

***Final Evaluation of the Project  
Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security  
Forces Phase III***

**December 2021**

Project information		
Project/outcome title	Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces Phase III	
ATLAS ID	00095989	
UNDCS Outcome and CPD Output (2016-2020)	UNDCS 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.  CPD Output 2.1.4 Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services  CPD Output 2.1.3 Enhanced capacity of civil society actors for participation in policy making and monitoring	
Country	Turkey	
Region	RBEC	
Date Project document signed	20.12.2018	
Project Dates	Start	Planned End Date
	21.12.2018	21.12.2021
Total Committed Budget	5.400.000 EUR	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	3.399.209,12 EUR (as of 24.11.2021)	
Funding Source	EU Delegation	
Implementing Party	Ministry of Interior - Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Acquisition Department (Main Beneficiary) TGNA (Co-beneficiary)	
Evaluation Information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country program, etc.)	Project Evaluation	
Final/midterm review/ other	Final Evaluation	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	December 2018	December 2021
Evaluators	Mr. Tomislav Novović, Senior Evaluation Expert	
Evaluator e-mail address	<a href="mailto:tomislav.novovic@gmail.com">tomislav.novovic@gmail.com</a>	
Evaluation Dates	Start	Completion
	September 2021	December 2021

## Executive summary

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office in Turkey contracted with an independent expert to conduct an independent final evaluation of its "Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces -Phase III" (after this COIII or Project). The COIII is a strategic initiative designed to ensure the institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices. The Project total budget has been €5,400,000; the European Union provided support to this initiative; the project was originally planned for the duration of 24 months; however, two non-cost extensions have been approved, reaching 36 months of implementation.

The evaluation independently assessed the Project's effectiveness to date, determined whether it has delivered planned results, identified gaps in performance against targets, and provided recommendations (including how to close these gaps in the remaining period of the Project and through the follow-up initiative). Thus, the evaluation serves to inform the stakeholders of the success of the COIII project and identify lessons learned to share with the partners, make course corrections and strengthen programming to achieve a more sustainable results and evident effects.

The evaluation conducted primary and secondary research, collecting qualitative and quantitative data to address the evaluation questions from the Terms of Reference, further elaborated through the Inception Report. The primary research applied 27 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and eight focus groups meetings with representatives of various Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSB) reaching a total of 48 persons (22 women and 26 men). The research has been focused on the main criteria for evaluation of development assistance.

### FINDINGS

#### Relevance

The COIII fully aligns with governance priorities related to democratic oversight of internal security forces, including citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices. The Project addressed the priorities of the Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018) and Turkey's EU Strategy. It also contributed to the objectives of the European Union's IPA II - Indicative Strategy Paper for Turkey (2014-2020) to improve the capacities of institutions, including CSOs, in charge of protecting and guaranteeing respect and defence of fundamental rights. The Project's support advanced Turkey's efforts and ongoing work regarding the Accession Partnership and EU/Commission policies. As a result, the country has adopted measures for expanding human rights and ensuring a zero-tolerance policy against torture and ill-treatment. In addition, the Project falls under the United Nations Strategy 2016-2020 and its Pillar 2: Democracy and Human Rights, and the UNDP Country programme document for Turkey (2016-2020).

The partners stated that COIII addressed their needs and priorities concerning their roles in civilian and democratic oversight of ISF, emphasizing that COIII focus on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety has been particularly beneficial.

The COIII remained well-aligned with governance-related strategic priorities during its implementation thus far. The key national - strategic documents, such as Turkey's Eleventh Development Plan 2019-2023 recognized the need for "strengthening security by taking into consideration all aspects within the framework of the rule of law and its supremacy, under the principles of civilian oversight, transparency, accountability and comprehensiveness". In addition, the recent EU Progress Report on Turkey recognized the government's efforts to consolidate further civilian oversight of the security forces. However, this document also stated that the security and intelligence sector's legal and institutional framework remained unchanged, with strengthened civilian oversight under the presidential election system. Furthermore, the EU report recognized the need to continue implementing efforts to improve the transparency and accountability of military, police and intelligence services.

#### Coherence and responsiveness

Coherence, coordination of activities and exchange of information between COIII's team, UNDP projects and other initiatives in fundamental rights and freedoms (and broader governance area) have been established.

UNDP Office in Turkey played an important role in promoting internal coherence. In addition, the COIII Project team has generally established coordination of activities and exchange of information with other UNDP projects and initiatives of other development partners in fundamental rights and freedoms broader good governance framework.

The Project participated in the sector coordination meetings. For example, during the inception period, the General Director of the Provincial Administration has organized meetings to discuss the Project, planned activities, and the national stakeholders' involvement. Furthermore, these coordination efforts continued, and the Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection (DSIODC), with the Project organized focal points' meetings to identify a reference person from each partner's institution, confirming commitment and interest during the project implementation. In partnership with the MoI-DSIODC, and the members of the LPSBs, the COIII has ensured the coherent and consistent implementation, ensuring effective citizens engagement in security governance and producing specific action plans.

### **Gender mainstreaming and leaving no-one behind**

The COIII has considered and addressed gender equality and gender mainstreaming during its implementation, at various levels, recognizing the need to address the challenge of gender-blinded public policies and practices as "barriers for women to gain full access to their civic, social and economic rights." Namely, the COIII has been working on "lasting changes in the power and choices of women over their own lives, while tackling the root causes of inequality" piloting activities for gender equality as a fundamental human right and a democratic principle, essential for improving good security sector governance. The partners highlighted the Local Prevention and Security in addition to gender-balanced participation in different events and programs. Practically, the COIII, through the LPSBs engaged citizens (involving civil society organizations, Mukhtars and media) into decision-making processes to improve the service orientation of the law enforcement agencies. The LPSBs, through their action plans, identified prevention priorities that could ensure significant differences in women's lives if implemented fully. Also, the LPSB recognized the pressing problems of gender-based violence, proposing capacity development for law-enforcement structures to act in the cases of GBV and support victims of violence. The local security plans proposed a more coordinated and multi-sectoral approach at the local level to eliminate gender-based violence. However, the COIII results matrix did not adequately integrate gender considerations, with limited presence of gender-sensitive indicators (to measure gender transformation). At the same time, the COIII at the level of activities has designed data collection methods to systemically analyse gender participation and disaggregate information by gender and monitor women's meaningful engagement across activities (for example, at the level of LPSBs, gender sensitive data collection for participation and engagement).

The COIII is based on the notion that citizens participation for transparent and accountable security management is a cornerstone of good governance and prerequisite for SDG achievement. The main reference has been SDG 16- to "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels" recognizes the strong link between sustainable development and peace, stability, human rights and effective governance, based on the rule of law. Generally, responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making and effective, accountable and transparent law enforcement institutions directly support national objectives, including those relating to the SDGs. The FEC finds that the COIII team and partners at the level of actual implementation have established people-centred processes that ensured broader participation and more effective civilian scrutiny and oversight to the police forces, thus, enabling links between national development objectives, including SDGs and security and crime prevention

### **Efficiency**

Despite initial delays, UNDP Office managed to introduce changes in the COIII Project Team, bringing a new Chief Technical Advisor and a new Project Manager onboard. Technical capacities of this strengthened COIII Project Team and partnership with participating institutions facilitated recovery and speed up implementation.

Furthermore, the Covid-19 pandemic and imposed restrictions (March 2020) adversely impacted the implementation of activities, reducing opportunities for direct interactions, meetings, and workshops. The Project's primary beneficiary, the General Directorate for Provincial Administrations (DGPA), has become the coordination point of COVID-19 related measures, limiting availability and ability to respond to the Project's requests. Thus, the decision to introduce the Ministry of Interior Department of Smuggling, Intelligence,

Operations and Data Collection (DSIODC) as main beneficiary has been positive, resulting in "significant momentum" to the COIII objectives".

UNDP prepared two requests for no-cost extensions, recognizing challenges and highlighting the unprecedented situation brought by COVID- 19. The approved extension provided additional 12 months for implementation. The FEC finds that the COIII no-cost extensions have been justified and required, contributing to the delivery of results and genuine knowledge transfer and development of capacities setting the ground for the follow-up activities and sustainability of results.

COIII has established a clear work plan and, with the approved extensions until December 2021, is on the path to completing planned targets within the approved budget.

COIII's included results-oriented annual plans and more detailed quarterly plans. These plans provided a sound basis for scheduling, resource allocation, budget control, and attainment of results. The COIII work plans have been instrumental in successfully delivering results, especially evident during the last Project's year. The focus has been on providing technical level activities, ensuring that strategic decisions are aligned with national priorities and identified needs of participating institutions.

The FEC found that the work plan preparation has been participatory, through the joint efforts of the COIII team and national partners, primarily the Ministry of Interior, Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT). The stakeholders stated that the COIII work plan also enabled coordination, especially being effective in planning, implementing and synchronizing activities, for example, the experts' missions and capacity development programs.

The COIII has established a Project Steering Committee as the main advisory and steering structure to provide guidance and support the COIII team to reach Project's objectives, ensuring coherence and coordination with other interventions (EU funded and other governance initiatives) in Turkey.

COIII has established a sound monitoring and reporting system. This monitoring system served as the reference during reporting, and it was based on the COIII Results Framework (RF), with tailor-made data collection protocols and instruments. The indicators presented in the RF have been mostly satisfactory; still, the evaluation team found gaps within the existing indicators, as they have not been sufficiently "gender sensitive" and some Project's areas have not been adequately considered. For example, indicators could not adequately measure COIII's performance in the areas, such as citizens participation- it rather remained at the level of established LPSBs.

The COIII Project has established a regular reporting practice, fully aligned with the results-oriented reporting principles. Concerning reporting frequency, after the initial Inception report the COIII team prepares regular annual reports, providing a presentation of implemented activities, and presenting plans for the next year.

## **Effectiveness**

Despite initial delays, the Project has been effective in delivering outputs and meeting planned targets, the primary and secondary sources confirmed positive changes in relevant statistical indicators under outputs<sup>1</sup>.

The FEC prepared a comprehensive table that analysed intervention logic (this included the overall results chain, outcome and outputs) and respective indicators under each of the elements, striving to establish credible links to the extent possible between specific results and reported progress under the COIII outputs and its outcome. Based on this analysis, the Project achieved around 94% of the planned targets. Some of the main results have been draft legal and policy document for establishing National Crime Prevention Center and institutionalization of the LPSBs, strengthening the role of the GNAT and improving capacities of the main stakeholders (at the national and sub-national levels) to implement their mandates regarding civilian oversight of the ISFs. Specifically, the COIII has addressed the need to facilitate the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system and increase government accountability (to the citizens) by setting the basis for sectoral policies and institutional mechanisms.

---

<sup>1</sup> The in-depth analysis of the COIII effectiveness has been based on its aggregated progress and monitoring reports, the work plans, and other prepared analytical reports and documents. The interviews with stakeholders served to validate findings.

The FEC used the policy cycle model as an analytical tool to assess and justify the links between the results of the Project and its objective at the policy level.

**I) Policy decisions (problem identification and agenda setting) and policy development:** the FEC finds various examples that the COIII produced inputs for policy development, identifying problems and setting the scene for decisions. The COIII prepared a legal gap and compliance analysis of democratic and civilian oversight of ISFs between Turkey and selected EU member-states. This analysis provided the basis for policy decisions, identifying gaps between Turkey and EU countries. This systematic assessment of the legal gaps proposed amending six laws. The COIII provided inputs and prepared recommendations for amendments to six laws. Two laws regulate ISF's actions with impact on citizens' fundamental rights, regulating use of personal data and freedom of expression / peaceful gathering. It also included two laws regulating judicial oversight- the administrative power of the prosecutor for oversight of agents and the penal responsibility of ISFs before a judge. The last laws concern the regulation and transparency of the use of force in two aspects: the use of stops and weapons. Another example could be that the Project carried out the review of EU best practices and prepared a gap analysis on the current performance evaluation system in Turkey with the reference to two dimensions of police performance: "civilian oversight of internal security forces" and "citizen focus".

In addition, the Project provided direct inputs to the national policy preparation through its support to the draft law establishing the National Crime Prevention Office.

Similarly, the Project provided policy recommendations to address the issues related to oversight of the ISF and enhance the potential of the new role of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT). The COIII also raised to the policy agenda the need to further strengthen and institutionalize participation of citizens.

**II) Policy drafting, including policy Instruments and Implementation mechanisms:** COIII has designed tools and instruments that, according to the stakeholders, resulted in new policies, and facilitated policy implementation. The COIII has completed and submitted to the national partners the Five years organisational Strategy, the Strategy for effective and full-functioning Parliamentary oversight and the Strategy on crime prevention and civilian oversight of the security sector. These documents could serve as the basis for sustainability planning.

The project has provided inputs and capacity support for the partners to mainstream gender in their COIII work. For example, gender equality approach has been mainstreamed in training programs for ISF and gendarmerie on citizens focused security services. The topics included presentation of the essential gender mainstreaming and gender equality concepts (including international norms and standards and national legal framework) and equality-based security services. In addition, the members of the LPSBs benefited from gender-sensitive capacity development support, that also addressed the need to ensure participation of women and to prepare gender sensitive action plans.

COIII has influenced the overall administrative culture among the partner institutions through the application of tools and methods to enhance knowledge of civilian oversight and apply practices for good security governance.

## **Sustainability**

The COIII has been contributing to sector policies and enhancing capacities of partners and beneficiaries involved in the civilian oversight of internal security forces. The Project responded to capacity development needs of participating institutions and is steadily strengthening capacity for civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and international best practices. However, future progress and its sustainability rests on the adoption of the legal framework to institutionalize civilian oversight structures at the national and local levels, and continued commitment of the authorities to proceed with reforms in this sector. The MoI has implemented all mandatory and consultative steps; still, the formal approval and adoption of this legal document/ Presidential Decree is still pending. Also, the challenge remains to ensure financial allocations and budgets for these structures at the national and local levels.

**Table 1: The overall score on evaluation findings**

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>Overall score</b>
Relevance	(HIGHLY) RELEVANT
Coherence and responsiveness	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
Cross-cutting (gender mainstreaming and leaving no-one behind)	SATISFACTORY
Efficiency	SATISFACTORY
Effectiveness (including policy and institutional effects)	SATISFACTORY
Sustainability	MODERATELY LIKELY

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Relevance**

Conclusion 1. COIII remains relevant for Turkey, aligning its intervention with national priorities for establishing civilian oversight over ISF, and transparent and accountable security governance. The COIII is directly contributing to the EU accession process, addressing issues identified in the annual progress reports.

### **Leaving no-one behind**

Conclusion 2. The "leaving no-one behind" principle has been considered and followed during the COIII design and implementation. In this context, especially effective have been the COIII results at the local level, achieved through the LPSBs' activities: participatory approach enabled considering various perspectives in identifying priorities, also ensuring that the needs of vulnerable groups have been analysed and addressed through the LPSB Action Plans. Also, the COIII capacity development activities, for the ISF members and the LPSBs members, have included the notion that needs of different vulnerable groups are inevitably linked to security governance (e.g., through a more focused and competent gender-sensitive approach in work of the ISF; or recognizing the issue of domestic violence as a security threat in the LPSB plans and considering support mechanisms)

### **Gender mainstreaming**

Conclusion 3: Greater gender equality in the country is one of the main preconditions for transparency and accountability, and broader, the achievement of good governance. The COIII played an important role in confirming the relevance of citizens participation in security governance for gender mainstreaming and women empowerment and working to ensure women's needs and specific context are reflected in prepared security plans.

### **Efficiency**

Conclusion 4. Despite initial delays and challenges, the COIII team with new technical and operational leadership, contributed to the effective implementation and achievement of results.

Conclusion 5: The approved no-cost extensions were required, justified and approved, enabling COIII to deliver all planned activities and meet planned targets

Conclusion 6: National ownership and leadership is crucial to effectiveness and efficiency and precondition for sustainability of results. The decision to replace the initial main beneficiary, the General Directorate of Provincial Administrations of the MoI with the DSIODC has been highly positive in terms of effectiveness and efficiency and participating in all activities and decision. The DSIODC involvement contributed to greater commitment to the COIII objectives and more broadly, emphasized the importance of the overall civilian oversight concept.

### **Effectiveness**

Conclusion 7. COIII has been effective in delivering results and meeting its targets, creating a solid basis to continue and expand activities in the area of civilian oversight and security governance. However, further progress is conditioned by the adoption and implementation of the legal system to institutionalize civilian oversight (at the national and sub-national levels) and ensure predictable financing. COIII has achieved concrete and visible results during this implementation period, strengthening institutional and individual capacities within



participating institutions, providing inputs for legislative and institutional framework and improving parliamentary oversight capacities.

Conclusion 8. Overall, the Project has contributed to national development priorities and the long-term institutional development of partners' organizations. The policy cycle model confirmed that positive results from COIII on bringing issues to the agenda, designing and testing policy tools while also preparing policies and laws to regulate this area further. However, the adoption of these documents will depend on the willingness and commitment of national institutions to adopt and implement them. COIII has influenced the overall administrative culture among the partner institutions by applying tools and methods to enhance knowledge of civilian oversight and apply practices for good security governance.

### **Sustainability**

Conclusion 9. COIII has been effective in responding to national capacity development needs in areas of intervention.

Conclusion 10. Sustainability of the COIII results and the achievements concerning the overall civilian oversight and security governance in Turkey require additional attention and further efforts by the authorities in Turkey.

Several external factors may undermine the sustainability of COIII interventions. Some of these factors are the need for commitment of executive structures to implement reforms and continue with the implementation of measures for greater transparency and accountability of the ISF; unpredictable political developments, and the recent economic decline largely due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**R1: Without clear governmental commitment and the adoption of legal and policy documents, UNDP and EUD should not continue supporting civilian oversight over ISF in Turkey.**

The main prerequisite for continuation of the assistance to civilian oversight if the ISF is demonstrated commitment of the Turkey's authorities and adoption of the required legal and policy framework to regulate establishment, roles, responsibilities and relationships between institutions under the civilian oversight of the ISF at the national and sub-national levels. The FEC recommends that, without clear governmental commitment and the adoption of legal and policy documents, UNDP and EUD should not continue supporting civilian oversight over ISF in Turkey.

**R2: Assist implementation of the legal and policy frameworks for civilian oversight of the ISF.**

The FEC recommends assisting with implementation of the legal and policy frameworks for civilian oversight of the ISF and support the MoI and its departments, the GNAT, and other national authorities to design a plan for implementation of legal and policy frameworks related to the civilian oversight. The priority should be to strengthen technical and operational capacities of the main institutions within the civilian oversight system. The FEC recommends to balance between more general training programs, covering topics such as legal framework for civilian oversight; roles and responsibilities including institutional coordination and cooperation; management of civilian oversight (steering mechanisms, monitoring, reporting) and needs based training programs, such as for example implementation of assigned roles for the particular institutions; participation for civilian oversight; gender sensitive civilian oversight; among other.

The FEC recommends considering longer timeframe (five to seven years) for the follow-up assistance

**R3: Assist establishment and functioning of the National Crime Prevention Office**

In addition to institutional strengthening around core service lines as envisaged by the law, there is a need to strengthen its coordination capacities and establish a platform for cooperation with sub-national/ regional crime prevention boards throughout the country.

**R4: Support establishment of new and strengthening of the existing LPSBs.**

The FEC recommends that COIII support establishing new and strengthening the existing LPSBs. In addition, the FEC recommends enhancing strategic planning, priority setting and participatory decision-making capacities of the LPSB members in the specific security areas. These efforts should be supported by strengthening LPSB



members' capabilities for gender-sensitive and pro-poor analysis. The FEC recommends improving LPSB management capacities for implementation of Action Plans, monitoring activities, and communicating results/ reporting on progress. The FEC recommends capacitating LPSB members to identify and mobilize other resources to implement priorities (e.g., public-private partnerships and opportunities from national sources or international development assistance).

**R5: Continue supporting the Grand National Assembly of Turkey to grasp its functions related to civilian oversight.**

**R6: Prepare clear and practical capacity development programme for the main target groups (e.g., the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy and the ISF, district governors, civil society organizations and media)**

**R7: Facilitate citizens participation in civilian oversight by enhancing the understanding, awareness and the need for their involvement in security governance**

The FEC recommends facilitating citizens participation in civilian oversight by enhancing the understanding, awareness and the need for their involvement in security governance. The FEC recommends continuing work with media and CSOs and facilitate their active involvement in civilian oversight.

**R8: Strike a balance between qualitative and quantitative indicators to enable adequate measuring of progress under components, also capturing COIII's and progress towards its planned results and broader reform agenda**

## Table of contents

<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>List of acronyms</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3 Evaluation objectives and scope</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Objectives of the final evaluation	14
3.2 Scope of the final evaluation	14
<b>4 Evaluation approach and methods</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Evaluability analysis	15
4.2 Key Evaluation Questions and Evaluation Matrix	16
<b>5 Data analysis</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1 Data collection methods and instruments	17
5.2 Sampling	18
5.3 Data analysis	18
5.4 Limitations	19
5.5 Ethical considerations	20
<b>6 Presentation of findings</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 Relevance	21
6.2 Coherence and responsiveness	24
6.3 Gender mainstreaming and leaving no-one behind	25
6.4 Efficiency	28
6.5 Effectiveness	30
6.6 Policy and institutional effects of the CO III	47
6.7 Sustainability	51
<b>7 Conclusions and lessons learned</b>	<b>56</b>
7.1 Conclusions	56
7.2 Lessons learned	58
<b>8 Recommendations</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>9 Annexes</b>	<b>64</b>
Annex 1: List of people interviewed	64
Annex 2: Interview Guides	66
Annex 3: CO III Evaluation matrix	74
Annex 4: Evaluability Analysis Matrix	80
Annex 5: Results/ Logical Framework- COIII	85
Annex 6: List of analyzed and consulted documents	96
Annex 7. Final Evaluation Consultant	100

## List of acronyms

CA	Contribution Analysis
CDC	Curriculum Development Committee
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DEUA	Directorate of EU Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
DoA	Description of Action
DSIODC	Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EUD	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
EUR	Euro
FAFA	Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement
FE	Final Evaluation
FEC	Final Evaluation Consultant
GCGA	Gendarmerie and Cost Guard Academy
GDPA	General Directorate for Provincial Administrations
GNAT	Grand National Assembly of Turkey
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession
IR	Inception report
ISF	Internal Security Forces
KII	Key Informants Interviews
LDC	Legislation Drafting Committee
LI	Lead Institution
LPSB	Local Prevention and Security Boards
MoI	Ministry of Interior
NIPAC	National IPA Coordinator
NPAA	National Programme for the Adoption of the EU Acquis
OBI	Open Budget Index
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PT	Project Team
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SMART	Specific Measurable Accepted Realistic Timely
SoV	Sources of Verification
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN SWAP	UN System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDC	United Nations Development System
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	UN Evaluation Group
WGI	Worldwide Governance Indicators

## 1 Introduction

This document presents the results of the final evaluation of the Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces- Phase III, a strategic initiative designed to enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety, while also fostering citizen engagement through civil society organizations participating in local boards.

The Project has reached the endpoint of the current implementation cycle. Therefore, the partners (UNDP, EU Delegation and national stakeholders) have agreed to conduct the final evaluation (FE) to assess the progress made on the results of the COIII during its entire period of implementation.

The structure of this evaluation report is the following:

In the background chapter the author provided the main background information about the civilian oversight in Turkey, in the context of needs and priorities of the main targeted organizations, parliaments and local security boards. This chapter provides details about the COIII, presenting its strategic area of intervention, outcome and outputs.

In the third chapter of this document the purpose and the objective of the evaluation are outlined. In this chapter the users of the evaluation are clearly identified.

The fourth chapter presents the design and the approach of the evaluation. First it explains the methodology that was applied and presents the COIII evaluation matrix that has been applied. The matrix includes core evaluation questions designed to address the relevance and coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, while looking at gender and no-one left behind principles cross-cuttingly. The complete matrix is added to the annex of the report. This chapter also includes information about how data was collected and analyzed. Finally, it addresses the question of limitations and risks as well as the risk mitigation strategies.

The final evaluation findings are presented in chapter five of the report. This chapter follows the structure of the main evaluation criteria, organized around key evaluation questions and provides responses of the evaluation consultant with the data to support elaborated findings.

Final, sixth and seventh chapters include conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations drawn from the results of the evaluation.

The last part of the report includes annexes, to facilitate better understanding of the evaluation assignment, details concerning the methodology that the Final Evaluation Consultant applied (including evaluation matrix and results framework) and brief biodata of the evaluation team.

## 2 Background

The project Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces Phase III (COIII or the Project”, hereinafter) is a European Union (EU) funded initiative that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) implemented within the scope of a Direct Grant Agreement<sup>2</sup>. This Project, continuation of the first phase (implemented between 2008-2010) and second phase (implemented between 2012-2015), considered as the main beneficiary the Ministry of Interior (MoI), General Directorate for Provincial Administrations (GDPA) in the signed grant agreement. However, GDPA has been replaced with the Ministry of Interior’s Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection (DSIODC) and the EUD approved amendment in beneficiary. The Co-Beneficiary of the Project is Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT).

The overall objective of the Project is to enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety. The specific objective of the Project is to ensure the institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices.

---

<sup>2</sup> signed between Delegation of the European Union to Turkey (EUD) (December 19, 2018) and UNDP (December 20, 2018).

The Project is developed in the light of gains from Phase I and Phase II which were also funded by the EUD. Therefore, most of the activities build on and/or complement the activities that have been realized within Phase II with a view to further the civilian oversight and increase the impact. Accordingly, the project focuses on the results of:

- Legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the ISFs improved considering civilian and democratic oversight and accountability principles provided by EU and international standards and best practices
- Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey
- Performance evaluation system based on Specific Measurable Accepted Realistic Timely indicators to ensure consistency during the evaluation of internal security forces by the MoI developed
- Legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office developed based on a compliance analysis with EU standards and practices
- Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSBs) scaled up in 10 selected districts/ provinces
- Delivered training programs for 500 professionals of MoI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of ISFs and citizen-focused security services
- Strategy for effective and full-functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISFs is developed
- Awareness of the public, civil society and local media on the civilian and democratic oversight is enhanced
- Curriculums of the GCGA in relation to civilian and democratic oversight topics are improved

The Project is composed of 4 components

**Component A - Legislative and Institutional Framework:** This component aims to improve, the training curriculum, strategies and the basic legislative and regulatory framework governing the Police, Gendarmerie and Coast Guard as well as the Local Security System in the light of civilian/democratic oversight and accountability principles. It is also planned that the performance evaluation system of MoI over ISFs will be strengthened through the Project.

**Component B - Parliamentary Oversight:** This component aims to develop a strategy to systematically oversee the work of ISFs through the work of relevant Commissions of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey.

**Component C - Scaling Up of the Pilot Security Governance Structures:** This component aims to scale up the pilot security governance structures nationwide and support their effective functioning through capacity development and technical assistance.

**Component D - Individual and Institutional Capacity Building:** This component aims to build institutional and individual capacities of the Governors, District Governors and citizens to enhance the understanding and internalisation of citizen-focused security services.

Project total budget has been €5,400,000; the European Union provided support to this initiative; the project was originally planned for the duration of 24 months; however, two non-cost extensions have been approved, reaching 36 months of implementation.

#### **Target groups and beneficiaries**

The main **target groups** included: The Ministry of Interior, including provincial administrations and law enforcement forces (Police, Gendarmerie, Coast Guards) and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey

Project **beneficiaries** are: Ministry of Interior – DSİODC (as per the amendment in the Action Document), Population of Turkey, Law Enforcement Forces (Turkish National Police, Coast Guard Command and Gendarmerie General Command), Local Authorities and relevant Civil Society Organisations

### 3 Evaluation objectives and scope

#### 3.1 Objectives of the final evaluation

The ToR has defined the objectives of this evaluation:

- To measure to what extent the project has contributed to solve the needs identified in the design phase.
- To measure project's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on expected results (outputs) and specific objectives (outcomes), against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
- To measure the project contribution to the objectives set in the Country Program Document (CPD) of UNDP and United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS), as well as relevant sections of "Institution Building and Reform" under "Chapter 24: Justice, Freedom and Security" of Accession Partnership for Turkey Document.
- 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.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess achievements to date, document lessons learned, and provide recommendations to UNDP and its partners. The evaluation is particularly interested in two questions:

- At the level of processes and direct results, understanding the process and mechanisms of strengthening civilian oversight over the internal security forces, and identifying the factors that have impacted the project's activities and how the project has contributed to sustainable change and progress of institutions;
- At the level of larger transformational change, understanding the contribution of the project to transparent and accountable institutions, making a difference to population and stakeholders in Turkey, notably with regards to achieving the sustainable development goals.

#### 3.2 Scope of the final evaluation

The scope of the final evaluation relates to results, timeframe, geography and organization.

**Results.** The Final Evaluation will assess if and to what extent the planned outputs have been achieved, contributing together with other initiatives to progress under its outcomes. Part of these efforts will be to assess COIII's processes, innovations, strategic partnerships and linkages in the specific regional context that proved critical in producing the intended outputs

**Timeframe.** The final evaluation will cover the entire period of implementation of the CO III (December 2018 to December 2021). The FE will consider UNDP's results and efforts from earlier, first and second phases of the CO initiative, and other relevant initiatives in the governance area when justified and required- e.g., if interpretation of the current CO III results and context involves this analysis.

**Geography.** The focus of the evaluation will be at the entire territory of Turkey.

**Organization.** The evaluation will examine the steering and management structures for the CO III Project implementation.

### 4 Evaluation approach and methods

The framework for the FE has been set in the Terms of Reference (ToR), and following its provisions, the evaluation has developed a tailor-made methodology. The main reference for the evaluation methodology

remains OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria<sup>3</sup>; the FEC adhered to UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards<sup>4</sup>, and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation<sup>5</sup>.

The evaluation methodology has been designed to ensure that the principles of *leaving no one behind*, *human rights-based approach* and *gender equality* are considered and analysed throughout the process.

#### 4.1 Evaluability analysis

The final evaluation used the three-dimension framework for evaluability assessment<sup>6</sup>, to measure the extent to which this Project, its implementation framework and achieved results could be analysed and assessed in a reliable and credible manner. The evaluability assessment has been in general positive.

The “*in-principle*” *evaluability analysis* was carried out to identify whether it is possible to evaluate the COIII as designed- the FE used the framework set by the Terms of Reference. The initial finding that are based on clarity, coherence, feasibility and relevance indicates that the COIII theory of change is solid and well-established.

The “in practice” evaluability analysis included availability of documents and relevant data, together with the capacities of the project team and other stakeholders to provide required information. The COIII Project team supplied the FEC with a solid set of project related documents, including Project document, annual work plans, Project reports, monitoring tools, budget and project related communications (Annex 4- Documents consulted during the IR). The analysis of these documents during the Inception Period suggests that quality, depth and adequacy of the information would be sufficient for a sound desk review and the establishment of the initial analytical framework.

Besides, the FE together with the COIII Team analysed the list of interlocutors for interviews- in addition to partners and beneficiaries, this list included other stakeholders that are relevant for the civilian oversight over ISF, and broader, security governance, transparency and accountability<sup>7</sup>

The extraordinary circumstances brought about by COVID-19 created a range of challenges, making it impossible for the evaluation consultant to conduct in-person meetings with the COIII Project Team and other stakeholders in Turkey. Still, use of online interviews, and use of tailor-made interview guides, together with focus group meetings, provided a solid platform for primary data collection.

The *contribution analysis (CA)*<sup>8</sup>, adjusted for the evaluation of complex programs<sup>9</sup> has been in the centre of the evaluation approach. Considering that the COIII Project outcome (defined as “intended changes in development conditions in participating countries”) have been set at the high level, requiring joint work of many partners, credible attribution of development changes to the UN Agencies/ COIII may be challenging or in some cases impossible to establish. To address these challenges, the contribution analysis has been applied to facilitate credible causal claims between the COIII Project, its results<sup>10</sup> and contributions to respective outcomes. The FE

---

<sup>3</sup> Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC), Network on Development Evaluation, Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, 2019, available at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/download/1294>

<sup>6</sup> Rick Dr. Davis “Planning Evaluability Assessments, A Synthesis of the Literature with Recommendations, Report of a study commissioned by the Department for International Development (DFID)”, Working Paper 40, October 2013- this document served as the basis for evaluability assessment.

<sup>7</sup> This is the OECD DAC definition; also, this definition has been adopted by Including IFAD, UNODC, OECD, SIDA, ILO, DFID, NORAD and NDC.

<sup>8</sup> John Mayne: „Contribution analysis: Coming of age?” from Evaluation, 2012, Sage Publication, DOI: 10.1177/1356389012451663.

<sup>9</sup> Line Dybdal, Steffen Bohni Nielsen, Sebastian Lemire (Ramboll Management Consulting and Aarhus, Denmark): “Contribution Analysis Applied: Reflections on Scope and Methodology”, The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation Vol. 25 No. 2 Pages 29–57 ISSN 0834-1516

<sup>10</sup> Also, where a paucity of data necessitates a quick assessment of a contribution, this should be carried out using appropriate evaluation methodologies that identify contributions at the outcome level and ascertain the plausibility of causal relationships between activities and outcomes. More details in John Mayne: „Contribution analysis: Coming of age?” from Evaluation, 2012, Sage Publication, DOI: 10.1177/1356389012451663.



used primary and secondary data sources to ascertain the plausibility of causal relationships between the COIII achievements and respective outcomes.

Operationally, the FEC made use of a theory-based and utilization-focused approach, with various complementary qualitative and quantitative methods<sup>11</sup> (a mixed method approach) of data collection and analysis. This approach enabled to meet the evaluation objectives, cover its scope and provide answers to the structured set of evaluation questions, while enabling to incorporate the cross-cutting dimensions of gender, equity, and human rights.

The evaluation has been participatory, flexible in design and implementation, ensuring stakeholder participation and ownership through consultation and validation, and facilitating learning and feedback

## 4.2 Key Evaluation Questions and Evaluation Matrix

The final evaluation focused on the main OECD DAC evaluation criteria – relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. Also, the evaluation considered additional cross-cutting criteria, gender and leave no one behind

The intention has been to provide credible, practical, evidence-based information to enable the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations, and lessons into the decision-making processes of the CO III's partners and key stakeholders to assess the potential of the continuation of efforts and assistance.

The TOR provided the basis for the evaluation questions that the final evaluation consultant analysed and proposed seven key evaluation questions, using also questions from the ToR as sub-questions to ensure that all areas indicated under the TOR are considered and covered. The FE report answered these questions using specific, objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) generated for each EQ to assess the current situation, delivery of outputs and progress towards the intended outcomes<sup>12</sup>.

Key Evaluation Questions (KQ)	Relevance	Coherence	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Sustainability	Cross-cutting
<b>Key Question 1:</b> Has the CO III project aligned its intervention with the needs and priorities for the achievement of fundamental rights and transparent and accountable governance in Turkey?	X	X				X
<b>Key Question 2:</b> How integrated into the UNDP activities and broader reforms has the CO III project been during its implementation? (e.g., UNDP activities, national interventions and activities of other development partners)	X	X				
<b>Key question 3:</b> Has the CO III contributed to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected/ stipulated in the project document?				X	X	X
<b>Key question 4</b> Has the CO III contributed to Turkey's broader development objectives?				X	X	X

<sup>11</sup> Review of regional and national statistics on security- received from the LPBS members; analysis of figures/ marks from the training events; other quantitative data

<sup>12</sup> The FE will also assess the accomplishment of the project goal (impact).

<b>Key question 5:</b> Has the implementation of the CO III been efficient concerning adherence to the work plans (timely implementation), flexibility and responsiveness?			X			X
<b>Key Question 6:</b> Has the CO III contributed to partnerships, policies and capacities of stakeholders to ensure ownership and sustainability of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces?				X	X	X
<b>Key Question 7:</b> Has the CO III project considered rights-based approach and gender equality, and followed the “no-one is left behind” principle during its design and implementation?	X					X

X- main evaluation criteria; X- additional evaluation criteria

These evaluation questions, judgement criteria, indicators and evidences, following all the provisions from the ToR have been presented in the evaluation matrix.

Each evaluation criterion will be scored using the evaluation rating scales:

- For effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and cross-cutting: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), or Unsatisfactory (U) scale
- Fore relevance- Relevant or Not relevant scale
- For sustainability: Likely; Moderately likely; Moderately unlikely or Unlikely scale

## 5 Data analysis

### 5.1 Data collection methods and instruments

The evaluation collected data for this evaluation from various sources including COIII related documents, key informant interviews, focus groups and secondary data sets. The final evaluation followed approaches described below:

#### I) Document review

The evaluation has started with an initial review of the documents provided by the COIII and accessed via open sources. A full list of documents consulted in this inception phase is included as Annex 3. These include many different levels and types of documents, such as:

- Strategic and country level - e.g., the EU Progress Reports, WB reports, National Strategic Documents- Including 10th and 11th Development Plans, UNDP country programmes, EC Partnership Strategies, other development/ sectoral strategies and governance indicators
- Project – COIII Description of the Action and Progress Reports and other COIII-related documents
- Presentations and other documents - delivered by COIII partners at various events
- Meeting records - conference proceedings and minutes

A brief gender analysis has been carried out to develop the hypothesis around reflection of gender in the data and reports, gender analysis of the operational environment i.e., socio-political and cultural barriers for gender equality and existing progress. This was done in the context that the ToR has defined.

#### II) Key informants' interviews

The **key informants' interviews** (KIIs) served to confirm assumptions and the initial findings using tailor-made tools to collect evidence-based, reliable, solid, and comprehensive information about the COIII Project. Key

informants have been selected based on their crucial role in the design and implementation of the project as well as based on their strategic position in the civilian oversight and security governance system.

The COVID-19 pandemic has had severe impact on the overall situation in the world and posed strict limitations to the mobility of the FEC, preventing and limiting in-person meetings. Therefore, the FEC organized and carried out online interviews with the partners and stakeholders<sup>13</sup>.

The **group interview** as method of data collection is particularly useful for organizational teams as they enable complementarity of information and save time for repeating information which often happens when individual interviews are conducted with the teams engaged in the same organization or project. Therefore, the FEC implemented group interviews with the national stakeholders, from the Mol-DSIODC, and GNAT and Directorate for EU Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs involved in project activities.

The **focus groups** have been organized with the selected Local Prevention and Security Boards, and representatives from seven out of 19 functional LPSBs participated in these focus group meetings.

The interview and focus groups' guides ensured systemic and uniform collection of data, providing (open-ended) questions and offering also opportunities for a more in-depth discussion about specific points related to the COIII's implementation and results. Especially important has been to discuss forward-looking opportunities and recommendations for the future interventions in the areas of civilian oversight and security governance. The FEC prepared brief interview notes, systemize, and brought together all data from the primary data collection in the evaluation matrix.

The overall on-line data collection process has been implemented during October and November 2021. The time constraints for this evaluation and the COVID19 restrictions prevented the FEC from meeting with representatives of groups which were often left behind. The FEC was using meetings with the CSOs from the LPSBs for proxy information about those "whose voice is normally not heard on Project-related issues". In addition, the FEC participated in eight focus group meetings, that served to collect views on most vulnerable population.

The FEC prepared transcripts from all in-person interviews and established a sound coding system, following the evaluation criteria, using MAXQDA software during the analysis.

### III) Secondary data sets

The FE analyzed and review other secondary data sets, including aggregated data on different key governance and socio-economic indicators for Turkey. The list of analyzed secondary data sets is provided in the Annex 3.

## 5.2 Sampling

The FEC selected interlocutors for Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) purposefully from among the projects' key stakeholders. Similarly, the participants for focus groups have been selected to represent different stakeholders (authorities and public entities, civil society organizations and experts) participating in the LPSBs.

## 5.3 Data analysis

The scope, complexity, and the period covered by the evaluation required an analytical approach deriving from UNDG evaluation guidelines and international practices. The evaluation consultant analysed collected information and the Results Matrix through a causality model as a part of the overall contribution analysis complementing it with appropriate analytical approaches<sup>14</sup>.

The FEC used a mixed-method approach to gather qualitative and quantitative information to answer specific evaluation questions. The FEC based desk research on collecting and analysing the secondary data, primarily COIII-related documentation, annual progress reports and annexes. The FEC collected primary data through in-

---

<sup>13</sup> The list of interviewed stakeholders and participants in the focus groups have been provided in the Annex 1, and interview guide is presented in the Annex 2.

<sup>14</sup> The FEC supported it with timeline analysis and conflict analysis to the extent required.

person interviews and focus groups with LPSBs, following well-established data collection tools, and gained a more in-depth analysis of the overall COIII implementation.

The evaluation process applied data triangulation (for checking the results obtained from the research (desk analysis and primary data from interviews). The rationale for using this approach was to increase the credibility and validity of the findings and enabled to collect a more detailed and balanced picture of the COIII and its results. The research experience enabled the FEC to map out and explain the details and complexity of the Project. The MAXQDA<sup>15</sup> qualitative research software and the coding system enabled easier analysis and cross-examination, identifying convergence, inconsistency and contradictions.

## 5.4 Limitations

The final evaluation included a primary data collection phase (comprising of on-line interviews), designed to collect in-depth information about the status of COIII outcome and respective outputs and complement the initial findings from the desk review. This phase also enabled to identify links between different issues impacting on achievement of the COIII outcome, and broader, the progress towards greater civilian oversight and more transparent security governance in the country. However, this evaluation included limited time for primary data collection. The final list of key stakeholders for interviews has been agreed in cooperation with the COIII team, while the involvement and importance of the stakeholders in the COIII implementation has been determining criterion. Although the evaluation team discussed COIII related issues with the representatives of different authorities, some of the local counterparts were not in the position to reflect on the cooperation and results directly, separating this support from other activities of the government and national authorities.

The COIII's effectiveness needed to be considered assessing the extent to which the Project contributed or is likely to contribute to understanding the process and mechanisms of strengthening civilian oversight over the internal security forces, and identifying the factors that have impacted the project's activities and how the project has contributed to sustainable change and progress of institutions. These efforts included analysis of the larger transformational change, understanding the contribution of the project to transparent and accountable institutions, making a difference to population and stakeholders in Turkey, notably with regard to achieving the sustainable development goals. However, it was challenging to determine "specific extent of the contribution" that the COIII made to this outcome. Another challenge has been that the indicators, although relevant provided only limited insight into the situation. The EU Progress Reports have been available for all years of COIII implementation; still, these reports provide only one-side perspective, and there has been strong discontent among the authorities in Turkey with the presented findings. The absence of some more specific indicators at outcome and impact level prevented to analyse if and to what extent the COIII facilitated changes.

Therefore, the FEC assessed progress under outputs and analysed links with outcomes, assuming possible contribution and progress under outcome. The indicators were in most cases relevant, informing the analysis of contribution to the outcome. At the same time, the evaluation has been challenged to extract "the most important" achievements contributing to the behavioural level- outcome changes and validate their contribution, especially considering requirements from the ToR, and request for the length of the evaluation report as well as the timeframe for the final evaluation.

The assessment of efficiency has been mainly focused on management processes and structures; the FEC has been analysing meeting minutes from different coordination forums and using interviews with some of the members of these various bodies. However, the FEC based conclusions on the professional experience and judgement on provisions of development assistance.

Sustainability is an ex-post measure and ideally, measuring this dimension requires a time-period between two to five years after the completion of the initiative. Still, this was ToR requirement and the evaluation team carried out context analysis and forecasted opportunities to ensure sustainability. However, changing realities of Turkey in the context of fundamental rights and freedoms, delayed adoption of the legal and policy frameworks, limited focus on reforms as well as effects of unplanned external developments (e.g., the effects of the COVID-19 and its possible extension) could considerably affect and compromise these conclusions.

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.maxqda.com/>

## 5.5 Ethical considerations

The FEC was aware of the OECD DAC ethical considerations for development evaluations<sup>16</sup> and United Nations Ethical Guidelines<sup>17</sup>. The evaluation followed ethical considerations in selecting interviewees, interacting with them, and respecting their personal and institutional rights. The FEC requested informed consent from stakeholders before asking any questions related to the COIII evaluation. To obtain consent, the FEC members briefly explained the reasons and objectives of the evaluation and the scope of the questions. Stakeholders had the right to refuse or to withdraw at any time.

The FEC also ensures respondents' privacy and confidentiality, as the disclosure of confidential information may seriously jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the evaluation process. Therefore, the FEC is responsible for exercising discretion in all matters of the final COIII evaluation, not divulging confidential information without authorization. The FEC respected informants' right to provide information in confidence; the team also made ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the key informants are protected from reprisals. Original data, including interview records and notes from interviews, will be retained in confidential files until completion of the evaluation. After the final report is accepted, the data and files will be permanently deleted.

The FEC is fully independent, unaware of any conflicts of interest for this work. During the evaluation process, the FEC followed the principles of impartiality, credibility, and accountability.

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation- UNEGFN/CoC, 2008.

## 6 Presentation of findings

The final evaluation has presented the following findings, responding directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.

### 6.1 Relevance

The analysis has been carried out with the intention to evaluate COIII's relevance at any point during the life cycle. The FEC assessed the area of involvement and the validity of the Project's intervention logic, including if the Project addressed the identified priorities of the partners and needs of the target groups. The FEC also analysed whether the established benchmarks remained valid and achievable during the implementation.

**Rel1. The COIII Project fully aligns with governance priorities related to democratic oversight of internal security forces including through citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices.**

The COIII addresses the priorities of the Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018) of Turkey. This overarching national strategic framework highlighted the importance of governance priorities to achieve sustainable development and economic growth. In this context, the COIII supported the *priorities within the Security sector* to strengthen security governance and oversight mechanisms, ensure the human and financial resources, and protect fundamental human rights. Practically, the Project aligns with the numerous priority development areas, such as, increasing both organizational and functional quality of security services, preventing conflict of authority among security forces, increasing effectiveness of preventive and protective security services, improving efficiency of coordination among security institutions, while addressing the need for “enhancing civilian oversight on security forces and operations”<sup>18</sup> and “empowering of community-based security forces approach by increasing sensitivity of citizens on public order and security”<sup>19</sup>.

The Project is well-aligned with the *objectives of the European Union Indicative Strategy Paper for Turkey* (2014-2020) to improve the capacities of institutions, including CSOs, in charge of protecting and guaranteeing respect and defence of fundamental rights. Particularly relevant have been the efforts of CO III to enhance the stakeholders' ability to conduct independent, impartial and effective investigations into security forces allegations of misconduct while facilitating the cooperation between institutions engaged in human rights protection. Furthermore, the Project is aligned with *Turkey's EU Strategy* that set the implementation of legal arrangements in the security sector as the primary objective for full enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms. The Project addressed the need to enhance the administrative capacities of the authorities concerning the implementation of human rights-related legislation, working also on proper accountability and control systems that involve the civil society<sup>20</sup>.

The importance of the transformation of civil-military relations with a focus on civilian/democratic oversight of the internal security sector has also been emphasized in the EU Progress Reports. These documents acknowledged the contribution of the first two phases of the Project. The EU Progress Report<sup>21</sup> that coincided with the COIII inception period recognized the efforts to revise the legal framework governing civil-military relations and the increase of the powers of the executive over the military as an important element in strengthening civilian oversight. Furthermore, this report highlighted challenges regarding the Parliamentary, administrative and judicial oversight and accountability of security and intelligence forces. It also identified the need to enhance the effectiveness of the law enforcement oversight commission. The core areas of the COIII

---

<sup>18</sup> The Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018), Decision No: 1041. This document was approved at the 127th plenary session of The Grand National Assembly of Turkey, on 1 July 2013, in accordance with the Law No.3067, dated 30 October 1984.

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, The Tenth Development Plan, page 37

<sup>20</sup> This is stated in the EU Action Document on "Support to Fundamental Rights", more details at: [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/system/files/2019-12/c\\_2019\\_8726\\_ad\\_fundamental\\_rights.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/system/files/2019-12/c_2019_8726_ad_fundamental_rights.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> Turkey 2018 Report Accompanying the document Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, available at <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/system/files/2019-05/20180417-turkey-report.pdf>



aligned with these priorities, ensuring the institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces. At the same time, the COIII supported the priority for building “inclusive political processes, transparent and accountable institutions (including Parliament) to foster participatory citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices”<sup>22</sup>.

The Project's support advanced Turkey's efforts and ongoing work regarding the Accession Partnership and EU/Commission policies<sup>23</sup>. The country has adopted measures for expanding human rights and ensuring a zero-tolerance policy against torture and ill-treatment that started in 2002. Broad modifications of the competence areas of the Police and the Gendarmerie and annulment of the Protocol on Cooperation for Security and Public Order that was conflicting with the law on public administration are among the critical steps taken by the government.

The Project falls under the United Nations Strategy 2016-2020 and its Pillar 2: Democracy and Human Rights. Under this pillar, the support has been planned to central and local administrations and other actors more to more effectively protect and promote human rights. Especially relevant has been support to adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems, with the full participation of civil society, including the most vulnerable<sup>24</sup>. In addition, the COIII supported the achievement of Output 2.1.4. Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services under Outcome 2 of the UNDP Country programme document for Turkey (2016-2020)<sup>25</sup> The COIII is particularly relevant to support “inclusive, informed and transparent decision-making processes, building accountable and responsive institutions at the national and sub-national levels.

The main partners and ultimately beneficiaries of the Project – the Ministry of Interior (MoI), including provincial administrations and law enforcement forces (Police, Gendarmerie, Coast Guards), the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Local Authorities participated in LPSBs and capacity development activities and relevant CSOs and media representatives through capacity development and awareness raising activities have also been in the centre of this process<sup>26</sup>.

- **The partners stated that COIII addressed their needs and priorities concerning their roles in civilian and democratic oversight of ISF, emphasizing that particularly beneficial has been COIII focus on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety.**

The COIII design was consistent, based on a “participatory and inclusive programming approach”<sup>27</sup>. The partners stated that the Project identified problems using a bottom-up process of collaboration, involving representatives from the main partners’ institutions.<sup>28</sup> This approach (to identification of needs and challenges) enabled “demanded technical assistance taking into consideration unique characteristics of participating institutions”<sup>29</sup> (that the Project delivered). The FEC finds that the partners stated “COIII helped to develop their capacities and deliver assigned services to ensure greater civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces”. These efforts helped to contribute to inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices<sup>30</sup>, responding to the needs of these partners.

The authorities have recognized the benefits from strengthened legislative and institutional frameworks for more accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs), also stating that national and local level participatory security governance structures contributed to advancing civilian and democratic

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, EU Progress Report, 2018

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.ab.gov.tr/accession-partnership-documents\\_46226\\_en.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/accession-partnership-documents_46226_en.html)

<sup>24</sup> United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy Turkey 2016-2020, by Government of the Republic of Turkey and the United Nations System in Turkey, available at [https://turkey.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/UNDCS-Final-2016-1-3\\_1.pdf](https://turkey.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/UNDCS-Final-2016-1-3_1.pdf)

<sup>25</sup> Country programme document for Turkey (2016-2020), June 2015, available at: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/798024?ln=en>

<sup>26</sup> For example, the article Accountability, Transparency, Participation, and Inclusion: A New Development Consensus? <https://carnegieendowment.org/2014/10/20/accountability-transparency-participation-and-inclusion-new-development-consensus-pub-56968>

<sup>27</sup> KII notes

<sup>28</sup> KII notes, national partners

<sup>29</sup> KII notes

<sup>30</sup> KII notes



oversight principles, in line with EU and international standards and best practices. Furthermore, the informants have recognized the need to continue efforts for consolidating civilian control of the security forces<sup>31</sup>. Thus, these statements, and interviews with the representatives of authorities/ leading institutions, confirmed COIII's relevance<sup>32</sup>. The shared views have been that the investments in developing capacities for transparency and accountability of military, police and intelligence services, lay the foundations for good and democratic governance<sup>33</sup>.

In addition to the qualitative evidence, the FEC finds that the COIII approach to identify the state of affairs ("baselines") and the needs of the key partners' institutions has been timely implemented. The Project has designed comprehensive data collection tools, for example, focusing on the legislature's role in the civilian oversight through the work of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. The Project prepared a survey to assess the functioning and capacities of GNAT<sup>34</sup>. This analysis of state of affairs, together with comparative perspective on role of parliaments in other EU countries provided a baseline for more substantive understanding parliamentary performance, identifying areas for support and strengthening. Following the results of the analysis, the Project facilitated strategic discussions and technical meetings with the GNAT, at which, among other, COIII support opportunities have been discussed in the context of their needs<sup>35</sup>. The FEC finds that this approach has ensured specific and demand-driven support, aligned with the partners' needs.

Furthermore, the CSOs and other members of the Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSBs) emphasized that the project's objectives were relevant to their needs. They emphasized the efforts of the Project to facilitate progress "towards citizens participation in policy and decision-making processes", recognizing relevance of the COIII initiative to advance and develop their capacities in the areas related to security governance<sup>36</sup>.

## **Rel2. The COIII remained well-aligned with governance related strategic priorities during its implementation**

The analysis of the changes on the demand side<sup>37</sup> shows that COIII's intervention logic remained relevant throughout its implementation. The key national - strategic documents, such as the Turkey's Eleventh Development Plan 2019-2023 recognized the need for "strengthening security by taking into consideration all aspects within the framework of the rule of law and its supremacy, under the principles of civilian oversight, transparency, accountability and comprehensiveness". In addition, this document recognized the need for providing the citizen participation through raising the consciousness on fight against crime while also increasing the effectiveness and quality of security services<sup>38</sup>. The recent EU Progress Report on Turkey recognized the government's efforts to consolidate further civilian oversight of the security forces. However, this document also stated that the security and intelligence sector's legal and institutional framework remained unchanged, with strengthened civilian oversight under the presidential election system. Furthermore, the EU report recognized the need to continue implementing efforts to improve the transparency and accountability of military, police and intelligence services.

---

<sup>31</sup> KII notes, national partners.

<sup>32</sup> Also, assessment of various progress reports of the European Commission along with the policy endeavors of Turkey to address gaps in the civilian oversight clearly outlined needs and areas for support.

<sup>33</sup> KII national partners

<sup>34</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B14-Assessment-of-the-Existing-Parliamentary-Oversight-in-Turkey.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B22-Comparative-Study-On-Good-Practices-In-Eu-Member-States-and-Recommendations.pdf>

<sup>36</sup> KII national partners – "The problems of CSOs are almost identical regarding citizens participation and involvement of CSOs in the security governance and civilian oversight, and they face the same challenges".

<sup>37</sup> The FEC assessed if the COIII external developments required response was made to adjust and fine-tune the intervention as set out in the Project's intervention logic and its logical framework. The evaluation has focused on whether the overall objective and outcomes, as the main references under the intervention logic, remained valid and achievable or whether there was a case for revision to take account of changes in the external environment, demand, or speed of delivery.

<sup>38</sup> The Eleventh National Development Plan of Turkey, 2019-2023. Decision No. 1225. The Eleventh Development Plan (2019-2023) was approved in the 105th plenary session of The Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 18.07.2019, in accordance with the provision of the Law No. 3067, dated 30.10.1984.

The FEC analysis and partners statements<sup>39</sup> show that indicated limited capacities for transparent and accountable governance and management of public affairs remain the underlying constraints, threatening long-term development efforts in Turkey. The country need support to bridge skills gaps, build institutional capacity, expedite reforms, and improve performance of public structures, including security forces. In recent years, various commonly-accepted indicators of the quality of a country's institutions (including World-wide governance indicators, the Corruption Perceptions Index, but also the World Economic Forum's Competitiveness Index) have shown that Turkey remains below the levels obtained in high-income countries, and that the distance from the frontier has been widening<sup>40</sup>. The importance of the strengthened role of oversight mechanisms and implementation of monitoring and oversight tasks has been also emphasized as the most effective system to address insufficient transparency and accountability<sup>41</sup>. Thus, the Project's engagement of the Ministry of Interior (MoI) and its departments, including provincial administrations and law enforcement forces (Police, Gendarmerie, Coast Guards), and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, the Local Security and Crime Prevention Boards and Civil society organization among other has confirmed as highly relevant.

The FEC overall score on the Relevance criterion: (HIGHLY) RELEVANT

## 6.2 Coherence and responsiveness

**Resi:** Coherence, coordination of activities and exchange of information between COIII's team, UNDP projects and other initiatives in the area of fundamental rights and freedoms (and broader governance area) have been established.

The UN reform emphasized the need for a more coherent strategy across the UN system, and efforts to advance funding and enhance activities that contribute to good governance. The FEC finds that the degree of internal communication across the COIII project team and participating organizations was good throughout the implementation<sup>42</sup>. In this context, UNDP Office in Turkey played an important role in promoting internal coherence and the COIII Project team have generally established coordination of activities and exchange of information with other UNDP projects and initiatives of other development partners in the area of fundamental rights and freedoms and broader good governance framework. There was a good level of day-to-day information exchange, coordination, and interaction between the COIII team and UNDP projects. The FEC finds that UNDP has ensured complementarity and coherence, using COIII to expand activities related to citizens participation and broader participatory governance. The example could be partnership and cooperation between the COIII and the Local Administration Reform Phase III, designed among other to provide the opportunity to adopt and implement the Participatory Local Governance Model<sup>43</sup> for new metropolitan municipalities. These two initiatives have been jointly preparing and delivering workshops and capacity development events<sup>44</sup>, exchanging experience views, thus, ensuring greater engagement with citizens and contributing to more accountable governance. The COIII team participated in regular UNDP programme meetings, exchanging information and exploring cooperation opportunities<sup>45</sup>.

The Project participated in the sector coordination meetings; for example, the General Director of the Provincial Administration has organized meetings to discuss the Project, planned activities, and the national stakeholders' involvement. This meeting included participants from the National Police, the Gendarmerie, the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard and Gendarmerie Academy, the Presidency and the GNAT.

The Project organized a focal points' meeting to identify a reference person from each partner's institution, confirming commitment and interest during the project implementation. The partners recognized the CO III

---

<sup>39</sup> KII national partners

<sup>40</sup> For example, World Wide Governance Indicators for Turkey, <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>

<sup>41</sup> <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/585411504231252220/pdf/Turkey-CPF-08072017.pdf> World Bank Partnership Strategy for . Also, the analysis of World-Wide Governance Indicators shows some worrying trends.

<sup>42</sup> KII notes, national partners

<sup>43</sup> <https://www.lar.org.tr/en/main-page/>

<sup>44</sup> KII notes

<sup>45</sup> KII notes

coordination efforts, stating that the Project Team has been responsive, organizing needs-based meetings with continued interactions on priority topics.

In partnership with the MoI, and the members of the LPSBs, the COIII project has ensured coherent and consistent implementation of approaches for effective citizens engagement in security governance (including crime prevention), producing specific action plans in each participating region. These action plans mapped the challenges and advantages, actors, and overall planning, drafting, adopting, executing, and reporting on security priorities. The specificities of national and regional contexts have been inevitably linked with the particularity of interventions on security priorities and CSOs'/ citizens engagement entry points in the civilian oversight. In addition, the partners stated the COIII Project has responded coherently to the LPSBs needs for more active and competent participation in civilian oversight processes. Practically, this partnership enabled Boards to benefit from COIII-related expertise, advance its tools and validate them through the interaction with its members in each of the focus regions. This network of the LPSBs served as an ideal "convening space" for the discussions around preparation of action plans preparation and civilian oversight (at that level)

The Project participated in the sector coordination meetings; for example, the General Director of the Provincial Administration has organized meetings to discuss the Project, planned activities, and the national stakeholders' involvement. This meeting included participants from the National Police, the Gendarmerie and the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy, the Presidency and the GNAT. In this context, the Project organized a focal points' meeting to identify a reference person from each partner's institution, confirming commitment and interest during the project implementation; furthermore, the partners recognized the CO III coordination efforts, stating that the Project Team has been responsive, organizing needs-based meetings with continued interactions on priority topics.

The Project cooperated with the Group on Legislation Drafting Process and Curriculum Development Committee through the Advisory Bodies, contributing to the quality and sustainability of knowledge transfers.

▪ **The COIII cooperated and coordinated activities with other development partners and their initiatives**

In addition, the COIII has been coordinating activities and cooperating in the specific areas of intervention with other development partners. For example, the Project's well-established scope enabled effective coordination and cooperation with the initiatives dealing with complaints and processing of alleged HR violations. This finding is especially related to the initiatives, namely the "Independent Police Complaints Commission & Complaints System for the Turkish National Police, Gendarmerie, and Coast Guard" and the "Technical Assistance for Empowerment of the Role of Ombudsman in the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights<sup>46</sup>". The FEC finds that during the initial phase of the Project direct coordination has been with the management of the Ombudsman project (October 2019); however, this project was reaching its completion. The cooperation with the initiative that was supporting the Independent Complaint Commission contributed to synergies and prevented duplications. These forms of cooperation have been especially effective concerning capacity development, experience sharing and discussion on some of the priority topics<sup>47</sup> (until the completion of the Independent Complaint Commission Project, that ended on 10 May 2020).

The FEC overall score on the Coherence and responsiveness criteria: **HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**

### **6.3 Cross-cutting criterion (including gender mainstreaming and leaving no-one behind)**

**Gendi.** The COIII has considered and addressed gender equality and gender mainstreaming during its implementation, at various levels.

The stakeholders perceived UNDP as steadily promoting gender equality in Turkey, particularly through assistance to governance institutions and other partners<sup>48</sup>. The evaluation finds that COIII remained on this path, giving the attention to gender equality and gender mainstreaming, recognizing the need to address the

---

<sup>46</sup> This project is for the Ombudsman Institution and is not part of the direct support to the Ministry of Interior.

<sup>47</sup> KII notes

<sup>48</sup> Ref to UNDP Turkey Gender Equality Strategy 2017-2020

[https://www.tr.undp.org/content/dam/turkey/GENDER%20EQUALITY%20STRATEGY\\_2020jan.pdf](https://www.tr.undp.org/content/dam/turkey/GENDER%20EQUALITY%20STRATEGY_2020jan.pdf)

challenge of gender-blinded public policies and practices as “barriers for women to gain full access to their civic, social and economic rights.”<sup>49</sup> Namely, the COIII has been working on “lasting changes in the power and choices of women over their own lives” through their involvement in LPSBs and ability to identify and decide on priorities and follow-up on decisions<sup>50</sup>. In addition, the COIII was supporting capacity development of the ISF, to mainstream gender equality approaches in their activities, as critical elements for improving good security sector governance<sup>51</sup>. The partners highlighted the importance of the technical support that COIII provided; they also showed some knowledge of the links between gender equality and security governance, expressing awareness of gender-sensitive practices that the Project implemented<sup>52</sup>. In addition to gender balanced participation in different events and programs, the partners highlighted the Local Prevention and Security Boards, indicating that Boards ensured gender balance, with almost equal number of women and men participating in the LPSB activities<sup>53</sup>. The LPSB supported communication between citizens and decision-makers on security priorities, being addressed through the “effective and binding action plans for crime prevention”<sup>54</sup>. Practically, the COIII, through the LPSBs engaged citizens (involving civil society organizations, Mukhtars and media) into decision-making processes to improve the service orientation of the law enforcement agencies. At the same time, the analysis of the reported results and achieved progress that communities ensured through the LPSB action plans implementation indicates benefits to women. The LPSBs through their action plans, identified prevention priorities that could ensure significant differences in women's lives if implemented fully. Some examples could be communities’ requests for public investment in street lighting: the citizens identified that secure, safe and comfortable access to essential services has been affected by lack of street lights; thus, neighbourhoods and streets that families and women use in their daily activities have been prioritized<sup>55</sup>. Also, the LPSB recognized the pressing problems of gender-based violence, proposing capacity development for law-enforcement structures to act in the cases of GBV and support victims of violence. The local security plans proposed more coordinated and multi-sectoral approach at the local level, to eliminate all forms of gender-based violence<sup>56</sup>.

In addition, the COIII through the LPSB supported CSOs, human rights defenders and also representatives of social protection system to provide the authorities with the relevant data to inform the implementation of security priorities. Namely, CSO provided evidence about the impact of the current situation on men, women and children, also highlighting that those submissions provided solutions on resolving the impact on women and other community groups. For example, the CSO partners provided evidence about increased return of redundant employees including women, due to the COVID-19 pandemic to their homes or origins. However, these women could not access essential public services, and the proposals reflected this issue. Also, the security issues have been raised, including gender-based violence<sup>57</sup>.

- **The COIII results matrix has integrated gender considerations, but there are opportunities for improvements**

The evaluation found that the COIII results framework does not adequately integrate gender considerations. The monitoring framework is void of gender sensitive indicators and minimally draws on the use of sex-disaggregated data. Furthermore, the COIII team did not design data collection methods to systemically disaggregate information by gender and monitor the meaningful engagement of women across activities. For example, under the capacity development components and activities, the focus has been limited to gender participation (e.g., number or percentage of women participating in training programs and other capacity development events), although the opportunity existed to identify perceptions, understanding, and challenges

---

<sup>49</sup> Gender, Equality and Corruption: What are the Linkages? Policy Brief 01/2014, Transparency international [https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2014\\_Policybrief1\\_GenderEqualityCorruption\\_EN.pdf](https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2014_Policybrief1_GenderEqualityCorruption_EN.pdf)

<sup>50</sup> <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-5-gender-equality.html>

<sup>51</sup> <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-5-gender-equality.html>

<sup>52</sup> KII notes- national partners

<sup>53</sup> Generally, the LPSBs included almost equal number of women and men; furthermore, in some cases more women have been participating in the LPSB.

<sup>54</sup> KII national partners

<sup>55</sup> FGM minutes

<sup>56</sup> FG meeting minutes

<sup>57</sup> FG meeting minutes, and Project Materials.

to the achievement of gender equality under the broader security governance framework.<sup>58</sup> This is particularly important as initiatives should go beyond gender participation and consider gender transformations, and tackling the root causes of inequality, while making security sector institutions more transparent, accountable, compliant with human rights and gender sensitive, operating on the basis of the rule of law.

**Gend2. The COIII has been instrumental in contributing to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and considering the principle “leave no-one behind” during its design and implementation**

The COIII is based on the notion that citizens’ participation for transparent and accountable security management is a cornerstone of good governance and prerequisite for SDG achievement<sup>59</sup>. The main reference has been SDG 16- to “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels”) recognises the strong link between sustainable development and peace, stability, human rights and effective governance, based on the rule of law. Generally, responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making and effective, accountable and transparent law enforcement institutions directly support national objectives, including those relating to the SDGs.

The FEC finds that the Project has considered these provisions, linking its intervention with the principle of “leaving no-one behind” from its design throughout the implementation<sup>60</sup>.

The FEC finds that the COIII team and partners at the level of actual implementation have established people-centred processes, that ensured broader participation and more effective civilian scrutiny and oversight to the police forces, thus, enabling links between national development objectives, including SDGs and security and crime prevention<sup>61</sup>. Practically, the Project provided opportunities for members of parliaments and CSOs and, more broadly, citizens to understand and assess the security issues and challenges and oversee reactions and measures that police forces implemented.

At the implementation level, the Project mainstreamed SDG targets in local security plans and the policies on civilian/democratic oversight of internal security forces. For example, the Project has involved specific sessions on SDGs in capacity development programs for members of the local security boards, governors and district governors. In addition, the Project supported mainstreaming of the SDGs throughout the development of security plans and sustainable and inclusive platforms for local security governance. Moreover, the Project bridged the gap of a simple “open government” approach that makes information available on a website and expects it to attract interested parties and collect their reactions and perceptions. Instead, the Project has been working to actively engaging citizens (through civil society organizations, muhtars and media) into decision-making processes to improve the services provided by the law enforcement agencies, the COIII fostered a culture of collaboration and partnership, effective use of resources and increase the impact of prevention programs<sup>62</sup>

In addition, the partners recognized that this COIII’s overarching focus on various groups has been also ensured through interaction with CSOs, being critical to avoid these groups being left behind<sup>63</sup>. For example, support to vulnerable groups has been ensured through the work of the human rights defenders and public social protection institutions and CSOs dealing with gender rights and elimination of gender-based violence. Under the COIII supported efforts through the LPSBs, the CSOs provided evidence about the need to improve targeting of social assistance scheme, showing the links with crime prevention and security in certain parts of municipalities<sup>64</sup>.

---

<sup>58</sup> The analysis of the Results Framework and the intervention logic

<sup>59</sup> Berkeley Hirsch “How Critical is Parliamentary Oversight of Security Forces in Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals?”, Prantice and Hall, NY, December 21, 2017

<sup>60</sup> KII- UNDP

<sup>61</sup> <https://www.osce.org/magazine/306696>

<sup>62</sup> KII notes; also Project Annual Reports

<sup>63</sup> KII notes, national partners and UN Agencies

<sup>64</sup> FG discussions and materials that CSO presented.

The FEC overall score on the Cross-cutting criterion (including gender mainstreaming and leaving no-one behind criteria): **SATISFACTORY**

## 6.4 Efficiency

**Effit:** Despite initial delays, UNDP Office managed to introduce changes in the COIII Project Team with a new Chief Technical Advisor and the Project Manager. Technical capacities of this strengthened COIII Project Team and strong partnership with participating institutions, facilitated recovery while speeding up implementation.

Despite identified delays, the analysed data indicates that all COIII components (under the direct UNDP management responsibility) have been implemented efficiently, exercising adaptive management. Partners stated that the UNDP COIII team has demonstrated flexibility throughout implementation.<sup>65</sup> Management mechanisms and implementation modalities have been timely established; however, delays in ensuring adequate human resources and dynamics within its operational structure affected Project's activities. The delays began from the Project's commencement: the COIII exceeded the planned initially three-month Inception Phase for an additional month. According to the documents and KII, the need for further baseline consultations and analysis required time beyond twelve weeks from the launching of the contract<sup>66</sup>. This delay from the Inception Phase set the performance trend for this Project during its first years. Furthermore, various challenges affected the smooth running of activities. For example, the delayed engagement of the team members, together with negative interpersonal relationships, severely influenced the COIII team and its ability to deliver. Also, the external challenges have affected implementation. For example, changes in the country's political landscape, with the new presidential system and local elections from March 2019, influenced the timely selection of the new pilot districts and field activities. In addition, these political developments affected the Grand National Assembly of Turkey as one of the main partners, as the Project Team could not present plans and introduce activities or establish cooperation ties until October 2019. Furthermore, the Covid-19 pandemic and imposed restrictions (March 2020) adversely impacted the implementation of activities, reducing opportunities for direct interactions, meetings and workshops. The Project's primary beneficiary, the General Directorate for Provincial Administrations (DGPA) has become the point of coordination of COVID-19 related measures, limiting availability and ability to respond to the Project's requests, approvals on the activities in the field, or participation in planned activities.

To respond to these challenges and recover implementation, UNDP requested two no-cost extensions ensuring additional time and enabling the COIII management team to implement planned activities.

Initially, the Project Steering Committee discussed a fifteen-month no-cost extension<sup>67</sup>. However, the EU Delegation approved additional seven months for COIII implementation and UNDP prepared a request (for a no-cost extension), recognizing challenges and highlighting the unprecedented situation brought by COVID-19. This request also recognized that the "Ministry of Interior General Directorate of Provincial Administrations has been overworked with responding to the pandemic", proposing to introduce the Ministry of Interior Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection (DSIODC) as main beneficiary. The FEC finds that the decision to involve DSIODC has been positive, resulting in "significant momentum to the COIII objectives<sup>68</sup>".

*This no-cost extension and changes of the main beneficiary and the management team (as described below in this chapter) have contributed to more efficient and effective COIII implementation<sup>69</sup>.*

---

<sup>65</sup> KII with national partners

<sup>66</sup> COIII Inception report and other documents

<sup>67</sup> This discussion was during the 4th Steering Committee (SC) meeting held on 27 November 2020

<sup>68</sup> Addendum No 1- No-Cost Extension Request, dated 15 December 2020, Contract/Agreement No: IPA/2017/385-810, Title of Project: Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces - Phase III, dated

<sup>69</sup> Since this decision to change the main beneficiary to the DSIODC, the project has made notable progress, with activity progress rising from 33% to 77% between December 2020 and June 2021. Also, ROM Report provided an overview of challenges; thus, reading this report and analysing delivery data improvements indicate that these changes have been highly important for the delivery.



Despite these positive changes in the implementation, the COIII could not fully recover. Another request for no-cost extension has been submitted, for the additional five months, “to ensure effective and comprehensive implementation of all activities and delivery of all expected results”<sup>70</sup> UNDP recognized in this request that COIII achieved significant progress in some areas despite the COVID-19 pandemic. Nevertheless, this additional time was required to continue with implementation and renew “face to face activities”<sup>71</sup> (as beneficiaries and stakeholders requested), while also working on the exit strategy for all LPSBs and the COIII as a whole<sup>72</sup>.

The FEC finds that the COIII no-cost extensions have been justified and required, contributing to the delivery of results and genuine knowledge transfer and development of capacities setting the ground for the follow up activities and sustainability of results.

- **COIII has established a clear work plan and, with the approved extensions until December 2021, has completed planned targets within the approved budget.**

At the operational level, COIII established a project team with the Chief Technical Advisor (KE1) as the “leader responsible for smooth implementation, also providing technical inputs across all Project components and deliverables”<sup>73</sup>. Still, the CTA position did not include managerial, supervisory and/or representative roles. These were the functions assigned to a Project Manager (COIII PM), together with responsibility to plan efficiently, deliver high-quality results, and follow the approved work plan and budget. The COIII included two full-time key experts (KE), Local Security Governance Structures-KE2 and Individual and Institutional Capacity Building (KE 3)<sup>74</sup>. The CO III demanding nature, sensitive topics and its operational complexity, required strong technical team (as described) and administrative and logistical support from the project associate and assistants.

However, the Project faced challenges in recruiting the pool of non-key experts, and UNDP/ COIII completed the selection nearly two years after the start of the Project, causing significant delays under some of the Project’s components<sup>75</sup>. The FEC found that UNDP/ CO III did not benefit from the experience from the previous phases regarding challenges to identify and engage staff/ experts<sup>76</sup>. Thus, UNDP/ COIII failed to implement adequate mitigation measures such as more proactive search, or communication with experienced short-term experts from the previous activities and phases. Still, there was a positive example as the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) from the previous two phases being engaged to act as “Lead Project Consultant” at the strategic policy level. With the management changes, the Lead Project Consultant has been selected for the CTA position. In addition, the new Project Manager has been engaged, from the experienced project staff. The FEC finds that operational and technical day- to -day interaction and communication has been established within the COIII Project Team and especially between the new Project Manager and the CTA. These changes have contributed to high effectiveness and delivery of results especially during the terminal year of implementation. Furthermore, the key informants recognized these changes, stating that the (new) “COIII Project Team’s technical knowledge and managements capacities” have been instrumental in resolving challenging situations<sup>77</sup>. The COIII PT strengthened with the new CTA/ PM ensured mobilization of resources, facilitating delivery of results<sup>78</sup> and facilitated regular communication and information exchange regarding strategic priorities with the partners and authorities.

COIII’s included results-oriented annual plans and more detailed quarterly plans, providing a sound basis for scheduling, resource allocation, budget control, and attainment of results. The COIII work plans have been instrumental to successful delivery of results, evident during the last Project’s year. The focus has been on

---

<sup>70</sup> Addendum No: 2, June 21, 2021, Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces – Phase III Project IPA/2017/385-810

<sup>71</sup> The main stakeholders, including participants in different capacity development events, stated that face to face interaction approach is “prerequisite for the success of learning and capacity development in this kind of projects”- KII notes

<sup>72</sup> Ibidem, Addendum No2

<sup>73</sup> Annex 4- Proposed Revised COIII Description of Action, 15.12.2021

<sup>74</sup> Ibidem, Annex 4

<sup>75</sup> KII notes and other project materials and deliverables

<sup>76</sup> COIII Results Oriented Monitoring Report, 2020

<sup>77</sup> The partners were particularly referring to resolving delays and issues from the first years of its implementation- KII notes

<sup>78</sup> KII notes, development partners and national partners



providing technical level activities, ensuring that strategic decisions are aligned with national priorities and identified needs of participating institutions.

The FEC found that the work plan preparation has been participatory, through the joint efforts of the COIII team and national partners, primarily the Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection of the MOI and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT). The stakeholders stated that the COIII work plan also enabled planning, implementing and synchronizing activities. For example, the experts' missions and capacity development programs have been coordinated with other initiatives<sup>79</sup>

- **The steering structure and UNDP management team have been timely established and contributed to efficient and effective implementation**

The COIII has established a Project Steering Committee as the main advisory and steering structure, to provide guidance and support the COIII team to reach Project's objectives, ensuring coherence and coordination with other interventions (EU funded and other governance initiatives) in Turkey. The PSC included representatives of UNDP, EUD and the main beneficiaries (Ministry of Interior, Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection), co-beneficiary (GNAT), EU Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Lead Institution on Fundamental Rights sector). The PSC meetings have been planned on quarterly basis; however, the delays in implementation required more active involvement and monthly monitoring meetings have been organized for closer follow-up. The FEC finds that these meetings served to discuss the progress of the Project, verify the achievements, discuss challenges and propose countermeasures for improvements.

- **COIII has established a sound monitoring and reporting system**

This monitoring system served as the reference during reporting, and it was based on the COIII Results Framework (RF), with tailor-made data collection protocols and instruments. The evaluation consultant found that the adopted indicators and the overall monitoring system have served to facilitate tracking of performance under all Project's outputs and activities and overall progress reporting, despite some weaknesses. The indicators presented in the RF have been mostly satisfactory; still, the evaluation team found gaps within the existing indicators, as they have not been sufficiently "gender sensitive" and some Project's areas have not been adequately considered. For example, indicators could not adequately measure COIII's performance in the areas, such as citizens participation- it rather remained at the level of established LPSBs. The proposed means of verification and data sources provided were appropriate to validate progress and achievements. The COIII has established a regular reporting practice, fully aligned with the results-oriented reporting principles. Concerning reporting frequency, COIII team prepares regular quarterly and annual reports, providing a substantive presentation of implemented activities, and presenting plans for the next year. Furthermore, results-oriented reporting and references to the COIII indicators to measure the progress towards the achievement of targets in the quarterly reports has been emphasized.<sup>80</sup>

**Despite challenges and delays from the first project's year, UNDP managed to recover its management framework and bring the Project back to planned implementation modality.**

The FEC overall score on the Efficiency criterion: SATISFACTORY

## **6.5 Effectiveness**

The FEC analysed relationship between the achieved results under COIII outputs and its outcome, reflecting on the extent to which the attainment of COIII's outputs contributed to progress under outcome.

**Effec:** COIII has been effective in delivering its outputs, and making credible contribution to the achievement of stated outcome

---

<sup>79</sup> KII notes with the national stakeholders

<sup>80</sup> Based on COIII annual reports

Despite initial delays, the Project has been effective in delivering outputs and meeting planned targets, the primary and secondary sources confirmed positive changes in relevant statistical indicators under outputs<sup>81</sup>.

The FEC prepared a comprehensive table that analysed intervention logic (this included the overall results chain, outcome and outputs) and respective indicators under each of the elements, striving to establish credible links to the extent possible between specific results and reported progress under the COIII outputs and its outcome. The FEC reflected on changes measured by proposed indicators and analyse the extent to which targets have been achieved. In the cases of missing information, the FE worked to collect other information and link reported results with outcomes.

---

<sup>81</sup> The in-depth analysis of the COIII effectiveness has been based on its aggregated progress and monitoring reports, the work plans, and other prepared analytical reports and documents. The interviews with stakeholders served to validate findings.

**Table 2: Analysis of status of COIII indicators**

Result Level	Result Statement	Indicator	Current value	Completion rate
Overall objective	To enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety	<p>II1: Existing system of civilian and democratic oversight of ISF improved in line with international and EU standards, providing an enabling environment for promotion of fundamental rights.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Existing legislative and institutional framework requires improvement aligned with EU Acquis. (Y2018)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Comprehensive legislative and institutional framework for civilian and democratic control of internal security forces in place and compliant with EU acquis (Y2021)</p>	The EU Progress Report (2021) <sup>82</sup> stated that the country has delayed the reform of the legal and institutional framework governing the security and intelligence sector. As a result, the transparency and accountability of military, police and intelligence services remained very limited. Parliamentary oversight of the executive, including security agencies, remained very weak and ineffective. The Parliament lacks the necessary means to hold the government to account. Members of Parliament can only address written questions to the Cabinet members. They cannot ask questions to the President. Presidential decrees remained exempt from parliamentary control. Parliamentary oversight of public spending needs to be improved <sup>83</sup> .	N.A
Specific objective	To ensure the institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices.	<p><b>O1:</b> Structures established for civilian and democratic oversight and implementation practices of internal security sector at local and national levels considered being in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p> <p><b>Baselines:</b></p> <p>No structure at the national level (Y2017)</p> <p>Local structures exist in 8 districts (Y2017)</p> <p>Civilian and democratic oversight structures are not fully in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p> <p><b>Targets</b></p> <p>One national level crime prevention commission in place and local structures scaled up to 19 districts/provinces. (Y2021)</p> <p>Civilian and democratic oversight structures are in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p>	<p>Completed:</p> <p>Regulation for NCPO has been, presented and discussed and submitted to MoI. The document has followed all steps and procedures and prepared for formal adoption.</p>	N.A

<sup>82</sup> European Commission - Turkey 2021 Report, Strasbourg, 19.10.2021

<sup>83</sup> Ibidem, European Commission - Turkey 2021 Report, Strasbourg, 19.10.2021

			Completed:  19 LPSBs functioning with their proper M&E system in place- during the Phase III, an additional 10 structures (8 districts boards, 2 provincial commissions) became operational		
			The FEC could not find international benchmarks or provisions in the EU Acquis on institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces. The FEC finds that the reference to “EU acquis and best international practices” have been used without specific meaning.		
Component A	Output 1	Legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) improved in light of civilian and democratic oversight and accountability principles provided by EU and international standards and best practices	<b>OT1-I1.</b> Laws regulating the work of the police, gendarmerie and coast guard improved in line with EU and international standards <b>Baseline:</b> 3 laws already revised (Y2017) <b>Target:</b> Proposals for 6 revised laws (Y2021)	Completed- Draft Oversight and Police Power Gap/Analysis Report Final version of Part 1: Oversight and Police Power Gap/Analysis Report, Draft version of Part 2: Basic Laws of ISFs Legal Gap/Compliance Analysis Report)/Data Set	100%
	Output 2	Five-years organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey	<b>Ot2-I1</b> Draft Strategy developed and presented Target: Proposal for Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey (Y2020)	Completed- Draft strategy has been prepared and 2 workshops are completed. Strategy has been finalized and submitted.	100%
	Output 3	Performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators to ensure consistency during the evaluation of internal security forces by the MoI developed	<b>Ot3-I1.</b> Performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators <b>Baseline:</b> Structured performance evaluation not based on SMART indicators (Y2017) <b>Target:</b> Proposal for a performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators developed for the MoI (Y2021)	Completed- Proposal for a performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators developed for the MoI and submitted	100%

	Output 4	Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (GCGA) improved in line with the principles of civilian oversight	<p>Ot4-I1. Revised curriculum</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Current Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2017)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Proposal for a revised Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2021)</p>	<p>Completed:</p> <p>Curriculum Development committee had been established. 6 Consultative Meetings and 5 workshops conducted. Training Needs Assessment &amp; Comparative Assessment Report are completed.</p> <p>Proposal for a revised Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy prepared and submitted</p>	100%
	Output 5	Legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office developed based on a compliance analysis with EU standards and practices	<p><b>Ot5-I1.</b> Recommendations for Draft Legal Framework on National Crime Prevention Office developed and presented</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Legal Framework not in place (2017)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Proposal for a Legal Framework developed and presented (Y2021)</p>	<p>Completed:</p> <p>Draft regulation for NCPO has already been drafted and has been presented to Mol (January 2021.)</p>	100%
Component B	Output 6	Strategy for effective functioning of Parliamentary oversight of ISF is developed	<p><b>Ot6-I1.</b> Draft Strategy developed and presented</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No Strategy in place (Y2017)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Draft Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF (Y2021)</p>	<p>Completed:</p> <p>Draft Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF has been prepared and discussed.</p> <p>2 trainings have been organized.</p>	90%
Component C	Output 7	Local Prevention and Security Boards scaled up in 10 selected districts/ provinces	<p><b>Ot7-I1.</b> Local Prevention and Security Boards are operational in 10 selected districts/provinces.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 9 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards(Y2017)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> 19 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards (Y2021)</p>	<p>Completed:</p> <p>10 Local Boards and Commissions have been established during the COIII</p> <p>In total, 19 boards are functioning in Turkey.</p>	100%
Component D	Output 8	Delivered training programs for 500 professionals of Mol and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of ISFs and citizen-focused security services	<p><b>Ot8-I1.</b> Delivery of trainings on civilian and democratic oversight to 500 people</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 250 people trained (Y2017)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> 500 people trained (Y2021)</p>	<p>Completed:</p> <p>All 9trainings have been completed 450trainees could be reached and and with the approval of additional 2 trainings</p>	95%

Output 9	Awareness of the public, civil society and local media enhanced as regards the human – centred security concept in the districts/provinces where Local Prevention and Security Boards established	<p><b>Otg-I1.</b> Number of civil society organizations and local media representatives, and public at large reached out through national opinion poll and awareness raising campaigns</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Results of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction and confidence in ISFs reached out 7500 respondents (during Phase II) (Y2014)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> 9,000 respondents of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction and 1,000 civil society and local media representative attended awareness raising campaigns (Y2021)</p>	Completed:	75%
			Survey for 9,000 respondents of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction Opinion polls have been completed in December 2020 and reports are completed in April 2021.	
				Partially completed:
			19 Awareness Raising events are completed, reaching 800800 civil society and media representatives	
RESULTS ACHIEVEMENT				94%

**Table 3: Detailed analysis of the COIII's effectiveness**

<b>ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OBJECTIVE</b>	
<b>Impact objective</b>	<b>Indicators (including benchmarks)</b>
<b>Impact:</b> To enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centered understanding of security and public safety	<p>II1: Existing system of civilian and democratic oversight of ISF improved in line with international and EU standards, providing an enabling environment for promotion of fundamental rights.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Existing legislative and institutional framework requires improvement aligned with EU Acquis. (Y2018)</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Comprehensive legislative and institutional framework for civilian and democratic control of internal security forces in place and compliant with EU acquis (Y2021)</p>
<b>Comments on Impact</b>	<b>Comments on Indicators (including benchmarks)</b>
<p>The COIII impact represents longer-term changes in development conditions in the country, requiring national leadership and joint work of other partners.</p> <p>The FEC finds that contribution claim could be established between the COIII achievements and progress towards civilian and democratic oversight of internal forces in Turkey. The main strings (of contribution) could be identified in form of inputs for improvements of the legal framework, preparation of strategic and policy documents, or assistance with the design of platform for establishing national-level coordination mechanism.</p>	<p>Despite weak formulation of this indicator (e.g., its wording is more appropriate for an objective of the target), the FEC finds that it could, together with the established target and baseline, serve to measure progress towards the establishment of civilian and democratic oversight of security forces.</p> <p>The proposed source of verification has been the European Commission annual report, that evaluates the progress achieved by the candidate countries with respect to the Copenhagen criteria since 1998. However, these one-sided documents reflecting only the European Commission's assessment and view.</p> <p>Thus, the FEC finds that additional indicators, such as perception surveys among the citizens and security forces (qualitative indicators), or certain dimensions of the worldwide governance indicators, together with possible proxy references (e.g., security and crime related statistics from the participating districts, with operational LPSBs) could complement this II1. Additionally, the prepared strategies and draft/ revised laws could serve as another source of verifications, as these documents have been designed to support EU accession process/ supports alignment with the EU acquis.</p>
<b>Validation of progress towards impact</b>	
<p>The Project was working to support establishing transparent and accountable security governance, strengthening oversight of internal security forces system in Turkey. This is an essential trait of a solid democratic state that contributes to the security sector personnel behaving with honour and integrity, detecting</p>	



and correcting mischief, and holding accountable those who commit them. Most importantly, oversight guarantees that defence institutions act in Turkey's best interest and carry out their primary duty to provide security to the public and protect the state from external threats without corrupt deviations. Therefore, civilian oversight is central to good governance, ensuring that all the members of the society follow the rules; respect others, the system and their place within that system; fulfil their duty in the best possible way; and refrain from corrupt practices. Thus, oversight is the process by which transparency translates into accountability and democratic control of the security sector; thus, providing an enabling environment for promotion of fundamental rights.

The COIII's areas of intervention have been and remained highly relevant while building oversight capacities and enhancing transparency and accountability of security forces have been stated reform priorities of Turkey (as reflected in various policies and strategies<sup>84</sup>). The FEC finds that Turkey is progressing with improvements of the existing system of civilian and democratic oversight of ISF, reflecting international and EU standards, and creating favourable environment for promotion of fundamental rights. The 2021 EU Progress Report<sup>85</sup> acknowledged that Turkey had strengthened civilian oversight under the presidential system, and broad powers over the security forces lie within the executive branch. Moreover, the report recognized that the government took steps to further consolidate civilian control of the security forces. For example, the Ministry of Defence has the authority (as of March 2021) to propose military personnel's promotion and appointment, a legal mandate that previously belonged to the General Staff. However, the report highlighted challenges, that "transparency and accountability of military, police and intelligence services remained limited". In response to the 2021 EU country report, the Government of Turkey did not accept "the unfounded claims and unjust criticism"<sup>86</sup>, in particular concerning "governmental and political system, fundamental rights, certain court rulings/administrative decisions as well as our fight against terrorism"<sup>87</sup>. The controversial issues, according to the Government, cannot be assessed without taking into consideration the specific conditions of Turkey<sup>88</sup>.

#### ANALYSIS OF OUTCOME

Outcome	Indicators and benchmarks
<b>Outcome.</b> <i>To ensure the institutionalisation of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices.</i>	<p><b>OI1:</b> Structures established for civilian and democratic oversight and implementation practices of internal security sector at local and national levels considered being in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p> <p><b>Baselines:</b></p> <p><i>No structure at the national level (Y2017)</i></p> <p><i>Local structures exist in 8 districts (Y2017)</i></p> <p><i>Civilian and democratic oversight structures are not fully in line with EU acquis and best international practices</i></p>

<sup>84</sup> More details have been available under the Relevance part of this report, under the Rel1.

<sup>85</sup> European Commission - Turkey 2021 Report, Strasbourg, 19.10.2021

<sup>86</sup> No: 351, 19 October 2021, Press Release Regarding the 2021 Country Report on Turkey by the European Commission, [https://www.mfa.gov.tr/no\\_-251\\_-avrupa-komisyonu-2021-turkiye-raporu-hk.en.mfa](https://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-251_-avrupa-komisyonu-2021-turkiye-raporu-hk.en.mfa)

<sup>87</sup> Ibidem, No: 351, 19 October 2021,

<sup>88</sup> The Government stated that "disregarding the challenges faced by Turkey and threats posed by terrorist organisations such as PKK/PYD/YPG, FETO and DAESH, serves no purpose other than satisfying anti-EU and anti-Turkey radical circles in Europe"- No:351.

	<p><b>Targets</b></p> <p><i>One national level crime prevention commission in place and local structures scaled up to 19 districts/provinces. (Y2021)</i></p> <p><i>Civilian and democratic oversight structures are in line with EU acquis and international best practices</i></p>
<b>Comments on Outcome</b>	<b>Comments on Indicators and benchmarks</b>
<p>The FEC finds that the formulation of this Outcome is more appropriate for mid-term impact objective. Each outcome should answer the question “what national stakeholders and partners do differently (partly as a result of UNDP/ EUD efforts). The reference to “doing things differently” could be observed through, for example, enhanced ability of MoI and authorities to continue with the civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces, or existence of capacities at sub-national level for inclusive and citizen-focused participatory planning for safety and security.</p> <p>Still, the FEC finds that “ensuring the institutionalisation of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices” is clearly beyond a scope of any development initiative or mandates of international development partners, but clearly responsibility of national authorities.</p> <p>Furthermore, the FEC finds that this is a composite outcome. The first component is related to the need to enhance stakeholders’ capacities and institutionalize civilian and democratic oversight of ISFs. The second component strives to ensure greater citizen engagement in policy planning and implementation in line with EU acquis and best practices.</p>	<p>The comments on impact indicators could be applied at this level: the FEC finds that formulation of outcome indicator does not comply with SMART<sup>89</sup> criteria. Thus, the adopted outcome indicators are more appropriate for an objective or its target. Similarly, the composite nature of this outcome is mirrored at its indicator, with two separate dimensions.</p> <p>Still, the FEC finds that this indicator does not directly capture the “inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices”, despite anticipation that the reference to the “EU acquis and best international practices” implies “citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices. The FEC could not find formally established “international benchmarks and codified best practices” for participative planning and implementation of “civilian and democratic oversight”.</p> <p>The proposed benchmarks (baselines and targets) helped to use this indicator to validate progress under outcome.</p> <p>The targets from the approved project document (2018) remained in the revised Project document (submitted under the request for extension). The Project’s scope and activities remained the same, with required additional time for its implementation.</p>
<b>Validation of progress under the Outcome</b>	
<p>The institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces is an essential element of legitimate, transparent and inclusive governance, showing that it includes a range of regulations and structures through which citizens participate—pursuing human rights and freedoms. The principles of civilian oversight are the same as those at the heart of democracy: Equity; Participation; Pluralism; Partnership; Subsidiarity; Transparency; Accountability; Rule of law; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Responsiveness; Sustainability. This finding indicates the complexity of “institutionalization” of civilian oversight over the ISF, and it requires (sufficient) time to ensure and institutionalize mechanisms and practices. Although the efforts to establish civilian</p>	

<sup>89</sup> Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound

oversight in Turkey have been ongoing for a long time, the gaps between these initiatives together with changes in the governance and political system have prevented institutionalizing results (of the previous phases of the civilian oversight support). Thus, the starting position for the difficult starting position for the COIII.

The COIII has partially achieved the first target. The national-level crime prevention office is not in place yet; at the same time, the COIII scaled-up local structures to 19 districts/ provinces.

The National Crime Prevention Office under the MoI has been planned, with the role to enhance national efforts for civilian/democratic oversight of internal security, also coordinating the work of LPSBs at local level. The national development programme stated that the MoI, through establishing a National Crime Prevention Office, would strengthen decentralized organization and effectiveness of the LPSBs and the provision of funds to District Boards for preventive actions selected by Governors<sup>90</sup>. The Project assisted to develop a legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office based on a compliance analysis with EU standards and practices; preparation of this document has been participative and nationally drive, with the MoI leading on all steps. The MoI has completed internal consultative process and but the adoption of this document is pending.

The Project reached the target to scale up *local structures to 19 districts/provinces*, deepening activities of LPSBs undertaken under Phase II, introducing organizational changes to LPSBs for active participation of citizens in local security policies. The LPSBs engaged citizens (through participation of civil society organisations, Mukhtars and media) into decision-making processes, improving the service orientation of the law enforcement agencies. The LPSBs fostered a culture of collaboration and partnership, effective use of resources and increase the impact of prevention programs.

## ANALYSIS OF OUTPUTS

### Outputs

### Indicators and benchmarks

#### Comments on outputs, indicators and benchmarks

The COIII intervention logic included nine outputs, a relatively large number considering the Project's scope. However, considering that outputs relate to activities' completion (rather than the conduct), the FEC finds that COIII formulated outputs inconsistently. Some of these outputs could be appropriate as targets, for example, Ot8. Delivered training programs for 500 professionals of MoI and ISFs on civilian/ democratic oversight of ISFs and citizen-focused security services. Also, these outputs could effectively serve as yes/no indicators, for example, Ot2. Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey or Ot6. Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF is developed.

The revised version of the logical framework contains indicators for all outputs. Still, most of these indicators have been formulated weakly. The FEC finds that some of these indicators are reformulated outputs, while others could better serve as output targets. Furthermore, these qualitative and quantitative indicators have not been gender-sensitive (even gender participation has not been considered, for example, based on reports from workshops and other training events).

Still, the analysis of these indicators and benchmarks (baselines and targets) and review of planned/ implemented activities enabled the FEC to assess COIII achievements and progress.

The FEC considered also sources of verifications to validate progress under respective outputs; generally, these sources could generally serve to validate progress. However, the FEC was using key informants' interviews and other sources to triangulate collected information and confirm findings.

<p><b>Ot1. Legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) improved in light of civilian and democratic oversight and accountability principles provided by EU and international standards and best practices</b></p>	<p><b>OT1-I.</b> Laws regulating the work of the police, gendarmerie and coast guard improved in line with EU and international standards</p> <p><i>Baseline:</i> 3 laws already revised (Y2017)</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Proposals for 6 revised laws (Y2021)</p>
<p><b>The COIII has been effective towards Ot1, meeting the targets and proposing revision of six laws regulating the work of the police, gendarmerie and coast guard to reflect EU and international standards</b></p> <p>The Project prepared a comprehensive Compliance Analysis Report on Democratic and Civilian Oversight of ISFs between Turkey and selected EU member-states<sup>91</sup>. This document assessed legal gaps regarding democratic and civilian oversight norms between Turkey and selected EU member-states, proposing recommendations for compliance with widely accepted international and EU norms. The COIII approach considered classic definitions of democratic and civilian oversight, comparing countries on dozens of aspects. The Project experts turned observations into measurable variables and coded, as the basis for the computation of ten indexes of democratic and civilian oversight and their comparison across countries allowed for the definition of the gaps<sup>92</sup>.</p> <p>The COIII prepared Report recognized that "Turkey has made progress in the oversight of ISFs by their affiliation ministry, the Ministry of Interior". In addition, the gendarmerie legal status changed to civilian, being under the authority of the MoI. Furthermore, internal oversight mechanisms such as the Law Enforcement Commission has been put in place in Turkey, although no report about its activity is currently available. At the same time, the Report indicated that gap between Turkey and EU countries varied from dimension to dimension.</p> <p>The COIII prepared inputs and prepared <b>recommendations for amendments to six laws</b>, that are submitted to the national stakeholders. The two first items are about oversight regarding the legal framework that regulates ISFs' actions that may impact citizens fundamental rights: the use of personal data (remit of Personal Data Protection Agency; use of personal data), and freedom of expression / peaceful gathering. The two subsequent laws are related to judicial oversight: the administrative power of the prosecutor for oversight of agents and the penal responsibility of ISFs before a judge (lifting some of the limitations to his current investigation powers). The Parliament may increase its role by raising the limits placed on the standing committees of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Currently, they cannot be engaged in matters other than those assigned to them and cannot compel ministers to attend sessions. The last laws are concerning the regulation and transparency of the use of force in two aspects: the use of stops and weapons<sup>93</sup>.</p>	
<p><b>Ot2. Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey</b></p>	<p><b>Ot2-I1</b> Draft Strategy developed and presented</p> <p><i>Target:</i> Proposal for Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey (Y2020)</p>

<sup>91</sup> Legal Gap / Compliance Analysis Report on Democratic and Civilian Oversight of ISFs between Turkey and selected EU member-states, August 2021, Prepared by: Sebastian Roché, Olgun Altundas, Noelle Castagné, Simon Varaine. More available at: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A13-Legal-Gap-Compliance-Analysis-Report-on-Democratic-and-Civilian-Oversight-of-ISFs-between-Turkey-and-selected-EU-member-states.pdf>

<sup>92</sup> Ten dimensions have been considered and measured, and each dimension is constituted of subdimensions: i) Fundamental rights protection (constitution, principles), ii) Data protection authority, iii) Parliament oversight, iv) Judiciary oversight, v) Internal oversight by MoI, 4 vi) Transparency of MoI and ISFs, vii) External Oversight Mechanism on ISFs, viii) Handling of citizens' complaints against ISFs, ix) Citizen orientation and Local accountability of ISFs, and x) Civil Society Orientation of ISFs.

<sup>93</sup> Ibidem, Legal Gap/ Compliance Analysis Report- <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A13-Legal-Gap-Compliance-Analysis-Report-on-Democratic-and-Civilian-Oversight-of-ISFs-between-Turkey-and-selected-EU-member-states.pdf>

<p>The FEC finds that the Ot2 could be more appropriate for a target under the Ot1 (not being at the same level as other outputs). Still, <b>the COIII prepared the Proposal for Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey and submitted to the Mol.</b></p> <p>The stakeholders stated that the COIII followed nationally- driven approach<sup>94</sup>, with the involvement of national stakeholders throughout the process: two workshops have been organized to discuss the draft Strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey<sup>95</sup>. All the inputs have been collected and the final draft Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces finalized and submitted.</p>	
<p><b>Ot3. Performance evaluation system based on Specific Measurable Accepted Realistic Timely (SMART) indicators to ensure consistency during the evaluation of internal security forces by the Mol developed</b></p>	<p><b>Ot3-I1.</b> Performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators  <i>Baseline:</i> Structured performance evaluation not based on SMART indicators (Y2017)  <i>Target:</i> Proposal for a performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators developed for the Mol (Y2021)</p>
<p><b>The FEC finds that the COIII has been effective towards achieving Output 3, and the Project prepared and submitted Proposal for a performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators developed for the Mol.</b></p> <p>The COIII followed a well-planned and comprehensive approach, setting the basis for the performance measurement system. The initial step was that COIII carried a desk review of best practices in certain EU countries concerning performance evaluation systems. The Project analysed <i>citizen-oriented performance evaluation of ISFs experience from Belgium, France and Greece (Coast Guard)</i> and prepared country reports<sup>96</sup>.</p> <p>Building on these (national) reports, the Project prepared <b>Comparative Assessment Report on Performance Evaluation System in Turkey, France, Belgium and Greece</b><sup>97</sup>, distinguishing between three dimensions (and this structure was followed in all other COIII reports):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizational performance, reviewing practices to define, measure and monitor collective performance within ISF or externally (by the Mol and other state entities, including independent bodies). The COIII analyzed three dimensions: the general orientations, the performance indicators used, and the monitoring process. In addition, the Report highlighted the importance of the quality and reliability of data and software options. It also reflected on a broad range of indicators that consider the attitudes and experiences of the public.</li> <li>• Individual performance, analysing the process of assessment of individual gendarmes and police officers. The Report mainly reflected how this assessment considered a citizen's perspective, distinguishing the process and the contents of the individual evaluation. In addition, the Report underlined the importance of performance criteria-based regular (yearly) individual evaluations.</li> <li>• Audit and control, focusing on the review of the investigation of individual misconduct (inspections, Ombudsmen) and organizational audit and accountability (inspections, courts of audits, etc.)<sup>98</sup>.</li> </ul>	

<sup>94</sup> KII notes

<sup>95</sup> Reports from the workshops

<sup>96</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A23-National-Assessments-Report.pdf>

<sup>97</sup> Comparative Assessment Report on Performance Evaluation System in Turkey, France, Belgium and Greece, prepared by: Jacques de Maillard, International Short-Term Expert (Prof. Dr., Political science University of Versailles-Saint Quentin), <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A23-Comparative-Assessment-Report.pdf>

<sup>98</sup> Ibidem, Jacques de Maillard

In parallel, the COIII was working to organize **a technical visit to Belgium**, as a country with a long tradition of citizen-focused and local policing. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a virtual study visit has been delivered<sup>99</sup>, presenting how the Belgian police integrate the citizens' perspective into its performance measure, management and evaluation<sup>100</sup>.

The FEC finds that the process continued as per plan, the Project prepared a **Gap analysis report on the current performance evaluation system**<sup>101</sup> that was based on comparative analysis and considering results of the study visit<sup>102</sup>. The Report indicated the areas for improvement of organizational performance, for example, the reliability of data, the careful definition of indicators, the inclusion of citizen-oriented data and the transparency of crime statistics. Regarding individual performance, the Report highlighted the need for regular and individual interviews with the personnel. Furthermore, the Report indicated the need for evaluation criteria to specify more clearly the skills related to the sense of service and the quality of the relation with the public. Finally, in terms of control and audit, the Report showed a gap in keeping records of all the complaints and disciplinary actions against ISF. Furthermore, it showed that the Ombudsman does not conduct performance evaluations or audits. Finally, citizen trust, public satisfaction or value for money have not become an open and direct standard<sup>103</sup>.

After the completion of this comparative work, the COIII prepared a **Comprehensive Recommendations Report for an Improved Performance Evaluation System of ISFs**<sup>104</sup>. The main priorities from this document could be summarized as defining and adopting principles for improved civilian oversight/citizen focus performance evaluation of ISF in Turkey, defining targets, and implementing indicators for monitoring.

**Ot4. Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (GCCA) improved in line with the principles of civilian oversight**

**Ot4-I1. Revised curriculum**

**Baseline:** Current Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2017)

**Target:** Proposal for a revised Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2021)

The aim was not to revise the curriculum of the GCCA but to propose a specific module on civilian oversight or

Improve the GCCA curriculum in line with the civilian oversight principles

<sup>99</sup> This has been a two-day on-line workshop, organized during 15 and 16 February 2021; more details at <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A22-Technical-Visit-Report-Belgium-v2.pdf>

<sup>100</sup> It had two main focuses: (a) "Citizen focused performance evaluation" of ISFs (internal evaluation of citizen focus, and also external evaluation by the mayors or other partners, formal or informal), (b) Effect of such focus on operations (improved relations of police with citizens/partners)

<sup>101</sup> Gap Analysis Report based on the Current Performance Evaluation System, July 2020, prepared by Jacques de Maillard, International Short-Term Expert University of Versailles-Saint Quentin, <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A24-GAP-Analysis-Report.pdf>

<sup>102</sup> KII notes and also COIII Annual and Progress Reports (2021, 2020, 2019)

<sup>103</sup> Ibidem, <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A24-GAP-Analysis-Report.pdf>

<sup>104</sup> A Comprehensive Recommendations Report for an Improved Performance Evaluation System of ISFs, December 2020, compiled by Jacques de Maillard, SNKE, more details at: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A25-A-comprehensive-recommendations-report.pdf>



The FEC finds that the COIII is likely to achieve this Output. The process for improving the Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (GCGA) is progressing, following a needs-based, nationally driven participative approach to introducing civilian oversight principles in improved Curriculum. Thus, the initial step for the Project was to prepare a comparative assessment study of the ISF Academies of Denmark, Germany, Italy, and Turkey regarding civilian and democratic oversight, comparing processes, programs, systems, organizations etc. The objective was to discover their relative differences, similarities and contrasts within a conceptual framework of civilian oversight<sup>105</sup>. The COIII supported analysis showed that ISF academies' functioning varies in their missions and tasks identified, namely, differences exist, depending on their characteristics, such as higher education or training-centric, levels and types of education and training, etc. The ISF academies' education and training systems included a combination of theory and practice. The Report showed that in the absence of a specific program on civilian and democratic oversight, some courses support the concept, such as ethics, human rights, and law. Compared to Denmark, Germany, and Italy, which are more focused on certain programs, the ISF academy of Turkey holds the most extensive coverage in terms of its education and training programs and courses. In this context, civilian and democratic oversight mechanisms seem to reach a wide population of law enforcement (Gendarmerie and Coast Guard) at a single ISF academy indicating that civilian and democratic oversight mechanisms require customization<sup>106</sup>. This comparative study, together with the Needs Assessment Report that the COIII prepared<sup>107</sup>, based on desk review and interviews with GCGA staff set the basis for the review and development of Curriculum.

The FEC finds that the COIII has ensured national leadership and ownership throughout this process, facilitating the establishment of a Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) under the chairmanship of Ministry of Interior/ GCGA. The CDC included representatives of GCGA, MoI, Gendarmerie, Coast Guard, academicians and experts working in the field of security sector reform and education systems and fundamental rights. The key informants stated that the CDC has been working to propose the GCGA a module on civilian oversight addressing middle and high-level managers, in line with the findings of the comparative assessment report and needs analysis on the training system<sup>108</sup>. The aim has been to ensure the accuracy of the training modules in line with international principles and enhance knowledge and awareness on civilian and democratic oversight from a fundamental rights perspective. The FEC finds that CDC with support from the Project drafted a specific training module on civilian and democratic oversight<sup>109</sup> and submit it to GCGA for approval and inclusion in its regular training curriculum<sup>110</sup>.

**Ot5. Legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office developed based on a compliance analysis with EU standards and practices**

**Ot5-I1.** Recommendations for Draft Legal Framework on National Crime Prevention Office developed and presented

**Baseline:** Legal Framework not in place (2017)

**Target:** Proposal for a Legal Framework developed and presented (Y2021)

<sup>105</sup> Comparative Assessment Report on the Functioning, Training Management and Curricula of Internal Security Forces Academies, Prepared By Dr. Ahmet BARBAK, September 2020 [http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A53-Comparative-Assessment-Report\\_EN.pdf](http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A53-Comparative-Assessment-Report_EN.pdf)

<sup>106</sup> Ibidem, Comparative Assessment Report

<sup>107</sup> COIII Annual Reports and Request for Second Extension, including annexes

<sup>108</sup> KII notes, also the COIII reports

<sup>109</sup> KII notes

<sup>110</sup> COIII reports and KII notes



The FEC finds that the Project achieved this output, and the proposal for a Legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office has been prepared following the COIII recommendations<sup>111</sup>. Namely, the COIII prepared analytical report that envisaged NCPO as part of the political landscape in the security area, ensuring also implementation of sectoral policies (by guiding the ministry's different bodies, especially the governorates and the law enforcement). Thus, the COIII recommended balance between strategic and operational capacities to implement the concrete measures of the strategic action plans, manage the budget, ensure communication, train and educate, and ultimately assess and adjust the policy.

These analytical documents and recommendations served to prepare draft law on National Crime Prevention Office, that was further analysed and adjusted reflecting findings from the compliance analysis with EU standards and practices<sup>112</sup>. The COIII in the compliance report compared the main sections of the draft law establishing the National Crime Prevention Office with EU standards and good practices. This process included systematic analysis of the equivalent legislation in European Countries by looking at the organization of crime prevention at the national and local levels (councils, funding, etc.), also examining European soft law produced by European networks. The compliance report indicated that the draft law aligns with EU practices, and French legal foundations and practices have been the main benchmarks. Practically, the Report showed that National Crime Prevention Office and the National Crime Prevention Department could compare to the French national level organizational architecture<sup>113</sup>. This structure favoured coordination between various actors, including CSOs, serving as a policy platform in this area. Also, the LPSBs compare to the French local prevention and security councils. Alike to the LPSB in Turkey, the French local prevention and security councils also gather a variety of partners, collect information on the diversity of security demands of the population, elaborate strategies based on crime prevention principles.

**Ot6. Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF is developed**

**Ot6-I1.** Draft Strategy developed and presented

**Baseline:** No Strategy in place (Y2017)

**Target:** Draft Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF (Y2021)

The Project has achieved the target and prepared the Draft Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF; it's formal adoption is planned for the end of this year following discussions and workshops that would enable fine-tuning and adjustments to the Strategy.

The FEC finds that the COIII approach was well-planned, nationally driven and based on the analysis of actual needs of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT). Namely, the Project assessed the existing parliamentary oversight of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) in Turkey, identified challenges and provided policy recommendations proposing tools, approaches, structures, and institutions, to fully accomplish the GNAT's oversight role. The policy recommendations in this report corresponded to the relations between the Parliament and Executive organ (Presidency and Government). It also included inputs for the improvement of the Rules of Procedure (RP)<sup>114</sup>. In addition, the Project prepared a comparative analysis of the EU Member States, Spain, Belgium and

<sup>111</sup> Preliminary Recommendations for National Crime Prevention Office, Prepared by Dominique Lapprand, July 2020 more: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A32-Preliminary-Recommendations-for-National-Crime-Prevention-Office.pdf>

<sup>112</sup> Comparative/Compliance Analysis - compliance analysis with EU and international standards and best practices, Prepared by: Jacques de Maillard, July 2021, more available at <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/A-3-4-Comparative-Compliance-Analysis-compliance-analysis-with-EU-and-international-standards-and-best-practices.pdf>

<sup>113</sup> Ibidem, <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/A-3-4-Comparative-Compliance-Analysis-compliance-analysis-with-EU-and-international-standards-and-best-practices.pdf>

<sup>114</sup> These included among other, needs to strengthen (a) the organizational, technical, research and expertise capacity of the GNAT, (b) civil society (CSO) participation, (c) auxiliary structures for relations with the officials, CSOs, universities, and other outside experts, (d) organizational capacity of the parliamentary committees. Furthermore, these

Germany, to identify standards derived from EU member states' good practices that could be taken into account by Turkey to improve the situation and fill-in some gaps<sup>115</sup>.

These inputs served to draft the Strategy for effective functioning of Parliamentary oversight of ISF, further validated through the workshops and capacity development activities. The inputs and comments have been compiled and reflected in the final draft Strategy, pending the last round of comments.

**Ot7. Local Prevention and Security Boards scaled up in 10 selected districts/ provinces**

**Ot7-Ii.** Local Prevention and Security Boards are operational in 10 selected districts/provinces.

**Baseline:** 9 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards (Y2017)

**Target:** 19 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards (Y2021)

**The FEC finds that the COIII has achieved planned targets: Local Prevention and Security Boards have been scaled in 10 selected provinces, reaching a total of 19 LPSBs in Turkey.**

The COIII followed well-planned process, that started with preparation of the guideline for the establishment of Local Prevention and Security Boards<sup>116</sup>. This document defined LPSBs' vision to enable local safety by promoting all inclusion irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, economic or another status. It further highlighted the need to ensure that women and all vulnerable groups participate in local security decision-making processes and contribute to the transparency and accountability of internal security forces. Therefore, the LPSBs served as a local platform based on good governance principles and promoted inclusion and civic engagement to protect fundamental rights, prevent local crime and disorder and significantly reduce all forms of violence and related losses<sup>117</sup>. The Strategy Paper, Roadmaps for the Functioning of LPSBs, focused on preventing various crimes like domestic violence, responding to the challenges faced by specific vulnerable groups like children, women, people with disabilities and contributing to the awareness-raising among society.

The LPSB members stated that the meetings served to discuss local security problems in their district, freely discussing local security problems with the District Governor and the police. Also, all of the participants mentioned that LPSBs did security analysis, prepared action plans, and took steps to resolve local security issues and protect vulnerable people. Regarding LPSB members, respondents deemed that LPSBs included all critical public and CSOs/ other stakeholders<sup>118</sup>. The participants stated that the LPSBs have been highly positive. One of the main effects has been the relation between citizens and police authorities and partnership among the LPSBs members<sup>119</sup>.

recommendations provided inputs for strengthening the parliamentary inquiry mechanism by establishing an effective system of ISFs' oversight with independent (oversight) bodies, strengthening the budgetary scrutiny and improving the GNAT website and digital tools Policy Recommendations for Improvement of Parliamentary Oversight in Turkey, September 2020, Prepared by: Fahri Bakırcı and Özge Genç <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B14-Policy-Recommendations-for-improvement-of-parliamentary-oversight-in-Turkey.pdf>

<sup>115</sup>

<sup>116</sup> Strategy Paper for the Establishment of 10 New Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSBs), Prepared by Dr. Sevcin Kılıç AKINCI Key Expert on Local Governance Structures, June 2020, Available at: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/C13-Strategy-Paper-v5.pdf>

<sup>117</sup> Analyse the Functioning of Local Prevention and Security Boards in Pilot Districts/Provinces Prepared by Dr. Sevcin Kılıç AKINCI Key Expert on Local Governance Structures, October 2019, Available at: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/C11-Analysis-Report-for-Functioning-of-LPSBs-in-Pilots-Districts.pdf>

<sup>118</sup> KII notes, national partners

<sup>119</sup> KII notes and Focus Groups notes

<p>The LPSBs ensured women's fair and effective participation and equal opportunities in local security planning and implementation for greater local safety, supporting SDG 5.2 and SDG 11.7<sup>120</sup>. In addition, the efforts to involve women CSOs in the LPSBs contributed to women's representation in policy and decision-making processes, promoting and ensuring women's empowerment.</p>	
<p><b>Ot8. Delivered training programs for 500 professionals of Mol and ISFs on civilian/ democratic oversight of ISFs and citizen-focused security services</b></p>	<p><b>Ot8-I1.</b> Delivery of trainings on civilian and democratic oversight to 500 people  <i>Baseline:</i> 250 people trained (Y2017)  <i>Target:</i> 500 people trained (Y2021)</p>
<p>The Project prepared and delivered trainings for professionals of Mol and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of ISFs and human-focused security services on crime prevention incorporating the perspective of civilian/democratic oversight to Governorates and District Governorates. It was planned that 200 Governorates and 300 District Governorates attend the training program, and the COIII reached nearly 500 participants. The two-day training programs have been organized in the selected pilot districts/provinces determined during the Inception Phase (the FEC finds that five out of planned six two-day training programs have been delivered)) all delivered with additional two trainings to reach the target beneficiary number. The programs have been in form of training-of-trainers and based on the modules that COIII developed<sup>121</sup>.</p>	
<p><b>Ot9. Awareness of the public, civil society and local media enhanced as regards the human-centred security concept in the districts/provinces where Local Prevention and Security Boards established</b></p>	<p><b>Ot9-I1.</b> Number of civil society organizations and local media representatives, and public at large reached out through national opinion poll and awareness raising campaigns  <i>Baseline:</i> Results of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction and confidence in ISFs reached out 7500 respondents (during Phase II) (Y2014)  <i>Target:</i> 9,000 respondents of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction and 1,000 civil society and local media representative attended awareness raising campaigns (Y2021)</p>
<p>The COIII has achieved the target under this output. The survey for 9,000 respondents of the national opinion poll on crime victimization and citizen satisfaction has been completed in December 2020 and reports are completed in April 2021.</p> <p>Also, the Project has been successful in delivering awareness raising workshops for CSOs and media representatives; according to the reports from these events, the Project is progressing towards the targeted number of civil society and local media representative to benefit from awareness raising campaigns. Until November 2021, eight major events have been organized reaching around 500 participants.</p>	

<sup>120</sup> Target 1.2: To reach a fair representation of women, ensure that on average 30 % of LPSB members are women in the short term which will be aimed to be on average 40 % in the medium term, and 50 % in the long-term.

<sup>121</sup> Seven modules available at: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/en/project-outputs/>; example Module 1: <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Module-1-Introduction-to-Civilian-and-Democratic-Oversight.pdf>

- **COIII has well-established communication platform, that contributed to delivery of results, further strengthening of civilian oversight**

The FEC finds that the partners recognized that COIII had established itself as a brand<sup>122</sup>, achieving acclaim and visibility in supporting civilian oversight and transparency and accountability in the security governance in Turkey. Especially important has been the Project's engagement of CSOs and preparation of the LPSB guides that enabled and mobilized citizens to understand and participate in these processes.

The COIII's team has prepared a sound communication approach and included directions for its promotional and communication materials elaborated and used during the Project and activities regarding meetings, round table discussions, cooperation with representatives of the CSOs and authorities, collaboration with media, participation in events. The Project's communication efforts included a formal language to address and communicate the results to the different audiences. Its critical aspect has been bottom-up participation across the various population groups, allowing building bridges and working on greater civilian oversight of IPF, and transparency and accountability in the security sector.

**Effe 2. Overall, the Project has made contribution to national development priorities, also contributing to long-term institutional development of partners' organizations**

The effects of the Project on broader development processes in the country, as much as its sustainability, can only be assessed after certain period upon its completion. However, it is increasingly conventional in the final evaluations to anticipate or forecast these effects and also sustainability. Therefore, the FEC followed this approach assessing (possible) effects on broader development processes in Turkey, while also assessing sustainability of these achievements.

The final evaluation followed general practice to validate this broader contribution looking at the expected outputs and outcomes, and assuming possibility of the Project to contribute to its impact objective. Thus, this analysis has been focused on policy and institutional levels.

- **Effects at the policy level**

The COIII has addressed the need to facilitate the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system and increase government accountability (to the citizens) by setting the basis for sectoral policies and institutional mechanisms.

The FEC used the policy cycle model as an analytical tool to assess and justify the links between the results of the Project and its objective at the policy level.<sup>123</sup>

**1) Policy decisions (problem identification and agenda setting) and policy development**

The COIII provided materials for definition of issues and agenda setting as closely allied elements of Policy decision<sup>124</sup>. Thus, the FEC finds that effects of the Project at this stage: by carrying out analysis and assessment, codifying its knowledge and experience, the Project was able to influence "problem definition and agenda setting" within policy cycle<sup>125</sup>.

Following the problem identification and agenda setting, the Project has been effective in proposing (what it considered) the appropriate responses to solve these problems in form of recommendations for policy development, as the next stage in the policy process. The FEC finds that COIII proposed policy solutions could be instrumental to improve security governance and enhance transparency and accountability of security forces.

---

<sup>122</sup> KII national partners

<sup>123</sup> Reference to Guy Peters "Policy Making Cycle- steps and approaches," from "Capacity for Policy- how can we do it better" (prepared by Tomislav Novovic, UNDP Serbia, 2010)

<sup>124</sup> Priority setting is almost inherently complex and involves making choices about what issues are important, and inescapable (while many others that have greater long-term significance may be very easy to ignore, or to define incorrectly). After the issues have been identified, the next step in setting of an agenda setting, to address the issues through the actions of the Government. The "framing" of issues involves defining particular problems, but in terms that can help to mobilize political support for its adoption. Ref to Guy Peters "Policy Making Cycle- steps and approaches,"

<sup>125</sup> Issue definition and agenda/ priority setting are inherently complex and involve making choices about what issues are most pertinent and time sensitive. After identifying priority issues, government and other governance actors must set the agenda to address the issues. "Framing" priority issues involves defining a problem in terms that can mobilize political support to find a solution. More available at Jon Pierre, B. Guy Peters "Governance, Politics and the State," Macmillan, USA, 2016

The FEC finds various examples that the COIII produced inputs for policy development, identifying problems and setting the scene for decisions. The COIII prepared a legal gap and compliance analysis of democratic and civilian oversight of ISFs<sup>126</sup> between Turkey and selected EU member-states. This analysis provided the basis for policy decisions: it revealed that Turkey made progress in the MoI oversight of ISFs and gendarmerie. However, the report emphasized that the country needs to consider the concept of democratic and civilian oversight comprehensively (not limiting it to its internal dimension). This systematic assessment of the legal gaps proposed amending critical laws. This included laws that regulate judicial oversight<sup>127</sup> and ISFs' actions concerning citizens' basic rights, such as regulation on use of personal data, and freedom of expression / peaceful gathering and judicial oversight. In addition, the document revealed the need for the Parliament to increase the role of the standing committees of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey<sup>128</sup>. Finally, the analysis suggested revising the regulation and transparency of the use of force in two aspects: use of stops and use of weapons. In addition, the Project provided direct inputs to the national policy preparation through its support to the draft law establishing the National Crime Prevention Office<sup>129</sup>. Practically, the COIII technical assistance analysed the equivalent legislation in EU countries, looking at the organisation of crime prevention at the national and sub-national levels (councils, funding, etc.).

Another example could be that the Project carried out the review of EU best practices and prepared a gap analysis on the current performance evaluation system in Turkey with the reference to two dimensions of police performance: "civilian oversight of internal security forces" and "citizen focus". The analysis revealed issues and provided recommendations to allow police systems for citizens' inputs in their performance management and evaluation mechanisms<sup>130</sup>.

Similarly, the Project provided policy recommendations to address the issues related to oversight of the ISF and enhance the potential of the new role of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT)<sup>131</sup>. These policy inputs considered the relations between the Parliament and executives, Presidency and Government. It also proposed improvements regarding the Rules of Procedure (RP) to strengthen the GNAT's organizational, technical, research and expertise capacity, including its committees. In addition, this policy document included recommendations for improving parliamentary inquiry mechanism and establishing an effective system of ISFs' oversight together with independent oversight bodies<sup>132</sup>.

The Project provided a brief reflection on the capacities of stakeholders, showing that participating representatives of IPF or Gendarmerie and Coast Guard and GNAP, have considerably different levels of skills and knowledge.<sup>133</sup> Similarly, members of the LPSBs have been representing different institutions- CSOs, media, local authorities and service providers; the broad basis of participants inherent to various understanding of the LPSB principal role and functioning. These findings indicated the need to prioritize systematic follow-up and continued capacity development. While COIII offered and tested some tools to address these differences and establish required capacities, the stakeholders expressed the need for continued support<sup>134</sup>.

---

<sup>126</sup> The analysis focused on ten dimensions, Fundamental rights protection (constitution, principles), Data protection authority; Parliament oversight; Judiciary oversight; Internal oversight by MoI; Transparency of MoI and ISFs; External Oversight Mechanism on ISFs; Handling of citizens' complaints against ISFs; Citizen orientation and Local accountability of ISFs; Civil Society Orientation of ISFs. Furthermore, each dimension is constituted of subdimensions. More details available at <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A13-Legal-Gap-Compliance-Analysis-Report-on-Democratic-and-Civilian-Oversight-of-ISFs-between-Turkey-and-selected-EU-member-states.pdf>

<sup>127</sup> For example, the administrative power of the prosecutor for oversight of agents, and the penal responsibility of ISFs before a judge, lifting some of the limitations to his current investigation powers

<sup>128</sup> Currently, the standing committees of the GNAT cannot be engaged in matters other than those assigned to them, and cannot compel ministers to attend sessions.

<sup>129</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/A-3-4-Comparative-Compliance-Analysis-compliance-analysis-with-EU-and-international-standards-and-best-practices.pdf>

<sup>130</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/A24-GAP-Analysis-Report.pdf>

<sup>131</sup> These changes have occurred after the Constitutional changes in 2017

<sup>132</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B14-Policy-Recommendations-for-improvement-of-parliamentary-oversight-in-Turkey.pdf>

<sup>133</sup> The interviews with different KIIs additionally confirmed some differences among the partners' institutions regarding their capacities for civilian oversight.

<sup>134</sup> KII with the national stakeholders

The COIII also raised to the policy agenda the need to further strengthen and institutionalize participation of citizens<sup>135</sup>. However, some of identified challenges, especially limited understanding and knowledge on civilian oversight and good security governance remained, and especially systematic and sustainable mechanism to request for accountability from authorities<sup>136</sup>. The limited capacities of authorities to engage with non-government actors and effectively carry out oversight is further affecting this situation<sup>137</sup>.

## **II) Policy drafting, including policy Instruments and Implementation mechanisms:**

COIII has designed tools and instruments that, according to the stakeholders, resulted in new policies, and facilitated policy implementation. Strategies prepared under the project included, the Five years organisational Strategy, Strategy for effective and full functioning of Parliamentary oversight and Strategy on crime prevention and civilian oversight of the security sector, serving as the basis for sustainability considerations. The COIII efforts to develop these three strategic documents included close and repeated exchanges with many participants, different departments of the MoI (legal, strategy, human resources, and budget), and various departments of the Police, Gendarmerie, the Coast Guard<sup>138</sup>. This process entailed intensive communication and interactions with representatives from the highest political and administrative levels. In addition, the FEC finds that the COIII technical support to MoI during policy preparation has been genuinely consultative. For example, the Project provided minutes from face-to-face meetings for consultation purposes and reports from workshops for discussing, elaborating, and amending proposals<sup>139</sup>.

- The Project drafted the Five-years organisational Strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey. The draft Strategy included short-, medium- and long-term actions/ measures for the Ministry of Interior and other relevant stakeholders. This document serves as a roadmap for the Turkish authorities to improve civilian and democratic oversight over internal security forces, define local and national levels priorities, and provide a platform for media and civil society engagement.
- The Project assisted in drafting of the Strategy for Parliamentary oversight, based on the assessment of the existing parliamentary oversight in Turkey<sup>140</sup> and policy recommendations for improvements.<sup>141</sup> The Strategy, through enhanced Parliamentary oversight of security forces, would provide checks and balances that prevent "human rights abuses, hold those guilty of abuses accountable, make recommendations to prevent recurrence and ensure that institutions within security governance operate efficiently and effectively while respecting the rule of law<sup>142</sup>". Formal adoption of this Strategy is planned for the last month of the Project's implementation, after the last round of consultations with the GNAT and the partners.
- The COIII assisted in preparing the draft Strategy on crime prevention through a nationally driven and participatory process. Namely, in coordination with the DSIO DC, the Project planned and organized workshops with the main stakeholders and collected different views and comments. As a result, the Project and DSIO DC are working on the final draft Strategy on crime prevention; the presentation of the final version is planned for December 2021. Another aspect of the COIII policy support could be preparing the Roadmap for Establishing the National Crime Prevention Office. The Project has presented draft legislation to the Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection of the MoI. The DSIO DC reviewed draft legislation and implemented steps for policy adoption through the Strategy Development Department and the General Directorate of Legal Services of the Ministry of Interior. The General Directorate of Personnel of the Ministry of Interior initiated the process in liaison with the Ministry of Treasury and Finance for staff positions of the new branch/branches. Upon completing

---

<sup>135</sup> KII notes

<sup>136</sup> KII notes

<sup>137</sup> The baseline surveys that the COIII prepared.

<sup>138</sup> COIII Annual Report for 2019 and 2020. Also, different reports produced during 2021.

<sup>139</sup> COIII meeting minutes and workshop reports that have been available to the FEC.

<sup>140</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B14-Assessment-of-the-Existing-Parliamentary-Oversight-in-Turkey.pdf>

<sup>141</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B14-Policy-Recommendations-for-improvement-of-parliamentary-oversight-in-Turkey.pdf>

<sup>142</sup> M. Bastick (2014) Integrating a Gender Perspective into Oversight of the Security Sector by Ombuds Institutions & National Human Rights Institutions, Geneva: DCAF, OSCE/ODIHR, OSCE



consultations with other ministries, the Ministry of Interior should submit the final draft to the Presidency to initiate the process for amendment (as an addition) into the Presidential Decree.

In addition to these policies and laws, the FEC finds that the Project has been effective in delivering various policy tools and instruments. For example, implementation of the performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators to ensure consistency during the evaluation of internal security forces as a framework for self, peer, or external assessment of a performance against the specific performance indicators, based on international standards and other established international good practices for civilian oversight of security forces. The Project provided tools to facilitate establishment of Local Prevention and Security Boards. The focus has been to ensure proper and timely establishment of LPSBs, mitigating possible risks (based on experience) and considering sustainability of LPSBs in the medium and long term. The CO III strategy paper on LPSBs established the fundamentals for the roadmaps for the functioning (accountability and workflow) and short, medium and long-term targets/activities of the LPSBs.

The Project has prepared LPSB guides to planning processes, a tool that removes barriers to CSOs and citizens to engage in the security strategies' preparation and oversight of security forces. These guides provided maps of security priorities and simplified information on actions, serving as the link between the national exercise of security and crime prevention with activities and planning processes at sub-national levels (with involvement of non-government actors).

The project has provided inputs and capacity support for the partners to mainstream gender in their COIII work. For example, the Project has already initiated a capacity strengthening component for its stakeholders/ beneficiaries to mainstream gender in their security and crime prevention work. This gender equality approach has been mainstreamed in training programs for ISF and gendarmerie on citizens focused security services.<sup>143</sup> The topics included presentation of the essential gender mainstreaming and gender equality concepts (including international norms and standards and national legal framework) and equality-based security services<sup>144</sup>. The members of the LPSBs benefited from gender-sensitive capacity development support, that also addressed the need to ensure participation of women in oversight bodies to increase public confidence and responsiveness of oversight to the concerns of all citizens. The COIII provided capacity development support to the LPSBs to prepare gender sensitive action plans presenting how these plans and security policies will specifically affect men and women in the respective provinces<sup>145</sup>.

**Eff3. COIII has influenced the overall administrative culture among the partner institutions through the application of tools and methods to enhance knowledge of civilian oversight and apply practices for good security governance.**

At the institutional level, the FEC analysed the Project's effects on the partners and beneficiaries' performance.

- **The Mol, the DSIODC and other departments** recognized assistance from the COIII project to identify priorities and prepare strategic and policy documents relevant for establishing civil oversight over the ISF forces, recognizing this support in the context of their organizational development.<sup>146</sup> Namely, technical and professional capacities of Mol/ DSIODC are improving, through enhanced capabilities to identify weak areas (for example, through Legal GAP/Compliance analysis, training needs assessment), and implement standards aligned with good international practices. Some examples that have been highlighted included comparative reviews and good practices on civilian oversight from EU member states, or overview of approaches for police systems to allow for citizens' inputs in their performance management and evaluation systems. Also, the COIII enabled to compare the provisions from the draft law establishing the National Crime Prevention Office) with EU standard and good practice.

The Mol benefited from enhanced policy making capacities support- especially critical being the National Strategy for Crime Prevention, or the Five-year organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey. The key informants representing Mol<sup>147</sup> stated that these improvements will be inevitably

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibidem, COIII Annual Report 2019-2020.

<sup>144</sup> COIII Reports from capacity development events

<sup>145</sup> KII notes and LPSB materials

<sup>146</sup> KII national partners

<sup>147</sup> KII national partners



linked with the quality the civilian oversight system that is to be further advance (through the adoption of legal and policy frameworks and ensured financial support).

The Project has been active in advising and advocating for transparency and accountability at different levels. The active role of COIII staff in implementing activities and building partnerships generated additional readiness and willingness among participating institutions to grasp principles of transparency and accountability.

- The COIII Project had an **institutional effect on empowered GNAT**. The FEC finds that the UNDP supported the Turkish Parliament, through the COIII support introduced and tested features on more active involvement in oversight of police forces, holding accountable law enforcement agencies and executives. The FEC expects that the GNAT will be more engaged in these oversight processes, preparing concrete inputs for more effective security governance. The communication established between GNAT, MOI and ISF and CSOs could be additional additionally contribute to transparency and accountability in the governance systems in Turkey.
- The CSO's representatives participating in LPBS stated they have increased actual understanding and enhanced competencies for participative policy making related to broad areas of security governance. This COIII's impact on CSOs is especially significant considering their limited experience in security oversight but also considering complexity and sensitivity of the topics<sup>148</sup>. Another dimension of effects at this level is through exchange of experience and direct interaction among the professionals from different CSOs participating in LPSBs and within the country, creating informal but functional networks for exchange of knowledge and experience related to CSO participation in the civilian oversight and security governance.

Delivery of training programs addressed knowledge gaps and enhanced capacities and skills among the members of the LPSBs. In addition, the trainings favoured horizontal knowledge sharing amongst the representatives from different organizations, helping these organizations to connect and unify their understanding of civilian oversight processes in different spheres.

The involvement of the leading local institutions relevant to security governance and crime prevention is another aspect of the Project's inter-institutional impact.

Similarly, COIII has helped MoI, the DSIO DC to maintain communication with other stakeholders, including LPSBs and with the parliament's representatives that participated in different events. During COIII events, the MOI/ DSIO DC participated as guest speakers or participants, establishing communication channels and peer-to-peer interactions.<sup>149</sup> According to the partners, this channel of communication has enabled to resolve some of the recommendations and issues under the LPSB's mandate.<sup>150</sup>

The FEC overall score on the Effectiveness criterion (including policy and institutional effects):  
**SATISFACTORY**

## 6.6 Sustainability

The COIII has been contributing to sector policies and enhancing capacities of partners and beneficiaries involved in the civilian oversight of internal security forces.

**Susi:** COIII has consistently responded to capacity development needs of participating institutions and is steadily strengthening capacity for civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices. Future progress and its sustainability, however, rests on the adoption of the legal framework to institutionalize civilian oversight structures at the national and local levels, and continued commitment of the authorities to continue with reforms in this sector.

The analysis of the COIII results would require reference to the previous CO phases. Namely, the EU support for improving civilian oversight policies and practices in Turkey started more than ten years ago through three similarly structured but essentially distinct phases.

---

<sup>148</sup> For example, scrutiny and citizens participation, communication with authorities

<sup>149</sup> KII national partners (including CSOs)

<sup>150</sup> KII national partners

The solid momentum for the EU accession process and renewal of work on democratic institutions characterized the first Project phase (2007-2010). The issue from this period has been the sensitivity of the subject and rather limited knowledge and awareness of democratic and civilian oversight (over the ISF). The efforts to bring the MoI and Parliament oversight pillars under the same initiative contributed to its complexity. In this period, the military's role in politics was decisive, creating challenges for civil-military relations. This phase adopted an introductory approach and focused on primarily awareness-raising events, as the concepts were discovered, dissected and discussed. The study visits mainly were oriented towards countries with a gendarmerie. The Project also analysed a possibility to integrate all ISFs chiefs into one academy, exploring local platforms for consulting citizens: the concept of Local Boards was tested and revised to be aligned with Turkish administrative culture, with genuine civil society participation, lawyers' association, locally elected leaders. The idea of having an opinion poll where citizens could evaluate the Project was found too ambitious. After two years, the familiarization with civilian oversight was increased at the central level and by prominent governors of the country.

The following, second Project phase (2012-2014) remained along with the same priorities but with a more ambitious plan. The legal review was more systematic, based on studies of international practices, and the Project prepared a proposal for unified legislation for all ISFs. However, the gendarmerie was not fully prepared to be integrated into MoI, but there had been a lengthy and detailed discussion about the unification of rules. The Project efforts resulted in an increased number of Local Boards, benefiting from a solid support. With the leadership of kaymakams (district governors), local cooperation and participation of CSOs grew.

In addition, the Project has been working on legal reform, ensuring full compatibility with Turkish legislation. A draft law was prepared in 2014 to enable the government to scale-up the pilot LPSBs in other districts / provinces and implement them at the national level with proper legal foundations. This document has been a key deliverable of the project and a breakthrough in the centralised public administration of Turkey. However, the MoI did not internally process these submitted laws. At the same time, with support from the COII, the MoI organized the first detailed opinion poll at the local and national level in Turkey and disseminated findings. In addition, a Law enforcement monitoring commission was established, which is not an independent mechanism, but at least an overarching mechanism of the MoI over the diversity of ISFs in Turkey. The Parliament benefited from this (second) phase of the Project; for example, training programs addressed the need for financial oversight of both major ISFs. Subsequently, following Project's recommendations, the Parliament created a committee dedicated to ISFs oversight.

**The FEC finds that both phases delivered important results for establishing civilian and democratic oversight in Turkey. However, these two phases remained essentially uncompleted, as the functional civilian oversight system has not been ensured. Also, the sustainability of Phase I and II results has been limited and fragile, ensured mainly at the level of individuals. Thus, the systemic and institutional changes have not been ensured.**

The Project's last phase generally preserved the same structure. Still, a five-year gap between this and the previous stage and changes in civil-military relations (the National Security Council- Milli Güvenlik Kurulu, MGK had been abolished, the gendarmerie had been placed fully under the MoI, and a united gendarmerie and coast guard academy had been established) additionally influenced and profiled the scope of the COIII initiative.

The UNDP recognized the demand to ensure sustainability of the COIII results, stating that plan for sustainability has been considered from the design stage<sup>151</sup>. Furthermore, the request for the second extension included demand to strengthen and establish “missing links to sustainability<sup>152</sup>”.

The senior decision-makers that participated in the Project Steering Committee have been well-informed and aware of activities and initiatives of UNDP, expressing positive opinion concerning sustainability of COIII achievements<sup>153</sup>, in the context of institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces. Specifically, they have stated that the positive experience and achieved results have ensured

---

<sup>151</sup> This has been a common opinion of the national partners and also the staff from UNDP

<sup>152</sup> ADDENDUM No: 2 June 21, 2021, Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces – Phase III Project IPA/2017/385-810

<sup>153</sup> Interviews with key informants from the participating countries. Also, meeting minutes from the Joint Programme Boards and National Coordination Bodies.

commitment of the MoI at the political and decision-making levels<sup>154</sup>. In this context, a positive factor has been a firm engagement of DSIODC leadership in Project activities and the overall process of strengthening civilian oversight. However, this primary beneficiary has been relatively new to the Project and recently introduced to the overall concept of civilian oversight. Thus, there are still limited capacities within this department and among public officials in general regarding the concept of civilian oversight and their roles within this mechanism. These limited understanding and capacities could affect use of the tools and knowledge that the COIIIU\ designed and tested.

The Project has assisted in developing a five-year civilian oversight organisational strategy that included actions and measures assigned to the Ministry of Interior and other relevant stakeholders. However, there is still a need to adopt the Strategy and use it as the road map for improving civilian and democratic oversight over ISF while ensuring broad consensus and participation of all stakeholders. Also, defining and implementing the MoI departments' functions for the effective implementation of this Strategy and achieving civilian oversight remains a challenge<sup>155</sup>. Furthermore, the FEC finds the need to ensure quality services to citizens through clearly defined roles and use of tools and knowledge (that Project tested).

The Project supported the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT) in redefining the oversight mechanisms specific for ISFs within the Presidential System of Government framework. During the project implementation, the Parliamentary commissions (primarily Parliamentary Commission on Internal Affairs and Parliamentary Human Rights Investigation Commission) have benefited from the Project as most suitable for the oversight purposes. Therefore, the Project prepared a strategy proposing amendments or actions to enable the GNAT to oversee the work of internal security forces more effectively. Namely, it included recommendations on organisational changes/ functioning that provide for dedicated professional oversight by the parliamentary commissions. However, the committees still need a plan of actions/ framework to work effectively and sustainably over time and implement oversight functions. In addition, the capacities for oversight among the elected GNAT members (including political parties) that are participating in mechanisms and structures related to the Parliament's oversight authority require further strengthening.

The LPSBs established during the previous phase have been affected by the political decisions and changes of district governors. Namely, LPSBs remained functional only where District Governors continued in the position. However, the appointment of new District Governors to pilot districts prevented the functioning of these local boards. This challenging situation has been further affected by the high staff turnover within public administration, especially after the coup d'état attempt in 2016, the war in Syria, and the migrants' crisis.

Still, the COIII restored and revived and established new, establishing and supporting a total of 19 LPSBs. According to the LPSBs members, there is a strong will to continue the consultations and workshops at the local level. These interviewed representatives expressed positive opinion about the cooperation methods and approaches used throughout the Project. The COIII played an important role in strengthening capacities of the LPSBs; this support included guidance to prepare local security and crime prevention plans. Despite efforts to facilitate implementation of these plans, the primary and secondary sources indicate various levels of engagement and activism across LPSBs<sup>156</sup>. The partners stated that "more has to be done to raise the awareness among the local authorities (District Governors, Deputy governors/Governors) and the citizens on the concept of citizen focused security and practices on civilian and democratic oversight of the ISF in Turkey"<sup>157</sup>. Moreover, the key informants stated that "more officials need to be trained, and the trainings need to be repeated every year"<sup>158</sup>.

Furthermore, in the absence of a legal framework to regulate the establishment and functioning of Local Boards, including predictable finances for their activities, the FEC finds that sustainability of these boards would be challenging to ensure (as already experienced). Positive input in this direction was the COIII efforts to prepare a new law for regulating both the local boards and the central office – the National Crime Prevention Office (NCPO) under the MoI aims to enhance national efforts for civilian/democratic oversight

---

<sup>154</sup> KII notes

<sup>155</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/B14-Assessment-of-the-Existing-Parliamentary-Oversight-in-Turkey.pdf>

<sup>156</sup> KII notes- Focus Grupus

<sup>157</sup> KII notes and Focus Groups notes

<sup>158</sup> KII notes

of internal security, mainly by coordinating the work of LPSBs at local level. By the establishment of a National Crime Prevention Office, the Ministry of Interior will promote the decentralized organization and effectiveness of the LPSBs and the provision of funds to District Boards for preventive actions selected by Governors.

**The MoI has implemented all mandatory and consultative steps; still, the formal approval and adoption of this law is still pending. Also, the challenge remains to ensure financial allocations and budgets for these structures at the national and local levels.**

COIII has provided capacity development assistance to stakeholders involved in the civilian oversight at different levels. Of the interviewed employees and stakeholders who participated in COIII's intervention, all stated they benefited from this assistance.<sup>159</sup>, recognizing that COIII has provided "timely, effective and highly demanded" technical assistance. The main contribution is strengthening the individual and institutional capacity of provincial administrators<sup>160</sup>. Due to the importance of the district governors in the context of civilian oversight, reviewing the training processes of the district governors, identifying the deficiencies and developing them is crucial. The district governors (DG) are responsible for the district's general administration, supervising and coordinating public services, especially education, health, and security. In the context of safety and security, they are heading law enforcement units in the district. At the same time, the DGs are responsible for establishing and developing relations with civil society, protecting human rights and removing obstacles to promote human rights and freedoms. Therefore, they have focused on law enforcement more than their other duties in recent years<sup>161</sup>. For this reason, district governors have an important function in the context of civilian oversight.

The Project delivered training programs for professionals of MoI and ISFs on civilian and democratic oversight and citizen-focused security services. These training programs and materials as well as video recordings of the trainings will remain with the MoI for regular distribution and delivery, serving for continuation of initiated activities. The COIII supported capacities and results will likely remain available after completing the Project. However, despite these sustainability prospects, the partners recognized the need for additional support in core areas of their performance related to civilian oversight. There are prevailing challenges, such as dominance and influence of the executive branch over the work of GNAT for example, or slow implementation of findings and recommendations, political influence, among others. These and other factors affect law enforcement institutions from promoting and ensuring credible, professional structures that follow the principles of participatory security governance, transparency and accountability, which may present possible implications for sustainability.

The Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy<sup>162</sup> benefited from the COIII support, providing inputs for improving Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (GCCA) in line with the civilian oversight principles<sup>163</sup>. Sustainability of these results has been ensured as the GCCA will continue delivering these programs.

**Sus2. COIII's demand-driven approach and strong stakeholders' participation, especially after the changes of the main beneficiary, has additionally contributed to strong sense of ownership of the COIII results.**<sup>164</sup>

National partners have been involved in conceptualizing and implementing activities under COIII: its support has been based on needs of the partners (e.g., through assessments and identification of needs)<sup>165</sup>. The COIII has employed a consultative and inclusive work planning, contributing to an increased sense of ownership. This is especially evident since the decision to change the main beneficiary to the DSIODC, recording notable

---

<sup>159</sup> According to the key informants' interviews, all of the participants stated they benefited from the capacity development support from COIII

<sup>160</sup> <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/D31-Review-Report.pdf> and also <http://sivilgozetim.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Module-1-Introduction-to-Civilian-and-Democratic-Oversight.pdf> (from Module 1 to Module 7)

<sup>161</sup> Structure of the Ministry of Interior and Civil Administration Workshop Report, 2019

<sup>162</sup> <http://en.jsga.edu.tr/>

<sup>163</sup> All participants in interviews have been positive about the training and capacity development support they have received from the COIII project.

<sup>164</sup> Notes from KII and the results presented under the previous part of this report.

<sup>165</sup> Experience with self-assessment of parliaments and linking this support to broader assistance that UNDP provide to parliaments

progress. Similarly, the COIII followed a participative partnership-building approach throughout the implementation of activities; particularly important have been LPSBs. National partners have been involved in the activities, either as participants, implementers or members of different forums, to create awareness of the achievements and results in their respective areas of work.

Strong and effective partnerships and UNDP collaborative advantages, paved the way for implementation of the Project; the stakeholders from the partners' organizations recognized "comparative advantages"<sup>166</sup> of UNDP as the implementing partner (of the Project), also stating that UNDP remains "an important, credible and widely accepted partner in achieving development priorities for the establishment of transparent and accountable governance in Turkey"<sup>167</sup>. The long-lasting presence, technical capacities and profound understanding of the organization-specific constraints and development needs, and also its proven independency and impartiality<sup>168</sup> have been the backbone of UNDP's comparative advantage. For example, UNDP through the large-scale support to local governments reform (and broader governance area), demonstrated strong abilities to support the establishment of citizen-oriented and quality local services, confirming its reliability and commitment<sup>169</sup>. Also, the partners recognized the added value of the Project through its efforts to ensure compliance with international norms and standards concerning the civilian oversight and democratic participation.<sup>170</sup>

The genuinely nationally driven approach has been emphasized<sup>171</sup> through partners' involvement in articulating, planning and participating in the Project's activities. Capacity support available through the Project has been based on needs assessment and reform priorities<sup>172</sup>. This approach has generated fairly strong sense of ownership of processes and results achieved (with support from the Project)<sup>173</sup>.

The FEC overall score on the Sustainability effects: **MODERATELY LIKELY**

---

<sup>166</sup> KII notes

<sup>167</sup> KII notes

<sup>168</sup> KII notes national partners

<sup>169</sup> KII notes

<sup>170</sup> KII notes and other project documentation

<sup>171</sup> KII notes 02 and the results presented under the previous part of this report

<sup>172</sup> Ref to the Relevance part of this report.

<sup>173</sup> KII notes with the representatives of the national partners. During the field phase, the stakeholders from the SAI and CHU commented on the draft project final report, clearly stating that the results of the Project have been achieved through strong and effective partnership, highlighting that the final report need to reflect it even more thoroughly.

## 7 Conclusions and lessons learned

### 7.1 Conclusions

#### RELEVANCE

##### **Conclusion 1. COIII remains relevant for Turkey**

The COIII aligned its intervention with national priorities for establishing civilian oversight over ISF, and transparent and accountable security governance, also contributing to the EU accession process.

COIII's intervention logic has been well-established, based on a sound problem analysis; thus, COIII has accurately identified components and clearly established areas of intervention. The COIII's scope and priorities remained relevant throughout the implementation: responsiveness of the Project (and UNDP) to the changing environment in the country and the capacities of participating institutions have additionally ensured high degree of the COIII relevance.

There is a need to continue support to civilian oversight of ISF, including further strengthening of institutional mechanisms, reinforcement of institutional coordination and cooperation and improvements of policy and legal framework.

#### LEAVING NO-ONE BEHIND

##### **Conclusion 2. The "leaving no-one behind" principle has been considered and followed during the COIII design and implementation.**

In this context, especially effective have been the COIII results at the local level, achieved through the LPSBs' activities: participatory approach enabled considering various perspectives in identifying priorities, also ensuring that the needs of vulnerable groups have been analysed and addressed through the LPSB Action Plans. Also, the COIII capacity development activities, for the ISF members and LPSBs members, have included the notion that needs of different vulnerable groups are inevitably linked to security governance (e.g., through a more focused and competent gender-sensitive approach in work of the ISF; or recognizing the issue of domestic violence as a security threat in the LPSB plans and considering support mechanisms)

These positive practices and efforts to ensure security and create favourable development context for marginalized groups to participate and to articulate needs, thus address root causes of marginalization and vulnerability, remains high priority.

#### GENDER MAINSTREAMING

##### **Conclusion 3: Greater gender equality in the country is one of the main preconditions for the transparency and accountability, and broader, the achievement of good governance. The COIII played an important role in confirming the relevance of citizens participation in security governance for gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment and working to ensure women's needs and specific context are reflected in prepared security plans.**

The FEC concludes that the support to citizen engagement in security and crime prevention (directly and through CSOs) contributed to gender mainstreaming in the citizen participation approach. The Project, through the LPSBs, was supporting female participation in policy and priority setting, advancing communication between citizens (including women and vulnerable groups) and decision-makers on security topics. The Project enabled members of the LPSBs to introduce and follow gender-related analysis, ensuring that security plans included gender-sensitive initiatives

#### EFFICIENCY

##### **Conclusion 4. Despite initial delays and challenges, the COIII team with new technical and operational leadership, contributed to the effective implementation and achievement of results.**

COIII has been a flexible and reliable partner, accountable for the achievements of results. However, the management challenges and internal dynamic within the team resulted in significant delays. Still, changes in the management team- highly competent Chief Technical Advisor and the Project manager together with other members of the team, succeeded in re-establishing implementation processes, bringing the Project to the full speed. These technical capacities, together with the strong partnership with the national

stakeholders, have been critical factors contributing to COIII's effectiveness and its flexible and responsive implementation (especially during the last years of the Project)

**Conclusion 5: The approved no-cost extensions were well-justified and approved, enabling COIII to deliver all planned activities and meet planned targets**

The COIII scope, involvement of various stakeholders (including ISF and gendarmerie), sensitivity of subjects and complexity of approaches required well-planned approach and enough time to ensure that processes are nationally driven and owned. The COIII requested two no-cost extensions that ensured enough time to complete the activities, within the approved budget and standard of quality. COIII also established an effective monitoring, evaluation and learning system, with a sound system for data-collection and analysis.

**Conclusion 6: National ownership and leadership is crucial to effectiveness and efficiency and precondition for sustainability of results**

The decision to replace the initial main beneficiary, the General Directorate of Provincial Administrations of the MoI with its Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection (DSIODC) has been highly positive in terms of effectiveness and efficiency and participating in all activities and decision. The DSIODC involvement contributed to greater commitment to the COIII objectives and more broadly, emphasized the importance of the overall civilian oversight concept.

The COIII steering structure provided strategic guidance and coordinated development interventions in the area of civilian oversight over the ISF and the overall security governance. This body has been an effective forum for greater involvement of high-level national partners to genuinely drive development efforts related to security governance and civilian oversight.

**EFFECTIVENESS**

**Conclusion 7. COIII has been effective in delivering results and meeting its targets, creating a solid basis to continue and expand activities in the area of civilian oversight and security governance. However, further progress is conditioned by the adoption and implementation of the legal system to institutionalize civilian oversight (at the national and sub-national levels) and ensure predictable financing.**

COIII has achieved concrete and visible results during this implementation period, strengthening institutional and individual capacities within participating institutions, providing inputs for legislative and institutional framework and improving parliamentary oversight capacities. Most notably, the results related to scaling up security governance structures at the sub-national level, through the LPSBs, and developing their abilities has been significant, contributing to institutionalization of citizens participation in civilian oversight and security governance. However, the EU progress report and key governance indicators for Turkey showed slow changes or decline in government accountability and rule of law, confirming the need to continue and expand support.

**Conclusion 8. Overall, the Project has contributed to national development priorities and the long-term institutional development of partners' organizations.**

The policy cycle model confirmed that positive results from COIII on bringing issues to the agenda, designing and testing policy tools while also preparing policies and laws to regulate this area further. However, the adoption of these documents will depend on the willingness and commitment of national institutions to implement them. COIII has influenced the overall administrative culture among the partner institutions by applying tools and methods to enhance knowledge of civilian oversight and apply practices for good security governance.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

**Conclusion 9. COIII has been effective in responding to national capacity development needs in areas of intervention.**

The sense of national ownership over the achievements under COIII is due to effective partnerships and the involvement of the new primary beneficiary- the Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection of the Ministry of Interior.

COIII has steadily and successfully developed the capacities of national partners to improve civilian oversight and security governance. Under all components, and especially under the Component III, Legislative and Institutional Framework, efforts were focused to improve, the training curriculum, strategies and the basic



legislative and regulatory framework governing the Police, Gendarmerie and Coast Guard commensurate to the civilian/democratic oversight and accountability principles. Its purpose is to aid technical and capacity development of both the new Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (institution that educates highly qualified Officers, NCOs and other personnel required by the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard organizations), and current middle and senior management, following EU and International standards and best practices. The GCGA had no obvious specific strategy and policy for its training system, but rather responded to expressed demands of its beneficiaries. However, with careful crafting, and a genuine buy in to the benefits of civilian oversight, the GCGA can lead the other Internal Security Forces and lay the foundations of Civilian Oversight understanding, and training that can be established in the future.

However, the sustainability of these achievements will depend largely on the decision of national authorities to adopt mandatory laws and improve legal and policy frameworks for civilian oversight. In addition to legislative changes, there is a need to ensure financial resources for national and local level oversight structures.

**Conclusion 10. Sustainability of the COIII results and the achievements concerning the overall civilian oversight and security governance in Turkey require additional attention and further efforts by the authorities in Turkey.**

The sustainability of COIII's achievements, however, require additional attention and further efforts. Several external factors may undermine the sustainability of COIII interventions. Some of these factors are the need for commitment of executive structures to implement reforms and continue with the implementation of measures for greater transparency and accountability of the ISF; unpredictable political developments, and the recent economic decline largely due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## **7.2 Lessons learned**

The FEC identified the following lessons learned:

- **Continued efforts and strong national commitment and ownership are crucial to ensuring progress in civilian oversight of ISF. However, gaps between different phases of the intervention caused that some important achievements from the previous phases have eroded and momentum to reforms in this sector weakened.**

The long-term UNDP support to national partners in Turkey in the area of civilian oversight over the ISF contributed to their capacity development to understand and engage in this process and participate actively in the improvement of security governance in the country.

However, long breaks between the end of the second and start of the third phase of support to civilian oversight twinned with substantive changes in the country's governance system (including turn over of competent employees and absence of the legal framework to institutionalize civilian oversight over the ISF) have affected achievements, causing loss of achievements from the Phase I and II. Despite the need to continue support to civilian oversight in the country, demonstrated genuine commitment of the key national institutions, including executive structures, is required. The adoption of the critical laws to regulate institutional arrangements for civilian oversight is prerequisite for next steps.

- **Involvement of civil society and citizens in the establishment of civilian oversight of ISF is highly important, serving also as an accountability mechanism.** The Project brought the civilian oversight of ISFs topic closer to the public, through the engagement of CSOs. The enhanced cooperation between the main governance partners, from civil society organizations, public institutions and the GNAT, has been the most critical factor in this regard. Also, strengthening capacities within CSOs to understand, propose and communicate best practices in civilian oversight of police at the local level proved to be an added value of the project.

The COIII scaled Local Prevention and Security Boards, providing opportunities to authorities, civil society in the region to build their capacities and generate actual outputs on civilian oversight. The Project has recognized very limited experience of CSOs in the districts of Turkey on civilian oversight and the sensitivity of the topic; thus, deciding on an accompanied capacity development support on general civilian oversight principles, and more specific on the LPSBs functions and the CSO's role in identifying local security priorities has been highly useful.

- **Ensuring institutional and systemic changes in the area of civilian oversight of ISF require sufficient time for beneficiary institutions to process and grasp those new practices.**

The initial delays have put the pressure on the new COIII team to focus on delivery of results within rather limited timeframe. The COIII managed to deliver all planned results; however, in some cases the priority to deliver has affected the processes required to grasp new practices.

- **The importance of the sound project monitoring system could not be overstated. This system should enable Project Team to follow implementation of activities and assess progress towards results.**

Equally important function of monitoring system should be to provide early indication on actual project management practice, serving as an early warning system (for UNDP) of management challenges. Practically, the operational/ management challenges that COIII experienced during first years of implementation could have been avoided with timely reaction of UNDP country office. The reaction of the UNDP office was delayed, but still changes in the project team have been critical to boost the delivery.

- **During COIII implementation, valuable knowledge products, different analytical reports, policy papers, training programs and educational materials, have been prepared. Some innovative models have been tested.** To avoid losing these generated (practical) knowledge products, there is a need to codify it in appropriate format, that would serve as critical inputs for similar activities in the targeted and other countries.
- **Open communication and partnerships are essential to establish trust and professional relationships between stakeholders and ensure effective oversight.** Communication between MoI, its departments, members of the GNAT, CSOs and other stakeholders is crucial to increase civilian oversight, while communication with CSOs has been instrumental in strengthening citizens views in this process. Successful communication and partnership building remain critical for meaningful involvement of all partners and progress in more transparency and accountability.
- **The flexibility and responsiveness have been underlying strengths of the COIII during the entire period of implementation, allowing to change some of the pre-established parameters.** The Project's responsiveness enabled timely and appropriate reaction to the partners' demands, being tools for ensuring progress under all components. At the same time, the Project Management remained focused on delivery of results, strongly involving partners in all decisions and activities. Working closely and collaboratively with counterparts is critical if ownership, and ultimately sustainability of change is to be achieved.

## 8 Recommendations

The analysis of primary and secondary data served to define findings (and also concerns and challenges during COIII implementation) serving for conclusions. Considering these inputs, recommendations have been defined, as a framework for further analysis and follow up actions.

The final evaluation consultant has formulated the following main recommendations in the case that legal and policy frameworks for civilian oversight over the ISF are adopted:

<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> (for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• Partners (MoI)</li> </ul> <p>EU Delegation</p>	<p><b>Without clear governmental commitment and the adoption of legal and policy documents, UNDP and EUD should not continue supporting civilian oversight over ISF in Turkey.</b></p> <p>The main prerequisite for continuation of the assistance to civilian oversight if the ISF is demonstrated commitment of the Turkey's authorities and adoption of the required legal and policy framework to regulate establishment, roles, responsibilities and relationships between institutions under the civilian oversight of the ISF at the national and sub-national levels.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> (for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• Partners (MoI)</li> </ul> <p>EU Delegation</p>	<p><b>Assist implementation of the legal and policy frameworks for civilian oversight of the ISF.</b></p> <p>The priority remains to support the MoI and its departments, the GNAT, and other national authorities to design a plan for implementation of legal and policy frameworks related to the civilian oversight, including clear milestones and targets.</p> <p>Moreover, the FEC recommends strengthening technical and operational capacities of the main institutions within the civilian oversight system (MoI, GNAT and sub-national authorities) to implement assigned functions. There is a need to balance between general and more needs-based training programs. Some of the general topics could be, for example, introduction to the (new) legal framework for civilian oversight; roles and responsibilities including institutional coordination and cooperation mechanisms; management of civilian oversight (steering mechanisms, monitoring, reporting), advantages of participation/ CSO engagement for civilian oversight; gender mainstreaming in civilian oversight. At the same time, more specialized training programs should address priorities based on the results of the training needs assessment and the assigned functions of the respective institutions</p> <p>Achieving measurable changes in the security governance systems, especially ensuring transparent and accountable ISF through stronger citizen oversight requires time and coordinated efforts of authorities, civil society and other national and international development partners. Therefore, the FEC recommends that UNDP, EU and participating countries consider long-term commitment (e.g., from five to seven years) for the new initiative.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3</b> (for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• Partners (MoI-NCPO)</li> <li>• EU Delegation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assist establishment and functioning of the National Crime Prevention Office</b></p> <p>The FEC recommends designing a comprehensive plan for establishing and strengthening core functions of the National Crime Prevention Office (upon adoption of the Presidential decree and amendments in 6 required laws). This assistance should include NCPO operational and management systems.</p> <p>There is a need to support NCPO to translate policies into an operational strategy that will associate external partners and guide the different bodies of the Ministry and especially the governorates and the law enforcement.</p> <p>The Project should support these strategic capacities, also looking and addressing more operational capacities to implement the concrete measures of the strategic action plans, to manage the budget, to ensure the</p>

	<p>communication, to train and educate and ultimately to assess and adjust the policy.</p> <p>In addition to institutional strengthening around core service lines as envisaged by the law, there is a need to strengthen its coordination capacities and establish a platform for cooperation with sub-national/ regional crime prevention boards throughout the country.</p> <p>However, the FEC is aware that the national policy will define the NCPO, set the rules of the game and identify the key players. For that reason, the build-up of the NCPO will be incremental with each step of its initial activities helping to shape its perimeter and its organization.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4</b> (for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• MoI/ LPSB</li> <li>• EU Delegation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Support establishment of new and strengthening of the existing LPSBs.</b></p> <p>The FEC recommends that COIII support establishing new and strengthening the existing LPSBs. For the existing LPSB, the priority should be to enhance strategic planning, priority setting and participatory decision-making capacities of the LPSB members in the specific security areas. These efforts should be supported by strengthening LPSB members' capabilities for gender-sensitive and pro-poor analysis.</p> <p>The FEC recommends improving LPSB management capacities for implementation of Action Plans, monitoring activities, and communicating results/ reporting on progress.</p> <p>For the newly established LPSBs, the FEC recommends using the methods and approaches that have been tested during the COIII and previous projects, from the screening and assessment, to tailor made support. The FEC recommends capacitating LPSB members to facilitate and accelerate civic engagement and ensure effective and efficient functioning for the development and implementation of the Local Security Action Plans. The support should aim to decrease the crime rate and violence through participation and ownership of local stakeholders, track trust to ISFs and satisfaction from internal security services at the local level.</p> <p>The Project should help LPSBs collaborate with different organizations for financial resources, training and know-how in line with their activities. Local Prevention and Security Boards need a budget and dedicated resources for effective crime prevention and sustainability. Therefore, the FEC recommends that LPSBs generate international, national or local funds for implementing action plans and build networks for training and benefiting from know-how for crime prevention activities.</p> <p>The FEC recommends developing LPSB capacities to raise awareness on civilian oversight of ISFs to oversee the partnership of ISFs and CSOs in the framework of LPSB. It is essential to do these activities constantly to get participants motivated and attract more public interest to the LPSBs.</p> <p>In addition to delivery of capacity development support, the Project should consider networking and exchange of knowledge and know-how among the experienced and newly established local boards. .</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• GNAT</li> <li>• EU Delegation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Continue supporting the Grand National Assembly of Turkey to grasp its functions related to civilian oversight.</b></p> <p>There is a great potential of the GNAT to carry out parliamentary oversight of the ISFs. In this regard, the FEC recommends amending or rewriting the Rules of Procedures to improve the organizational, technical, research and expert capacity of the GNAT.</p>

	<p>The FEC recommends strengthening parliamentary committees to have a legislative approach and ensure that all political parties actively participate in their work. Therefore, there is a need to improve GNAT's legislative drafting capacity and enhance the abilities of members of the committees to increase their participation in the legislative process by holding meetings among themselves and developing technical skills for drafting laws.</p> <p>Concerning the improvement of the GNAT's legislative performance, the RP can be amended to enable better organizational, research and expert capacities of the MPs and legislative experts in the Parliament. The RP should envisage the implementation of Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA), Better Regulation Techniques (BRT), Civic Participation or Participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and Establishment of Liaison Offices</p> <p>The FEC recommends improving the participatory capacity of the GNAT by enhancing its engagement with the CSOs. The FEC recommends exploring forms to establish a standardized participatory method for CSOs and other organized initiatives to participate in the legislative process. The participation of the CSOs is an indispensable element for the oversight of ISFs, including monitoring of activities and addressing security priorities.</p> <p>Also, the FEC recommends establishment of auxiliary structures (i.e. liaison offices) for the parliamentary relations with the officials, CSOs and outside experts.</p> <p>The Project should support a specific Parliament-ISFs Liaison Office related to the ISF oversight to build relations with the security-related public offices.</p> <p>The FEC recommends improving the Parliamentary Inquiry mechanism and the Inquiry Committees should be given compelling powers, such as sending subpoena and contempt powers, to enable witnesses to appear or submit documents needed to shed light on the subject of inquiry.</p> <p>The GNAT should work with stakeholders and independent oversight bodies to further strengthen an effective system of ISFs' oversight and strengthen interaction with the national human rights institutions (Human rights and equality institution of Turkey- TIHEK), independent oversight bodies (e.g., Ombudsman office, etc) and benefit from their expertise.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6:</b></p> <p><b>For:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• Partners (MOI, GNAT, LPSBs)</li> <li>• EU Delegation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prepare clear and practical capacity development programme for the main target groups (e.g., the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy and the ISF, district governors, civil society organizations and media)</b></p> <p>COIII should continue implementing its systemic approach to capacity development, following needs assessments of the main stakeholders and partners. At the current stage of development of civilian oversight over the ISF, it is important to consider and provide a longer-term and needs-based capacity development assistance.</p> <p>The FEC recommends continuing support to the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (GCCGA) to become a nationally and internationally recognized higher education institution that educates highly qualified Officers, NCOs and other personnel required by the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard organizations.</p> <p>The Project should support the GCCGA to lay the foundations of Civilian Oversight understanding and establish training programs for ISF. In this context, the Academy should continue training the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard on human rights issues and investigation techniques, the culture of service and prevention of crime, and further elaborate recommendations from the training needs assessment (carried out under the COIII)</p>

	<p>Concerning the needs of district governors, civilian oversight course based on applied techniques and a Management of Local Prevention and Security Boards course should be placed in the curriculum. Moreover, it is recommended to internalize concepts such as participation and partnership and present them to the district governors.</p> <p>The Project should consider the needs of the civil society and media and provide capacity development support to enable them to actively participate and follow up on civilian oversight.</p> <p>The evaluation team recommends that COIII design a comprehensive training evaluation approach based on the Kirkpatrick model, assessing four levels of learning: 1) participant satisfaction with the training; 2) immediate change in individual knowledge and skills; 3) change in individual performance back in the workplace; and 4) change in the overall performance of the institution.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 7:</b> (for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• Partners (MOI, LPSBs)</li> <li>• EU Delegation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Facilitate citizens participation in civilian oversight by enhancing the understanding, awareness and the need for their involvement in security governance</b></p> <p>The FEC recommends exploring opportunities to expand activities to enhance understanding of the civilian oversight, especially among citizens through public advocacy activities, public discussions and awareness events.</p> <p>The role of media and civil society organizations (Recommendation 6) in this process is highly important.</p> <p>The FEC recommends using social media for informing citizens on rights and processes for civilian oversight. Some of the new platforms such as Tik Tok, Instagram, twitter, twitch, etc could be adjusted to serve the purpose of informing and involving citizens, especially youth, in governance and local policy making activities</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 8:</b> (for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> </ul>	<p><b>Strike a balance between qualitative and quantitative indicators to enable adequate measuring of progress under components, also capturing COIII's and progress towards its planned results and broader reform agenda.<sup>174</sup></b></p> <p>The evaluation consultant recommends that COIII provide a well-balanced combination of qualitative and quantitative indicators to capture changes and results attributable to the Project, using national indicators and targets to the extent possible. The FEC also recommends including gender-sensitive indicators with a focus on "gender transformative results".</p>

<sup>174</sup> For example, indicators could not adequately measure COIII's performance in the areas such as development of capacities of the participating institutions or the effects on LDSBs decision and activities on vulnerable groups.

## 9 Annexes

### *Annex 1: List of people interviewed<sup>175</sup>*

#### **UNDP- COIII Project Team**

Ms. Seher Alacaci -Assistant Resident Representative of UNDP- [seher.alacaci@undp.org](mailto:seher.alacaci@undp.org)

Ms. Eltaf Ersay – Project Manager – [eltaf.ersay@undp.org](mailto:eltaf.ersay@undp.org)

Mr. Sebastian Roche- Chief Technical Advisor [roche.sebastian@gmail.com](mailto:roche.sebastian@gmail.com)

Serra Titiz- Key Expert 3 - [serratitiz@gmail.com](mailto:serratitiz@gmail.com)

Seda Helvacioğlu – Communications Expert- [sedahelvaci.communications@gmail.com](mailto:sedahelvaci.communications@gmail.com)

Sevcan Akinci – [sevcan.akinci@undp.org](mailto:sevcan.akinci@undp.org)

Ozge Genc [ozge.genc@par.com.tr](mailto:ozge.genc@par.com.tr)

#### **EU Delegation**

Ms. Maria Stogova, Programme Manager – [maria.stogova@eeas.europa.eu](mailto:maria.stogova@eeas.europa.eu)

#### **Mol DSIO DC**

Senior Expert, Department of Smuggling, Intelligence, Operations and Data Collection

#### **Grand National Assembly of Turkey**

Deputy Chair of GNAT Department of Laws and Decisions

Ministry of Foreign Affairs- Directorate of EU Affairs

Senior EU Affairs Expert- Fundamental Rights

Senior EU Affairs Expert

#### **Presidency of Strategy and Budget**

Senior Planning Expert

Senior Planning Expert

#### **Focus Group I**

Police Officer/Community Policing Department

Director Çorlu Social Service Center

President of Women Rights Association of Çorlu

Locak Media Representative

Çorlu Education Department

Namık Kemal University

#### **Focus Group II**

Akçaabat Education Director

Alanya Zabıta

İskenderun Bar Association

İskenderun Judicial Support Services

---

<sup>175</sup> The evaluator did not include the names of people interviewed (except for UNDP team and EU Delegation representative) deliberately; this is the practice deriving from the personal data protection and has been recommended in all recent evaluation practices.



**Focus Group III**

Sincan District Governor

Akçaabat District Governor

Sincan Deputy Mayor

**Focus Group IV**

Konak Mukhtar

Green Crescent

Beşiktaş City Council

Beşiktaş District Govership

Women's Rights Association

Bar Association Womens Rights

**Focus Group V**

Local Media Representative

Director of Sosyal Service Center

Buca Municipality Social Services

Buca Disabled Association

Buca District Governorship

Local Media Representative

**Focus Group VI**

Malatya

Hekimhan District Governor

İskenderun CSO

**Focus Group VII**

Şehitkamil District Governor

İskenderun Deputy Mayor

Alanya City Council

Alanya Social Services

## ***Annex 2: Interview Guides***

During the primary data collection phase, the Final Evaluation will use semi-structured interviews with the main questions provided in this interview guide; this will enable us to ask additional, more specific questions, in line with the Evaluation Matrix and the Terms of References.

The priority is given on-line interviews and the intention is to ensure a representative sample during the primary data collection phase. Also, other means such as on-line interviewing will also be considered.

## Interview guide- UNDP Project Team

### **RELEVANCE (INCLUDING COHERENCE, FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS)**

- Please describe your role and the circumstances under which you have engaged in the project design and/or implementation.
- Please describe the process of project design. What do you find very successful, and where were the challenging issues? How did the designing project team address these issues?
- What was the role of national partners during CO III design? Do you think that the lessons from COI and COII were adequately considered?

***Key Question 1: Has the CO III project aligned its intervention with the needs and priorities for achievement of fundamental rights and the establishment of the transparent and accountable governance in Turkey?***

- Is the COIII relevant to national priorities? Has it been aligned with the EU accession process and priorities? Please provide examples, if you agree
- Has the CO III responded to the needs of the participating institutions- Ministry of Interior, Internal Police Forces, Grand National Assembly of Turkey, CSOs- to ensure civilian oversight?
- If you have been involved in the CO III design, do you think that CO Phase I and Phase II lessons learned were considered during the current phase?
- Do you think that the CO III results and area of interventions have been clearly defined? Have any changes been made to the Project design during implementation? Please explain.
- How appropriate and realistic have been the CO III's outputs, outcomes, and established targets? How adequate have been the indicators to capture work of the CO III?
- Have you been using the existing indicators to monitor and measure progress under outcomes and outputs?
- Was there a need to revise and update the indicators (including their benchmarks- targets and baselines) to better reflect external developments and progress achieved?
- Do you think that the indicators and targets have been gender-sensitive sufficiently?
- Has the CO III been effective in strengthening the capacities for data collection and analysis at the level of participating institutions to ensure disaggregated data?

***Key Question 2: How integrated into the UNDP activities and broader governance reforms has the CO III project been during its implementation? (e.g., UNDP activities, national interventions and activities of other development partners)***

- Has the CO III created synergies/linkages with other projects and interventions in the country? Has the CO III Project complemented other UNDP interventions and initiatives of government and other development partners? Could you please provide examples.
- Was the Project flexible to the new circumstances imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic?

### **GENDER AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

***Key Question 3: Has the CO III project considered rights-based approach and gender equality, and followed the “no-one is left behind” principle during its design and implementation?***

- Did the Project have an explicit approach to gender-mainstreaming, SDGs and “leaving no-one behind”? How was the “rights-based approach and gender equality principles applied in the Project’s activities and work with beneficiaries?
- To what extent has the CO III Project been SDG-driven during formulation and implementation?

### **EFFICIENCY**

***Key question 4: Has the implementation of the CO III been efficient concerning adherence to the work plans (timely implementation), flexibility and responsiveness?***

- Has the CO III been implemented in line with work plans, using available resources (financial, human, technical)?
- Has the CO III established sound management practices? (How well did the Project collect and use data to monitor results? How effectively was updated data used to manage the Project? How well did the Project team communicate with partners, stakeholders and Project beneficiaries on its progress?)
- Are there any weaknesses in Project design, coordination, management, human resource skills, and resources?
- To what degree did the external developments influence the Project's efficiency?
- What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by UNDP?

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

***Key question 5: Has the CO III contributed to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document?***

- To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document?
- Has the CO III contributed to the improvement of the legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs)? Has the legal framework on the National Crime Prevention Office been prepared?
- Has the COIII supported preparation of the five-year organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey
- Has the CO III assisted with the MOI performance evaluation system?
- Have the Local Prevention and Security Boards been scaled up?
- How effective has the project been in addressing capacities of the professionals of MoI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight and citizen-focused security services?
- Has the CO III supported preparation of the Strategy for effective and full-functioning Parliamentary oversight of IFS?
- Do you think that the project contributed to greater awareness of the public, civil society and local media on the civilian and democratic oversight?
- Have there been factors that affected achievement of results?

***Key question 6 Has the CO III contributed to the broader development objectives of Turkey?***

- Has the CO III contributed to the advancement and the progress of EU Accession agenda and priorities of National Development Plan of Turkey?
- Has the project contributed to the United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

***Key Question 7: Has the CO III contributed to sustainable partnerships, policies and capacities of stakeholders for civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces?***

- Do you think if the national partners have undertaken the necessary steps to ensure the sustainability of the CO III results? Are there some risks that can affect sustainability of results?
- Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits?

## Interview guides- MOI/ IPF

### **RELEVANCE (INCLUDING COHERENCE, FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS)**

Please describe your role and the circumstances under which you have engaged in the project design and/or implementation.

- Have you been involved in the design of the COIII? Is the COIII been sufficiently aligned with the National Development Plan of Turkey? Is this initiative relevant for the country's EU Agenda?
- Has the CO III responded to the needs of the Ministry of Interior to advance civilian oversight?
- Has the CO III created synergies/linkages with other projects and interventions of the MOI? Could you please provide examples?
- Was the Project flexible and responsive to the need of the MoI especially by the new circumstances imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic?

### **GENDER AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

- Does the MoI consider gender equality in its work, especially in implementing civilian oversight priorities? How has the MoI considered needs of vulnerable groups? To what extent have the activities implemented under the CO III Project reflected needs of women and vulnerable groups?

### **EFFICIENCY**

- How satisfied have you been with cooperation with UNDP and COIII project? Have there been issues and delays in implementation of activities? What were the main challenges?
- How flexible has the UNDP CO III Project been and responsive to your requests?

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

**Key question 5: *Has the CO III contributed to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document?***

- Has the CO III contributed to the improvement of the legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs)? Has the legal framework on the National Crime Prevention Office been prepared?
- Has the COIII supported preparation of the five-year organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey
- Has the CO III assisted with the MOI performance evaluation system? What is your opinion about this system?
- Have the Local Prevention and Security Boards been operational and has the Project contributed to their developments? Please explain
- How effective has the project been in addressing capacities of the professionals of MoI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight and citizen-focused security services?
- Do you think that the project contributed to greater awareness of the public, civil society and local media on the civilian and democratic oversight?
- Have there been factors that affected achievement of results?

**Key question 6 *Has the CO III contributed to the broader development objectives of Turkey as in the National Development Plan of Turkey?***

- Has the CO III contributed to the advancement and the progress of EU Accession agenda and priorities of National Development Plan of Turkey?
- Has the project contributed to the United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

***Key Question 7: Has the CO III contributed to sustainable partnerships, policies and capacities of stakeholders for civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces?***

- Do you think if the MOI has undertaken the necessary steps to ensure the sustainability of the CO III results? Are there some risks that can affect sustainability of results?
- Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits?

## **Interview guides: Civil Society Organizations/ other partners**

### **RELEVANCE (INCLUDING COHERENCE, FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS)**

- Do you think that partnership with ISF contributed to greater civilian oversight? Has the cooperation with ISF contributed to crime prevention in your area?
- Could you kindly indicate
- Are there other partners that supported your organization? Have these activities been coordinated?
- Has the (UNDP) Project been flexible in work with your organization, adjusting to the new circumstances imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic?

### **EFFICIENCY**

- Has the CO III been implemented in line with the plans that you agreed? How was cooperation and communication with the COIII team?

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

- Do you think that the legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) has been improved? Has the legal framework on the National Crime Prevention Office been prepared?
- From your view, how effective have the Local Prevention and Security Boards been? Have they contributed to prevention of crimes in your area? Could you provide some examples.
- How would you assess your cooperation with the ISF? How could be improved
- What have been the main results of the Local Prevention and Security Boards? Have there been factors that affected achievement of results?
- Do you think that the project contributed to greater awareness of the public, civil society and local media on the civilian and democratic oversight?

### **SUSTAINABILITY**

- What is your opinion about the Local Prevention and Security Boards- do you think they would continue operating in the future? What else needs to be done to ensure its functioning?
- What are in your view priorities for the future?
- Are there some risks that can affect sustainability of results?



## Interview guides- international development partners

- Could you please introduce yourself, your organization and your role in this organization?
- Are you familiar with the CO III Project? If yes, how is your work related to the areas of intervention of this Project?
- Which specific governance reform priorities of the country and needs of people (especially vulnerable) your organization is addressing?
- Do you think that the CO III Project have been appropriately focused on the transparency and accountability in Turkey through the improvement of civilian oversight of the internal police forces?
- Have there been any external factors that affected or affecting oversight and accountability and progress in this area?
- From your perspective, what areas should be prioritized in the future in the area of good governance and civilian oversight?
- Was there an effective nation-driven mechanism for donor coordination in place? If not, what other mechanisms for donor coordination were in place?

## Focus Group Discussion - guide for partners/ beneficiaries

Thank you for taking participation in this FGD organized for the purpose of final evaluation of CO III project. You were selected as a beneficiary/ partner of the project and we would like to discuss with you several issues which will help us to understand the effects of the project and to recommend possible improvements for future similar actions.

Your participation is voluntary and confidential and nothing you say will be linked to your identity. Information will be used only for the purpose of the evaluation.

Please, could you briefly present yourself and indicate in which project activities you have participated.

- How much you are familiar with the overall CO III project?
- What is your opinion about the following topics: do you think this kind of projects/activities that contribute to civilian oversight of the police forces, and greater participation participated are needed in your country? Why? What are the main problems in the area of civilian oversight and broader governance sector that are addressed by this project?
- And for you personally, how much this project was useful? What have you achieved through participation in this project?
- What are your personal benefit from this project?
- Would you like to participate in the future in similar projects/activities? Why?
- What would you recommend in regard to civilian oversight of the police forces, what needs to be done and what can be done through similar projects?

### Annex 3: CO III Evaluation matrix

Relevant sub-question	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Data Sources and collection tools	Data analysis
Relevant evaluation criteria: <b>RELEVANCE</b>				
<b>Key Question 1: Has the CO III project aligned its intervention with the needs and priorities for the achievement of fundamental rights and transparent and accountable governance in Turkey?</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent was the design and strategy of the CO III (and its development intervention) relevant to Turkey's national priorities, primarily the National Development Plan of Turkey? Have there been clear linkage to CPD, UNDCS, EU norms established?</li> <li>- How much and in what ways did the project contribute to address the needs and problems identified in the design phase?</li> <li>- Has the project included soundly formulated intervention logic including indicators for measuring progress? Have any changes been made to the Project design during implementation?</li> <li>- To what extent CO Phase I and Phase II lessons learned were considered during the current phase and planned to reach certain results that weren't achieved in the previous phase?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III has been aligned and contributed to the implementation of the National Development Plan of Turkey 2014-2018 and 2019-2023, other relevant national strategic frameworks, UNDP CPD and EU norms</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III objectives are relevant to the needs of the partners and problems that beneficiaries have been facing</li> <li>▪ The degree of lasting relevance of the CO III (measured through the flexibility of the project and changes introduced during planning and implementation)</li> <li>▪ The extent of partners involvement in the design and implementation of the CO III</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the lessons from the CO Phase I and Phase II were considered and reflected in the CO III</li> </ul>	<p>Results of the analysis of the CO III Project in context of national development and EU accession priorities</p> <p>Evidences that CO III recognized and addressed the needs of beneficiaries and target groups</p> <p>Evidences that the CO III intervention logic remained relevant to national governance priorities within the context of its accession process</p> <p>Examples of the partners involvement in the design process and their opinions about their role in the design and implementation of the CO III</p> <p>Evidence (including examples and opinions) that the COIII considered and build on the lessons learned from the CO I and CI II</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Desk/literature review of relevant documents (including problem analysis conducted by the UNDP)</li> <li>2. Key informants' interviews (semi-structured interviews/ focus groups)</li> <li>3. Focus groups</li> </ol>	<p>Map a theory of change to identify the logic, problem analysis and assumptions behind the CO III</p> <p>Problem/risk analysis of underlying development challenges including national strategic and policy documents</p> <p>Analysis of Project indicators under the intervention logic</p> <p>Triangulate data collected from various sources and means (e.g., cross check interview data with desk review to validate or refute TOC).</p>
<b>Key Question 2: How integrated into the UNDP activities and broader reforms has the CO III project been during its implementation? (e.g., UNDP activities, national interventions and activities of other development partners)</b>				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent does the project create synergy/linkages with other projects and interventions in the country?</li> <li>- To what extent did the CO III Project complement the other UNDP interventions and initiatives of government and other development partners in the respective sector?</li> <li>- To what degree were the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with the activities of the national stakeholders?</li> <li>- Was the Project flexible to the new circumstances imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which CO III complemented other UNDP - interventions and initiatives of different development partners)</li> <li>▪ Evidences of synergies that the CO III established with other interventions related to governance, transparency and accountability</li> <li>▪ The degree to which the CO III aligned its design, implementation, monitoring and reporting with other Projects in this sector</li> <li>▪ The extent to flexibility of the CO III especially during the COVID-19 pandemic</li> </ul>	<p>Examples of synergies between the CO III and other development initiatives and examples of complementarities that the COIII established (activity level)</p> <p>Opinions of the development partners, UNDP projects and initiatives, other agencies about synergies and cooperation with CO III</p> <p>Evidence and examples that CO III adjusted its intervention and modified its approach during the COVID-19 pandemic</p> <p>Opinions of stakeholders and examples of responsiveness and flexibility of the CO III Project during implementation</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Desk/literature review of relevant documents (including third-party reports and national documents)</li> <li>2. Key informants' interviews (semi-structured interviews/ focus groups)</li> </ol>	<p>Analyse governance and public sector reform interventions of UNDP. Analysis of the reports and analysis of other development partners Agencies and other development partners and CO III reports and deliverables</p> <p>Interviews with the key informants</p> <p>Results of implemented researches and surveys</p> <p>Triangulate data collected from various sources and means (e.g., primary and secondary data sources).</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Relevant evaluation criteria: **EFFECTIVENESS -**

**Key question 3: Has the CO III contributed to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document?**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III contributed to the improvement of the legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) considering civilian and democratic oversight and accountability principles (provided by EU and international standards and best practices);</li> <li>▪ Existence of the Five-years organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey</li> <li>▪ Existence of the MOI performance evaluation system based to ensure consistency during the evaluation of internal security forces;</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence (opinions and examples) that the CO III contributed to the improvement of the legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs)</p> <p>Opinions if the new and improved legislative framework considered civilian and democratic oversight and accountability principles (provided by EU and international standards and best practices);</p> <p>Evidence that the Five-years organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey has been prepared</p> <p>Evidence that the CO III supported the MOI performance evaluation system/ Examples of performance</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CO III Project relevant data extraction</li> <li>2. Interviews with key informants - focus on validating or refuting lines of inquiry - collecting perceptions about legal documents, strategies, partnerships established and skills developed and actions implemented related to CO III. Observations on the "why" and factors that influence or impede effectiveness</li> <li>3. Other findings to cover gaps or validate preliminary findings</li> </ol>	<p>Contribution analysis against the outcomes and outcome indicators</p> <p>Analysis of the CO III achievements versus established targets</p> <p>Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP/ CO III support</p> <p>Completion of a template of 'factors' with analysis of 'strength of influence (the factors affect CO III's ability to achieve its objectives)'</p>
---	--	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of the legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office that reflects compliance analysis of EU standards and practices</li> <li>▪ The extent to which Local Prevention and Security Boards have been scaled up</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III has addressed capacities of the professionals of MOI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of and citizen-focused security services</li> <li>▪ Existence of the Strategy for effective and full-functioning Parliamentary oversight of IFS</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the public, civil society and local media are aware on the civilian and democratic oversight</li> <li>▪ Existence of the factors contributing to project success or underachievement</li> <li>▪ Existence of good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples generated during the implementation</li> </ul>	<p>evaluations of internal security forces/ Opinions about functioning of the MOI performance evaluation system</p> <p>Existence of the legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office that reflects compliance analysis of EU standards and practices</p> <p>Evidence, including opinions, that the Local Prevention and Security Boards have been scaled up in 10 regions</p> <p>Evidence that the CO III has been effective in addressing capacities of the professionals of MOI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of and citizen-focused security services</p> <p>Opinions on the improvement of knowledge and skills of the MOI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of and citizen-focused security services</p> <p>The Strategy for effective and full-functioning Parliamentary oversight of IFS developed</p> <p>Number and the effects of the awareness raising strategies on the civilian and democratic oversight</p> <p>Examples of the factors contributing to project success or underachievement</p> <p>Examples and opinions of good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples generated during the implementation</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

**Key question 4 Has the CO III contributed to the broader development objectives as spelled out in the National Development Plan of Turkey?**

- To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress of EU Accession agenda,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which the project contributed to the advancement and the progress of EU Accession agenda,</li> </ul>	Evidence, including opinions, examples and analysis that the project contributed to the advancement and the progress of EU	1. CO III Project relevant data extraction	Contribution analysis against the outcomes and outcome indicators
--	---	--	--	---

National Development Plan of Turkey, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?	<p>priorities of National Development Plan of Turkey, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III contributed to an enabling environment for the institutionalisation of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces</li> <li>▪ The extent of the inclusion of citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices</li> </ul>	<p>Accession agenda, priorities of National Development Plan of Turkey, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</p> <p>Evidence that the CO III contributed to an enabling environment for the institutionalisation of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces</p> <p>Opinions about the inclusion of citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p>	<p>2. Interviews with key informants - focus on validating or refuting lines of inquiry - collecting perceptions about legal documents, strategies, partnerships established and skills developed and actions implemented related to CO III. Observations on the “why” and factors that influence or impede effectiveness</p> <p>3. Other findings to cover gaps or validate preliminary findings</p>	<p>Analysis of the CO III achievements versus established targets</p> <p>Counterfactual analysis to check whether results could have been delivered without UNDP/ CO III support</p> <p>Completion of a template of ‘factors’ with analysis of ‘strength of influence (the factors affect CO III’s ability to achieve its objectives)’</p>
---	---	---	---	--

Relevant evaluation criteria: **EFFICIENCY**

**Key question 5: Has the implementation of the CO III been efficient concerning adherence to the work plans (timely implementation), flexibility and responsiveness?**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has the CO III been implemented in line with work plans, using available resources (financial, human, technical)?</li> <li>- Has the CO III established sound management practices? (<i>How well did the Project collect and use data to monitor results? How effectively was updated data used to manage the Project? How well did the Project team communicate with partners, stakeholders and Project beneficiaries on its progress?</i>)</li> <li>- Are there any weaknesses in Project design, coordination, management, human resource skills, and resources?</li> <li>- To what degree did the external developments related to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The degree of timely implementation of the CO III, in a logical sequence, and availability of inputs in a timely fashion</li> <li>▪ The extent of existence and utilization of management systems that facilitated efficient implementation of the CO III</li> <li>▪ The extent to which UNDP practices, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities contributed to the efficiency of the CO III Program</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III team communicated achievements and other priorities (with implementing partners, stakeholders and Project beneficiaries)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidences of timely implementation of activities (without delays)- analysis of planned vs implemented activities including utilization of inputs</p> <p>Evidences and records on timely implementation or delays and changes in implementation of plans</p> <p>Evidence that sound of management system was in place and facilitated efficient implementation of the CO III</p> <p>Existence of results-oriented and quality monitoring and reporting systems and analysis of reports</p> <p>Evidences and opinions that UNDP practices, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities contributed to the efficiency</p> <p>Existence of a sound risk management practice and evidence</p>	<p>1. Desk review of the CO III documents and project management practices</p> <p>2. Interviews with CO III Project Team</p> <p>3. Interviews with national and other development partners</p> <p>4. Analysis of the UNDP management practices</p>	<p>Analysis of the CO III management practices</p> <p>Meeting minutes with CO III Team and other stakeholders</p> <p>Socio-economic analysis of Turkey</p> <p>Desk review of the critical indicators</p> <p>Triangulation of the collected primary and secondary data</p>
--	--	--	--	---



<p>governance and particularly related to law enforcement and security sectors influence the Project's efficiency?</p> <p>- What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts &amp; as percentage of total) by UNDP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which risks were adequately monitored and mitigated</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the COIII delivered its budget, according to the plans</li> </ul>	<p>that risks were adequately monitored and mitigated</p> <p>Evidence that project funds have been used timely and effectively for implementation of activities</p>		
Relevant evaluation criteria: <b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>				
<b>Key Question 6: Has the CO III contributed to sustainable partnerships, policies and capacities of stakeholders for civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces?</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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?</li> <li>- Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits?</li> <li>- 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which the project decision making bodies and implementing partners undertaken decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the project</li> <li>▪ The extent to which (financial and operational) sustainability of the achieved results and made changes has been ensured</li> <li>▪ Opportunities for continuation and expansion of the results and activities in the area of CO III intervention</li> <li>▪ The extent to which stakeholders identified areas for future considerations and follow-up actions</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the ownership of stakeholders has been ensured (to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained)</li> </ul>	<p>Opinions of the stakeholders regarding sustainability of the achieved results and progress in the areas of the CO III</p> <p>Evidences that the CO III project and partners have ensured financial and operational sustainability of the achieved results. Evidences about the opportunities for continuation and expansion of the results and activities in the area of CO III intervention</p> <p>Stakeholders' opinions about partnership, actual involvement and ownership of results achieved during implementation of the CO III</p> <p>Examples of innovative practices and novel approaches tested and followed during the Project's implementation. Opinions of the stakeholders about areas for future considerations and follow-up actions</p> <p>Examples and opinions that the project decision making bodies and implementing partners undertaken decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the project</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Desk review of the CO III documents and project deliverables</li> <li>2. Interviews with stakeholders and partners</li> <li>3. Third-party analysis and analytical documents</li> </ol>	<p>Analysis of good governance (World Wide Governance indicators, for example) and macro-economic and social indicators</p> <p>Analysis of the CO III reports and deliverables and also other reports of development partners</p> <p>Analysis of meeting minutes and results of surveys</p> <p>Triangulation of primary and secondary data</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidences that the CO III's tested and followed novel or innovative approaches</li> <li>▪ Existence of the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes for sustaining project benefits</li> </ul>	<p>Examples and opinions that the ownership of stakeholders has been ensured (to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained)</p> <p>Evidence that legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes are in place for sustaining project benefits</p>		
Relevant evaluation criteria: <b>CROSS-CUTTING</b>				
<b>Key Question 7: Has the CO III project considered rights-based approach and gender equality, and followed the “no-one is left behind” principle during its design and implementation?</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent was this project designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated as rights based and gender sensitive?</li> <li>- Did the Project have an explicit approach to gender-mainstreaming, SDGs and “leaving no-one behind”?</li> <li>- How was the “rights-based approach and gender equality principles applied in the Project’s activities and work with beneficiaries?</li> <li>- To what extent has the CO III Project been SDG-driven during formulation and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The extent to which the COIII addressed and mainstreamed rights based and gender sensitive approaches</li> <li>▪ The extent to which the CO III Project support has been relevant to the achievement of the SDGs,</li> <li>▪ The extent to which gender mainstreaming (and human rights-based approach) was considered and implemented within the CO III project</li> <li>▪ The degree to which partners are capacitated to implement gender equality and rights-based approach in oversight activities</li> </ul>	<p>Examples of practices in promotion and mainstreaming of gender during formulation and implementation of the CO III project</p> <p>Opinions of the CO III project team and stakeholders about the degree of mainstreaming gender equality and rights-based approach during the project preparation and implementation</p> <p>Evidences that CO III has been relevant and effective for the achievement of planned targets under the SDG framework</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Desk/literature review of relevant documents (including third-party reports and national documents)</li> <li>2. Key informants’ interviews (semi-structured interviews/ focus groups)</li> <li>3. Other sources and consultations as appropriate</li> </ol>	<p>Analyse of the SDG frameworks and progress reports for Turkey, including Voluntary National Report (VNR) for Yurkey and other analytical documents</p> <p>Interviews with the key stakeholders (including UN, development organizations, etc)</p> <p>Analysis of the results o the “citizen perception of security forces” surveys (COII and COIII phases)</p> <p>Review of national statistics and other available data</p> <p>Triangulation of the collected primary and secondary data</p>

#### Annex 4: Evaluability Analysis Matrix

The FEC has prepared the evaluability matrix during the Inception phase, that served to formulate comprehensive evaluation methodology.

Project Design (as described in a Theory of Change, Logical Framework or narrative)	
<b>Clarity</b>	<p>The CO III's overall objective "To enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety" has been clearly defined, reflecting the efforts of the Project. The FEC finds that, similarly, the specific objective ("to ensure the institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices") has been composite objective, almost at the outcome level. It included component on the institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces (as mentioned under the overall objective, in slightly modified form) and the second component is aiming to establish and enhance citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices.</p> <p>The FEC finds that CO III overall and specific objectives represent intended changes in development conditions in the country set at the high level, requiring joint work of many partners. Therefore, credible attribution of development changes to the CO III may be challenging or even impossible to establish; this has been also recognized in the Terms of References.</p> <p>To address these challenges, the Final Evaluation Consultant (FEC) has developed a tailor-made methodology, that covered the overall CO III's results framework, its outputs and activities that contributed to its specific and overall objectives. The outputs are correlated to outcome and identified and the proposed steps- for the achievement of outputs- have defined.</p>
<b>Relevant</b>	<p>The CO III's areas of intervention have been and remained highly relevant to the challenges facing Turkey. The Project has been relevant for implementing the IPA II Indicative Strategy Paper for Turkey (2014-2020), committed to improving the capacities of institutions, including CSOs, in charge of protecting and guaranteeing the respect and defence of fundamental rights, as highlighted in the CO III. Specifically, the Project has addressed the need to enhance capacities for independent, impartial and effective investigations and crime prevention. In addition, the Project addresses limited cooperation between institutions and stakeholders engaged in human rights as one of the fundamental challenges.</p> <p>The CO III aligns with the New EU Strategy, that recognized legal arrangements in the security sector are among the primary objectives for ensuring the full enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms.</p> <p>The importance of the transformation of civil-military relations with a focus on civilian/democratic oversight of the internal security sector has also been emphasized in EU Progress Reports, acknowledging the contribution of the CO initiatives. However, this report also noted the need for improvements for Parliamentary, administrative and judicial oversight and accountability of security and intelligence forces. In addition, the commission needs to increase the effectiveness of the law enforcement oversight.</p> <p>The Project at hand is also in conformity with the priorities of the Accession Partnership and EU/Commission policies by supporting the ongoing work of Turkey. Assessment of various progress reports of the European Commission along with the</p>

	<p>policy endeavours of Turkey to address gaps in the civilian oversight and the outputs of the partnership of Turkey jointly achieved with UNDP and the Delegation of the European Union to Turkey (EUD) are the basis of the Project.</p> <p>The Project has strong links to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG16 on 'participatory decision making and effective institutions) and the UNDP country programme for Turkey.</p> <p>The target group of the Action is the Ministry of Interior, including provincial administrations and internal security forces and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. The CO III reflected the changed structure of the internal security system. The CO III was responsive to the needs of its target groups, who were closely involved in implementing project activities.</p>
<b>Plausible</b>	<p>The validity of the CO III's intervention logic remained high throughout its implementation- a brief situation assessment indicates that, despite achieved results and progress, the challenges continue to affect the full transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety.</p> <p>The CO III is likely to achieve progress under the institutionalisation of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces, through the improvement of the legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) and organizational development efforts ( e.g., five-year organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey , performance evaluation system for internal security forces; legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office; Local Prevention and Security Boards and other capacity development activities). However, ensuring fully functional system requires more than legal provisions and initial efforts for development of capacities. In addition, the institutionalization of the citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation in line with EU acquis and best international practices remains work in progress and efforts are required to ensure broader acceptance, especially at the level of participating institutions.</p> <p>The country is facing different factors and dynamics in the region that remain present and could affect achieved results (e.g., policy changes and turn-over of qualified staff; sustainable partnerships at different levels; financial aspects, COVID-19 pandemic)</p>
<b>Validity and reliability</b>	<p>The CO III project team has established a comprehensive monitoring system, that involved data collection from different levels and cooperation with the partners and other stakeholders. All the received data have been collected and were available for the evaluation consultant.</p> <p><b>Still, the FEC finds some challenges within the intervention logic.</b></p> <p>The <b>overall objective</b> ("To enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety") included only one indicator:</p> <p><b>IOO:</b> Existing system of civilian and democratic oversight of ISF improved in line with international and EU standards, providing an enabling environment for promotion of fundamental rights<sup>176</sup></p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>

<sup>176</sup> The baseline: Existing legislative and institutional framework requires improvement aligned with EU Acquis. (Y2018) and the target: Comprehensive legislative and institutional framework for civilian and democratic control of internal security forces in place and compliant with EU acquis (Y2021)

	<p>The FEC finds that the only indicator at the overall objective/ level is not adequate to appropriately measure the progress. Rather, this indicator, essentially reformulated overall objective; could serve as the overall objective target.</p> <p>The indicator should validate if and to what extent the oversight of ISF improved and it it reflected civilian and democratic principles. The FEC will, therefore, verify the progress considering additional indicators. For example, the FEC will analyse if and to what extent the legal framework has been improved- laws revised and adopted) and consider if these laws are compliant to EU acquis. The reference and source of verification could be annual EU Progress Report on Turkey, for example. The improvement of institutional framework for civilian and democratic oversight could be verified through the assessment of adequacy and demand of capacity development programs, and perception of the key informants from different structures. The FEC will also analyse activities and results under the institutional reform context that the CO III supported.</p> <p>Also, the OO's dimension on human centred understanding of the security and public safety requires attention. The FEC will discuss with the key informants' issues and achievements related to security and public safety. The FEC will investigate about for example, availability of information regarding number of complaints. This indicator generally reflects on confidence in the procedure. The aim of a complaint's procedure is to prevent impunity and restore (or enhance) public confidence. It is often observed that the number of complaints increases (rather than decreases) if police enhance their efforts to improve integrity and the complaints procedure in particular.</p> <p>The FEC will discuss with key informants their views and evidences about the reduction in police misconduct including timely resolution of issues. Important dimension will be to assess confidence and cooperation of civil society. The key informants representing the human rights groups, bar and other professional associations, corporate organizations and the social media will be considered for the discussion.</p> <p>The FEC will use primary data sources, and other indicators under specific objective and outputs to assess if and to what extent progress towards civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces has been achieved.</p> <p>The FEC finds similar situation with the specific <b>objective</b>. The specific objective is a composite objective that included two dimensions (institutionalization of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces as the first and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices as the second component; interestingly, both components exceeded the scope of the specific objective, being more at the overall level.</p> <p>The indicator at the specific objective level has been poorly formulated; still, the FEC will use baselines and targets to validate progress (e.g., if one national level crime prevention office in place; if local structures scaled up to 19 districts/provinces or if the civilian and democratic oversight structures have been established in line with EU acquis and best international practices)</p> <p>The <b>CO III outputs</b> are well-elaborated and fit into the CO III chain of results.</p> <p>The FEC finds that the proposed indicators are relevant to measure progress and findings from interviews, together with surveys, will serve to validate the progress and actual achievements.</p> <p>The FE will strive work to identify links, if existing, between these indicators and identify examples of "spill-over" effects- if for example, capacity development resulted in strengthened oversight mechanisms or improved quality of civilian participation, etc.</p>
--	---

<b>Testable</b>	The FEC finds that the critical linkages have been between activities and outputs; however, direct links and establishing contribution claims between outputs and progress under outcome was more challenging. The evaluation questions have been formulated to explore, discuss and identify these links.
<b>Consistent</b>	The consistency exists between the CO III's Theory of Change and how it is described in the Project document and application across multiple documents (Design, M&E plans, work plans, progress reports, etc.). Basically, all the documents have been focused with clear references to the original ToC and the project's intervention logic.
<b>Complexity</b>	<p>The FEC finds that UNDP CO III project and its focus to support civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces in line with EU acquis and best international practices has been a factor of complexity. Also, complementary area of intervention- inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices is a complex issue that require well-planned approach.</p> <p>The management structure- decision making and implementation mechanisms- have been complex and included involvement of various partners. For example, MOI has been a partner involved in numerous capacity development activities and with the overall oversight system. Therefore, ensuring well-articulated and harmonized implementation has been challenging, but the team has been successfully dealing with these issues.</p>
<b>Agreement</b>	The stakeholders' commitment at all levels (the MoI, ISF, civil society organizations) remained high from the initiation of the Project.
Information availability	
<b>The complete set of CO III documents available</b>	The CO III provided full set of documentation, including submitted CO III Project Document, Annual Progress Reports, Other Reports including commissioned studies
<b>Baseline measures exist</b>	<p>The baseline data are available for all indicators. Some of the baseline data has been in the form of international, national and subnational statistics. Disaggregated data are partially available for indicators.</p> <p>Also, the FEC had access to follow up reports on conferenced and workshops that the CO III project organized.</p>
<b>Data on a control group</b>	The CO III did not include the control group to compare with the intervention group
<b>Data has been collected for all the indicators</b>	<p>The data is being collected for all indicators and this was sufficient frequency. The FEC finds that there are no significant data missing.</p> <p>The measuring has been generally reliable.</p>
<b>Availability of critical data</b>	<p>The FEC has analysed project materials and finds that the intended and actual beneficiaries could be easily identified.</p> <p>The CO III team provided details and information about involvement of partners and beneficiaries answering questions who were involved in what project activities and when.</p>
<b>Gender disaggregated data</b>	The CO III provided disaggregated data for most of the indicators, especially those that were under direct Project's responsibility

<b>Previous reviews or evaluations</b>	The CO III project did not include previous mid-term reviews or analysis. However, the FEC had access to the final evaluation of the previous CO phases, and access to other documents and lessons learned.
Institutional context	
<b>Accessibility to and availability of stakeholders</b>	<p>The FEC received contacts of all the stakeholders from the CO III project. Besides, the FEC together with the CO III Team analyzed the list of interlocutors for interviews- in addition to partners and beneficiaries, this list included other stakeholders that are relevant for the police sector reform, and broader, good governance, transparency and accountability<sup>177</sup>- reference to the Annex 2 of this report.</p> <p>The extraordinary circumstances brought about by COVID-19 created a range of challenges for evaluative work as discussed in sections below. For the moment, it is worth noting that the new context makes it impossible for the evaluation consultant to conduct in-person meetings with the CO III Project Team and other stakeholders in Turkey. Still, use of online interviews, and use of tailor-made interview guides will provide a platform for primary data collection.</p> <p>The FEC is in communication with the partners to identify other interlocutors for interviews and analysis.</p>
<b>Resources available to do the evaluation</b>	The FEC has established regular communication with the CO III team, and with the main partners. This communication helped the evaluation to identify and access key informants. It will also serve to resolve any issue that could emerge during the evaluation.
<b>Coordination requirements?</b>	The evaluation will involve representatives of the CO III team. The evaluation consultant will meet with the EU Delegation representatives.

<sup>177</sup> This is the OECD DAC definition; also, this definition has been adopted by Including IFAD, UNODC, OECD, SIDA, ILO, DFID, NORAD and NDC.

## Annex 5: Results/ Logical Framework- COIII

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective: Impact	To enable the transition to civilian and democratic oversight of internal security system based on good governance principles and a human-centred understanding of security and public safety	Existing system of civilian and democratic oversight of ISF improved in line with international and EU standards, providing an enabling environment for promotion of fundamental rights.	Existing legislative and institutional framework requires improvement aligned with EU Acquis. (Y2018)	Existing legislative and institutional framework requires improvement aligned with EU Acquis. (Y2021)	Comprehensive legislative and institutional framework for civilian and democratic control of internal security forces in place and compliant with EU acquis (Y2021)	EU Commission Turkey Progress Reports, 2019, 2020, 2021. Legislative and institutional framework for the oversight mechanisms for security sector governance Result-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) reports Media and CSOs reports Records of the provincial Human Rights Boards Records of the Parliament's Human Rights Inquiry Committee Parliament Legislative Records	Continued commitment to the EU accession process and institutionalisation of civilian oversight over ISFs  Political climate and conjuncture may affect the progress and timely implementation of the Project activities



	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
<b>Specific objective(s): Outcome(s)</b>	To ensure the institutionalisation of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces and the inclusion of a citizen-focused participatory planning and implementation practices in line with EU acquis and best international practices.	Structures established for civilian and democratic oversight and implementation practices of internal security sector at local and national levels considered being in line with EU acquis and best international practices	<p>No structure at the national level (Y2017)</p> <p>Local structures exist in 8 districts (Y2017)</p> <p>Civilian and democratic oversight structures are not fully in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p>	<p>Draft regulation for NCPO submitted(Y2021) 19 functioning LPSBs (Y2021)</p> <p>There is no clear indicator to gauge whether those structures are in line with EU Acquis. (Y2021)</p>	<p>One national level crime prevention commission in place and local structures scaled up to 19 districts/provinces. (Y2021)</p> <p>Civilian and democratic oversight structures are in line with EU acquis and best international practices</p>	<p>Legislative and institutional framework for the governance of internal security sector at local and national levels</p> <p>National Opinion Polls</p> <p>Parliament Legislative Records</p> <p>Media, CSOs, IOs reports</p>	Stakeholders' dedication to participate and cooperate throughout the process.
<b>Outputs</b>	1) Legislative framework for the accountable and transparent functioning of the Internal Security Forces (ISFs) improved in light of civilian and democratic oversight and accountability principles provided by EU and international standards and	Laws regulating the work of the police, gendarmerie and coast guard improved in line with EU and international standards	3 laws already revised (Y2017)	Draft Proposals for 6 revised laws (Y2021)	Proposals for 6 revised laws (Y2021)	Report on laws' review; workshops' lists of participants	Stakeholders' dedication to participate and cooperate throughout the process.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	best practices (Component A)			Draft Proposal for Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey (Y2021)	Proposal for Five-years organizational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey (Y2020)	Records of the workshops.	
	2) Five-years organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey						
	3) Performance evaluation system based on Specific Measurable Accepted Realistic Timely (SMART) indicators to ensure consistency during the evaluation of internal security forces by the Mol developed (Component A)	Performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators	Structured performance evaluation not based on SMART indicators (Y2017)	Recommendation Report for Structured performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators (Y2021)	Proposal for a performance evaluation system based on SMART indicators developed for the Mol (Y2021)	Proposal for a performance evaluation system; gap analysis report; technical visit report; comprehensive recommendations report; minutes of the workshops; workshops' lists of participants	
	4) Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (GCCGA) improved in line with the principles of civilian oversight (Component A)	Revised curriculum	Current Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2017)	Current Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2021)	Proposal for a revised Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy (Y2021)	Revised Curriculum of the Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy; desk review report; technical visit reports; comparative assessment report; training programme report; minutes of the consultative meetings and workshops; workshops, meetings and trainings' lists of participants	
	5) Legal framework on National Crime Prevention Office developed based on	Recommendations for Draft Legal Framework on National Crime Prevention		1 Legal Framework Proposal (Y2021)		Proposal for a Legal Framework for National Crime Prevention Office; technical	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	a compliance analysis with EU standards and practices (Component A)	Office developed and presented	0 Legal Framework (Y2017)		Proposal for a Legal Framework developed and presented (Y2021)	visit report; minutes of the consultative meetings and workshops; workshops and meetings' lists of participants	
	6) Strategy for effective functioning Parliamentary oversight of ISF is developed (Component B);	Draft Strategy developed and presented	0 Strategy (Y2018)	Draft Proposal for a Strategy (Y2021)	Proposal for a Strategy (Y2021)	Parliament Legislative Records; detailed assessment policy recommendations report; technical visit report; training programme report; minutes of the consultative meetings and workshops; list of participants	
	7) Local Prevention and Security Boards scaled up in 10 selected districts/ provinces (Component C)	Local Prevention and Security Boards are operational in 10 selected districts/provinces.	9 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards(Y2017)	19 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards (Y2021)	19 functional Local Prevention and Security Boards (Y2021)	Analysis report on Local Prevention and Security Boards; technical visit report; minutes of the workshops; workshops' lists of participants	
	8) Delivered training programs for 500 professionals of MoI and ISFs on civilian/democratic oversight of ISFs and citizen-focused security services (Component D)	Delivery of trainings On civilian and democratic oversight to 500 people	250 people trained (Y2017)	400 people trained (Y2021)	500 people trained (Y2021)	Training module; training programme report; trainings' lists of participants; list of the members of the trainees	
	9) Awareness of the public, civil society and local media enhanced as regards the human – centred security concept in the	Number of civil society, local media representatives and the	Results of the national opinion poll	9,000 respondents of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation	9,000 respondents of the national opinion poll on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction and 1,000 civil society and local media representative	National Opinion Poll Report, training module; training programme report; trainings' lists of participants; awareness raising programmes	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	districts/provinces where Local Prevention and Security Boards established (Component D)	public at large reached out through national opinion poll and awareness raising campaigns	on crime victimisation and citizen satisfaction and confidence in ISFs reached out 7500 respondents (during Phase II) (Y2014)	800 civil society and local media representative attended awareness raising campaigns (Y2021)	attended awareness raising campaigns (Y2021)		
Activities	<p>A.1. Review of the police and gendarmerie basic laws, in the light of civilian oversight and accountability principles provided by EU and international standards and best practices.</p> <p>A.1.1. Desk review of the relevant laws, which regulate the roles, responsibilities and functioning of the ISFs</p> <p>A.1.2. Organise two-day workshops (50 participants in each workshop) to discuss the findings of the desk review (A.1.1) and develop recommendations for improvement</p> <p>A.1.3. Develop legal gap/compliance analysis report including comparative analysis and recommendations for improvement in line with the results of the workshops held under A.1.2.</p> <p>A.2. Improvement of the performance evaluation system and consistency of the control system by the Ministry of Interior over internal security forces</p> <p>A.2.1. Initial desk review of best practices in certain EU countries with regard to performance evaluation systems</p>		<p><b>Means:</b></p> <p>Project Team (PT) Short term experts (STEs) Training costs Study visit costs Project Office costs Visibility and publication costs</p> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>Covering the human resources, costs for travels, local office and services - details are indicated in the Budget for the Action</p>				Factors outside project management's control that may impact on the output-outcome linkage.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>A.2.2. Carry out a technical visit to a selected EU member state</p> <p>A.2.3 Develop a comparative assessment report based on the results of the desk review and technical visit</p> <p>A.2.4. Develop a gap analysis report on the current performance evaluation system</p> <p>A.2.5. Draft a comprehensive recommendations report for an improved performance evaluation system of ISFs</p> <p>A.2.6. Organise a workshop to review and discuss the findings of the draft recommendations report</p> <p>A.3. Preparation of a draft legal framework for the establishment of “National Crime Prevention Office” under Ministry of Interior</p> <p>A.3.1. Organise 5 two-day consultation meetings in Ankara with the participation of LDC members (12 participants + 3 PT members) to discuss the roles and responsibilities as well as possible structuring of the National Crime Prevention Office and its coordination with LPSBs</p> <p>A.3.2. Develop the first draft legal framework for the establishment of the “National Crime Prevention Office” by the LDC</p> <p>A.3.3. Organise 5 two-day workshops to share the draft legal framework and receive substantial inputs by stakeholders</p> <p>A.3.4. Carry out a technical visit to a selected EU member state with the aim of reflecting on international experience in legal framework drafting processes on institutions similar to the envisaged National Crime Prevention Office.</p> <p>A.3.5. Finalise the draft legal framework on the establishment of a National Crime Prevention Office based on the results of the workshops, compliance analysis with EU and international standards and best practices, as well as the technical visit</p> <p>A.4. Development of a National Strategy on crime prevention and security plans at national level</p> <p>A.4.1. Develop a draft strategy on crime prevention and civilian oversight of the security sector by the PT, with support of STEs</p> <p>A.4.2. Organise 5 two-day and workshops to discuss the draft strategy developed under A.4.1.</p> <p>A.4.3. Finalise the strategy based on the results of the workshops (A.4.2) and submit to Mol. Present the final strategy with a 1 day event.</p> <p>A.5. Focusing on Civilian and Democratic oversight and fundamental rights topics, Technical and Capacity Development Support to the New</p>						

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy in line with EU and international Standards and best practices</p> <p>A.5.1. Conduct a desk review of other country experiences on the functioning, curriculum and training systems of ISF Academies from the perspective of civilian and democratic oversight in line with fundamental rights</p> <p>A.5.2. Conduct two technical visits to selected EU member states.</p> <p>A.5.3. Develop a comparative assessment report on the functioning, curriculum and training management of ISF academies in EU member states and the GCGA, from the perspective of civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces</p> <p>A.5.4. Analyse the needs of the training system introduced by the GCGA in line with international best practices/standards ensuring civilian and democratic oversight of internal security from a fundamental rights perspective</p> <p>A.5.5. Organise 5 two-day consultative meetings in Ankara with the participation of MoI, GCGA, Gendarmerie, police and coast guards (50 per meeting, 250 in total) to discuss the findings of the needs analysis on the training system, which will be developed in the course of the Project</p> <p>A.5.6. Facilitate the establishment of a Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) under the chairmanship of Ministry of Interior/ GCGA</p> <p>A.5.7. Review of the GCGA curriculum and addressing middle and high-level managers in line with the findings of the comparative assessment report and needs analysis on the training system</p> <p>A.5.7.1. Organise 1 two-day consultative meeting and 5 one-day consultative meetings with the participation of the CDC members in Ankara in order to discuss the main concepts/issues that need to be included in the civilian and democratic oversight training module of the GCGA Curriculum</p> <p>A.5.7.2. Draft a module on civilian and democratic oversight of internal security and organise a test training for middle and high-level managers to ensure its accuracy and adoptability</p> <p>A.5.7.3. Finalise module on civilian oversight of internal security based on the results of the test training mentioned above and submit it to GCGA for approval and adoption</p> <p>A.5.7.4. Organise 5 one-week training programs targeting training planners, academicians, administrators of GCGA, who will practice the module on civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces</p>						

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>A.5.8. Organise 2 one-day experience sharing meetings in Ankara with the participation of Ministry of Interior and GCGA staff to raise awareness on civilian/democratic oversight</p> <p>A.5.9. Develop a training management system for the adoption of a specific module on civilian and democratic oversight of internal security by GCGA, including, but not limited to, performance evaluation and monitoring of the success of trainings</p> <p>A.5.9.1. Draft a proposal on training management system, including policy recommendations on training processes, performance evaluation and monitoring of the training results to improve the effectiveness and impact of trainings</p> <p>A.5.9.2. Organise 5 two-day consultative meetings in Ankara with the participation of MoI, GCGA, representatives of Gendarmerie, police and coast guard (50 persons per meeting, 250 in total, 50 participants will be from outside Ankara) to discuss the proposed training management system and receive input by the relevant parties for its finalisation</p> <p>A.5.9.3. Finalise the proposal on training management system to be submitted to, and approved by, GCGA</p> <p>A.6. Five years organisational strategy for the oversight of the internal security forces in Turkey</p> <p>A.6.1. Develop a draft five-years organisational strategy for the oversight of internal security forces in Turkey by the PT, with support of STEs and in line with the findings of the project activities under all components</p> <p>A.6.2. Organise two two-day workshops to discuss the draft strategy developed under A.6.1.</p> <p>A.6.3. Finalise the strategy based on the results of the workshops (A.6.2) and submit to MoI and other relevant stakeholders. Present the final strategy with a 1 day event.</p> <p>B.1. Update of the assessment of parliamentary oversight in Turkey</p> <p>B.1.1. Organise 2 two-day consultative meetings in Ankara with the participation of MoI, General Secretariat of the GNAT, and deputies from the relevant Specialised Commissions in GNAT and other relevant stakeholders including but not limited to relevant civil society organizations, universities and think-tank organizations (75 participants in each meeting) to discuss obstacles in Parliamentary oversight of ISFs in the context of Turkey</p>						



	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>B.1.2. Draft a detailed assessment and policy recommendations report for improvement of parliamentary oversight, in line with the discussions of the consultative meetings that will be conducted in B.1.1.</p> <p>B.1.3. Organise a two-day workshop in Ankara to discuss the above-mentioned recommendations report with the participation of Mol, General Secretariat of the GNAT, and deputies from the relevant Specialised Commissions in GNAT, other relevant stakeholders (ISFs, CSOs, Academia) (75 participants)</p> <p>B.1.4. Finalise the recommendations report and submit to the GNAT.</p> <p>B.2. Preparation of a strategy proposing amendments or actions to enable the GNAT to more effectively oversee the work of internal security forces</p> <p>B.2.1. Organise 4 two-day workshop workshops with legal experts and MPs and other relevant stakeholders including Academia, CSOs (75 participants per workshop) to discuss the organisational structure and functioning of parliamentary commissions</p> <p>B.2.2. Provide recommendations on organisational changes/functioning that provide for dedicated professional oversight by the parliamentary commissions based on the findings of the workshops</p> <p>B.2.3. Conduct 3 two-day technical training programs on parliamentary oversight mechanisms</p> <p>B.2.4. Develop strategy for an improved parliamentary oversight of ISFs</p> <p>C.1. Preparation of a strategy and implementation plan for an effective institutionalisation of Local Prevention and Security Boards</p> <p>C.1.1. Analyse the current functioning of LPSBs (in total 9 districts in 5 provinces under Phase II) in order to determine lessons learned and good practices</p> <p>C.1.2. Conduct 5 two-day workshops with the participation of LPSB from 9 pilot districts (in 5 provinces) and other relevant stakeholders in order to share the findings of the analysis report that will be developed under C.1.1.</p> <p>C.1.3. Develop a strategy paper for the establishment of the 10 new LPSBs in the scope of the Phase III of the Project</p> <p>C.2. Establishment of Local Prevention and Security Boards across the country on the basis of relevant legal regulations made by the Ministry of Interior</p> <p>C.2.1. Define the criteria for the selection of the 10 provinces and/or districts, where LPSBs will be established</p>						

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>C.2.2. Define the criteria for the selection of members of the LPSBs</p> <p>C.2.3. Conduct a detailed study on the relationship, the level of accountability and workflow within Governorate and/or District Governorate structures in 10 selected pilot districts/provinces and develop a road map for implementation</p> <p>C.2.3.1. Conduct semi-structured meetings by PT and STEs with the Governorates and/or District Governorates in selected pilot districts/provinces to identify the needs for the establishment of the LPSBs</p> <p>C.2.3.2. Conduct 10 two- day workshops with the participation of CSOs and local media in each selected pilot districts/provinces to identify the internal security needs and discuss the possible structure of LPSBs</p> <p>C.2.3.3. Develop road maps for the functioning and short, medium and long-term objectives/activities of the LPSBs in 10 selected pilot districts/provinces</p> <p>C.2.4. Provide technical support to the 10 LPSBs in development of security plans and ensuring sustainable and inclusive platforms for local security governance</p> <p>C.2.4.1. Organise 3 two-day consultative meetings on the development of local security plans with the participation of LPSBs members in each 10 districts/provinces</p> <p>C.2.4.2. Organise 10 two-day workshops in 10 pilot districts/provinces with LPSBs members to discuss lessons learned and best practices as well as the sustainability of the services of the LPSBs in each pilot district/province.</p> <p>C.2.4.3. Conduct 10 one-day experience and knowledge-sharing workshops between and among the pilot LPSBs</p> <p>C.2.4.4. Conduct a technical visit to a selected EU member state, with the aim of reflecting international experience in the functioning of civilian/democratic oversight at local administrative level</p> <p>C.2.4.5 Publish the Local Security Action Plans that will be developed by the LPSBs and disseminate among the relevant authorities</p> <p>D.1. Preparation, periodical update and conduct of a training module for public officials employed in Local Prevention and Security Boards</p> <p>D.1.1. Develop tailor-made training modules on crime prevention incorporating the concept of civilian/democratic oversight from fundamental rights perspective</p>						

	Results chain	Indicators	Baseline (incl. reference year)	Current value Reference date	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>D.1.2. Deliver trainings for 500 professionals of Mol and ISFs on civilian and democratic oversight of ISFs and Human focus security services on crime prevention incorporating the perspective of civilian / democratic oversight to governorates and district governorates</p> <p>D.2. Development and periodical implementation of awareness raising programs for civil society and public at large on civilian and democratic oversight and citizen-centred security</p> <p>D.2.1. Conduct an opinion poll at the national level to measure the level of confidence and satisfaction of the citizens with the work of ISFs</p> <p>D.2.2. Develop tailor-made training modules on citizen centred security and civilian/democratic oversight targeting civil society and media</p> <p>D.2.3. Deliver trainings on human centred security and civilian/democratic oversight to civil society and media</p> <p>D.2.4. Develop the implementation strategy of the awareness raising programs</p> <p>D.3. Evaluation and update of training programs which are implemented by the Ministry of Interior for district governors from the perspective of civilian/democratic oversight</p> <p>D.3.1. Review the training curriculum of District Governors in cooperation with the Training Department of the Mol in relation to civilian/democratic oversight</p> <p>D.3.2. Organise 3 two-day workshops in Ankara to identify the bottlenecks and positive aspects of the training curriculum of District Governors based on a human-centred security concept</p> <p>D.3.3. Develop a needs assessment report and recommendations for improvement in the training curriculum of District Governors</p>						

## ***Annex 6: List of analysed and consulted documents***

### **Project document**

#### **Decription of the Action- Strengthening the Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Forces Project Phase III**

##### **15 December 2020 Addendum I**

Annex I-Note on Addendum I -No-Cost Extension Request  
Annex II-Revised Workplan  
Annex III – Budget Addendum (002)  
Annex IV-Proposed Revised Full Description of the Action (DoA)  
Annex V-Proposed Revised DoA - Comparison Table  
Annex VI Projects Results Progress Document  
Annex I-Note on Addendum I -No-Cost Extension Request  
Annex II-Revised Workplan  
Annex III - Budget Addendum (002)  
Annex IV-Proposed Revised Full DoA  
Annex V-Proposed Revised DoA-Comparison Table  
Annex VI Projects Results Progress Document  
Signed Addendum Oversight Document

##### **Addendum 2 (21 June 2021)**

Annex IV Meeting Minutes of 4th Steering Committee - 27 NOV 20  
Annex V Result Based Monitoring Reporting Addendum II  
Annex VI Progress in percentages, December 2020 & June 2021 Addendum II  
Annex VII DSIODC Presentation  
Annex VIII DSIODC Roadmap  
Cover Letter Addendum II  
Addendum II Clarifications  
Annex I Workplan Addendum II  
Annex II Logical Framework Addendum II  
Annex IX Revised DoA-Addendum II  
Annex III Budget for Action Addendum II  
Note on Addendum II  
Signed Addendum II

### **Progress reports**

**Inception report and annexes (April 2019)**

Annex 1 Annual Work Plan for 2019

Annex 2 Updated logical framework

Annex 3 Resources and Budget for the Action (Justifications)

Annex 3 Resources and Budget for the Action

Annex 4 Communication and Visibility Plan

Annex 5 Civilian Oversight Phase II Final Report

CO3 Inception Report ENG FINAL

**Progress report I, 21 December 2018-21 December 2019**

Annex 1-Revised Workplan

Annex 2-Updated Logical Framework

Annex 3\_ Budget for the Action

Annex 4.1-SCM Attendance List

Annex 4.2-SCM Minutes

Annex 5.1-B.1.1. Consultative Meetings Report

Annex 5.2 B.1.1 Consultative Meeting Attendance list

Annex 6-C.1.1 Questionnaire

Annex 7-C.1.1. Analysis Report for Functioning of LPSBs in Pilots Districts

Annex 8.1-C.1.2 Malatya Workshop Report

Annex 8.2-C.1.2 Cesme Workshop Report

Annex 8.3-C.1.2 Sahinbey Workshop Report

Annex 8.4-C.1.2 Vakfikebir Workshop Report

Annex 8.5-C.1.2 Istanbul Workshop Report

Annex 9-C.1.3 Strategy Paper for the Establishment of the 10 new LPSBs

Annex 10-C.2.1 Criteria for selection of the 10 new LPSBs

Annex 11-C.2.2 Criteria for the Selection of Members of LPSBS

Annex 12.1-C.2.3.2 Sincan Workshop Report

Annex 12.2-C.2.3.2 Sincan Workshop Attendance List

Annex 13- Launch Event Attendance List

Annex 14.1- Visibility Materials

**Progress report II, 21 December 2019-21 December 2020 with Annexes****Steering Committee Meetings (6 meetings including meeting minutes)****Component A**

A.1.3 Legal Gap / Compliance Analysis Report on Democratic and Civilian Oversight of ISFs between Turkey and selected EU member-states, Prepared by: Sebastian Roché, Olgun Altundas, Noelle Castagné, Simon Varaine

A.2.2. Report on Virtual Technical Study Visit to Belgium (Prepared By: Jacques de Maillard and Theo Van Gasse)

A.2.3. Comparative Assessment Report on Performance Evaluation System in Turkey, France, Belgium and Greece, prepared by Jacques de Maillard, International Short-Term Expert (Prof. Dr., Political science, University of Versailles-Saint Quentin)

A.2.4. Gap Analysis Report based on the Current Performance Evaluation System, Prepared by Jacques de Maillard, International Short-Term Expert (Prof. Dr., Political Science - University of Versailles-Saint Quentin)

A.2.5. A comprehensive recommendations report for an improved performance evaluation system of ISFs

A.3.2 Preliminary Recommendations for National Crime Prevention Office

A.3.4. Compliance analysis report, Prepared by Jacques de Maillard, International Short-Term Expert (Prof. Dr., Political Science - University of Versailles-Saint Quentin)

A.5.3 Comparative Assessment Report on the Functioning, Training Management and Curricula of Internal Security Forces Academies

## **Component B**

### **B.1.4. Assessment of the Existing Parliamentary Oversight in Turkey**

## **Component C**

C.1.1 Analysis Report for Functioning of LPSBs in Pilots Districts

C.1.2. Çeşme Workshop Report

C.1.2. Istanbul Workshop Report

C.1.2. Malatya Workshop Report

C.1.2. Şahinbey Workshop Report

C.1.2. Vakfıkebir Workshop Report

C.1.3. Strategy Paper for the Establishment of 10 New Local Prevention and Security Boards (LPSBs)

C.2.4.4 France Study Visit Report

## **Component D**

Module 1 Introduction to Civilian and Democratic Oversight

Module 2 Introduction to Crime Prevention

Module 3 Crime Prevention from Human Rights Perspective

Module 4 LPSBs and Civil Society Collaboration in Crime Prevention

Module 5\_Crime prevention and citizen-focused policing Policing

Module 6\_Best Practices in Crime Prevention

Module 7\_Capacity Building for Civil Society Oversight in Crime Prevention

D.1.2 Training Report (March 18-19, 2021)

D.1.2 Trainings Report (April 01-02, 2021)

D.1.2 Trainings Report (June 03-04, 2021)

D.1.2 Trainings Report (June 10-11, 2021)

D.1.2 Trainings Report (March 25-26, 2021)

## D.1.2 Trainings Report for 11-12 March 2021

### **Other documents**

UNDP Turkey CPD 2016-2020

UNDP Turkey CPD 2021-2025

Civilian Oversight III Result Based Reporting (dated: 26 January 2021)

Gender Mainstreaming in Practice- a toolkit

UNDCS 2016-2020

UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2021

UNDP Social and Environmental Standards

## **Annex 7. Final Evaluation Consultant**

**Mr Tomislav Novovic**, is one of the leading evaluation experts, with more than 20 years of professional experience in the management of international development assistance, including evaluation of large-scale projects and programmes. Tomislav has carried out eight UNDAF evaluations in different countries, including UNDAF 2015-2019 final evaluation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and UNDAF 2016-2020 final evaluation in Montenegro.

Mr. NOVOVIC is highly skilled and competent in the area of good governance, local governance, justice sector reform and public administration and civil service. During long carrier he gained substantive experience in public policy planning, including designing monitoring systems and evaluating progress and achievements in the areas of regional development and public management system reform. He is highly competent in providing high-level advisory support to the national authorities. Particularly successful were his assignments on institutional capacity building the Ministry of Economy of the Government of Montenegro and local authorities to prepare and implement regional development strategy (2011-2014). He was also working on the institutional capacity development of the regional development agencies in Serbia (2011-2015) through the Regional Socio-Economic Development project (RSEDP-II) etc

Throughout his career, Tomislav has gained valuable experience in leading teams for complex evaluations. This experience included mid-term, ex-ante, ex-posts, and impact evaluations of more than forty projects, programs, and country programs. His experience included the implementation of a robust gender-sensitive approach. Tomislav is PhD student at the Metropolitan University and holds master's degrees in management and development economy.