aid and other services to clients; ii) collect disaggregated data and statistics on the VPCs; iii) and implement certain activity areas of the Project that were delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic (*i.e.*, *Activity 2.4 and Activity 2.5*); iv) afford time to undertake a new round of negotiations with UTBA and the Bar Associations about the creation of: a) the online "distance learning" component; and b) a performance management system (*i.e.*, *Activity 4.1*).

At the same time, the Evaluation cautions UNDP, and the Project from becoming overly ambitious at this point. Any new initiatives undertaken (including those resulting from a reallocation of the Project's budget surplus, should be prioritized, and properly "scaled". **The Evaluation urges UNDP to utilize the existing budget surplus and any NCE for the purpose of solidifying the impact of ILAP II and the effectiveness of the seven pilot VPCs as a "proof of concept", before "scaling-up" these VPCs to additional provinces in Turkey.**

---

<sup>29</sup> The Project under the umbrella of the UNDP CPD for Turkey also was designed with all possible contingencies accounted for, including the possibility that UNDP may be forced to shift to a "work from home" stance. Thus, UNDP and UN Agencies in Turkey were well-positioned to adjust to the COVID-19 pandemic and its restrictions. UNDP also was able to coordinate the procurement process of attaching expert consultants to the Project. UNDP procurement also facilitated the tender process for vendors and suppliers to furnish the seven pilot VPCs according to "Technical Specifications of the VPCs" [See Annex #8, First Progress Narrative and Financial Report" (June 2019-June 2020)]. The Project document provided for an Advisory Board and a Steering Committee that also served as mechanisms for UNDP to communicate with its Donor, Partners and others about the Project's outputs and activities and to obtain valuable feedback from these organizations and their representatives. These oversight mechanisms proved especially useful during the COVID-19 pandemic.



## Sustainability

MEDIUM	LOW
--------	-----

### *Measures by UTBA and MoJ to make the project sustainable*

The Evaluation received indications from the MoJ that it is interested in scaling-up the 7 pilot VPCs, depending upon whether these VPCs are successful. The UTBA and MoJ informed the Evaluation that they hope to be able to present a case for scaling-up the VPCs; however, both MoJ and UTBA want to see “Proof of Concept” before considering scaling-up to more provinces in Turkey.

The Project’s training materials, guidelines, reports of expert-consultants, and minutes from meetings of the Advisory Committee, Steering Committee and workshops provide some evidence that the decision-making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken to support the sustainability of the effects of the Project. All these outputs serve to move the VPCs in a direction of institutionalization and build the capacity of the legal profession to represent these types of clients.

As of the Project’s midterm, the verbal statements of stakeholders and documents all support continued sustainability. The true test will be how the VPCs are able to operate on a day-to-day basis over the course of the coming 6 months to one year; and whether UNDP its partners can document the operations and processes of the VPCs, including gathering statistics. It is at this point, too early to make such an assessment.

The Evaluation suggests that going forward the Project build-in at least a minimum capacity to track #s of clients visiting the VPCs, types of clients and cases, mechanisms of referral to the VPC, how the client was served/case resolved, etc. Otherwise, it will continue to be difficult to attribute impact upon women victims of GBV and domestic abuse and other clients to the Project and the VPCs.

Stakeholders also informed the Evaluation that they experienced a substantial level of enthusiasm amongst municipal mayors and local governates for the Project and the 7 pilot VPCs.

### *Risks impacting the Sustainability of the Project*

There continue to be political and legislative risks that threaten the level of stakeholder ownership of the Project.

The amendments to Turkey’s “Attorney’s Act” resulted in widespread opposition and demonstrations on the part of the Bar Associations—especially those located in major cities. **The Evaluation suggests that it may be advisable for UNDP to conduct a revised (internal) political and contextual analysis once the UTBA and Bar Associations elections take place to gauge their impact on political will towards the Project and its outputs.**<sup>30</sup>

Additionally, **multiple stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation stated that they anticipate far-reaching negative consequences because of the Turkish Government’s decision to withdraw from the “Istanbul Convention”.** These include undermining the legitimacy and effect of Law 6284; reduced political will for implementing Turkey’s other human rights obligations; and reduced political will for investigating, policing, and prosecuting cases of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse. Additionally, the Bar Associations had viewed Article 8 of the Istanbul Convention as providing a basis for the MoJ to provide continuous and regular financial resources for legal aid and trainings [See, comments of the Antalya Bar Association made at the Project’s 1st Regional Workshop]. **The Turkish Government’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention may carry with-it longer-term risks to the Project’s sustainability and legal aid for women in Turkey.**

<sup>30</sup> UTBA elections and those of the Bar Associations have been repeatedly delayed since 2019, thereby, causing uncertainty about when the leadership of UTBA will be renewed. As of this Evaluation report, there are indications that these elections will be held in October 2021.

### ***What happens if donor funding ends?***

It is too early in the operations of the VPCs and other outputs (i.e., establishment of the “distance learning” component; impact of ToT; practicality of the “guidelines” developed for VPCs to assess the extent to which these benefits and outcomes of the Project will continue after donor funding ends. **UNDP will need to closely monitor the implementation of the VPCs, gather data and make the case to the Government to further support the VPCs, distance learning and other outputs, and in fact scale-up the outputs to all of Turkey’s 81 governates.**

**The Evaluation suggests that going forward, the Project continue its efforts to involve Ankara Bar Association and consider extending an invitation to the Ankara Bar Association to become a member of the Project’s Advisory Committee, if the UNDP’s project implementing partners provided that UTBA and MoJ are fully on board with this approach.<sup>31</sup>**

Based upon its interviews with Stakeholders and given the way that legal aid is structured in Turkey (i.e., precluding attorneys from fully “volunteering” their time without pay) it is highly unlikely, also considering the delays in implementation due to the COVID-19 pandemic, that that 7 VPCs will be operationally and financially self-sustainable once the donor funding of the Project ends. The Evaluation recommends that if by the end of ILAP Phase II (including any NCE), an evidence-based analysis of the VPCs shows that have achieved “benchmarks” as a “proof of concept”, that UNDP and its Donor strongly consider continuing funding by way of a successor project (i.e., either ILAP Phase III or under a different perhaps innovative and expanded project); but with enhanced co-funding/budgetary commitments from the Government of Turkey and additional implementing partners beyond UTBA and MoJ.

### ***Additional measures to maximize sustainability***

Stakeholders informed the Evaluation that to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes, the UTBA and MoJ should consider evaluating the fee schedule that currently governs how much a lawyer must be paid for his/her time and explore legislative reforms to permit true “pro bono” legal service to occur in Turkey. The Evaluation suggests that UNDP should explore other mechanisms to increase the likelihood of sustainability going forward (i.e., consider creating a “certification course” of a minimum number of hours that a wider spectrum of lawyers interested in representing GBV and domestic abuse and child cases be required to complete; and/or outreach to law schools in Turkey). Such outputs could foster a future generation of lawyers who are prepared to take-on such cases.

As further discussed below, MoFSS apparently views the ILAP II supported VPCs as competing with the MoFSS-run SÖNİM that also offer services to abused women and victims of VAW such as shelter and psycho-social support services. UNDP’s donor Sida emphasized at meetings of the Project’s Steering Committee held in 2020 and 2021, the importance of including additional actors such as TÜBAKKOM (Tukey Women’s Law Committee), the Ankara Bar Association and other actors in the networking and meetings.

---

<sup>31</sup> The Evaluation found that while the Ankara Bar Association has yet to be brought to the table formally, the Project has succeeded in hiring two consultants who had previous experience at the Ankara Bar Association and who were involved in the design of the Poppy Project. As far as TÜBAKKOM is concerned, the Evaluation found that UNDP had attempted to include TÜBAKKOM, but that beyond participating in two events planned by the Project, TÜBAKKOM showed little interest in becoming more involved. The Evaluation suggest that it would be extremely valuable to have more insights into how the Ankara Bar Association’s “Poppy Project” has evolved over time. As stated above, the Evaluation believes that UNDP should continue to solicit the participation of the Ankara Bar Association in the Project.

## Cross-cutting issues

HIGH

### *The extent to which the Project has contributed to Human Rights*

While it is far too early to make any attribution between the 7 pilot VPCs and the well-being of vulnerable groups in Turkey, **the Evaluation finds that the Project takes a “Human Rights-Based Approach” (HRBA) and is designed to promote and further the realization of human rights as laid down in the charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments such as CEDAW. Its fundamental objective is to increase access to justice and legal aid for women, girls, and other vulnerable groups, who are victims of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse. The Government’s decision to withdraw from the Istanbul Convention has in the opinion of some stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation, placed the Project at risk. Many CSOs and lawyers have publicly stated their intent to challenge the legality of the Government’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention. This has implications for the HRBA of the Project.**

As discussed above, **the Project is also designed to operate within Turkey’s legal framework and its international treaty obligations, including the Istanbul Convention and domestic law No. 6284. This is evidenced by the Project’s website, publicity and training materials that provide lawyers and end-beneficiaries information on VAW and domestic abuse and mechanisms by which abused women and others may obtain legal assistance and access to justice.** The Regional Conferences of the Project have served as key networking events for women’s NGOs/CSOs and other organizations to exchange information about human rights, gender equality and legal aid.

**In addition, the Evaluation finds that the Project’s design adheres to the “Leave No One Behind” (LNOB) principal, which is the central, transformative promise of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDGs and the commitment of all UN Member States to eradicate poverty, end discrimination, and reduce inequalities and vulnerabilities that threaten to marginalize people.** While it is too early to tell how the 7 pilot VPCs will perform, they have the potential to provide legal assistance to women and other vulnerable groups that can help fight discrimination and inequalities with derivative impacts on conflict reduction and poverty. The NGOs/CSOs interviewed by the Evaluation confirm that they are already heavily active in this area. As stated elsewhere in this report, the Evaluation encourages UNDP and its partners to put in place mechanisms for collecting statistics to document the Project’s impact upon women and most vulnerable groups.

**As discussed *supra*, the Evaluation finds that the Project promotes Gender Quality and Empowerment both in its design and its outputs to date. The Evaluation encourages the Project to continue to engage with NGOs/CSOs to use statistics from the 7 pilot VPCs as a basis for advocating for the principals of the Charter of the United Nations, the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Resolutions of the General Assembly, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action of the Fourth World Conference on Women, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It is also important that in the wake of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention that the Project revise its training materials to place emphasis on Turkish Law No. 6284 and other domestic remedies available to victims of VAW and domestic abuse.<sup>32</sup>**

---

<sup>32</sup> The Evaluation takes notice of the fact that the March 2021 decree of the President of Turkey and notice to the European Council of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention has potentially wide-ranging implications for the Project and its continued relevance. This was voiced to the Evaluation by all the local Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs who state that within this context the Project and its outputs become even more relevant to Turkish women. Many CSOs and lawyers have publicly stated their intent to challenge the legality of the Government’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention. UNDP’s donor Sida also voiced similar concerns.

The Evaluation observes that it may be necessary for the Project and its consulting experts to revise the guidelines developed for the VPCs, as well as certain training materials, considering Turkey's withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention (i.e., citations to the Istanbul Convention vis-à-vis the Turkish Code of Criminal Procedure Art. 234, et. al.). The Project may also wish to strengthen references in training materials to Turkey's other international human rights obligations under the U.N. Charter and Treaty Bodies as well as European Convention on Human Rights Article 6.<sup>33</sup>

***The extent to which the Project has contributed to women's empowerment and gender equality***

The Project has been implemented at a time when, according to the reports of civil society, Turkey is experiencing a backsliding in terms of women's rights and gender equality. Throughout the late 1990s and into the early 2000s Turkey undertook legislative reforms and other measures to strengthen women's rights (i.e., reform to the Turkey Civil Code, Criminal Code and Code of Criminal Procedure; Labor Code; etc.). Turkey became a signatory to the Council of Europe "Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence" ("Istanbul Convention") in 2011. Turkey passed Act No. 6284 dated 8 March 2012 "to Protect Family and Prevent Violence against Women. Country". Turkey also became more engaged generally with the international community regarding women's rights, VAW, child marriage, abortion rights and gender equality during this period.

According to stakeholders interviewed, this situation began to change by late-2014 when a backsliding began to occur. By 2016, there was a pronounced shift in the Turkish Government's political posture regarding women's rights, VAW and gender equality. The Project is a GEN3 Project. It is designed fundamentally as a women's rights and empowerment project to increase women's access to justice and legal aid, with derivative beneficiaries such as LGBTQ, the elderly and PWDs.

The Bar Associations informed the Evaluation that the Project has tremendously strengthened their communications with NGOs/CSOs even because of the early preparatory visits made by UNDP to the 7 pilot processes to prepare for the establishment of the VPCs, and via all subsequent networking events.

As stated above, the key networking events of the Project were its 1st Regional Workshop and 2nd Regional Workshop. The Evaluation only had access as of mid-July 2021 to the meeting reports of the 1st Regional Workshop; but it appears that this event exhibited a high level of gender mainstreaming, in both the numbers of women that attended (62 total participants=27.5% Male; 72.5% Female) and the types of NGOs/CSOs that were invited to attend; as well as, the content of the presentations made at the workshops, materials and discussions held between the Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs at the afternoon working groups (note: 53.5% of all participants at the 1st Regional Workshop were NGOs). [Source: "Project Narrative and Financial Progress Report" (June 2019-June 2020)].

Other meetings held during the Project's initial year (June 2019-2020) also maintained strong gender balance (i.e., ILAP II "First Coordination Meeting (November 4th, 2019) (28 Participants; 39% Male; 61% Female); ILAP II "First Advisory Meeting" (10 March 2020) (27 participants: 44.5% Male, 55.5% Female); ILAP II "First Steering Committee Meeting" 11 March 2020) (18 participants; 39% Male; 61% Female).

**The Project through its Gender Expert, in close cooperation with the UNDP Gender Advisor, informed the design, agenda and materials for all networking and coordination practices of the Project, as well as a workshops and trainings.** This included the Gender Expert's "GBV analysis for the seven pilot provinces: the Project's "Gender Action Plan"; review of ToT and training materials; expert presentations; review of the "VPC Guidelines" and development of the "Gender-Sensitive Communications Elements".

---

<sup>33</sup> Note: The Bar Associations made various suggestions as to how the draft guidelines could be improved during the "ILAP Project 2nd Component/1st Coordination Meeting" held in Ankara on 4th November 2019.

**The Evaluation found that the training materials, Gender Action Plan and VPC guidelines were designed to ensure that the Project and its implementing partners collect both quantitative and qualitative data and statistics; increase women’s visibility; bring discriminatory practices, customs and behaviors to light, which contribute to a cycle of VAW and impunity; increase women’s access to justice and promote knowledge and awareness of women’s rights and the Project.** In addition, the enhancement of the Project’s website that has occurred on a continuing basis has furthered these same objectives and helped gender-mainstreaming and awareness-raising (i.e., See sections of the website and draft prepared by the Gender Expert on “Gender-Based Violence and Relevant info”).

As stated elsewhere in this report, it is too early to assess how VPCs will implement in practice on a day-to-day basis, including their adherence to gender-mainstreaming principals.

By mid-2020, UNDP had hired a Lead Law Expert; 2 Senior Law Experts, a Gender Expert and a Communications Expert, a Psychologist, a Train-the-Trainers (TOT) Expert; and a Social Worker to advise the Bar Associations. The Gender Expert’s GBV report and mapping was supposed to set the stage for enhanced collection of disaggregated data on VAW and domestic violence from each of the pilot Bar Associations, but the Evaluation finds that at Midterm, systemized data collection and reporting has not yet been achieved.

**The Project is fully in line with the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2021. The Project’s RRF and outputs are designed to mainstream gender. The Evaluation found that meetings, workshops, and trainings have maintained gender balance throughout the Project. As of its midterm, the project’s Gender expert (consultant) with the input of UNDP developed a Project Gender Action Plan for the Project, as well as relevant content on GBV for the Project’s website. According to the Evaluation’s interviews, the guidelines are also relevant to LGBTQ clients and abuse, and other vulnerable populations.**

**Furthermore, the Project has successfully involved the participation of leading Turkish women’s rights NGOs/CSOs in the Project. These NGOs/CSOs expressed to the Evaluation that the Regional Meetings had been extremely valuable to them in terms of capacity building and networking and raised awareness on GBV.**

The Evaluation cannot at the Project’s midterm fully assesses its impact upon women’s empowerment in Turkey as the VPCs at the 7 pilot locations are not yet fully operational to a stage of accepting clients. The UTBA supplied the Evaluation with some legal aid statistics in the 7 pilot bar associations. Sex aggregated data started being collected by UTBA as of 2020. These statistics, however, do not cover the time after which the VPCs were fully capacitated and began accepting clients. They do not clearly identify cases handled by the VPC, but by each bar association through its customary mechanisms of allocating lawyers to legal aid clients. *[N.B. These statistics are included in the Annex to this evaluation report only to demonstrate that these bar associations have handled legal aid cases during the past several years. The Evaluation has not probed into this data to inquire as to the specifics of these cases or their adherence to standards of the legal profession and best practices for VAW and domestic abuse cases].*

MoJ stressed to the Evaluation that one of its primary goals is to ensure that women have equal access to justice as victims per Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 234, which provides that victims of sexual assault crimes be afforded a lawyer from the UTBA/Bar Associations free of charge; but that the lawyers assigned by the Bar Associations are not always qualified to handle such cases (i.e., “best practices” in interviewing and communicating with women victims of VAW and GBV). The Project’s trainings offer the possibility to improve the capacity of lawyers in Turkey for such cases.

The 7 Pilot VPCs are viewed by MoJ and UTBA as an opportunity to institutionalize the legal aid process and add structure, oversight and incorporate best practices into the legal aid system in Turkey to afford women greater access to justice and human rights. The MoJ believes that its “Judicial Support

and Victim's Support Services Department" and the 7 pilot VPCs can synergize closely with each other. MoJ also indicated that the Project's relevance and effectiveness could be enhanced by working with the Judicial Support Centers (ADM) and the Forensic Interview Rooms supported by the MoJ and the Attorney General's Office (AGO).

***The extent to which the project was designed, implemented, monitored, and evaluated as a rights-based and gender sensitive project***

The Project was designed to develop a more coordinated, qualified, and systematic approach to legal aid practices in Turkey to enhance access to justice for women victims of GBV and domestic abuse. Its theory of change is grounded in Turkey's international human rights commitments. Beyond this, the Project's main outputs are devoted to perpetuating the "Poppy Project" model—which was an initiative of the Ankara Bar Association to help female, LGBTQ, and child victims of physical, psychological, economic, and sexual violence.

The Project as implemented has involved human rights and women's NGOs/CSOs (i.e., such as Turkey's Federation of Women's Associations), that have handled cases of VAW, domestic abuse, GBV, divorce, child rights, custody, maintenance and support and other types of cases. As discussed in more detail below, Gender is a cross-cutting area of the Project's RRF along with conflict reduction and the environment.

The Evaluation recommends that the Project continue to conduct M&E for gender-balance and gender-equality across all outputs and activities and closely monitor legislative development in Turkey impacting upon gender equality and the empowerment of women.

## Conclusions

**Conclusion-1.** ILAP Phase II is relevant not only to Turkey's NDP and JRS, including court reforms, but also to the implementation of Turkey's existing human rights treaty obligations. The Project has been implemented with a human-rights based lens and its outputs are all geared towards most vulnerable groups and women. The March 2021 decree of the President of Turkey and notice to the European Council of Turkey's withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention has potential implications for the Project and has reinforced its relevance.

**Conclusion-2.** The groundwork has certainly been laid for a transferable model and lessons learned for establishing and capacitating the VPCs; structuring the Steering Committee; development of common guidelines; networking opportunities for convening Bar Associations; and involving CSOs and local officials. All of these are good practices and success stories that are potentially transferable to other projects and partners. Beyond this, the way UNDP and the Project have adapted to the risks posed by COVID-19 (i.e., by deploying online technologies) and to political developments in Turkey, including changes to the Attorneys Law (i.e., by continuing to be a "neutral"/apolitical. These practices are transferable to other projects. The overall Relevance of the Project will continue to be enhanced by addressing the other two main problems and needs identified in the Project's design: Awareness Raising on the performance management system and instituting better evaluation mechanisms.

**Conclusion-3.** The Evaluation attributes the Project's overall effectiveness to date to several key factors including: i) UNDP's decision to include a broad-base of stakeholders in the design of the Project and its communication with all stakeholders; ii) UNDP's ongoing ability to adapt to the *force majeure* event of the global COVID-19 pandemic and political events in Turkey and its willingness to deploy remote technologies for this purpose; and iii) the Project's overall design and its relevance to the Government of Turkey's development agendas and strategic plans, as well as the needs of its end-beneficiaries (i.e., women) that has continued to ensure that the Project has received a high degree of political will from its Government partners (at both national and provincial levels), as well as enthusiasm from Bar Associations and NGOs/CSOs in Turkey.

**Conclusion-4.** It is not possible to make any *statistical attribution* at this point between the Project's outputs and activities and a percentage (%) increase/decrease in the targets of the JRS achieved for protecting the rights of specific groups (women, youth, children) between 2016 and 2020. What can be said at Midterm is that the Project's key partners and beneficiaries believe that the establishment of the seven pilot VPCs represents *an opportunity* to advance access to justice and human rights for women victims of VAW and GBV. The governance systems surrounding the legal aid process (i.e., referrals mechanisms, case inventory and tracking, performance management, etc.) are not yet fully actualized.

**Conclusion-5.** The Bar Associations likely would not have convened as a group, nor met with UTBA on the issue of legal aid for women and vulnerable groups as frequently in the absence of such an intervention. Beyond this, NGOs/CSOs most certainly wouldn't have been included to such a large extent in networking events attended by UTBA, MoJ, Bar Associations and other members of civil society. Civil society stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation team noted that this level of involvement of civil society in an initiative of the UTBA was unprecedented.

## Recommendations

**Recommendation-1.** The Evaluation encourages UNDP to view the 7 pilot VPCs as a “Proof of Concept” with a view towards scaling-up the pilot VPCs to all of Turkey’s 81 provinces in a subsequent Phase III of the Project (or in a different project), with the strong backing of the MoJ. Part of this “proof of concept” should be contrasting how the 7 pilot VPCs have implemented (and improved upon) the original Poppy Project model. In fact, *this process should begin immediately with the continuing collection of data and statistics that can inform M&E of the VPCs as they progress.* Such analysis can be better informed with more information from the Ankara Bar Association on how the Poppy Project at Ankara ultimately evolved over time, including its issues, challenges, methods, and successes. The Evaluation suggests that the Project utilize the remaining period of implementation to put systems in place for gathering statistics on referrals, clients, types of cases, severity of injuries, children, length of time between intake and resolution, ancillary services required (i.e., psycho-social support), etc. at the 7 Pilot VPCs. Going forward, the Project should continue to build the capacities of the MoJ, UTBA, and Bar Associations to institutionalize the collection of data disaggregated by gender and types of clients. The Evaluation recommends that the Project continue to conduct M&E for gender-balance and gender-equality across all outputs and activities and closely monitor legislative development in Turkey impacting upon gender equality and the empowerment of women.

**Recommendation-2.**

The Evaluation recommends that UNDP plan to conduct *an expert in-depth mapping* of how the VPC are operating in practice at the six-month point after the VPCs have begun accepting clients. This should be submitted by UNDP in final form to the Project’s Steering Committee by no later than end of Q1 2022. *Such a mapping should reference the VPC Guidelines designed by the Project* as a starting point and examine each VPC to assess how it is operating on a day-to-day basis and the extent to which it is adhering to the VCP guidelines drafted by the Project [See, VPC Guidelines drafted by the Project consultants in 2020]; whether the lines of communication and referral networks are working as expected and to identify possible “bottlenecks” and problems within the system. As of the Project’s Midterm it was not possible for the Evaluation to conduct such analysis because the 7 pilot VPCs, although capacitated, were either not yet fully operational or lacked sufficient implementation history and processes to generate an analysis.

**Recommendation-3.** The Evaluation recommends that the Project and its consulting experts to review and revise the guidelines developed for the VPCs, as well as certain training materials, considering Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention (i.e., citations contained in project materials that refer to the Istanbul Convention *vis-à-vis* the Turkish Code of Criminal Procedure Art. 234, *et. al.*). The Project may wish to revise its materials and training manuals to strengthen references to Turkey’s other international human rights obligations under the U.N. Charter and Treaty Bodies, as well as European Convention on Human Rights Article 6.

**Recommendation-4.** The Evaluation recommends that the Project continue its efforts to involve Ankara Bar Association and consider extending an invitation to the Ankara Bar Association to become a member of the Project’s Advisory Committee, if the UNDP’s project implementing partners (i.e., UTBA and MoJ) and 7 pilot Bar Association are fully on board with this approach. This Recommendation should be reevaluated by the Project following the long anticipated UTBA elections in fall 2021.

**Recommendation-5.** The Evaluation suggests that UNDP and the Project’s Steering Committee consider rethinking Output 4 of the Project; perhaps backing-away from calling this “Performance Management” and rather implementing something that is more



acceptable to the Bar Associations. The Evaluation recommends that UNDP and the Project examine in more detail how the Bar Associations are organizing “Bar Management Boards” per Article 6 of the VPC Directive drafted by the Project and annexed to the Project’s “Project Narrative and Financial Progress Report” (June 2019-June 2020).

**Recommendation-6.** The Project’s online trainings could be made more extensive via the Project’s website. The Evaluation encourages UNDP to explore possibilities for organizing online information exchange sessions with international partners as substitute for the planned international study visits if the study visits are not able to take place due to COVID-19 restrictions. The Evaluation suggests that UNDP should consider creating a “certification course” of a minimum number of hours that a wider spectrum of lawyers interested in representing GBV and domestic abuse and child cases be required to complete; and/or outreach to law schools in Turkey). Such outputs could foster a future generation of lawyers who are prepared to take-on such cases. The Evaluation encourages UNDP support the UTBA and Bar Associations to develop a system of Continuing Legal Education either within the context of ILAP Phase III or a separate project in the future.

**Recommendation-7.** The Evaluation recommends that the Project strengthen its Public Relations campaigns, press releases and social media footprint and visibility of events going forward with specific target audiences in mind.

**Recommendation-8.** The Evaluation recommends that UNDP and its Donor make a NCE for the Project with the following objectives: i) allow time for the VPCs to become fully operational in terms of rendering legal aid and other services to clients; ii) collect disaggregated data and statistics on the VPCs; iii) and implement certain activity areas of the Project that were delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e. Activity 2.4 and Activity 2.5); iv) afford time to undertake a new round of negotiations with UTBA and the Bar Associations with regard to the creation of: a) the online “distance learning” component; and b) a performance management system (Activity 4.1). The Evaluation cautions UNDP and the Project from becoming overly ambitious at this point. Any new initiatives undertaken during and NCE period (including those resulting from a reallocation of the Project’s budget surplus), should be prioritized, and properly “scaled”. The Evaluation urges UNDP to utilize the existing budget surplus and any NCE for the purpose of solidifying the impact of ILAP II and the effectiveness of the seven pilot VPCs before “scaling-up” these VPCs to additional provinces in Turkey.

**Recommendation-9.** The Evaluation recommends that Bar Associations submit monthly activity reports, documenting the performance of the VPCs and referral, networking, and outreach mechanisms. The Evaluation suggests that UNDP and the Project consider having a dedicated part of the website for the volunteer attorneys of the VPCs to report statistics on their cases (while protecting the confidentiality of their clients), network with each other and/or access research materials. This could be a password protected page available only to attorneys who volunteer their time to a VPC.

**Recommendation-10.** The Evaluation recommends that if by the end of ILAP Phase II (including any NCE), an evidence-based analysis of the VPCs shows that the VPCs have achieved “benchmarks” as a “proof of concept”, UNDP and its Donor strongly consider continuing funding by way of a *successor project* (i.e., either ILAP Phase III or under a different perhaps innovative and expanded project); but with enhanced co-funding commitments from the Government of Turkey and additional implementing partners beyond UTBA and MoJ. The Evaluation recommends that UNDP conduct a revised (internal) political and contextual analysis before any successor Project is undertaken.

## Lessons learned

**When UNDP maintains its role as an “apolitical” international organization, it can effectively bring stakeholders with diverse political and ideological viewpoints around a common project and theory of change.** For example, in this Project notwithstanding the controversy surrounding amendments to Turkey's attorney's law, UNDP and the project managed to effectively convene all stakeholders around a common goal. This likely would not have been possible had UNDP not maintained and a political profile.

**When UNDP's development interventions are designed with the host's government's national development plans and ministerial strategic plans in mind, then political will for UNDP's interventions is maximized.** For example, in this Project the government stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation stated that their enthusiasm and commitment to the project were largely based in the fact that UNDP's project design fully accounted for Turkey's National Development Strategy as well as the judicial reform agenda and strategy that include enhanced goals 4 legal aid, prevention of violence against women and prosecution of violence against women and domestic abuse.

**When unforeseen force majeure and political risks require UNDP to adapt its implementation methodologies, then UNDP Project management's direct involvement in Project implementation can ensure that implementation proceeds—despite such risks—until situations stabilize.** For example, the Project's effective implementation and progress during the COVID-19 pandemic with its travel restrictions in Turkey, was greatly facilitated by the Project Manager's willingness to drive to all seven pilot locations. This ensured that UNDP moved out from Ankara and to the provinces when necessary to ensure that project implementation proceeded to the greatest extent possible notwithstanding the constraints of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**When unforeseen force majeure and political risks require UNDP to adapt its implementation methodologies, then online trainings, meetings, and workshops can be an effective substitute for “live events”.** For example, this project showed the merits of UNDP's flexible approach during the pandemic. UNDP was able to effectively shift this to a remote methodology that involved allowing the Evaluator to conduct the interviews with stakeholders remotely from his home base. UNDP hired an outside vendor to organize the schedule and to provide simultaneous translation from Turkish to English during all calls that took place. The consultant further utilized the app “Transcribe” to make rough transcripts of all interviews. These greatly assisted consultant in writing the report. UNDP's willingness to quickly adapt the ToR to the constraints of the COVID-19 pandemic and its innovative use of online platforms should be considered a **practice” for other UNDP offices around the world.**

**When NGOs/CSOs are incorporated in Project planning, advising, and networking, then UNDP's ability to reach its core constituency—most vulnerable groups, women, and the poor—is enhanced beyond levels that can normally be achieved by working with Government partners alone.** For example, the project regional meetings served as valuable networking opportunities among NGOs /CSOs and provided them an opportunity to continually inform the project with their viewpoints.

## Annex

### A. “Mapping of Bar Association and NGO/CSO Coordination for Legal Aid”

[Current as of mid-July 2021]

The Samsun Bar Association already had both a Legal Aid Committee and a Women’s Rights Committee before the Project. The Samsun Bar Association’s Executive Board also provides oversight over all its donor funded initiatives, including the Project. Currently, the chair of the Women’s Rights Committee acts as the Samsun Bar Association’s focal point for the Project and VPC. The Samsun Bar Association informed the Evaluation that over time it has interacted with as many as nine or ten different CSOs (i.e., including the CSO “From Women to Society” and others); but this cooperation was not extensive until the Project, which the bar association credits with having strengthened and increased communications between the bar association and the CSOs. To date, the Samsun Bar Association has made some reports on legal aid but has not implemented any mechanisms to collect disaggregated statistics for VAW and GBV.

Meanwhile, the Balıkesir Bar Association informed the Evaluation that it has worked with several NGOs/CSOs over the years, including the Sil Baştan Association. The bar association is in “constant contact” with such NGOs/CSOs about legal aid cases and vice-versa. In addition, the Balıkesir Bar Association refers women victims of GBV and VAW to the MoFSS ŞÖNİMs. The bar association informed the Evaluation that it has no formal MoUs in place but relies on “personal connections” for referrals between the bar association and the CSOs/NGOs. The local Governor’s office and mayor’s office are also sources of reference.

The Antalya Bar Association informed the Evaluation that its lawyers have historically represented women victims of VAW and GBV. Meanwhile, the Mardin Bar Association informed the Evaluation that its attorney members volunteer their time via the “Women’s Rights Center” that has activities for women victims of VAW and GBV. The Mardin Bar Association also interacts with the local Governor’s office on an *ad hoc* basis when referrals are needed to the bar association.

Similarly, the Nevşehir Bar Association informed the Evaluation that its “Legal Aid Commission” is the focal point at the bar association for providing legal aid services to clients, including women victims of GBV and VAW; but that this is not a highly organized process and lacks structure or a dedicated center. The Nevşehir Bar Association views the Project and the VPC as offering the potential to improve this process. As it stands, the Nevşehir Bar Association’s Legal Aid Commission assesses clients, and, if they need legal aid, pairs the client with one of its attorneys.

All the bar associations reported to UNDP that clients have historically included women, victims of domestic abuse, VAW, GVB, presenting such issues as petitions for restraining orders against an abusing spouse or family member or other perpetrator; interfacing with the local public prosecutors and police to bring charges against a perpetrator and prosecute them; filing for divorce; child custody issues; obtaining ancillary services (i.e., psycho-social support and shelter) from the MoFSS and its ŞÖNİMs, etc. In addition, some bar associations (i.e., Denizli) reported to the Evaluation that they have handled cases of refugees (i.e., Syrians, Iraqis, Iranians, and Africans, *et.al.*), PWDs and members of the LGBTQ community in Turkey. Refugees often present special issues such as petitions for relief from administrative detention, stays of deportation, as well as, requiring language interpretation from Turkish to Arabic or other languages.

The local Bar Associations of Antalya, Nevşehir and Samsun reported at the Project’s “First Advisory Committee Meeting” in March 2020, that local municipalities, mayor’s offices, courts, AGOs, and Governorships were assisting the Bar Associations to locate premises and facilities to house the VPCs (with Nevşehir being finalized as of mid-July 2021).

The Evaluation found that the Project and its partners effectively liaised with local authorities and Governates to initialize the VPCs—especially in Antalya and Nevşehir. As referenced above, the Antalya and Nevşehir Bar Associations could not house the VPC within their buildings and relied upon their local municipalities to identify and supply separate premises for the VPC in these cities. As part of this process, the Project and its partners engaged in extensive dialogue with the local municipalities and governorates, ultimately resulting in the municipalities finding premises for the VPCs. In Samsun the local courthouse will house the VPC.

Several of the Bar Associations informed the Evaluation that they depend upon their municipalities (mayors' offices) and Governates (Governors' offices) for support and coordination. For example, the Balıkesir Bar Association stated that the Balıkesir Governor's office was helpful in facilitating meetings between UNDP and local police, etc. during the Project's inception phase. The Balıkesir Governor's office has also organized meetings with CSOs, attended by the Balıkesir Bar Association. The Mardin Bar Association also informed the Evaluation that the municipality in Mardin had assisted the Bar Association in its communications with CSOs

Meanwhile, the Denizli Bar Association informed the Evaluation it has a standing relationships and protocols established with local authorities and officials to inform them of their activities. Denizli Bar Association supports the efforts of the Denizli Governor's Office, MoFSS Protective Services Division and Denizli Municipality (mayor's office) to protect women victims of violence. The Denizli Bar Association has legal aid and information "desks" at two municipal offices on Fridays, where Denizli Bar Association volunteer lawyers offer legal advice to women and other clients. Denizli Bar Association also interfaces with the local police who sometimes telephone the bar association on behalf of a women victim of GBV or VAW who needs assistance and shelter. When children are involved, the Denizli Bar Association sometimes seeks the intervention of the Governor's office to procure shelter (i.e., hotel rooms) or place the women into the MoFSS shelter system. Denizli Bar Association also informed the Evaluation that it exchanges statistics on VAW and GBV with the Public Prosecutor's office.

## B. Schedule of Deliverables

Activity of the Implementation Phase	Responsible Party	Due Date
Kick off meeting	Portfolio Manager, Evaluation Manager and Project Team	3 May 2021
Draft Inception Report	Individual Consultant	31 May 2021
Providing the feedbacks to the Draft Inception Report	Portfolio Manager, Evaluation Manager	4 June 2021
Finalized Inception Report based on the feedbacks received from UNDP	Individual Consultant	10 June 2021
Data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders	Individual Consultant	2-18 June 2021
Delivery of Draft Evaluation Report compiling findings from data collection and interviews with key stakeholders	Individual Consultant	28 June 2021
Review the Draft Evaluation Report and provide feedback	Portfolio Manager, Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Reference Group	9 July 2021
Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report by taking into consideration the feedbacks received from UNDP	Individual Consultant	16 July 2021
<b>Total Evaluation Process (days)</b>		<b>30 Days</b>
<b>Estimated Maximum Total Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC</b>		<b>30 Days</b>

## **C. Evaluation criteria and questions.**

### Criteria

#### Relevance:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse the extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and international norms.

#### Effectiveness:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the Project objectives have been achieved or how likely they are to be achieved.

#### Efficiency:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and the results have been delivered with the least costly way possible.

#### Sustainability:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the project's positive actions are likely to continue during the remainder portion and after the end of the project.

#### Cross-cutting issues

Cross-cutting issues include Gender, Conflict Reduction and the Environment. These will be evaluated, considered, and analyzed throughout the evaluation. Methods for evaluating these three areas will include: i) research and document review (i.e., project reports; content of trainings and materials; independent internet research results for information, data and statistics on Gender, Conflict Resolution and the Environment in Turkey)—especially internet websites of Women's and environmental NGOs/CSOs; ii) collection of statistical data (i.e., % increase/decrease in rates of VAW during 2019-2021; # of laws/legislation passed; etc.); iii) qualitative stakeholder interviews, wherein beneficiaries will be asked about the degree to which trainings and communications of the Project included a focus on VAW, conflict reduction and the environment.

These methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders. This will include interviews with members of women's NGOs and CSOs, the MoFSS and UNDP's Gender Advisor, the UTBA and the Bar Associations and beneficiaries of trainings.

### Questions

#### Relevance:

1. To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant to national priorities (including clear linkage to CPD, UNDCS and international norms)?
2. How much and in what ways did the project contribute to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase until the mid-term?
3. To what extent was this project designed, implemented, monitored, and evaluated as rights based and gender sensitive?
4. To what extent does the project create synergy/linkages with other projects and interventions in the country?

#### Effectiveness:

1. To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document's logical framework until

the mid-term of the project duration? (The Individual Consultant is expected to provide detailed analysis of 1) planned activities and outputs until June 2021 and 2) achievement of results until June 2021.)

2. To what extent, Legal Aid Phase I lessons learned were considered during the current phase and efforts were taken to reach certain results that weren't achieved in the previous phase. To what extent was Ankara Bar Association's Poppy Seed Center (which was promoted as a best practice in the first phase) is successfully emulated by 7 Violence Prevention Centers set up in the Second Phase?

3. Did the project successfully establish a robust cooperation mechanism between CSOs and Bar Associations in pilot cities?

4. What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement until the mid-term of project execution? How might this be improved in the future?

5. Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.

6. To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of Judicial Reform Strategy, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?

7. To what extent has the project contributed to the well-being and human rights of vulnerable groups, including, women and girls subjected to Gender Based Violence (GBV)? Did the project effectively contribute to leave no one behind agenda and successfully integrate human rights-based approach (HRBA)?

8. Did Covid-19 measures have a positive or negative effect on the achievement of project results?

#### **Efficiency:**

1. To what extent did the project's management model (i.e., instruments; economic, human, and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?

2. To what extent was the implementation of this project intervention more efficient in comparison to what could have been in the absence of such an intervention?

3. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency?

4. What type of (administrative, financial, and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?

5. What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by UNDP until the mid-term of project execution?

#### **Sustainability:**

1. To what extent have the project decision making bodies and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the project? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?

2. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits? How does the recent changes in legislation pertaining to lawyers and other relevant legal reforms might influence the sustainability of the project?

3. To what extent will the project be replicable or scaled up?

4. To what extent will the benefits and outcomes continue after external donor funding ends? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends?

5. What is the likelihood that 7 Violence Prevention Centres established will be operationally and financially self-sustainable once the donor funding ends?

6. What can be done to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes?

**Cross-cutting issues:**

1. To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress in women's empowerment as well as mainstreaming gender equality? (To be elaborated in relation to the UNDP Gender Mainstreaming strategies and guidelines, along with other relevant strategies and guidelines)
2. To what extent the project adopted environmental and conflict mainstreaming?



## D. Evaluation matrix.

### Evaluation Matrix (MTA Legal Aid Phase II Project)

**\*An asterisk in the table below denotes that an Indicator/Success Standard was supplied by the Evaluation (not the Project's RRF)**

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>			
<b>Relevance</b>	To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant to national priorities (including clear linkage to CPD, UNDCS and international norms)?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	How much and in what ways did the project contribute to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase until the mid-term?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent was this project designed, implemented, monitored, and evaluated as rights based and gender sensitive?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent does the project create synergy/linkages with other projects and interventions in the country?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<i>See Project-Outcome/Activity Areas questions listed below.</i>	<i>See below.</i>	<i>See below.</i>
<b>Efficiency</b>	To what extent did the project's management model (i.e., instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent was the implementation of this project intervention more efficient in comparison to what could have been in the absence of such an intervention?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
	What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by UNDP until the mid-term of project execution?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
<b>Sustainability</b>	To what extent have the project decision making bodies and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the project? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits? How does the recent changes in legislation pertaining to lawyers and other relevant legal reforms might influence the sustainability of the project?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent will the project be replicable or scaled up?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent will the benefits and outcomes continue after external donor funding ends? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	What is the likelihood that 7 Violence Prevention Centres established will be operationally and financially self-sustainable once the donor funding ends?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	What can be done to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
<b>Cross-cutting issues:</b>	To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress in women's empowerment as well as mainstreaming gender equality? (to be elaborated in relation to the UNDP	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
	Gender Mainstreaming strategies and guidelines, along with other relevant strategies and guidelines)		
<b>Overall Effectiveness and Progress towards Project-Outcome/Activity Areas</b>	<i>*Note: incorporates Evaluation Questions on Effectiveness.</i>		
<i>Overall Effectiveness</i>	To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document's logical framework until the mid-term of the project duration? (The Individual Consultant is expected to provide detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs until June 2021 and 2) achievement of results until June 2021.)	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement until the mid-term of project execution? How might this be improved in the future?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of Judicial Reform Strategy, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	Did Covid-19 measures have a positive or negative effect on the achievement of project results?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
<i>Outcome 1 - Enhanced Coordination Between Women NGO's, Civil Society Organizations, Lawyers and Bar Associations to Improve the Legal Aid System in Turkey</i>			

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
1.1 Networking and coordination practices	To what extent have the recommendations of the Regional Workshops in Istanbul (and Ankara) been implemented?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews Workshop participant lists	# of regional workshops
	To what extent has the process of networking and coordination between NGOs and Bar Associations become 2-way? Are Bar Associations more aware of NGOs?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	*Bar associations and NGOs report communications with each other.
	What is the level of change perceived by the UTBA and by the leadership of NGOs and CSOs?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	To what extent have public authorities and officials at the local level become involved with networking and coordination practices of bar associations?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	How many bar associations have created coordination committees?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	*# of coordination committees created
	To what extent have numbers of legal aid referrals increased because of improved networking and coordination practices?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	What is the status of the collaboration between SÖNİM and the Samsun Bar Association? (i.e., cited as an example of effective coordination in the Phase II project document)? Are there other examples that can be cited of collaboration at the 7 Pilot Bar Associations for Phase II?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
	How have the networking and coordination practices taken account of Gender mainstreaming?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	N.A.
<b><i>Outcome II – Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations: Poppy Project practices</i></b>			
2.1 Tailor-made Training Programme	Were the training programmes developed? How many lawyers participated?	List of attendees to trainings	*# of materials? # of trainees participated in trainings

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
2.2 ToT Training Programme	Did lawyers take advantage of the ToT? How many lawyers participated in ToT? What was the impression of the participants?	Training certificates Interviews of training participants Results of UNDP survey	70 trainees participated in ToT trainings
2.3 Infrastructure Support and Upgrading of Pilot Bar Associations	To what extent, Legal Aid Phase I lessons learned were considered during the current phase and efforts were taken to reach certain results that weren't achieved in the previous phase. To what extent was Ankara Bar Association's Poppy Seed Center (which was promoted as a best practice in the first phase) is successfully emulated by 7 Violence Prevention Centers set up in the Second Phase?	Document review and Stakeholder Interviews	*# of Bar Associations provided <i>infrastructure</i> and management supports and technical advice. 7 pilot bars designed to implement poppy services (Refurbished, equipped and organized)
2.4 Communication and Outreach for each Pilot Bar Association	Did the project successfully establish a robust communication mechanism between CSOs and Bar Associations in the 7 pilot cities?	Communication Action Plan	Awareness raised in terms of legal aid services and Poppy practices through PR campaigns in 7 pilot bars [Note: this indicator from the Project RRF may not be measurable].
	How many PR campaigns were undertaken to date by the project?	Communication Action Plan PR campaign materials	*# of PR campaigns
2.5 Monitoring and Review of Local Poppy Practices (annual for 2020-2021)	Has groundwork been laid for an improved methodology for communications been developed for the 7 pilot VPCs ("Poppy Centers")?	Communication Action Plan	*Monthly activity reports #of promotion materials and informative videos circulated for 7 pilot bars.
	Has groundwork been laid for a data generating system for Bar Associations been designed and made operational?	Communication Action Plan	*Monthly activity reports #of promotion materials and informative videos circulated for 7 pilot bars.

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
	# Of monthly activity reports of each pilot Bar Association?	Communication Action Plan	*Monthly activity reports
	To what extent has the project contributed to the well-being and human rights of vulnerable groups, including, women and girls subjected to Gender Based Violence (GBV)? Did the project effectively contribute to leave no one behind agenda and successfully integrate human rights-based approach (HRBA)?	Document review and stakeholder interviews  Content of training materials	*Monthly activity reports; training materials
	How many victims of GBV have visited each pilot VPC to date? What have been the main types of cases and issues presented at the VPC? How many women have been referred by a VPC to a shelter? What is the length of time from initial intake to assignment of a legal aid lawyer for victims of GBV at the VPC?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	*Monthly activity reports
	What is UTBA's and MoJ's impression of the pilot VPC? What has been the role of local public officials in the VPC? Have the "bottlenecks" of the Poppy Project been resolved?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	*Monthly activity reports
<b><i>Outcome III – Enhanced Capacities of Lawyers Practicing Legal Aid Through a Tailor-made Training Programme</i></b>			
3.1 Training Needs Assessment for a tailor-made Online Training Programme on Legal Aid	Were the training programmes developed? # of materials? How many lawyers participated?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	Number of needs assessment report;
3.2 Preparation of Priority Modules on Legal-Aid for Online Training	Were the Priority Modules prepared and delivered?	Selected priority modules	Number of training programs developed;

Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas	Key Questions	Data Sources	Indicators/Success Standard
3.3 Preparation of Software Infrastructure for Online Training Programme	Status of Software Infrastructure for the Online Training Programme?	Desk reviews	Number of desk reviews conducted;
3.4 Number of training modules developed for online trainings.	What is the assessment of the UTBA of the Software Infrastructure?	Online trainings	Number of training modules developed for online trainings;
3.5 Number of analysis reports	Is UTBA satisfied with the technical assistance provided?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	Number of analysis reports
3.6 Number of lawyers issued certificates for their completion of training programs	Did lawyers take advantage of the ToT? How many lawyers participated in ToT? What was the impression of the participants?	Training certificates Results of UNDP survey of training participants	Number of lawyers issued certificates for their completion of training programs;
<b><i>Outcome IV – Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers</i></b>			
4.1 International Study Visits to Best Practices	How many study visits have been completed? Who were the participants? # of participants?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	# of international study visit reports
4.2 Implementation of Communication Plan for Awareness Raising on Performance Management and Automation System	Status of preparation of the Communication Plan?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	N.A.

<b>Evaluation Criteria and/or Project Outcome/Activity Areas</b>	<b>Key Questions</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>	<b>Indicators/Success Standard</b>
4.2.1 One-day National Conference	Status of the One-day National Conference?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	N.A.
4.2.2 Five Local Study Visits to Best Practicing Bar Associations	What were the locations of the study visits and who were the participants?	Document review and Stakeholder interviews	*# of study visits



## **E. Final List of individuals or groups interviewed**

### ***Proposed Stakeholders to be interviewed***

[Note: The MTE intends to interview all of the interviewee listed below, unless they are unavailable]

#### *UTBA and Pilot Bar Associations*

Union of Turkish Bar Associations

UTBA CCP Commission and/or Legal Aid Commission

Antalya Bar Association

Balıkesir Bar Association

Denizli Bar Association

Mardin Bar Association

Nevşehir Bar Association

Rize Bar Association

Samsun Bar Association

#### *Ministry of Justice*

Judicial Support and Victims' Services Department

#### *NGOs*

##### *Antalya*

Antalya S.S. Tourism Food Environment Women Initiative Production Operation Cooperative

Antalya Gender Equality Association

Antalya Women's Center and Solidarity Association

##### *Balıkesir*

Association of Research and Examination of Women's Social Life (KASAID)

Association of Sil Baştan

Anatolian Women's Movement

Edremit City Council Women's Assembly

##### *Denizli*

Protection of Women's Rights Association

Denizli Metropolitan Municipality City Council Women's Assembly

##### *Mardin*

Mardin Joint Women's Cooperation Association (MOKID)

"Leading Women's Association

(KIZILKADER - Kızıltepe Leader Women's Association) "

Women's Education Foundation and Employment Support Association

##### *Nevşehir*

Nevşehir Chamber of Commerce and Industry & Nevşehir Bar Association

Cappadocia Women's Solidarity Association

##### *Rize*

Rize Urban Development and Research Association

Rize City Council

##### *Samsun*

Turkish University Women Association (TÜKD) Samsun Branch

Elvinder Association

Women to Society Education Movement Association (KATEDER)

Donor

Embassy of Sweden in Ankara

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida

UNDP \*and UN

Assistant Resident Representative (Programme)

UNDP Gender Advisor

UNDP Project Management staff and Project Advisory Committee

UN Women

European Union

EU Commission Office in Turkey

## **F. Indicative Questions for Stakeholders Interviewed by the Evaluation**

### **MoJ**

How do you see this project contributing to the overall Judicial Reform and Human Rights strategies of the MoJ?

Can you describe the system of legal aid in Turkey and indicate how the ILAP contributes to legal aid?

What is the role of the provincial Bar Associations? How does the MoJ interact with the bar associations?

How does the government and MoJ track and prosecute cases of VAW?

In terms of the 7 pilot VPCs, can you provide me with MoJ's assessment of the relevance and status of the VPCs as of the project's midterm? What is the progress with organizing each of the VPCs?

Can you confirm that Nevshir is currently negotiating with the municipality for space and tell me more about that process?

What is the MoJ's overall assessment of the project's implementation at mid-term?

How does the MoJ determine which lawyers are experienced enough to render legal aid?

What was your assessment of the materials that you and consultant developed for the project?

How did the project adapt to the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic?

What are your thoughts on the sustainability of the project? Is it possible to scale the VPC to other provinces? What is the goal of the MoJ?

What is the MoJ's view of the CSOs involved in the project? Can you describe the MoJ's process for "vetting" of the CSOs?

### **UTBA**

What are the overall strengths and weaknesses of the implementation to date across its log frame, but in particular with the VPCs? What is the status of each of the VPCs?

How were the locations for the VPCs selected?

What have been some of the challenges of finding lawyers who can represent clients?

Can you describe the interaction between CSOs and UTBA?

What training has been implemented by the Project. Are you satisfied with the trainings?

How would you say that the Project has met its Gender goals?

How has the situation with legal aid and VAW changed over the past several years?

How does UTBA communicate for legal aid? What is the status of the UTBA communications plan?

What referral mechanisms are in place and used by UTBA, MoJ and the Bar Associations for legal aid?

How has UTBA interacted with the MoLFA

What was your impression of the other consultants hired by the Project?

What has been the impact of changes to Turkey's Attorney's Law on the intervention?

Have the regional meetings taken place? What were the outputs and impact?

What types of cases have you seen typically arising for legal aid? VAW/domestic abuse?

Are there any "roadblocks" procedurally that interfere with or deter women from obtaining legal aid/access to justice?

What is UTBA's working relationship with MoJ under the project?

How has the Project incorporated the "Poppy Model"? Why is the Ankara bar association not involved to a greater extent?

What is the effect of Turkey's withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention on legal aid for women?

### **UNDP**

From among the seven violence prevention centers, which centers are actually fully operational this point and receiving clients, or have none of them received clients yet? How many clients have, has each of the VPCs had already?

How have the VPC guidelines developed by the project been used and applied in practice?

How has the Project incorporated the “Poppy Model”? Why is the Ankara bar association not involved to a greater extent?

What is the effect of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention on legal aid for women?

Can you explain how Law 6284 operates?

How have the consultants performed?

What has been the visibility of the project?

The performance management system was not able to be achieved in Phase I. How is this progressing in Phase II? What is your plan for M&E and quality control at the VPC?

What is the rate of budgetary execution? How does UNDP intend to utilize or reallocate the surplus?

What is UNDP’s vision for scaling-up the VPCs? What is the level of political will on the part of the Government?

What are the experiences of the Project Manager and Senior Management with regard to implementation? What have been some of the main challenges and how did you overcome them?

What are your suggestions for the remaining period of the project’s implementation?

What are the project’s synergies with other projects across UNDP and the UNCT?

How has UNDP performed M&E for this project to date?

How has the Project met its cross-cutting outcomes (gender, conflict-reduction and the environment)? Specifically, what are the nodes in the legal system for addressing VAW and women’s rights? What is the current state of women’s rights in Turkey? What are the main legal issues facing women?

What are you seeing in the rural areas of Turkey with, uh, rural women, illiterate women, your most vulnerable populations?

What is your assessment of the outreach conducted of the project? Of the communications strategy?

What do you see the role of the project with local internal security forces in Turkey?

### **Sida**

What Sida’s overall assessment of the project’s relevance and impact to date?

Are you satisfied with the Project’s design and current log frame?

Do you have any statistics on legal aid at the Bar Associations....at the VPCs?

How has COVID impacted the ability of women in Turkey to report VAW, domestic abuse?

How has COVID impacted the project and how has UNDP adapted?

What is your overall assessment of UNDP’s performance as the administrative agent of the project?

What is your assessment of the role of UTBA and MoJ and the Government’s political will for this project? What lead Sida to approve a second phase of ILAP?

Why is the Ankara Bar Association (*i.e.*, where the “Poppy Project” began) not seen as a project partner?

Where there other partners that Sida would have liked to have seen as project partners? Were you satisfied with the selection of the CSOs? Are these CSOs truly independent and representative of the CSOs engaged in legal aid work in Turkey/in these provinces?

Are you satisfied with the level of M&E and statistics being generated to date?

What is your impression of the trainings that have been conducted by the Project? What feedback has Sida received from the project/trainees?

What was your impression of the other consultants hired by the Project?

Is the intervention sustainable?

What has been the impact of changes to Turkey’s Attorney’s Law on the intervention?

### **Bar Associations**

Are you familiar with the UNDP ILAP? What has been your Bar Association’s role and duties in the project?

How many years have you and your organization been involved with legal aid in Turkey?

How do you interact with the CSOs in your province to deliver legal aid? How do you communicate with the CSOs and legal aid lawyers on a daily/weekly basis? Is there a formal referral system for legal aid in your province? Within your bar association?

What is the status of the VPC at your bar association? Is the VPC yet fully capacitated? If so, has the VPC begun to accept clients? How many lawyers from your bar association do you expect to become involved with the VPC?

Does your Bar Association have a management committee or focal point established for legal aid? Does your Bar Association have a formal referral mechanism for legal aid? Does local government refer cases to the bar association?

How do you communicate with the public, with CSOs and the local administration? Do you feel that the communication between the bar association and the CSOs is a “two-way process”?

What has been the role of local state administration in the legal aid process and what is the political will for the VPC within your province/city?

What are the typical types of cases presented to your Bar Association?

Can you describe the procedures surrounding the investigation and prosecution of VAW?

Roughly speaking, what percentage of your legal aid clients are men and what percentage are women?

Do you charge clients for your services? How do you determine indigency?

What is your perception of the trainings that you received under the project? How many persons from your organization attended the trainings? In turn, how many persons have been trained by your organization using the ToT?

Were the regional meetings valuable? How have you utilized the knowledge and experience gained at such meetings?

Do you work with refugees? If so, can you provide an idea of what are the specific issues facing women refugees?

Do you work with women prisoners? Can you describe the legal aid needs of this population and how your organization works with them?

Out of the total number of women clients for legal aid serviced by your organization, what percentage also require shelter? What is your conception of how the VPCs will interact with the MoFLA SONIM?

In addition to women, do you have other groups of vulnerable people that come to your center or come to your Bar Association? For example, people with disabilities, are you seeing people with disabilities or handicap people, people that are mentally ill, are there other categories of cases and vulnerable groups that you see coming to your Bar Association?

Do you collect statistics on legal aid? How do you communicate such statistics to UNDP? To the Government? To UTBA? In your opinion is this a true “two way” communication?

How does your organization interview women who are victims of SBV and rape? What is the role of the medical examiner in documenting cases of SBV?

How does your Bar Association interact with local officials (i.e., the mayor’s office/Provincial governate) for women’s rights and legal aid? How do you interact and communicate with the medical examiner?

What is your assessment of the level of political will on the part of the Government of Turkey for legal aid? /women’s rights?

Can you describe any significant case histories that come to mind in order to illustrate how your Bar Association provided legal aid and interfaced with the local bar association/state administration?

How has your organization adapted to the COVID pandemic? How have you communicated to the public? How do you use social media?

What is your idea for sustainability of the VPCs?

What is the expected impact of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention?

What are other donor initiatives in which you’ve participated as aa Bar Association?

Are there legislative reforms that should be implemented for legal aid?

Has your Bar Association benefited from any study tours or exchanges? If so, which organization funded you and what did you learn?

Did your Bar Association benefit from the trainings provided by the Project? ToT trainings? Did you feel that the trainings were properly scaled? How did your

### **CSOs**

Are you familiar with the UNDP ILAP? What has been your role and duties in the project?

How many years have you and your organization been involved with legal aid in Turkey?

How do you interact with the Bar Association in your province to deliver legal aid? How do you communicate with the bar association on a daily/weekly basis? Is there a formal referral system for legal aid in your province?

What are the typical types of cases presented to your CSO?

Can you describe the procedures surrounding the investigation and prosecution of VAW?

Roughly speaking, what percentage of your legal aid clients are men and what percentage are women?

What are the mechanisms of communication that you use to communicate with the public and bar associations?

Do you charge clients for your services? How do you determine indigency?

What is your perception of the trainings that you received under the project? How many persons from your organization attended the trainings? In turn, how many persons have been trained by your organization using the ToT?

Were the regional meetings valuable? How have you utilized the knowledge and experience gained at such meetings?

Do you work with refugees? If so, can you provide an idea of what are the specific issues facing women refugees?

Do you work with women prisoners? Can you describe the legal aid needs of this population and how your organization works with them?

Out of the total number of women clients for legal aid serviced by your organization, what percentage also require shelter? What is your conception of how the VPCs will interact with the MoFLA SONIM?

In addition to women, do you have other groups of vulnerable people that come to your center or come to your NGO? For example, people with disabilities, are you seeing people with disabilities or handicap people, people that are mentally ill, are there other categories of cases and vulnerable groups that you see coming to your NGO?

Do you collect statistics on legal aid? How do you communicate such statistics to UNDP? To the Government? To UTBA? In your opinion is this a true “two way” communication?

How does your organization interview women who are victims of SBV and rape? What is the role of the medical examiner in documenting cases of SBV?

How does your NGO/CSO interact with local officials (i.e., the mayor’s office/Provincial governate) for women’s rights and legal aid? How do you interact and communicate with the medical examiner?

What is your assessment of the level of political will on the part of the Government of Turkey for legal aid? /women’s rights?

Can you describe any significant case histories that come to mind in order to illustrate how your NGO/CSO provided legal aid and interfaced with the local bar association/state administration?

How has your organization adapted to the COVID pandemic? How have you communicated to the public? How do you use social media?

What is your idea for sustainability of the VPCs?

What is the expected impact of Turkey’s withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention?

What are other donor initiatives in which you’ve participated as an NGO/CSO?

Are there legislative reforms that should be implemented for legal aid?

Has your NGO/CSO benefited from any study tours or exchanges? If so, which organization funded you and what did you learn?

## **G. List of supporting documents reviewed**

### Background Documents on Country and UNDP Priorities

Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators  
M&E strategy  
UNDP Guidelines on “Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit”  
UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2014-2017)  
UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (14 July 2014)  
UNDCS 2016-2020 and UNDP Country Programme Document 2016-2020  
Judicial Reform Strategy Document (updated in May 2019)

### Project Documents

Project Document of Legal Aid Project Phase I and Phase II  
Grant Agreement and its Annexes (including Description of the action, budget, communication plan)  
Inception and progress reports  
Final Report of Legal Aid Project Phase I  
Annual Workplan  
Steering Committee and Management Meeting Minutes  
Advisory Board Meetings Minutes  
Gender Action Plan  
VPC guideline  
Protocols  
First Regional Meeting Minutes  
\*Project Document of the UNDP “Enhancing Access to Public Services and Recourse for Violence Against Women (VAW) Survivors” Project (2020)  
\*Project Final Report: UNDP “Enhancing Access to Justice and Legal Aid for Refugees in Turkey” (December 2019)

### Internet Sources Documents

EU Commission Reports on Turkey’s EU Accession Application (2014-2020)

### Legislation

Law to Protect Family and Prevent Violence Against Women (Law No. 6284)  
Code of Lawyers  
Code of Civil Procedure  
Code of Criminal Procedure

## H. Summary of ILAP II Regional Workshops

The Project's 1st Regional Workshop was held in Ankara Hotel on 10 March 2020 was widely cited as a success by all Project partners and NGOs interviewed by the Evaluation. The workshop was attended by UTBA, the MoJ Department of Victim Rights, the seven pilot Bar Associations, UNDP's Project team and consultants, as well as the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative (for Programme), and the Embassy of Sweden/Sida as well as NGOs. The NGOs included the Federation of Women's Associations in Turkey (TKDF)-and umbrella organization. Additionally, Women's Studies Research Centers at universities in the 7 pilot provinces were invited to the Workshop. [See, *Report of the ILAP Phase II Project Component 1/1st Regional Workshop, 10 March 2020, Ankara and Annexes*]. The Workshop was gender sensitive with the participation of 17 men and 47 women and gender sensitive language used in its materials.

The Workshop served as an opportunity for all parties involved in the Project and its beneficiaries to discuss current problems and possible solutions. As such, the Regional Workshop served as the Project's key networking event. Project Experts made presentations on the legal framework, NGOs and communications. Afternoon sessions were devoted to provincial-focused discussions between each Bar Association and the NGOs/CSOs in their province, with the goal of increasing communications between these stakeholders and identifying key issues, challenges, and possible solutions. [*Id.*]

Based upon the Evaluation's interviews with members of civil society, the "1st Regional Meeting" was universally perceived by the NGOs who participated as a key networking event, which raised their awareness and enhanced their knowledge on how to perform legal aid services effectively in coordination with their local Bar Associations.

Several problems common to all 7 pilot locations were identified by the Project's Legal Expert. These included: lack of statistics and problems that this lack of statistics creates between women NGOs and institutions within their provinces such as law enforcement; the lack of Judicial Interview Rooms for prosecutors and lawyers to interview victims of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse and children; capacities of MoJ prosecutors; the need for ongoing training for lawyers and prosecutors; and enhanced cooperation between NGO and Bar Associations.

Meanwhile the Project's NGO experts discussed the need for Bar Associations and NGOs to start collecting statistics on cases of VAW. The Project's Communication Expert explained the general framework of the Communications Strategy and facilitated a Q&A session.

The group discussions between the seven pilot Bar Associations and NGOs identified similar issues, including the following:

- Collecting data and statistics within the framework of the VPCs
- Developing a common case management, data and file tracking system
- Translation of forms into local languages
- Providing psychological support to VPC lawyers
- Signing MoUs and Protocols between NGOs and Bar Associations
- Approaching provincial human rights boards to include the VPCs
- Having a VPC commission composed of stakeholders and NGOs
- Incorporating the input of the MoLSSF (MoFSS)
- Identifying "blind spots" (schools, tea distribution points, villages) to educate citizens
- Awareness raising should extend to Mukhtars.
- Establishing a common 24-hour call center with MoJ support
- Studying the impact of Statutory Decree No. 671 on conditional release for female prisoners.
- Promote more information and data sharing between the VPCs and NGOs
- Provide vocational, economic and legal support to victims of VAW, GBV and domestic abuse.
- Develop trainings and include the NGOs on VAW.
- Be more aware of the time limitations of volunteer lawyers and other experts.



## I. TOR for the evaluation.

Terms of Reference  
for  
Short Term Expert on Project Evaluation  
within the scope of  
**Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to  
Justice for All in Turkey Phase II Project (ILAP)**



### 1) BACKGROUND

According to Turkish justice system, legal aid applications are made either to Bar Associations or -if the case started to be processed- to the related court. Legal aid services are provided by lawyers appointed by Bar Associations. Legal aid fees are paid to lawyers by the Ministry of Treasury and the fee rate is determined by the court where the case has been processed. Turkey's efforts to improve access to justice for all have been given impetus since 2000 and providing better functioning legal aid system has been seen an important means for attaining that goal. For instance, one of the most important aspects of **Judicial Reform Strategy (JRS) of 2015-2020** was that unlike the previous one it started addressing the legal needs of specific groups such as women and children. The JRS was amended for a second time in May 2019 which includes provisions related to legal aid quality and performance standards. Furthermore, Ministry of Justice took important steps through its Judicial Support and Victims' Services Department such as the creation of Judicial Support Directorates<sup>34</sup> and Judicial Interview Rooms<sup>35</sup>. However, despite the initiatives for improvement of the legal aid services in Turkey, it is addressed by both EU Progress Reports, as well as international and national analysis that legal aid system in Turkey needs to be further supported and improved in terms of its procedures, quality and impact on citizens together with the coordination among all actors involved and further improvement of quality of legal-aid services provided by lawyers<sup>36 37</sup>. Legal aid system requires systemic improvement by incorporating new and practical mechanisms for recipients of legal aid, especially survivors of violence and victims of crimes to access solutions as fastest as possible. These mechanisms should be holistic where victims are able to access both legal and physical protection regardless of their age, gender, ethnicity, religion or status.

Both UNHCR 2016-2020<sup>38</sup> and UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD 2016-2020) make explicit references to the need to strengthen the judicial system to better protect and promote the rights of most vulnerable. **CPD Output 2.1.1** (Transparent and efficient judicial system providing better access to justice and redress for all, especially groups facing vulnerabilities) has a specific indicator on the provision of high-quality legal aid stated as:

**Indicator 2.1.1.1** # of individuals, particularly those facing vulnerabilities, with access to high quality legal aid, disaggregated by sex

Baseline: 30,000 (w); 35,000 (m) Target: 50,000 (w); 50,000 (m)

By considering all these circumstances and based on the achievements and results of the "Support to the Improvement of Legal Aid Practices for Access to Justice for All in Turkey Phase I", this Project aims to develop more coordinated, qualified and systematic approach to legal aid practices in Turkey

<sup>34</sup> <https://magdur.adalet.gov.tr/Home/SayfaDetay/adm-nedir> (accessed on 4 February 2021)

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.avrupa.info.tr/en/eu-and-turkish-authorities-improve-protection-vulnerable-groups-justice-system-7113> (accessed on 4 February 2021)

<sup>36</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20190529-turkey-report.pdf> (pg. 39, accessed on 4 February 2021)

<sup>37</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/turkey\\_report\\_2020.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/turkey_report_2020.pdf) (pg. 40, accessed on 4 February 2021)

<sup>38</sup> **UNHCR 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

**Indicator 2.1.3:** % of the targets of the new Judicial Reform Strategy to promote and protect the rights of specific groups (women, youth, children) achieved (from 0 % in 2016 to 4 % by 2020)

and build awareness on the operationalization of performance management tools and mechanisms to enhance the efforts to ease access to justice. This will be achieved through developing mechanisms for better coordination and improving networks among legal aid service providers (Union of Turkish Bar Associations, Bar Associations and lawyers), women's NGOs and civil society at large, as well as increased capacity of lawyers through a tailor-made training programme. With the aim to develop a systematic and structured approach, the Project will implement pilot practices for specialized legal aid services towards gender-based violence victims. The Project will also address the implementation of the policy recommendations for improved legal aid services generated in Phase I and will further support the institutional needs of Bar Associations through the dissemination of performance criteria and evaluation mechanisms that are introduced to ensure an effective, coordinated and monitored legal aid system in Turkey.

To give more detail about the nature of pilot practices of ILAP Phase II, 7 Violence Prevention Centers in Denizli, Balıkesir, Samsun, Rize, Mardin, Antalya and Nevşehir have been established so far with their proper venue, necessary hardware and human resources to serve legal aid recipients more effectively. These 7 Violence Prevention Centers will work as legal-aid support centers where effective counselling is provided to vulnerable individuals and people subjected to gender-based violence. VPCs will be working for an efficient legal aid system both in terms of the referral mechanism and quality of services provided. Legal aid lawyers will be working at VPCs, primarily to support women and girls subjected to violence and other members of vulnerable communities. VPCs will be cooperating with relevant public institutions at the local level such as: security forces, gendarmerie, provincial directorate of Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Services (MoFLSS), provincial directorate of Ministry of Health (MoH), governorates, district governorates, provincial directorate of migration management, municipalities, chief prosecutors and courthouses. VPCs will actively cooperate with civil society especially with NGOs working in the field of women and girls' rights. The VPCs will fill the gap in the local violence prevention mechanisms for efficient legal support and counselling for accelerating access to legal protection.

The project aims to achieve the following results for enhancing the efficiency of the legal aid system in Turkey:

- **Result I: (COORDINATION)** Enhanced coordination between women's NGOs, civil society, public bodies, lawyers and bar associations to improve the legal aid system in Turkey.
- **Result II: (SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT)** Development of a systematic and structured approach for legal aid services via implementing and further improving best practices in pilot Bar Associations
- **Result III: (CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT)** Enhanced capacities of lawyers practicing legal aid through a tailor-made training programme
- **Result IV: (AWARENESS RAISING)** Awareness raising among bar associations in Turkey on the performance criteria and evaluation mechanism for legal aid services and automation system for appointment of CCP lawyers

Union of Turkish Bar Associations (UTBA) is the end beneficiary and Ministry of Justice (MoJ) is the co-beneficiary of the Project. UNDP is the Implementing Agency of this Project. The Project is funded by the Swedish Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) which is based in Swedish Embassy in Ankara.

The project commenced on 1 June 2019, following the signature of the Project Document. The Project has been carrying out its activities in line with agreed workplans and deliverables set out in the Project Document. The project will end on 30 June 2022. Alongside this, the activities are also in line with the inception phase, where pilot reviews, road maps and reports were prepared, listing the training needs in each pilot bar association to establish and operationalize VPCs. While mid-term evaluation was initially scheduled for September 2020, due to spread of Covid-19 pandemic, there have been certain delays in project activities such as the establishment of Violence Prevention Centres (VPCs) and training of legal practitioners whose exclusion from the mid-term evaluation would have given an incomplete picture about project accomplishments. In agreement with the donor, it was later decided to carry out the mid-

term evaluation in June 2021 to capture the lessons learned and to translate them into actionable strategies for the remaining portion of the project.

## **2) SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

Short Term Expert on Project Evaluation will be mobilized as Individual Consultant for preparing an independent mid-term evaluation report that measures the expected results and specific objectives achieved until the mid-term of project duration against those stated in the Project and identifying the lessons learned which are relevant for the remaining portion of the project duration as well as to the planning, preparation and implementation phases of a possible subsequent project through the conduct of an evaluation mission.

**The object of study for this evaluation is** understood to be the set of components, specific objectives (outcomes), expected results (outputs), activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document(s) and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This midterm evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

- To measure to what extent the project has contributed to solve the needs identified in the design phase until the mid-term of project duration,
- To measure project's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on expected results (outputs) and outcomes, against what was originally planned until the mid-term of project duration or subsequently officially revised,
- To measure the project contribution to the objectives set in the Country Program Document (CPD) of UNDP Turkey and United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS),
- To generate substantive evidence-based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability) and to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components.

## **3) EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Considering the evaluation parameters, the Individual Consultant is expected to analyse data and share his/her findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by this analysis. As a reference point for the evaluation, the Individual Consultant is provided with indicative evaluation questions below, which are expected to be amended, elaborated and submitted and shall be included as an annex to the final version of the midterm report.

### **Relevance:**

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse the extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and international norms:

1. To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant to national priorities (including clear linkage to CPD, UNDCS and international norms)?
2. How much and in what ways did the project contribute to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase until the mid-term?
3. To what extent was this project designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated as rights based and gender sensitive? (See Gender Equality related documents to be reviewed under Annex C.)
4. To what extent does the project create synergy/linkages with other projects and interventions in the country?

### **Effectiveness:**

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the Project objectives have been achieved or how likely they are to be achieved:

1. To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document's logical framework until the mid-term of the project duration? (The Individual Consultant is expected to provide detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs until June 2021 and 2) achievement of results until June 2021.)

2. To what extent, Legal Aid Phase I lessons learned were considered during the current phase and efforts were taken to reach certain results that weren't achieved in the previous phase. To what extent was Ankara Bar Association's Poppy Seed Center (which was promoted as a best practice in the first phase) is successfully emulated by 7 Violence Prevention Centers set up in the Second Phase?
3. Did the project successfully establish a robust cooperation mechanism between CSOs and Bar Associations in pilot cities?
4. What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement until the mid-term of project execution? How might this be improved in the future?
5. Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
6. To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of Judicial Reform Strategy, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?
7. To what extent has the project contributed to the well-being and human rights of vulnerable groups, including, women and girls subjected to Gender Based Violence (GBV)? Did the project effectively contribute to leave no one behind agenda and successfully integrate human rights-based approach (HRBA)?
- 8) Did Covid-19 measures have a positive or negative effect on the achievement of project results?

### **Efficiency:**

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and the results have been delivered with the least costly way possible:

1. To what extent did the project's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
2. To what extent was the implementation of this project intervention more efficient in comparison to what could have been in the absence of such an intervention?
3. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency?
4. What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
5. What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by UNDP until the mid-term of project execution?

### **Sustainability:**

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the project's positive actions are likely to continue during the remainder portion and after the end of the project:

1. To what extent have the project decision making bodies and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the project? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
2. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits? How does the recent changes in legislation pertaining to lawyers and other relevant legal reforms might influence the sustainability of the project?
3. To what extent will the project be replicable or scaled up?
4. To what extent will the benefits and outcomes continue after external donor funding ends? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends?
5. What is the likelihood that 7 Violence Prevention Centres established will be operationally and financially self-sustainable once the donor funding ends?
6. What can be done to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes?

### **Cross-Cutting Issues:**

All the above-mentioned 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:

1. To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress in women's empowerment as well as mainstreaming gender equality? (to be elaborated in relation to the UNDP Gender Mainstreaming strategies and guidelines, along with other relevant strategies and guidelines)
2. To what extent the project adopted environmental and conflict mainstreaming?

#### **4) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The Individual Consultant will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in this Terms of Reference and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, Individual Consultant is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements which are indicatively listed in **Annex C** of this Terms of Reference. Individual Consultant is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tool to collect relevant data for the evaluation. The Individual Consultant will make sure that the voices, opinions and information of target audience/participants of the project are considered.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the Inception Report and the Final Evaluation Report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality.

In addition, the Individual Consultant must assure that information and data are gathered and reported in a gender sensitive approach. To that extent, specific methodological tools should be used, and sex disaggregated data should be provided.

#### **5) KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

There will be actors involved in the implementation of monitoring and evaluation:

##### **1. Evaluation Manager**

This role will be conducted by the **Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst of UNDP** who will have the following functions:

- Supervise the evaluation process throughout the main phases of the evaluation (preparation of the ToR, implementation and management and use of the evaluation)
- Participate in the selection and recruitment of the Individual Consultant
- Provide the Individual Consultant with administrative support and required data and documentation
- Ensure the evaluation deliverables meet the required quality
- Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the Individual Consultant
- Review the Inception Report, Draft Evaluation and Final Evaluation Reports and give necessary approvals on behalf of UNDP
- Collect and consolidate comments on draft evaluation reports and share with the evaluation team for finalization of the evaluation report
- Contribute to the development of management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP
- Ensure evaluation terms of reference, final evaluation reports, management responses are publicly available through Evaluation Resource Center within the specified timeframe
- Facilitate, monitor and report on implementation of management responses on a periodic basis

##### **2. Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio Manager** will have the following functions:

- Establish the Evaluation Reference Group with key project partners when needed
- Ensure and safeguard the independence of the evaluation
- Provide comments and clarifications on the Terms of Reference, Draft Inception Report and Draft Evaluation Reports

- Ensure the Individual Consultant's access to all information, data and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who are expected to participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods
- Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions
- Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to key stakeholders
- Be responsible for implementation of key actions of the management response

**3. The Individual Consultant** will conduct the evaluation study by fulfilling his/her contractual duties and responsibilities in line with this ToR, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and ethical guidelines. This includes submission of all deliverables stipulated under Article 11 (Terms and Payments) of this ToR, to the satisfaction of UNDP. Individual Consultant's functions do not include any managerial, supervisory and/or representative functions in UNDP, end beneficiaries and implementing partners. All documents and data provided to the Individual Consultant are confidential and cannot be used for any other purpose or shared with a third party without any written approval from UNDP.

**4. Evaluation Reference Group:** Union of Turkish Bar Associations, Ministry of Justice and SIDA will function as the evaluation reference group. This group is composed of the representatives of the major stakeholders in the project and will review and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation process, as well as on the evaluation products (more specifically comments and suggestions on the draft report and final report) and options for improvement.

## **6) EXPECTED DELIVERABLES**

The Individual Consultant is expected to submit the following deliverables to the satisfaction of UNDP:

- **Inception Report:**

This report will be 15 pages maximum in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for carrying out the independent evaluation. The report should justify why the said methods are the most appropriate, given the set of evaluation questions identified in the ToR. It will also include a mission programme which indicates proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. This document will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Individual Consultant and UNDP. In principle, the report is expected to contain the outline stated in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.

- **Draft Evaluation Report:**

The draft evaluation report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be approximately 30 pages in length, excluding annexes. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. UNDP will disseminate the draft evaluation report to the Evaluation Reference Group in order to seek their comments and suggestions. Comments and suggestions of UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group will be collected in an audit trail and will be shared with the Consultant for him/her to make his/her final revisions.

- **Final Evaluation Report:**

The final evaluation report will be approximately 30 pages in length excluding annexes. The final evaluation report will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality. In addition, the Final Evaluation Report should contain clear recommendations that are concrete, feasible and easy to understand. The Final Evaluation Report will be shared with UNDP to be disseminated to the key stakeholders. In principle, this report is expected to contain the sections stated in Annex B of this Terms of Reference. The Consultant will

also submit his/her answers to the Audit Trail to show the actions taken/not taken and revisions made/not made in line with suggestions and recommendations of UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group providing detailed justifications in each case.

### **Reporting Line**

The Individual Consultant will be responsible to the Evaluation Manager (in this case UNDP's Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst) for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned throughout this Terms of Reference. All the reports are subject to approval from Evaluation Manager, in order for the payments to be affected to the Individual Consultant.

### **Reporting Conditions**

The reporting language will be English. All information should be provided in electronic version in word format. The Individual Consultant shall be solely liable for the accuracy and reliability of the data provided, along with links to sources of information used.

### **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.

## **7) TIMING AND DURATION**

The Assignment will be non-consecutively undertaken by the Individual Consultant throughout the timeframe below;

**Contract Start Date:** 3 May 2021

**Contract End Date:** 26 July 2021

Following the mobilization of the Individual Consultant; submission of the documents, access to reports and archives and briefing on project, the following timeframe will be followed:

Activity of the Implementation Phase	Responsible Party	Due Date
Kick off meeting	Portfolio Manager, Evaluation Manager and Project Team	3 May 2021
Draft Inception Report	Individual Consultant	10 May 2021
Providing the feedbacks to the Draft Inception Report	Portfolio Manager, Evaluation Manager	14 May 2021
Finalized Inception Report based on the feedbacks received from UNDP	Individual Consultant	18 May 2021
Data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders <sup>39</sup>	Individual Consultant	20 May – 4 June 2021
Delivery of Draft Evaluation Report compiling findings from data collection and interviews with key stakeholders	Individual Consultant	11 June 2021
Review the Draft Evaluation Report and provide feedback	Portfolio Manager, Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Reference Group	18 June 2021
Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report by taking into consideration the feedbacks received from UNDP	Individual Consultant	25 June 2021
<b>Total Evaluation Process (days)</b>		<b>30 Days</b>
<b>Estimated Maximum Total Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC</b>		<b>30 Days</b>

<sup>39</sup> (exact interview date(s) will be decided by UNDP and communicated with the Individual Contractor)

## Expected Interview Schedule

Partners/ Stakeholder(s) to be Interviewed	Location <sup>40</sup>	Estimated Day(s) of Interview
UNDP	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Union of Turkish Bar Associations	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Ministry of Justice	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
SIDA	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Violence Prevention Centers at 7 pilot provinces and NGOs	Antalya, Balıkesir, Denizli, Nevşehir, Rize, Samsun, Mardin	10
ESTIMATED TOTAL		12

## 8) INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

UNDP will provide background materials for the IC's review. Neither UNDP nor any of the project partners are required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection, etc.) and at the discretion of UNDP and/or the relevant project partners, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC. UNDP and/or the relevant project partners will facilitate meetings between the IC and other stakeholders, when needed.

## 9) ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the UNEG.

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Individual Consultant and Project Team in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The Individual Consultant must corroborate all assertions and disagreements with him/her must be noted.
- **Integrity.** The Individual Consultant will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The Individual Consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the interviews, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to UNDP. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by UNDP in this Terms of Reference.
- **Validation of information.** The Individual Consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.

<sup>40</sup> The locations of partners and stakeholders does not rule out the probability of a remote monitoring mission. The names of cities are there to inform the reader about the location of stakeholders and do not mean that the evaluator must pay an in-person field visit to each city indicated in this list.



- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the Consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports/deliverables.** If delivery of the reports/deliverables is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is lower than of the quality desired by UNDP, the Individual Consultant will not be entitled for any payment regarding that specific report/deliverable, even if s/he has invested person/days for submission of the report/deliverable.

## 10) PLACE OF WORK

Duty Station for the Assignment is Home-based. The Individual Consultant may be requested to travel to or within Turkey. However, as the COVID-19 pandemic is still continuing, field visit to Ankara might not be possible and interviews might be held virtually through telecommuting and online conferencing tools, or any other alternative method to protect the safety of individual consultant, key actors and informants whilst ensuring the successful conduct of evaluation mission. “Interviews” referred in this Terms of Reference comprises such telecommuting and online conferencing tools as well. Nevertheless, if UNDP deems a field visit is necessary, travel, accommodation costs (bed and breakfast) and living costs (terminal expenses, intra-city travel costs, lunch, dinner, etc.) of the missions to Ankara and/or other provinces of Turkey will be borne by UNDP. UNDP will arrange economy class roundtrip flight tickets through its contracted Travel Agency.

Assignment-related travel and accommodation costs outside of the Duty Station, which are pre-approved by UNDP, will be borne by UNDP in line with UNDP’s corporate rules and regulations. 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, through UNDP’s official Travel Agency or,
- Reimbursed to the Consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table or,
- Covered by the combination of both options.

The following guidance on travel compensation is provided as per UNDP practice:

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/receipt, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP’s F-10 Form 3- 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 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	

## 11) TERMS AND PAYMENTS

### • Contracting Authority

Contracting Authority for this Assignment is UNDP, and the contract amount will be provided through the project budget.

### • Contracting Modality

IC – Individual Contract of UNDP.

• **Payment Schedule**

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of all corresponding deliverables by UNDP on the basis of payment terms indicated below, along with the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the Individual Consultant and approved by Evaluation Manager (Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst).

The maximum total amount to be paid to the Individual Consultant within the scope of this assignment cannot exceed equivalent of 30 person/days. The payments will be made according to the below table:

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Estimated Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC*</b>	<b>Payment</b>
Draft Inception Report	10 May 2021	6	N/A
Finalized Inception Report based on the feedbacks received from UNDP	18 May 2021	2	N/A
Data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders	4 June 2021	12	N/A
Delivery of Draft Evaluation Report compiling findings from data collection and interviews with key stakeholders	11 June 2021	5	N/A
Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report by taking into consideration the feedbacks received from UNDP	25 June 2021	5	Upon submission and approval of all five deliverables (100% of the total contract amount)
<b>Estimated Maximum Total Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC</b>		<b>30 Person/Days</b>	

\*While the number of days to be invested for each deliverable may change, the total number of days invested by the Individual Consultant cannot exceed **30 days** for this assignment (i.e. for submission of all the deliverables) as defined in this ToR.

Without submission and approval (by UNDP) of the above listed deliverables in due time and quality, the Consultant shall not be entitled to receive any payment from the UNDP even if he/she invests time in this assignment. While the IC may invest less or more than estimated number of person/days for each deliverable different than the estimated person/days stipulated in the above table, the total amount of payment to be affected to the IC within the scope of this Assignment cannot exceed equivalent of **30 person/days** throughout the contract validity.

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

If any of the deliverables stipulated in this Terms of Reference are not produced and delivered by the IC in due time and to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the IC has invested person/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

The IC shall be paid in USD if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TRY through conversion of the USD amount by the official UN Operational Rate of Exchange applicable on the date of money transfer.

The amount paid to the consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax, etc. The daily fee to be paid to the Consultant is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. The daily fee amount should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed) etc. UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa etc. It is the applicants' responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters.

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.

## 12) QUALIFICATION AND SKILLS REQUIREMENTS

	Minimum Qualification Requirements	Assets
<b>General Qualifications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bachelor's Degree in public administration, law, economics, international relations, development studies or any other relevant field.</li> <li>• Good command of spoken and written English.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master's or Ph.D. Degree in law, development studies, public administration or any other relevant field.</li> </ul>
<b>General Professional Experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 7 years of overall professional experience in research design, field work, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research strategies, including but not limited to focus groups, surveys and interview techniques.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 to 11 years of overall professional experience in research design, field work, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research strategies, including but not limited to focus groups, surveys and interview techniques.</li> <li>• More than 12 years of overall professional experience in research design, field work, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research strategies, including but not limited to focus groups, surveys and interview techniques.</li> </ul>

	Minimum Qualification Requirements	Assets
<b>Specific Professional Experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 5 years of professional international experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, research or review of legal aid/justice/human rights projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator.</li> <li>• Experience in evaluation of legal aid, justice sector and/or human rights projects/programmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 to 9 years of professional international experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, research or review of legal aid/justice/human rights projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator.</li> <li>• More than 10 years of professional international experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, research or review of legal aid/justice/human rights projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator.</li> <li>• Experience in evaluation of projects funded by SIDA.</li> <li>• Authorship of article(s) / research paper(s) on programme/project evaluation.</li> </ul>
<p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.</li> <li>• Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.</li> <li>• Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.</li> <li>• Experience gained prior to completion of undergraduate studies is not considered professional experience.</li> </ul>		

### 13) ANNEXES

#### Annex A - Outline of the Inception Report

1. **Background and context** illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
2. **Evaluation objective, purpose and scope.** A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. **Evaluation criteria and questions.** The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
4. **Evaluability analysis.** Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
5. **Cross-cutting issues.** Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analyzed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.

6. **Evaluation approach and methodology**, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods,<sup>41</sup> sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
7. **Evaluation matrix**. This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
8. A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed **resource requirements** tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites
10. **Outline of the draft/final report** as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.

## **Annex B - Outline of the draft and final reports**

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:
  - Name of the evaluation intervention.
  - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
  - Countries of the evaluation intervention.
  - Names and organizations of evaluators.
  - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
  - Acknowledgements.
2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports (non-GEF) on second page (as one page):
3. **Table of contents**, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.
4. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**.
5. **Executive summary (four-page maximum)**. A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
  - Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), 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.
  - Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.
6. **Introduction**
  - Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
  - Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
  - Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention).
  - Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

---

<sup>41</sup> Annex 2 outlines different data collection methods.

7. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:
  - Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
  - Explain the **expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
  - Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDCS priorities, corporate multi-year 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.
  - Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
  - 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 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).
8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.
  - **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
  - **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
  - **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
  - **Evaluation questions** define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.
9. **Evaluation approach and methods.** The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- **Evaluation approach.**

- **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
  - **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
  - **Data-collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
  - **Performance standards:** the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
  - **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
  - **Ethical considerations:** the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).<sup>42</sup>
  - **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
  - **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.
10. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
  11. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.
  12. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
  13. **Recommendations.** The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or

---

<sup>42</sup> UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.



programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

14. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.
15. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
  - TOR for the evaluation.
  - Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
  - List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
  - List of supporting documents reviewed.
  - Project or programme results model or results framework.
  - Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
  - Code of conduct signed by evaluators.

## **Annex C – Documents to be Reviewed**

### **Background Documents on Country and UNDP Priorities (will be provided after Contract Signature)**

- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- M&E strategy
- UNDP Guidelines on “Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit”
- UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2014-2017)
- UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (14 July 2014)
- UNDCS 2016-2020 and UNDP Country Programme Document 2016-2020
- Judicial Reform Strategy Document (updated in May 2019)

### **Project Documents, which will be provided after Contract Signature**

- Project Document of Legal Aid Project Phase I and Phase II
- Grant Agreement and its Annexes (including Description of the action, budget, communication plan)
- Inception and progress reports
- Final Report of Legal Aid Project Phase I
- Annual Workplan
- Steering Committee and Management Meeting Minutes
- Advisory Board Meetings Minutes
- Gender Action Plan
- VPC guideline
- Protocols
- First Regional Meeting Minutes