NAME OF THE EVALUATION INTERVENTION:

IDENTIFICATION AND REMEDIATION OF CONTAMINATED SITES WITH PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPS)

TIME FRAME OF THE EVALUATION: DECEMBER 2023-APRIL 2024

DATE OF THE REPORT: 11 MARCH 2024

COUNTRY OF THE EVALUATION INTERVENTION: TÜRKIYE

NAME OF EVALUATOR: MARIA ONESTINI

NAME OF THE ORGANIZATION COMMISSIONING THE EVALUATION: UNDP

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The evaluation consultant would like to acknowledge and thank all who kindly shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews, dialogues and consultations that took place as part of this process.

MARCH 11 2024

PROJECT AND EVALUATION INFORMATION DETAILS

Project information			
Project/outcome title	IDENTIFICATION AND REMEDIATION OF CONTAMINATED SITES WITH PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPS)		
	UNSDCF 2021-2025 Outcome:		
	Priority Area 3: Climate Change, Sustainable Environment and Liveable Cities (which includes specific sections of national development priorities relevant to the Project within this Area, such as: 2.2.1.2.1. Chemical Industry, 2.2.2.1. Agriculture, 2.2.3.6. Energy, 2.2.3.7. Mining, 2.3.3. Health, 2.4. Liveable Cities, and Sustainable Environment)		
	CPD Output: National Priority or Goal: 11th UNDP Axis 4. Liveable Cities and Sustainable Environment, Sustainable Development Goals 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; Cooperation Framework Outcome Involving UNDP #3.1: By 2025, all relevant actors take measures to accelerate climate action, to promote responsible production and consumption, to improve the management of risks and threats to people, and to ensure sustainable management of the environment and natural resources in urban and ecosystem hinterlands; Related Strategic Plan Outcome: Outcome 2 – Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development; Output 3.4 Chemicals and waste prevented, managed and disposed of in an		
Country	Türkiye		
Date Project document signed	October 2019		
	Start	Planned End Date ¹	
Project Dates	October 2019	April 2024	
Total Committed Budget	EUR 2,030,000		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	971,975 Euros as of 8/10/2023		
Funding Sources	European Commission/UNDP/Gover	nment of Türkiye	
Implementing Parties	Ministry of Environment, Urbanization	on and Climate Change and UNDP	
Evaluation Information			
Evaluation type	Project		
Type of evaluation	Final Evaluation		
	Start	End	
Period under evaluation	November 2019	April 2024	
Evaluator	Maria ONESTINI		
Evaluator e-mail address	Onestinimaria59@gmail.com		
Fuchantian Datas	Start Completion		
Evaluation Dates	December 2023	March 2024	

¹ Including extensions granted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS, INCLUDING FIGURES AND ANNEXES

CONTENTS

Project and evaluation information details 2
Table of contents, including figures and annexes 3
List of acronyms and abbreviations 5
Executive Summary
Introduction, Evaluation Scope and Objectives11
Evaluation approach and methodology13
Description of the intervention16
Data Anaysis and Findings
Design
Relevance
Effectiveness
Efficiency
Cross-cutting issues
Sustainability45
Conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations
Conclusions 49
Lessons learned
Recommendations
Report annexes

	Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference	57
	Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix	86
	Annex 3: Training Presentations	95
	Annex 4: Data Collection Instruments	97
	Annex 5: List of individuals interviewed or consulted	103
	Annex 6: List of target groups for participation considered from design onward	106
	Annex 7: Achievement Of Activities For Expected Result 1 And For Expected Result 2	2 Of
March	2023	107
	Annex 8: TE Audit Trail	111
	Annex 9: List of supporting documents reviewed	112
	Annex 9: Project results framework	116
	Annex 10: Code of conduct signed by evaluator	120

Figure 1:	Planned main activities concrete expected outputs by component at design	19
Figure 2:	Logical Framework in first planning document	21
Figure 3:	Project Budget and expenditure as of October 2023 in Euros	41

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.

СО	UNDP Türkiye Country Office	
CPD	UNDP Country Program Document	
EC	European Commission	
ESOP	Sector Operational Programme: Environment and Climate Action	
EU	European Union	
EUD	Delegation of the European Union to Türkiye	
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance	
KM	Knowledge Management	
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation	
	Multi-Annual Action Programme for Türkiye on Environment and	
IVIAAP	Climate Action	
MoEU	Ministry of Environment and Urbanization	
MoEUCC	Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change	
NGO	Non-governmental organization	
NIP	National Implementation Plan	
PCU	Project Coordination Unit	
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants	
PRAG	Practical Guide to Contract Procedures for EU External Actions	
PSC	Project Steering Committee	
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals	
STE	Short Term Expert	
ТА	Technical Assistance	
TAT	Technical Assistance Team	
UN	United Nations	
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme	
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1 The Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Project in Türkiye has been a national – level intervention in the country that intended to focus on the management of contaminated sites through enhancing national implementation capacity of the European Union's POPs Regulation and the Soil Contamination Strategy. The Project aimed to protect the environment and improve the quality of life by reducing the adverse effects of POPs and other hazardous substances. The Project has been co – financed by the European Union and the Republic of Türkiye, as well as UNDP. It has been implemented by the UNDP Türkiye Country Office (CO) with the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC).
- 2 The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an impartial review of the advance of the implemented activities, as well as if these have had effects aligned with planned objective and results. The objective of this assessment has been to examine the overall performance of the Project, if its inputs and activities led to expected outputs and outcomes, as well as if and how the delivered outputs contributed to improved environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances.
- 3 The primary evaluation audience are the key actors involved in project planning and execution. These were: the different units of the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC) involved in planning and implementation of this Project, UNDP (both at the corporate level and the UNDP Türkiye Country Office), as well as the European Union (in general and, also, with a specific focus on the Delegation of the European Union to Türkiye).
- 4 The evaluation approach participatory and consultative ensuring close engagement with key stakeholders and partners. This assessment did, as an approach and as methodological basis, use a variety of multiple information and data sources (primary, secondary, qualitative, quantitative, etc.) extracted from document analysis and desk reviews, as well as through online interviews, validated and triangulated. Data sources were the bases of evidence, the main data sources were documents (such as project planning documents, monitoring reports, financial reporting, auditing reports) and stakeholders (such as donor, Ministry, UNDP, members of provincial governments, business associations, private companies).
- 5 The problems and issues the Project sought to address are various. Türkiye has been a signatory of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants since 2001 and has been a dynamic international actor in dealing with these contaminants in the last years to meet with the aims of this accord. That is: *"to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants."* The country has assumed the inventory of POPs and a National Implementation Plan has been reviewed. Türkiye has also dealt with updating actions in accordance with the new POPs added in the annexes of the Convention later after ratification. Türkiye's MOEUCC has published POPs regulation to better ensure the

management of POPs stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites in 2018. This Regulation covers the life-cycle management of POPs such as banning or severely restricting production/use/import/export of these chemicals, environmentally sound management of POPs stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites

- 6 The Project's design included several different mechanisms for its execution. To achieve its aims and objectives, the Project was at design and inception principally organized into three components as follows: *Component 1*. Technical and institutional capacity strengthening for management of POPs contaminated sites; *Component 2*. Identification and classification of contaminated sites with POPs and Pilot remediation activities, and *Component 3*. Increasing institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites.
- 7 These components were expressed as expected results. The Project is now in its concluding phase (it will end four months after this evaluation exercise started, i.e. it will be finished in April 2024). As will be seen and as further explained in this report, there have been significant changes in plans, strategies and logical frameworks. Due to several external issues (such as the COVID 19 pandemic and due to the earthquake of February 2023 that severely impacted upon the country) there have been substantial changes. This project had to face several externalities and internal issues to be completed as best possible. Yet, there has been a perseverance, adaptive management, and working deeply with the technical assistance components so that the Project could show outputs and –above all—promises for net benefits to continue accruing once this intervention has ended.
- 8 Project design was affected by a deficiency regarding the sites the project would identify and remediate (that is perhaps one of the very roots of the intervention since these pilots were to be the demonstrative factors). Other design matters have to do with issues of the implementation architecture as well as unclear assumptions particularly regarding sites and public-private spheres of action regarding POPs
- 9 The technical assistance areas of work have been fruitful. In the first place in accompanying Türkiye in the search of updating, upgrading, and modernising legislation to deal with POPs within an integrated manner that not only undertakes identification of the problem, but promote remediation and push for cohesive management of chemicals. This to be done to keep with regional and international commitments the country is party to, as well as attending to current and foreseen future country needs. Regrettably, the pilot remediation sites component (also called works component) did not come to realisation. Yet the ground work and general framework for eventual remediation has been laid which could hopefully be used in the future, adapting of course to redirected circumstances.
- 10 Furthermore, several upgrading and updating tasks have been successfully undertaken. Such as those that deal with software. Additionally, technical assistance in specific issue was provided, responding to the country's needs and a robust number of institutions and individuals have been capacitated in several issues related to POPs.

- 11 A robust strength and best practice of the Project has been the work of the management unit, reinforced by the contribution of significant technical expertise in the field. Management, in as much as possible within the realm of what it could control, generated and applied a robust set of adaptive management measures when the circumstances called for this.
- 12 There are strong expectations by most parties that the draft legislation (within the context of the technical assistance provided by the Project in this area) will be approved before long. Although no technical changes are foreseen in the text, it is expected that there will be some policy debates. This is, overall, a foreseen catalyst for future work for the institutions involved in this project in their diverse capacities.
- 13 Regarding effectiveness, therefore, the result has been varied. The project achieved several objectives and targets as put forth in the results framework (original and revised versions) and other planning documents. The capacity building and technical assistance activities were at a product level fully achieved while the works components were not. Several contributing factors aided in this, while a few hindering factors stalled attainments. In conclusion, although the outputs that were achieved were of good quality, other outputs were not delivered on a timely basis. Ownership, adaptive management, and technical quality of outputs were some of the main contributing factors to effectiveness (as well as efficiency).
- 14 With respect to efficiency, it can be stated that outputs for technical assistance were delivered in a timely manner (barring issues such as externalities) and with high quality. The works component was not delivered. Therefore, the technical assistance components have ensured value for money if analysed vis-à-vis efficiency criteria while the works component does not stand-up to a value for money analysis. Ownership by implementing partners impacted positively on the efficiency of the Project. The synergies between other UNDP initiatives were identified early on in project planning stages, and they have contributed to efficiency in the sense that there has been harmonisation while duplication of efforts has been avoided. Project management has worked well for the achievement of results, both in the sense of seeking –and obtaining—high quality in the technical assistance component and in seeking that the works component would be implemented –although it did not due to several reasons indicated in the text of this report. The latter, i.e. not being able to implement works component, also meant that time and resources were used for this while delaying other expected outputs, such as those related to legislation support.
- 15 Sustainability (or the prospect of sustainability) is a delicate aspect and criteria to assess at this point vis-à-vis the achievements made thus far. Although several of the conditions are there for sustainability, others are not or are contingent upon processes beyond the Project itself. For instance, regarding the proposed legislation that the Project has worked very intensively upon throughout the intervention, it is expected to be approved in the intermediate future with debate ensuing in several aspects.
- 16 The catalytic roles that the Project may have had are closely related to potential sustainability. If policy change occurs (not only theoretically but also in the implementation of new and upgraded policy), then this is a catalytic role that can be attributed to partners

and to the Project in the immediate future. Since the works component did not take place, there is no direct link to uptake of demonstrated technologies, practices nor management approaches in the future that could be attributed to the Project. Nevertheless, the preparatory analysis that took place when seeking sites could –if this knowledge is used—have a catalytic role in the future. The same is accurate regarding capacities developed. That is, in all the above, when implementation (or if) fully takes place of some of these variables (policy, technological upgrade, capacity uptake) could ensure achievements attained thus far or in the immediate future to contribute to the identification and remediation of contaminated sites with persistent organic pollutants in Türkiye.

- 17 The Project has left several lessons learned (not only for future programming but also for its follow up and its sustainability). For instance, if project design is not thorough in all its aspects, there are negative impacts upon implementation, effectiveness, and efficiency. Project design needs to be thorough in the sense that all components need to be set upon this stage. Operative design (and successful implementation) is directly linked to the analyses and preparation set at design. Surveying at design potentially benefits a project not only by implementing agencies, but also with the cooperation of the public and private sectors to avoid lengthy reforms, failings and cancellations. For instance, contaminated sites to be worked with need to be determined at the at the beginning of project design and detailed issues of articulation between different partners should also be set. Assumptions need to be candidly explored for these to be acknowledge from the very beginning of planning and corrective measures implemented.
- 18 Another lesson learned is that streamlined implementation architecture is a necessity, so that there are not multiple actors implementing and thus avoiding conflicts, discrepancies, and multi-layered rules. While keeping with donors' design indications, national partners' requisites, and UNDP implementation modalities might prove challenging, these must be acknowledged early on to have successful implementation and avoid bureaucratic delays that can affect project performance. Streamlining also implies that all partners know what working within these modalities imply and attempt to avoid delays and misunderstandings and keeping complex architecture to a minimum.
- Several stakeholders and documents point out that procurement and tendering issues, if not addressed properly and streamlined, can have a series of interlinked effects. Lastly, as a lesson, the lack of fluid information exchange between and among the private and the public sector hinders transparency and proper application of a project, especially when the connection between the two is a cornerstone of an issue. With the understanding, therefore, that public private partnerships are key for integrated hazardous waste management projects (including POPs, evidently) that deal with industry and private companies.
- 20 Following are summarised recommendations divided into three different types: for conclusion of the Project, for follow up, and for future programming. These are based both on supporting and learning from positive aspects of this project, or in attempting to correct course in further programming and future projects.

- 21 Recommendations for the conclusion of the Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with POPS) Project, focused on UNDP include: (a) Rapidly develop and disseminate broadly to all actors involved in the project the remaining products that are to be generated (such as knowledge management products, exit strategy, and outstanding technical papers); and (b) Generate events (seminars perhaps) and mechanisms/products (KM) in the remaining period of implementation to aid in anchoring capacity built and for this not to be lost due to staff rotation in different public sector institutions.
- 22 Recommendations for follow-up to the Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) Project, focused on UNDP and the Government of Türkiye include: (a) Generate dialogues between the Government of Türkiye and UNDP to promote the debate of, adoption and implementation of legislation regarding POPs that has been promoted by the Project, aiding parliamentary negotiations, consultations with different private and public stakeholders, and identify existing gaps; and, (b) Commence to contemplate and plan follow-up, replication and upscaling of the achievements while being forward looking in the changing POPs management field.
- 23 With regards to recommendations for future programming, they are: (a) Design should be more specific in all project aspects and streamlined in other aspects such implementation architecture reducing the number of implementing partners to a workable minimum, and should be clear in streamlining rules and procedures specificity when coordinating among different institutions and their different guidelines; (b) It should carefully explore sequencing (i.e. if one component is contingent upon another) and plan accordingly; (c) It should also include elements of flexibility, attending that varying circumstances occur in the field, and not being inordinately strict; (d) Results frameworks should place an emphasis on results and outcomes, not only on activities and products with a robust indicator set a results framework and with outcome indicators that can allow for measuring performance and facilitate implementation and planning based on progress towards results/outcomes/effects, as well as set at set at design, adjusted yes --if necessary-- but and not changed repetitively nor retrofitted within the lifespan of a project; (e) A project's exit strategy with all of its relevant components should be developed early on in project implementation/inception; (f) Develop a greater number of KM products to solidify technical assistance processes, (g) Complex projects should have a mid-point review or assessment; and (h) Projects with intricate components and multiple partners (even multiple partners within the same institution) need to have internal communication mechanisms to integrate different relevant areas of government within a particular project.

INTRODUCTION, EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

- 24 The Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) Project is in its final stages of implementation and it is expected to end in April 2024. Therefore, a final evaluation is to take place within this time framework. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an impartial review of the advance of the implemented activities, as well as if these have had effects aligned with planned objective and results. Furthermore, this is a proactive assessment and –due to this— lessons learned, and forward-looking recommendations are generated based on the evaluation findings.
- 25 That is, the aim of this assessment has been to examine the overall performance of the Project, if its inputs and activities led to expected outputs and outcomes, as well as if and how the delivered outputs contributed to improved environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances. Especially regarding contaminated sites through enhancing the implementing capacity of EU POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination Strategy.
- 26 The evaluation's time scope (i.e. the period of the Project being assessed) runs from Project start – up to the date until the end of the Project (April 2024). Attainments' analysis is based on a comparison between actual accomplishments vis-à-vis expected achievements as expressed in project planning document and results framework, considering reforms and adaptive management. The scope of the assessment includes all components of this intervention.
- 27 There are, also, several specific purposes for this evaluation, such as:
 - To measure to what extent the Project has contributed to solving the needs identified in the design phase.
 - To measure the Project's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on expected results (outputs) and specific objectives (outcomes), against what was originally planned or officially revised.
 - To measure the Project's contribution to the objectives set in the UNDP Country Program Document (CPD) for 2021-2025, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) for 2021-2025, EC's Progress Report for Türkiye's accession period, Environment Chapter, 11th National Development Plan of Türkiye, SDGs as well as to 2023 Industry and Technology Strategy, national level policy documents such as Contaminated Soil Regulation, POPs By-Law, Mercury Draft By-Law and National Implementation Plans (NIP) for Stockholm Convention, technical guidelines for management of POPs.
 - To assess both negative and positive factors that have facilitated or hampered progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, externalities, weakness in design, management, and resource allocation.

- To assess the extent to which the application of the rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming are integrated within design, planning, and implementation of the project
- 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 1 level (replicability) and to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components and for further programming.
- 28 The final evaluation follows a set of guidance and manuals that set standard practice for these sorts of processes.² This evaluation addressed the questions it did given that they operationalised evaluative criteria to assess performance. The criteria along the lines of which this assessment took place were: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues.
- 29 For this evaluation criteria were defined as:
 - Relevance. The extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, national strategies, and relevant legislation.
 - Effectiveness. To what extent the Project objectives have been achieved or how likely they are to be achieved.
 - Efficiency. To what extent the resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and to what degree have the results been delivered with the least costly way possible.
 - Sustainability. To what extent the project's positive actions are likely to continue after the end of the intervention.
 - Cross-cutting issues. The extent to which design, implementation and monitoring have taken gender equality and the empowerment of women and the leaving no one behind agenda into consideration.
- 30 The rationale for analysing performance vis-à-vis the above-mentioned criteria was to generate findings based upon evidence and to generate lessons learned and recommendations based on these findings. Key questions for each of these criteria have been grouped in the evaluation matrix (see Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix). This matrix includes criteria, key questions, specific sub-questions, data sources, data collection methods / tools, indicators and methods of analysis as shown, interlinking the questions with the data and the methodology to be used in this process. Therefore, the matrix not only displays the questions

² Such as, *inter alia*, UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (by Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP (Revised Edition of June 2021); UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2021 Updates and Revisions; as well as gender and rights-based guidance.

based on criteria but also the support of methodologies used for data gathering (as seen below).

- 31 The primary audience of the evaluation are the key actors involved in planning and execution. These were: the different units of the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC) involved in planning and implementation of this Project, UNDP (both at the corporate level and the UNDP Türkiye Country Office), as well as the European Union (in general and, also, with a specific focus on the Delegation of the European Union to Türkiye).
- 32 The overall intention of this evaluation process, including the above-mentioned interested parties, has been to assess design, implementation, and perspectives of sustainability to have this learning process provide inputs for future programming and for improved project and programmes' development.
- 33 The structure and the contents of this report including the present section as an introduction to the assessment process is followed by a methodological section where evaluation approach, data gathering and data analysis methods are briefly displayed. After these two sections, the Project per se is presented with an explanation as to its aims, objectives, expected results, and similar mechanisms. Further along, findings are presented based on analysis of the data gathered.
- 34 To satisfy supplementary the information needs of the report's intended users the last sections of the present report include sections on conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations based on data analysis and on analytical findings. The annexes section are intended to provide supporting documentation of the assessment process.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

- 35 The approach for the evaluation was participatory and consultative ensuring close engagement with key stakeholders and partners. This assessment did, as an approach and as methodological basis, use a variety of multiple information and data sources (primary, secondary, qualitative, quantitative, etc.) extracted from document analysis and desk reviews, as well as through online interviews.
- 36 The participatory and consultative approach was not only in the data gathering aspects but also through the presentations and validation processes. For instance, in addition to consultations to stakeholders throughout the data gathering periods, the ensuing reports were put forth for comments to key stakeholders to consult in all stages of evaluation report production.
- 37 The consultative approach necessitated the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data to validate and triangulate information. Methodologies implemented through specific tools fed into each other and were mutually supportive.
- 38 Through a combination of methods, feedback was sought for the various tools as well as validation between different levels and types of data collection. These aggregation methods

triangulated information, and thus ensured the validity of the data that give rise to the evaluation process. This has been the rationale of the selection of different sources.

- 39 Data sources were the bases of evidence. These are also presented in the matrix in annexes. The main data sources were mainly documents (such as project planning documents, monitoring reports, financial reporting, auditing reports) and stakeholders (such as donor, Ministry, UNDP, members of provincial governments, business associations, private companies). The rationale for their selection was to harness information (points of view, experience with the Project, etc.) from different sorts of stakeholders to triangulate and validate these sorts of information.
- 40 Within the constraints of funds and time available for the assessment (which was also compounded to the lack of mission in situ due to the evaluator's time and travel restraints) evaluability was nevertheless realised and methods employed yielded the necessary data for further analysis, generated findings based on data sources and generated forward-looking recommendations.
- 41 Although not a focus given the nature of the Project, aspects such as gender and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups was sought and attained. The analysis, as seen further along, included gender considerations as much as possible given the nature of the intervention (not only in the data gathering stages but also in the analysis)
- 42 Gender considerations were included as an integral part of the criteria used for evaluation (within cross-cutting issues). The evaluation process was implemented using genderresponsive and cross -cutting issues methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, a rights-based approach, including health and developmental rights, as well as looking into exploring how other cross-cutting issues and SDGs were incorporated, as relevant to do so.

As indicated, several data-collection procedures and instruments were used. Mainly: document analysis, presentations and dialogues, and online interviews/focus group discussions. The latter were guided by interview protocols catered to the type of stakeholder with whom the evaluation engaged with and presented in annexes (see Annex 3: Training Presentations

Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

The training presentations in Turkish language which were publicized at the project web site are as follows:

Sectoral Training: Toprak Kirliliğinin Kontrolü ve Noktasal Kaynaklı Kirlenmiş Sahalara Dair Yönetmelik Kapsamında Sektörel Eğitim – 24-25 Ekim 2023 – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Risk Assessment and Alternative Remediation Technologies Training: 23-27 Ocak 2023 – Risk Değerlendirmesi ve Alternatif Temizleme Teknolojileri Eğitimi – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Consultation Meeting on Technical Guidelines: Teknik Kılavuz İstişare Toplantısı – 6 Eylül 2022 – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Remediation Technologies, Remediation and Monitoring Training: Temizleme Teknolojileri, Islah ve İzleme Eğitimi Sunumları – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Training: Sağlık ve Ekolojik Risk Değerlendirilmesi Eğitimi Sunumları – 11-12-13 Ekim 2021 – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Detection of Soil Pollution Load and Assessment Training: 8-10-12 Şubat 2021 tarihlerinde "Toprak Kirlilik Yükünün Tespiti ve Değerlendirilmesi Eğitimi" çevrim içi olarak yapılıyor – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

The presentations for the Legislation Training and Workshop Legislation Revisions were not publicized online or delivered to the participants to prevent the misunderstanding during information exchange, since the revision is ongoing.

The video on soil sampling in Hopa and laboratories who carry out soil sampling analysis: https://we.tl/t-eL8x1LAA4V

- 43 Annex 4: Data Collection Instruments).
- 44 As stated above, the quantitative and qualitative nature of the data gathered through these instruments were deemed appropriate not only for analysis but also for reliability and validity through diverse sources. It was deemed that through these diverse tools data gathered was reliable and valid.
- 45 The documents consulted were all the documents produced by the Project which were shared with the evaluator as well as other documents/sources such as newsletters, webpages, etc., which were retrieved by different searches. Therefore, documentation sample is ample and nearly comprising the totality of documentation produced for and by the Project.
- 46 The interview and dialogue sampling used a sample selection criterion of involving several representatives from all the types of key institutions involved in design/implementation of the Project, plus a purposive sampling of actors generally defined as "end users" of the project activities. These were representatives from provincial governments, representatives from business associations, and from private companies participating in project processes. A total of 27 persons were engaged in these dialogues, interviews and focus groups discussions (see Annex 5: List of individuals interviewed or consulted). This is deemed as a representative sample and a suitable level of involvement of diverse types of stakeholders given the size of the Project and actors involved.
- 47 Ethical considerations were respected, especially those that guarantee anonymity and confidentiality of responses. Interviews as well as focus group discussions were maintained between the stakeholder(s) and the evaluator only (without participation of other institutions nor of project staff). Ethical considerations followed UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators.³
- 48 The use of both qualitative and quantitative data supported the validation and triangulation of information. Quantitative analysis was carried by using logical framework and related indicators as benchmarks to tally project progress in implementation. Qualitative analysis was mainly applied to the information harnessed by using thematic analysis of interviews' responses. All these analytical tools were triangulated and validated internally and through validation via stakeholders' reviews.
- 49 Evaluability and potential limitations of the methodology were considered. Although these sorts of assessments normally face limitations, such as time, resources, data availability, formal and substantive components were present to guarantee evaluability and to support the proposed methodology. Therefore, although some limitations (time, resources, travel, etc.) have been identified, these did not affect this assessment given that evaluation approach, methodological means, and analytical approach side-stepped and/or avoided any such limitations.

³ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation,' June 2008. Available at <u>http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines</u>.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION

- 50 The Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Project in Türkiye has been a national – level intervention in the country that intended to focus on the management of contaminated sites through enhancing national implementation capacity of the European Union's POPs Regulation and the Soil Contamination Strategy. The Project aimed to protect the environment and improve the quality of life by reducing the adverse effects of POPs and other hazardous substances. The Project has been co – financed by the European Union and the Republic of Türkiye, as well as UNDP. It has been implemented by the UNDP Türkiye Country Office (CO) with the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC).
- 51 The problems and issues the Project sought to address are various. Türkiye has been a signatory of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants since 2001 and has been a dynamic international actor in dealing with these contaminants in the last years to meet with the aims of this accord. That is: "to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants."⁴ For this, and among other actions, the country has assumed the inventory of POPs and a National Implementation Plan has been reviewed. The country has also dealt with updating actions in accordance with the new POPs added in the annexes of Convention later after ratification. Türkiye's MOEUCC has published POPs regulation to better ensure the management of POPs stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites in 2018. This Regulation covers the life-cycle management of POPs such as banning or severely restricting production/use/import/export of these chemicals, environmentally sound management of POPs stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites.
- 52 A priority for Türkiye, aligned with the implementation of the Convention and the POPs Regulation, deals with contaminated sites' management given that country is in a fastgrowing period and has intensive usage of POP chemicals in various industrial sectors which may increase the uncontrolled contamination of soil with these chemicals. As well as, evidently, the need to deal with the negative effects on health that these may have.
- 53 Further to a global aspect, as framed by the Stockholm Convention, in a more regional level Türkiye is implementing legislation of EU for the Stockholm Convention and not only implement policies aligned with the obligations of the Stockholm Convention (SC) but also with related EU POPs Regulation (EC) No 850/2004.
- 54 The overarching explicit objective of this project has been to improve environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites through enhancing the implementing capacity of the EU POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination Strategy.

⁴ Stockholm Convention.

- 55 The final beneficiaries of this intervention, as has been thoroughly indicated in planning documents, are those who will benefit from the action in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large. Final beneficiaries of the Project have been defined as local stakeholders, MoEUCC-certified companies and vulnerable communities and citizens. It was intended that these institutions, and individuals, would benefit from the Project given that the intervention intended --as an intermediate stance-- to provide technical assistance and capacity building to better implement the POPs By-law and By-law of Point Source Soil Contamination that are the baseline legislation for management of contaminated sites with POPs. This was to be achieved through technical assistance and works to reach the goal protecting human health and the environment from POPs negative effects.
- 56 The technical assistance portions of this project have been executed by UNDP through the signature of the Contribution Agreement between UNDP and MoEUCC and is referred to as "Project" throughout the present Description of the Action. Accordingly, UNDP is responsible and accountable for implementation of this part only.
- 57 The Works Component is executed through MoEUCC. Accordingly, accountability and responsibility of the Part B, which involves tendering and contracting a works company, is bestowed with MoEUCC.
- 58 The Project's design included several different mechanisms for its execution. For first section of this report, the architecture as well as the planned contents of the project upon first design will be used. That is, this information based on the original signed project document of 2019 will be the basis for this first introduction to the Project. Within the body of this report changes made throughout implementation will be described further on in the appropriate sections as relevant. This is taking into consideration that several aspects (activities, results framework, etc.) recurrently changed throughout implementation.⁵
- 59 To achieve its aims and objectives the Project was principally organized into three components⁶ as follows, at the first stages of design and as indicated in the first project document:
 - Component 1. Technical and institutional capacity strengthening for management of POPs contaminated sites,
 - Component 2. Identification and classification of contaminated sites with POPs and Pilot remediation activities,
 - Component 3. Increasing institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites.

⁵ This will be dealt further on as relevant and revisited in the sections on adaptive management.

⁶ What are called *components* in some documents are called *results* in others, or even *parts*. In this section of the report the word components will be used and the matter will be further analysed further along in the report.

60 These components are expressed as expected results. In turn, these components are part of an expected output model operationalized by planned activities, work plan and implementation strategies. The following chart indicates what the expected activities in each of the components and sub-components were and how they were to be operationalised expected outputs.

FIGURE 1: PLANNED MAIN ACTIVITIES CONCRETE EXPECTED OUTPUTS BY COMPONENT AT DESIGN

COMPONENT 0 – INCEPTION

Main activities	Expected output
Establishment of Technical	Inception report
Assistance Team (TAT) and	Media package
office	Project website, project newsletters, business cards, banners, posters etc.

COMPONENT 1 - TECHNICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF POPS

CONTAMINATED SITES HAS BEEN STRENGTHENED

Main activities	Expected output	
Trainings for staff that will be working on POPs/contaminated sites management from different target groups	Training need assessment report Training module and reports	
LGA/Guidance documents/publications preparation and update	Legal gap analysis Recommendation for draft legislation A public video on general information on POPs contaminated sites Brochures on general information on POPs contaminated sites, registration and remediation information for contaminated sites, information on post-monitoring activities Revised guidelines (Technical Guidelines on Contaminated Sites Assessment, Remediation, Monitoring and Risk Assessment) A new guideline on POPs contaminated sites management Undated report forms of Appexes of Contaminated sites legislation	
 Study visits	Study visits reports	
Establishment of Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme	Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme	
Health Risk Assessment Software Programme	Health Risk Assessment Software Programme Envisaged delivery date: 40 months after the project's start date.	
Circularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites Management	A Report on Circularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites Management.	

COMPONENT 2 – CONTAMINATED SITES WITH POPS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AND CLASSIFIED

	Main activities	Expected output
	Update of CSIS Software	Updated CSIS Software Analysis Document Training Report Envisaged delivery date: 54 months after the project start date.
	Identification and Classification of POPs Contaminated Sites in Türkiye	POPs contaminated sites identification and classification report Workshop Report Seminar Report List of Contaminated Sites Updated CSIS with this data Envisaged delivery date: 45 months after the project's start date.
	Prioritization of POPs/Persistent Toxic Substances Contaminated Sites for Remediation	Prioritized list of POPs contaminated sites Workshop Report Envisaged delivery date: 30 months after the project's start date.
	Selection of Two Pilot Areas among the Prioritized Contaminated Sites in Activity 2.3	Pilot Site Selection Report Permission Correspondences
	Preparation of Operational Plan for 2 pilot sites	Technical specification and operational plan of two pilot sites
	Preparation of a Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pilot sites	On-site Technical Supervision and Monitoring Supervision and Monitoring Plan Supervision Reports-operational Post Remediation Plan Recommendations Report
_	Preparation of Technical Specification for 2 Pilot Sites for Pilot Application	Recommendations respecting Post Remediation Plan Technical Specifications
	Implementation of Supervision Support and Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites	Recommendations respecting Implementation of Supervision Support and Monitoring Pan for 2 Pilot Sites

61 In the first planning document there was a logical framework as seen in the figure below. This logical framework contained the intervention logic, what are defined as verifiable indicators of achievement, sources/means of verification and assumptions.

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Protect human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites through enhancing the implementation capacity of POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination By-law.	Contribution to the improved quality of life of citizens through protecting human health and environment from POPs.	European Commission's Regular Reports from 2019 to 2022 European Environment Agency's State of Environment Reports Statistical data on environment and climate change Progress in the implementation of Sector Operational Programme: Environment and Climate Action Progress in the implementation of National Action Plan for EU Accession Progress in the implementation of Multi-annual Action Programme for Turkey on Environment and Climate Action	Stable political climate and macro- economic situation Strong commitment and dedication of the stakeholders to participate and cooperate throughout project implementation Strong stakeholder coordination during project implementation Convergent views and decisions among stakeholders and relevant institutions Sufficient number of assigned personnel in charge of the project within relevant institutions Sufficient number of experienced and high qualified experts with satisfactory knowledge and perception of the Turkish context for each sector which will be dealt with
Specific	The purpose of the project is to enhance Turkey's capacity on implementation of EU POPs Regulation through supporting central and local	Strengthened Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites	European Commission's Regular Reports from 2017 to 2020 Statistical data on environment and climate change	Coherence between the training subjects/campaigns and the target group

FIGURE 2: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK IN FIRST PLANNING DOCUMENT

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	authorities on identification and remediation of contaminated sites with POPs.	Identified and classified contaminated sites with POPs Increased institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites	Monitoring Reports Project Progress Reports Project Final Report Project Evaluation Reports	
	Result 1. Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites has been strengthened	Approximately 490 staff were trained and certificated Study visits held to EU Countries were organized for information/experience exchange on contaminated sites remediation and soil pollution prevention	Study visit materials, evaluation report and participants list Training of trainees' programme materials, evaluation report and participants	National and local institutions are committed to contaminated sites management. Owners of pilot sites are willing to cooperate in the project activities. Other national and local stakeholders
	Result 2. Contaminated sites with POPs have been identified and classified	At least 10 number of POPs contaminated sites were identified, assessed and prioritized A Helpdesk for contaminated site remediation was established.	Training materials, evaluation report and participants list Number of certificates given to the participants	project activities and participating. Trained staff members (national and local) remain in their posts during the entire duration of the project.
Expected results	Result 3. Institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites have been increased	2 number of pilot applications were implemented	Project Inception Report Activity Evaluation Reports Project Progress Reports PSC Meeting Minutes Project Final Report Project Evaluation Reports	
	1. Technical and	Means	Cost	Assumptions
Activit	for Management of	Project Coordination Unit (PCU)	Covering the human resources,	Factors outside project

Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
POPsContaminatedSitesHasBeenStrengthened1.1. Trainings for staffthat will be working onPOPs/contaminatedsites management fromdifferent target groups1.2.LGA/Guidancedocuments/publicationspreparation and update1.3. Study visits1.4. Establishment ofHelpdeskNavigatorSoftware Programme2. Contaminated Siteswith Pops Have BeenIdentified and Classified2.1.Update of CSISSoftware2.2. Identification andclassification of POPscontaminated sites inTurkey2.3.Prioritization ofPOPs/PersistentToxicSubstancesContaminated Sites forRemediation2.4.Selection of TwoPilot Areas among thePrioritizedContaminated Sites inActivity 2.32.5.Preparation ofOperational Plan for 2pilot sites2.6.Preparation of aSupervisionandMonitoring Plan for 2pilot sites2.7.Preparation ofTechnical Specificationfor 2 Pilot Sites for PilotApplication	Technical Assistant Team (TAT) Short term experts (STEs) Stakeholder engagement activity (e.g. consultative meetings, bilateral meetings, workshops, study tours) costs Assessment, research, study costs Web-based platform and software development and maintenance costs Training costs Project office costs Knowledge material development, visibility and dissemination costs	costs for travels, local office and services - details are indicated in the Budget for the Action.	management's control that may impact on the output-outcome linkage.

Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
 2.8. Implementation of Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites 3. Works Component: Pilot Remediation Activities⁷ 			

- 62 The Project is now in its concluding phase (it will end four months after this evaluation exercise started, i.e. it will be finished in April 2024). As will be seen and as further explained in this report, there have been significant changes in plans, strategies and logical frameworks. Due to several external issues (such as the COVID 19 pandemic and due to the earthquake of February 2023 that severely impacted upon the country) there have been substantial changes.
- 63 An extension was granted for 18 months to accommodate for these externalities and their corresponding delays. Due to the pandemic, the modality of implementation of most activities went from in-person to online and –due to the earthquake—implementation was hindered not only in the most affected region of the country, but also the national level due to the magnitude of the event, was hindered. The main change, however, has been the cancellation of the works component (Activity 2.8. Implementation of Supervision Support and Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites). While some new activities aimed at technical strengthening were added to compensate this issue.
- 64 The results framework was changed over time in several instances. However, the objective of the Project did not change within the result framework's alterations, nor the explicit intervention logic. The results framework was amended to ensure scope modifications and (as reflected in this framework) to track progress and ensure that indicators would improve in their specificity, measurability, achievability and relevance, as well as assure that they be time-bound.
- 65 The intervention linked to several specific and broad national and corporate priorities. On a broader scale, there was a specific aim to contribute to the general objective of the EU IPA Environment and Climate Change Sector Operational Programme (IPA-2) (ESOP) –i.e. environmental protection through increasing the capacity of the MoEUCC for protection of soils from POPs and other dangerous pollutants--. The project is also fitting the respective output of the ESOP which is the "Legislative reform and capacity building advanced in the

⁷ Cancelled with Addendum 2.

areas of climate action, air quality, civil protection, marine environment, horizontal legislation and nature protection" since it aimed to contribute capacity building for implementation of POPs Regulation and Point Source Contaminated Sites Legislation. Multi-annual Action Programme for Environment and Climate Action 2014-2016 and National Action Plan for EU Accession Phase-II (June 2015-June 2019).

- 66 The Project was, moreover, also aligned to UNDP Country Program Document (CPD) for 2021-2025, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) for 2021-2025; the Environment Chapter of 11th National Development Plan of Türkiye, as well as to 2023 Industry and Technology Strategy; as well as national level policies such as the Contaminated Soil Regulation, POPs By-Law, Mercury Draft By-Law and National Implementation Plans (NIP) for Stockholm Convention, and the technical guidelines for management of POPs.
- 67 The three main key partners in this intervention were (as planned):
 - the Government of Türkiye (mainly through Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change, with the General Directorate of Environmental Management, Chemicals Management Department as the direct recipient and with the Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change General Directorate of European Union and Foreign Relations as the contracting authority);
 - EU as the donor, and
 - UNDP as implementing partner.
- 68 Nonetheless, there were a few other stakeholders identified as partners, end-users, and/or target groups. See Annex 6: List of target groups for participation considered from design onward, for a listing of these partners, specific end -users and target groups as set at design. The Project Document identifies specifically the typology of final beneficiaries of the project as the local stakeholders, MoEUCC-certified companies and vulnerable communities and citizens.
- 69 The total budget of the Project was of Euros 2,030,000 with a financing request of EUR 1,700,000 to EUD; 300,000 Euros of financing from the Government of Türkiye; as well as UNDP co-financing of EUR 30,000.
- 70 It should be noted that the Project built upon other key initiatives and projects, and worked with other on-going projects. In the first place, as stated in the initial planning documents for this intervention, the country implemented the EU Project on Implementation of POPs Regulation in Türkiye for the application of legislation of EU for the Stockholm Convention. And, when that intervention was being executed, for the preparation of the POPs By-law for publication. The prepared By-law was adopted in 2018. The EU Project supported the country in implementation of essential legislation on POPs that generated needed context measures and limits for POPs management. However, that legislation did not contain specific provisions for implementation of the POPs Regulation such as management of POPs stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites.

- 71 The other major intervention linked with the project being evaluated here (i.e. *Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants* (*POPS*) *Project*) was the GEF – funded UNDP-implemented intervention called *POPS Legacy Elimination and POPS Release Reduction*. As is well explained in the design documents, the IPA POPs Project was not only a sort of continuation of the GEF-funded project but also it clearly stated upon design that these two interventions were to be the complementary.
- 72 As stated in planning documents for the IPA project being evaluated here "The proposed project will have such potential for increasing an added value between different donors such as GEF since there is an ongoing GEF project entitled POPs Stockpiles Elimination and POPs Releases Reduction Project (GEF POPs Project) in which there is a small component for contaminated site management."
- 73 This analysis, as well as thorough examination contained in the planning documents, signals planned coherence and connectivity between these two interventions and seeking synergies by partners. That is, there is internal coherence given the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the institutions that implemented both interventions (i.e. MoEUCC and UNDP) as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institutions/government adheres. This also signals complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination given the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.⁸

⁸ OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use.

DATA ANAYSIS AND FINDINGS

DESIGN

- As indicated before, the Project's design included several different mechanisms for its execution. To achieve its aims and objectives the Project was principally organized into three components –again at design--⁹ as follows, and as indicated in the first version of the project document:
 - Component 1. Technical and institutional capacity strengthening for management of POPs contaminated sites,
 - Component 2. Identification and classification of contaminated sites with POPs and Pilot remediation activities,
 - Component 3. Increasing institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites.
- 75 These components are expressed as expected results. In turn, these components were part of an expected output model operationalized by planned activities, work plan and implementation strategies, and what the expected activities in each of the components and sub-components were and how they were to be operationalised in expected outputs.
- 76 In general, the framework at design only contains indicators for the three expected results (what were called components in other sections of the first design document). Not for subcomponent nor sub results. These components or results had the indicators shown below in italics:
 - Result 1. Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites has been strengthened: Approximately 490 staff were trained and certificated
 - Result 2. Contaminated sites with POPs have been identified and classified: At least 10 number of POPs contaminated sites were identified, assessed and prioritized. Helpdesk for contaminated site remediation was established
 - Result 3. Institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites have been increased Two pilot applications were implemented ¹⁰
- 77 Yet, these can be interpreted as output indicators and not outcome indicators. This, to some degree, is not totally attuned to results-based management concepts whereby a project needs to contain and pivot around.

⁹ What are called *components* in some documents are called *results* in others, or even *parts* in other documentation.

¹⁰ Although indicators were more concrete for this section (i.e. called the works component) since this area of the Project was cancelled, this report does not dwell on the indicator sector for a result which was not achieved.

- 78 As project implementation progressed, the indicator set was altered to include at least qualitative indicators of achievement, yet this was done after two years of implementation.¹¹
- 79 Also, some results were not achieved (i.e. works component) in part due to externalities which will be explained later, but in part due to design issues such as not identifying the sites a priori upon design, nor having an assumption of working with the private sector fully fledged out upon planning. Sequencing hindered application also since some components depended on the application of another component first and thus affecting the whole of implementation processes.
- 80 Other overall design weaknesses have been identified by several key stakeholders. For instance, it was deemed that some processes should have been more participatory (consultations with non state actors for instance, increased sharing of information), more specific (for instance, in costing determination and in determining sites to work at design and not after project start), and with a more streamlined implementation architecture.
- 81 Regarding the latter, it was indicated that having in one intervention under different implementing partners (i.e. Ministry and UNDP) has caused difficulties and delays. Furthermore, design did not fully consider the relationship between the private sector – public sector, particularly due to rules of the Turkish State which assert that governmental funds cannot be used for the private sector. That is, when an intervention is funded by government (such as it is in this case) it cannot benefit a particular company or private sector. Therefore, working in privately owned sites is not allowed as a rule.
- 82 The design went through several changes throughout implementation. As indicated above and as seen in further sections, some of these changes were due to unforeseen events (COVID-19 pandemic, earthquake of 2023) but others were linked —either directly or indirectly to-- design issues.
- 83 Further issues along these lines arise in the definition of the composition of the Project as stated in the reporting and monitoring documents. For instance, the last monitoring report –of December 2023—states: In this respect the Project is composed of 2 components:
 - Component A Technical Assistance for strengthening technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites and identification and classification of contaminated sites with POPs: This component aims to improve the capacity of all relevant stakeholders at central and local level so that (i) there is a strengthened technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites, and (ii) POPs contaminated sites were properly identified and classified.
 - Component B Works for increasing the institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites: This component aims to build a "capacity" for

¹¹ This will be expanded upon in the effectiveness and efficiency sections as it relates to adaptive management sections.

implementation of remediation activities in Türkiye in line with EU regulations and standards.

84 It is partially understood by this evaluation that these terminology variations are due to changes that the Project suffered, adaptations, approved reforms (called Addendums). Yet, this calls for some confusion by partners in different institutions as to what made up the Project and how or why it changed over time.

RELEVANCE

- 85 Relevance is the extent to which a project's objectives are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.
- 86 The Project has been highly relevant, not only concerning national policies and corporate mandates but also in the materiality of the significance regarding dealing with integrated chemicals management in Türkiye (regarding POPs in this case) given the complexity of this issue in the country.
- 87 First, the Project objective (to improve environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites through enhancing the implementation capacity of EU POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination Strategy) is relevant to the needs and priorities of the country, keeping in mind economic, political, social, legal, and institutional contexts of the country.
- 88 Regarding alignment with national development and environmental priorities, this is demonstrated by the fact that the Government of Türkiye places a high priority on addressing the reduction of pollution and eliminating related pressures and impacts to the natural and human environment. This is echoed in the series of policies that the country has adopted to deal with waste management (including hazardous waste management) and which are imbedded in the country's policy and regulatory framework.
- 89 The project –as indicated in planning documents-- has contributed to the general objective of the ESOP: "environmental protection through increasing the capacity of the MoEU¹² for protection of soils from POPs and other dangerous pollutants." The project is also fitting the respective output of the ESOP which is the "Legislative reform and capacity building advanced in the areas of climate action, air quality, civil protection, marine environment, horizontal legislation and nature protection" since it will contribute through capacity building for implementation of POPs Regulation and Point Source Contaminated Sites Legislation. Multiannual Action Programme for Environment and Climate Action 2014-2016 and National Action Plan for EU Accession Phase-II (June 2015-June 2019) clearly state that the chemicals sector is one of the major sectors for putting EU Acquis into practice in the country. It is

¹² Institutional name of MoEUCC at the time of design.

therefore relevant in addressing the MoEUCC's capacity enhancement needs to align its strategies and actions with those of EU legislation and practices and enforce this normative configuration.

- 90 The design, strategy and implementation of the Project has been relevant vis-à-vis other policies, such as the National Development Plan; national level policy documents such as Contaminated Soil Regulation Law, POPs Law, Mercury Draft Law, and National Implementation Plans (NIP) for the Stockholm Convention, national technical guidelines for management of POPs).
- 91 Relevance is also applicable regarding international commitments relative to hazardous waste, chemicals and contaminated sites management assumed by Türkiye. The Project explicitly facilitated having the country meet its international obligations as expressed in the relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements Türkiye is a party to that deal with these issues (mainly the Stockholm Convention but also the Basel, and Rotterdam accords).
- 92 Türkiye signed the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in 2004 and ratified it in 2009. According to Article 7 of the Convention Parties are required to develop National Implementation Plans (NIP) to demonstrate how they intend to implement obligations assumed under the Stockholm Convention. According to existing rules, each Party should develop and submit the NIP within two years from ratification and update NIPs within every five years thereafter considering amendments and additional listed POPs. The first NIP, addressing the inventories and strategic action plan for the initial twelve POPs, was developed by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in the period 2007-2010. The inventory of POPs in the country and action plans in the NIP has been reviewed in 2013 since there has been an addition of nine new POPs in the annexes of the convention in between 2004-2011. As it is indicated in the NIP, one of the prior areas of the country on implementation of the Convention and the POPs Regulation is contaminated sites management since the country is in a fast-growing period and has intensive usage of such chemicals in various industrial sectors which may increase the uncontrolled contamination of soil with these chemicals.
- 93 Given the latter, it is also understood that the materiality of relevance is very much present. That is, the presence of POPs and the intensive usage of chemicals in several sectors (including the industrial sector but not only) signal a need for increased capacity to manage POPs.
- 94 Relevance is also analysed in relation to UNDP's corporate mandate. This is exemplified by alignment of the Project with the following *at the time of planning and project signature*:
 - Contribution to achieving current UNDAF at the time of design through alignment with its Outcome 2: Democratic and Environmental Governance.
 - Contribution to achieving expected CPAP UNDP at design: Outcome 3: Strengthening policy formulation and implementation capacity for the protection of the environment,

and cultural heritage in line with sustainable development principles and taking into consideration climate change and disaster management.

- Contribution to the achievement of CPAP Output 3.3.8: Protection of health and environment through elimination of current POPs legacies, ensure longer term capacity to manage POPs into the future consistent with international practice and standards, and integrate POPs activities with national sound chemicals management initiatives.
- Contribution to achieving expected CPAP UNDP: Output 3.3.8: Protection of health and environment through elimination of current POPs legacies, ensure longer term capacity to manage POPs into the future consistent with international practice and standards, and integrate POPs activities with national sound chemicals management initiatives.
- 95 As stated above, this relates to relevance at the time of design and of signature of the Project Document. However, this significance is maintained with newer corporate mandates and documentation that came into effect after approval of the Project in the implementation process (UNSDCF 2021-2025 and UNDP Country Programme Document 2021-2025).
- 96 Regarding UNSDCF 2021-2025 the intervention is aligned with Priority Area 3: Climate Change, Sustainable Environment and Liveable Cities (which includes specific sections of national development priorities relevant to the Project within this Area, such as: 2.2.1.2.1. Chemical Industry, 2.2.2.1. Agriculture, 2.2.3.6. Energy, 2.2.3.7. Mining, 2.3.3. Health, 2.4. Liveable Cities, and Sustainable Environment).¹³
- 97 Regarding the current UNDP Country Programme Document, the Project is aligned with several goals. As stated in UNDP CPD 2021-2025: "The country programme will place special emphasis on waste management. Sites contaminated with industrial and chemical waste will be managed in an environmentally sound manner." Specifically, for instance, the Project is aligned with National Priority or Goal: 11th UNDP Axis 4. Liveable Cities and Sustainable Environment, Sustainable Development Goals 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; Cooperation Framework Outcome Involving UNDP #3.1: By 2025, all relevant actors take measures to accelerate climate action, to promote responsible production and consumption, to improve the management of risks and threats to people, and to ensure sustainable management of the environment and natural resources in urban and ecosystem hinterlands; Related Strategic Plan Outcome: Outcome 2 Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development; Output 3.4 Chemicals and waste prevented, managed and disposed of in an environmentally sound manner in crisis and non -crisis urban settings.¹⁴
- 98 Regarding SDGs the Project links to several such as:
 - SDG-3: Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all at all ages

¹³ Source: United Nations Country Team in Turkey (2021), United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework 2021-2025, Ankara.

¹⁴ Source: Country Programme Document for Turkey (2021-2025).

- SDG 3.9: By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination.
- SDG-6: Clean water and sanitation"
- SDG 6.3: By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally.
- SDG-12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
- SDG 12.4: By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment.
- 99 The Project has effectively addressed the national needs as well as referred and attended to corporate mandates. It is aligned with several key significant national, regional, and global mandates, assuring its relevance.

EFFECTIVENESS

- 100 The effectiveness of a project is defined as the degree to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved. The valorisation of effectiveness is used as an aggregate for judgment of the merit or worth of an activity, (i.e., the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives proficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact).
- 101 The Project has had a high degree of completion of most, not all planned, activities at the technical assistance level. Several of them are in the process of completion, or have been initiated at the product level. The Project did not achieve, however (and is not expected to achieve) the pilot demonstration site activities.
- 102 In annexes a chart can be found with information provided by the Project for the different planned activities and showing progress as of December 2023 (that is, when this evaluation process began (see Annex 7: Achievement Of Activities For Expected Result 1 And For Expected Result 2 Of March 2023).
- 103 At the activities and sub activities output levels have been mostly completed for the technical assistance modules. For expected Result 1, five of the planned activities were ongoing in late December, and three –a consultation, a strategy, and a study visit—are expected to take place before completion. The others have been completed. For expected Result 2, a great deal has been completed. Two are ongoing (updating software and training related to said software), two will take place at the end of the project –understandably so since one is a dissemination event and another the closure event. Yet, a major and pivotal planned activity

(that is the Implementation of Supervision Support and Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites) will be cancelled following due procedures as stated above. ¹⁵

- 104 If the straightforward metric of quantitatively comparing planned activities vis-a-vis achievements it can be seen below that, at this level of analysis, most indicators have been met for the TA modules and not for the pilot module. Without weight of achievement (that is, by tallying achievement strictly by comparison between expectation and what was implemented, yet not having a judgement if one achievement is more or less important than other) most have been completed.
- 105 However, as indicated in other previous sections of this report, many of them are output/activities gages and not outcome indicators. For instance, when it is indicated that for sub-activity the 1.1.3 Number of central and local level staff capacitated on management of POPs contaminated sites is 490 and this has been achieved, and even surpassed. Yet, this is an output indicator but not an effect (outcome) gage and neither is there a tally on impact. Aware of this, the indicator set was changed in different versions of the results framework, yet this was done two years after implementation began and with qualitative indicators.
- 106 The only quantitative indicator that could be truly construed as an outcome indicator with clear impact would have been those sites where remediation was to take place. Unfortunately for several reasons that will be shown further on, this is the one activity that could not take place.
- 107 Taking into account that the overall objective of this intervention was "to improve environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites through enhancing the implementation capacity of EU POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination Strategy" a more qualitative analysis –however-- can take place when the indicator set is not resilient to specifying effects or impact, as will be seen below.
- 108 The Project has attained and is in the process of achieving some activities, products, and processes which can clearly have a positive impact upon improving environmental protection, integrated hazardous chemicals management, and quality of life (when dealing with human health). As well as advancing upon broader policy factors such as meeting with international commitments as related to the Stockholm Convention, enhance capacity to implement EU POPs regulations, as well as update/streamline/modernise national legislation dealing with POPs. And this is a matter to concentrate upon in immediate and medium-term follow-up.
- 109 The Project has been effective in many ways in the attainment for or drive of products that could prove fully effective in the immediate future (for instance in the application of new more streamlined forward looking normative and in potentially having a cadre of individuals and institution capable of applying the technical assistance imparted). This would indicate a

¹⁵ Approval of addendum 3.

strong potentiality for further efficacy and overall usefulness. The main achievements that arise in relation to effectiveness (not only from monitoring and reporting but also from qualitative evidence obtained through interviews, dialogues and focus group discussions and thus triangulated) are seen in the paragraphs immediately below. The section below is divided into the foremost mechanisms through which effectiveness has been mainly manifested.

110 Training. This has been one of the key processes through which the Project has comprised its implementation. That is, a main module of this Project (implicitly and explicitly) has involved training. A robust number of trainings have taken place, through which strengthened technical institutional and individual capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites and identification and classification of contaminated sites with POPs was sought. Different modalities of training took place, either in presence or (due to COVID-19) online. Interestingly, some stakeholders indicated that COVID-19 modality in some ways was more efficient since it helped to further engagement of some individuals since (due to the online nature of workshops, etc.) they did not have to leave their place of work and could participate online without disattending their work duties. Furthermore, some activities such as international site visits were also carried-out envisaging them as training. Capacity building through training engaged with several different types of stakeholders, not only national and provincial government representatives, but also members of publicly owned companies and the private sector (private associations, private companies, etc.). It has been repeatedly pointed out by a variety of actors that the quality, competence and knowledge of technical teams and consultants engaged in training has been very high. And this has been reflected in the approval of technical quality of training activities by different stakeholders. This is not only echoed as qualitative data harnessed by this evaluation through different dialogues/interviews but also expressed through the high participants' satisfaction (at times nearly 90 percent, although varying among different training activities) regarding training content as articulated in after-workshops' surveys. This variability is expressed in different post training surveys. For instance, in some events, when asked post training: Do you feel more competent after the training on contaminated sites remediation technologies and determination of cleanup targets? twenty-three percent of attendees indicated that yes, they did. While forty percent stated –for instance—that the training expanded their knowledge about legislation. After 2022 new tools and analysis to measure training effectiveness were added, as part of improved monitoring processes that the Project introduced. These consisted of exams of face-to-face participants knowledge on different subjects imparted in the training sessions, before and after the training. This provided metrics that were an improved gage on effectiveness than opinions on training which were exclusively asked before. Answers manifested substantial correct answer rate in most questions, and increases up to 90 percent in some cases, ascertaining that -in general-- attendees improved their
knowledge of the subject after the training.¹⁶ Also, the participation of site-visits was seen as quite restricted, and that those individuals that will eventually apply knowledge attained (sub-national governments, site owners, private companies) should also further partake in these types of events, in-country and internationally. Several knowledge management products have been produced and some disseminated and/or made public to a wide audience (see Annex 3: Training Presentations). Several KM products are being produced at the same time as this assessment process, and that a dissemination event is being planned when Project ends. It is understandable to a degree that since the Project has not finished, there has been no full-fledged dissemination of knowledge management (KM) products which according to stakeholders would be beneficial and provide a full devolution of results as well as maintain and sustain further the information shared and the capacity upgrade imparted. Yet, this has been one of the requests explicitly made by different sorts of stakeholders. That is, that KM products be produced as amply as possible and disseminated at the same time as the training events as much as possible. It is acknowledged by this evaluation that some visibility products were generated (newsletters, insertion of the Project in institutional webpages, tutorial materials, as seen in annexes in listings of tutorial videos as well as in publicly available webpages cited in the consulted document list), but what is being called for by stakeholders (and which this evaluation strongly agrees) is that more technical KM products be produced and not only fully disseminated at the end of the Project in future programming but as the intervention progresses. This not only aids in training and visibility but also in uptake of conveyed training.

Technical assistance regarding by-laws. A key element of this Project has been the revision 111 and updating of legislation and norms (by-laws, guidelines, etc.) to streamline current legislation and to introduce changes to be in accord with modern global trends regionally (IPA, ESOP) and national commitments for global accords (Stockholm Convention et.al.) while meeting with national needs. This has been one of the important pillars of this intervention. A great deal of technical assistance has been in this area. The Project has generated several products and activities regarding this area of work. The activities have ranged from the production of technical papers, consulting work on recommendations for draft legislation on contaminated sites legislation and POPs, dissemination and comparative analysis of current legislation and proposed norms, as well as specific training related to the proposed reforms. With the understanding that a project cannot guarantee adoption of normative legislation, and that effectiveness in this sense cannot be assessed as an outcome, there are expectations that a future piece of legislation based greatly on the project-supported assistance and activities might be approved in the immediate future. It is expected that the proposed legislation to eventually be approved would not change greatly in technical aspects in comparison with what is presently in the drafts, and that the Bylaw defines more enforcement-oriented technical standards and procedures. Yet it is expected that still there

¹⁶ Reference: Training On Remediation Technologies, Remediation and Monitoring Training Reports.

will be a debate (governmental, parliamentary, etc.) as to many other aspects (financial, private sector responsibilities, etc.). Nonetheless, there are great expectations with the potential new legislation given that the proposals presented within the Project are perceived as streamlined instruments that could furthermore aid in application given that implementation of current instruments (at the sub-national level specially) is intricate. The current intricacy is not only given the complexity of the current legislation but also due to lack of personnel and capacity to fully implement a non-streamlined legislation. Several stakeholders have indicated that the activities and products dealing with legislation were positive, but there were a couple of matters that were brought up. First, non-state actors (private sector, institutions which agglutinate certain productive sectors, for instance) mainly indicated that there was no profound consultation. That is, (although there were several rounds of legislation workshops where the drafts were presented and discussed) non-state actors indicate that the proposals were presented as a *fait accompli* and that their input was not actively sought. Although appreciated technically, it is understood by non-state actors that a more proactive modality of consultations and of seeking their inputs would improve the drafting and / or approval as well as implementation. It is understood by these stakeholders that if a discussion process by all relevant parties is adjunct to the events the Project realised regarding legislation it would improve draft and eventually acceptance of the proposed piece of legislation. Although some actors do not see participation as affecting Project results, this assessment understands that greater consultation, full participation by all relevant actors (governments at all levels, non – state actors, industries) not only benefits outcomes but also appropriation and uptake of results as well as sustainability. Furthermore (although it was clear that the presentations/workshops/technical events/meetings presented the differences between current legislation and proposed future one) many stakeholders from different sorts of institutions indicate that the effectiveness of the capacity building exercises and of the more technical trainings are not as solid as they could have been since the application of the technical capacity (ergo effectiveness and uptake) is greatly dependent on the potential future approval of the legislation.

112 Other technical assistance. Several specific technical assistance products were formed with and by the Project; some are in preparation. Outputs such as upgrading sites evaluation and contaminated sites evaluation systems; generating a Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme and putting it into operation online; generating a health risk assessment programme; analysing and updating current registration system and inventory systems, for instance, firmly related to technical assistance were all generated within the processes of implementation. Other technical reports are in process. For example, a report on circularity of POPs and the impact on contaminated sites management. All the completed activities have been much valued by stakeholders, not only due to the updating of outdated instruments (such as software) but also for their current and potential streamlining of POPs management and site clean-up.

- 113 Following there is a narrative on effectiveness as to what have been the *contributing* factors based on informational evidence, documents, internal communications and information gathered and harnessed through interviews, focus group discussions, and dialogues.
- 114 Perceived need for undertaking integrated management of POPs. There is a perceived need from different sectors (public and private) that the country needs to undertake integrated management of POPs due to the severity of chemical management requirements in the country (current and foreseen in the near future). This includes not only the need to update legislation but also to update technical components (which the Project promoted already). This is a contributing factor given that the Project supported this perceived need which also underscored the relevance of the action. Furthermore, the need to streamline controlling factors and management, due to the weak capacity present in some areas where only a few officials oversee a great number of sites which –with present tools and capacity—are not able to manage. The "trickling down" of capacity actions to provincial and sub-national levels is a linked contributing factor to the need for undertaking integrated management of POPs, which is a good practice by the Project and which –as indicated by several stakeholders often does not occur in similar contexts in other projects.
- 115 *Ownership*. A great deal of ownership from the public sector (barring issues with the works component) and of the implementing agency is detected, regarding –particularly-- to the technical assistance and capacity building areas of the Project. This has been a strong contributing factor for implementation and for current as well as potential future effectiveness of the TA elements.
- 116 *Quality of technical assistance*. The quality of technical teams, consulting persons, management team, and institutions is a key contributing factor for effectiveness and for the current as well as future appropriation of the technical aspects of the Project.
- 117 *Leverage*. Although acquis is not strictly related to some aspects of the Project IPA assistance to meet with ESOP etc, has had influence in the Project, not only for complementarity with other donors, but also as leverage for Project effectiveness. In relevant documentation it is clearly stated that that chemicals sector is one of the major segments for putting EU Acquis into practice in the country, and this is and has been a contributory factor for implementation and potential effectiveness.
- 118 Adaptive management. The Project had to deal, unfortunately, with many issues that impacted heavily on the Project (several will be seen below in the hindering factors section). Some as externalities that were impossible to foresee (COVID-19 and earthquake of 2023); others which could have been foreseen to some degree but which were not (such as design issues due to a lack of site selection *a priori* upon planning). Others which occurred at the same time of design or for tendering, complicated several processes (PRAG, FIDIC, etc.). Yet, the Project staff was able to work through these issues. Perhaps not ending with a project as envisioned in its totality but –through adaptive management as one of the contributing factors—the intervention is coming to an end with several clear accomplishments and the potential for further effectiveness. The adaptive management modality used helped in

retrieving some aspects of implementation when works component was cancelled and reallocation of remaining funds were channelled to further capacity building activities. Adaptive management can be seen as a good practice given that, through this, the Project was able to persist to achieve what it achieved in the circumstances it had to face. This not only aided in effectiveness but also in efficiency.

- 119 Following there is a narrative on effectiveness as to what have been the *hindering* factors based on informational evidence, documents, internal communications and information gathered and triangulated through interviews, dialogues, and focus group discussions.
- 120 *COVID-19*: Understandably with COVID-19 in person activities (training, meetings, site visits) were restricted for a period, and stakeholders indicate that this might have hindered knowledge appropriation process by the targeted actors, as well as stalled a more interactive modality with site participation of a broader spectrum of in field "hands-on" modalities. Although desk studies were prioritized and the pandemic period did not seem to affect these aspects greatly, all other training and capacity building activities were hindered, as well as field site visits and on-the-ground activities.
- 121 *Design issues*. Several design weaknesses manifested themselves as hindrances to effectiveness. Among them the matter and complexity derived given that there were in fact –actually-- two implementing partners (i.e. UNDP and Ministry), and that sites where concrete pilot interventions would take place were not determined at design.
- 122 Cancellation of works component. Since there are no government-owned POPs contaminated sites (nor orphan sites) this posed a major challenge for the Project which necessitated deep changes in implementation tactics to eventually try to fulfil the pilot works module. Project's efforts to find publicly owned contaminated sites and the subsequent efforts to prepare a full-fledged tender dossier (accompanied with sampling and site analysis) took place. It was not an issue of not being able to find suitable sites only. The Project overcame this hurdle and yet the works component was still cancelled due to lengthy tender dossier review processes and earthquake's effects. The Project had two pilot sites with fullfledged site characteristics analysed and tendering documents made ready. After the earthquake, it was decided that the funds would be allocated to the pool of IPA resources, and then redistributed to urgent earthquake response activities instead. Although technically the TAT succeeded in identifying the sites, there were other matters that came into play as an obstacle for site clean-up. After trying to accommodate these matters, nevertheless, the works component was cancelled. This was a great obstructive matter not only for effectiveness (as seen here) but also for efficiency, relevance, and other questions. A major area of the intervention was affected by this, not only for the sites themselves, but because they were to be demonstrative modules as pilots. Although the ultimate reason for the cancellation given was that recovery from the earthquake of February 2023 should override other activities, although this was reasonable motive and a choice that the Government of Türkiye made, the fact is that the earthquake was the breaking point for the cancellation by adding yet another difficulty to this issue on top of the already occurring matters. Among

other main issues that contributed at some levels with the decision to cancel were design weaknesses (no determination of sites at design nor inception); procurement, bidding and tendering complications; difficulty in making these compatible among and between the different partners; as well as difficulties in relation to private – public sector works within a project that is partially funded and supported by the Government of Türkiye. The latter is even a conceptual issue, given that overarching Turkish legislation follows the polluter – pay principles and public funds could not conceivably be used for clean-up of private sites. In summary, as Project monitoring documentation indicates: "At the project design stage, poor project design and risk assessment based on false assumptions in site identification for pilot remediation works led to major delays and rescheduling in the implementation schedule of this many other outputs … Beneficiary and project team had to take substantial adaptive management actions to prioritize and mobilize resources for identification of eligible sites for pilot remediation works at the expense of delaying other outputs. "

- 123 *Elections and related political processes.* Government-level stakeholders, for the most part, have indicated that the elections of 2023 and related political processes did¹⁷, in some ways, slow down some project developments, particularly those related to decision making processes.
- 124 *Earthquake of February 2023.* The earthquake of February 2023, a 7.8-magnitude earthquake that impacted southeast Türkiye and had thousands of aftershocks, was a hindering externality that obstructed implementation of certain sectors of the Project. Due to the delays caused by the earthquake, the need to attend to urgent response for the affected regions, and the grave impact on the communities and rotation and out-migration of people involved in the Ministry in the affected areas as well as –understandably—the impact on morale, effectiveness was impacted. This was the final push and the breaking point for the ultimate cancellation of the work components, which had many difficulties already as seen above.
- 125 Government sectors acting separately from one another. In the case of the Project, it has also been pointed out that although the view of POPs and chemical management should be integrated, different areas of government (even within the same ministry, even within the same action) act as "silos" and that this hindered effectiveness. Although of course these matters are beyond the domain of a project and a project cannot –nor should not -- do anything about this modality of work *per se*, it is something that (by being aware of these circumstances) future programming and exit strategies could impel mechanisms to integrate

¹⁷ Only one stakeholder indicated that this was not relevant upon review of this evaluation report in its draft form, while all others –even those within the same divisions of government-- did point-out that this was a matter that slowed down decision-making processes within the Project itself, therefore validating this finding. For the record, this was not part of a guidance question as such. When asked what challenges the Project faced, stakeholders indicated (by themselves) that among these were "political processes, including elections."

areas of government relevant to a particular project.¹⁸ This is key regarding a matter not only of implementation but also of sustainability.¹⁹

- 126 *Lack of information and weak reporting regarding sites*. When site visits took place (for soil analysis for instance) it was found that information was not fully made available to interested parties and it is not clear if this information on contaminants was not available or not made available. Also, key stakeholders indicate that neither public nor private sites fully report on their contamination, and therefore hinders potential effectiveness due to lack of candid baseline information.
- 127 This evaluation was posed to the following question: Compared to 2019, to what extent has MoEUCC increased its capacity in terms of POPs identification and improved follow-up through enforcement of relevant regulation(s)? Although there is no specific outcome measurable indicator to tally in a quantifiable way the extent of upgraded capacity to deal with POPs in Türkiye (that is, quantifiable the outcome regarding training uptake) a robust number of activities, products, and processes took place to increase capacity. At a qualitative level it is established by this evaluation that capacity building did take place, however²⁰.
- 128 Also, as the evaluation progressed it was also clear to the evaluation that this question is partial given that, although the MoEUCC is the main target for capacity building and technical assistance by the Project, this took place similarly --to varying degrees-- for sub-national governments and the private sector, which can also be identified as a good practice given that although implementation of this sort of capacity often falls under the responsibility of these two types of stakeholders, often interventions bypass them.

129

EFFICIENCY

130 Efficiency as an evaluation criterion is understood to be the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Efficiency is a gage of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results. The analysis of efficiency responds to the evaluation questions of to what extent resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and the results have been

¹⁸ This has been indicated by several key stakeholders of different institutions, not only as a matter for the current assessment (i.e. the evaluation of this project) but also key in follow up and sustainability of the achievements that this project has had and may have in the future.

¹⁹ This finding is of course relevant within the domain of this project evaluation, and not a comment on how government functions *per se* since this is not the purpose of this assessment nor is this within its scope to evaluate the Government of Türkiye. That is, the assessment is made regarding functioning of the Project and –perhaps even most importantly—for follow up and sustainability of achievements with regards to integrated POPs management.

²⁰ In Paragraph 88 above self-declared satisfaction and perceived knowledge transfer as indicated in post training monitoring (i.e. surveys filled out by trainees) is also indicated.

delivered with the least costly way possible. As well as to what extent whereby outputs were delivered in a timely manner and with high quality.

- 131 The Project has been efficient in achieving outputs/products as a composite. This is a composite analysis since technical assistance as a section has been very efficient and the works/pilot component has not.
- 132 For the technical assistance area of work, the Project has provided value-for-money since it achieved the results within budgets, agreed disbursement, etc., with high quality and in a timely manner (of course, except for circumstances due to external problems such as the COVID-19 pandemic and earthquake of 2023).
- 133 Budgets proved to be valid and justifiable and there was budgetary adaptive management when changes were made to improve delivery and efficiency. For instance, funds not used due to the cancellation of the works components were re allocated to generate new activities which were added to increase the project's outputs.²¹
- 134 Progress in financial terms is reported as follows by the Project as of October 2023 (i.e. seven months before closure).

Project Budget	Grant	Expenditure as of 8/10/2023	Balance
2,030,000.00	1,058,024.94	971,975.06	47.88%

FIGURE 3: PROJECT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE AS OF OCTOBER 2023 IN EUROS

- 135 Resource mobilization efforts were successful given that the funding was sufficient for the achievement of outputs.
- 136 Management by UNDP of the area of technical assistance (i.e. the section of the project that fell fully under UNDP's control) was appropriately accomplished, without major administrative, financial, nor managerial obstacles. Although there were consultants'

²¹ These were:

Activity 1.1.2.6 Additional Training on Risk Assessment and Alternative Remediation Technologies

Activity 1.2.1.3 Workshop on By-law on POPs legislation

Activity 1.3.3. Visiting an EU Country with Contaminated Sites with Different Pollutants and Soil Remediation Techniques

Activity 1.2.3.4 Consultative Meeting on the Report on Chemicals Management to Ensure Better POPs and PTS Management

Activity 1.7 Better Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road Map.

rotations, this was not major and proper expertise appears to have been involved, even after these matters.

- 137 Appropriate accomplishment was aided by oversight through steering committee.²² These minutes, and other similar reporting are indicative of managerial/oversight functioning.
- 138 A great aide to efficiency has been the monitoring and evaluation system in place and how it has thoroughly been managed and implemented by Project staff. The monitoring system generated management data that allowed for learning and consequently to adjust implementation accordingly to this information. This data (contained in reporting documentation such as activity and progress reports) allowed for many adjustments to implementation as needed as well as to provide transparency as to what was being implemented or achieved and what was being delayed or stalled. This is also linked to the Addendums generated to adjust for externalities and for other issues that arose as implementation took place.
- 139 However, the monitoring and evaluation system did not plan (therefore did not execute) a midpoint assessment. Had there been a midterm review or assessment it could, conceivably, provided early signals of issues that arose with implementation and/or programmatically deal with some of them in a timely manner.²³
- 140 Since effectiveness and efficiency are linked concepts, the same contributing as well as hindering factors to effectiveness are relevant to a degree (as seen in the section of this report immediately before this one) vis-à-vis efficiency. Nevertheless, many actors and key stakeholders identified a problem regarding other issues that hindered efficiency exclusively.
- 141 For instance, although some partners indicate that roles and responsibilities of the three project partners (i.e. Government of Türkiye, EUD, and UNDP) were clearly delineated and applicable rules were clear, some partners understood that the highly regulated environment in which this project developed and even having to deal with different rules and procedures internally between these three main actors slowed down decision-making processes (such as procurement). This is seen as a major obstacle and challenge by some, not all however, key stakeholders.
- 142 A positive aspect regarding effectiveness as well as efficiency is that there were synergies with previous projects (other EUD – funded projects and the already mentioned GEF-funded and UNDP-implemented project on POPs). External coherence is defined as the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes

²² Source: Steering Committee Minutes.

²³ It is understood that UNDP policy is that projects with 3-5M USD budget are subject to either a midterm or a final evaluation, not both. Also, it is understood by this evaluation that Instead, monitoring missions and progress reports assessed project issues. Yet, it is perceived by this evaluation that if a midterm review would have been carried out, even as a rapid yet integrated assessment and not only monitoring and progress assessment, it could –potentially of course—benefitted implementation and the prospect of sustainability.

complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of efforts. This Project has done so from design onward to generate complementarity and fill the gaps that other interventions have left but avoiding duplication and avoiding wasting resources.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

- 143 To some extent cross-cutting issues have been considered in the Project. Several of these have been incorporated in design particularly. To a lesser degree in implementation, and monitoring.
- 144 At design some matters of gender equality were incorporated in planning documents, as a cross-cutting issue. For instance, gender equality is mentioned in several areas with indications that:
 - "Understanding the relationship between gender and sound chemicals management is important for the overall effectiveness of any project on chemicals and wastes. Women and men are impacted differently by chemicals and through different routes. They have different experiences of dealing with sources of exposure, and different priorities, responsibilities and needs relating to the reduction of toxic chemicals and wastes. In many developing countries, women and men also often have different levels of access to participation, decision-making, information, education or justice, and face different constraints in their efforts to improve their environment and living conditions. They can also play different roles in making decisions about pollution prevention, waste management, identification of sources of chemical exposure, and building a safer environment for communities."
- 145 These pronunciations were supposed to emerge in different ways in implementation. For example, by acknowledging that gender mainstreaming will be one of the main cross-cutting themes of the Project via including a gender sensitive approach and gender sensitive delivery planning. This is also expressed in several monitoring reports, yet there is no concrete evidence that this has percolated to actual implementation more than paying formal attention to gender in documentation. Furthermore, stakeholders were not aware nor sensitive for that matter to any gender equality related matters throughout implementation.
- 146 A gender analysis and screening of the project was made at planning.²⁴ Within it, information for gender marker, as seen below, was generated. Although this gender analysis tool touched upon several issues related to chemicals and women, it was also generic regarding gender issues.
- 147 During the design phase, the gender marker for the project was determined to be GEN1. When projects are classified as GEN1 it is because they are expected to contribute (albeit in a limited way) to gender equality. Moreover, for the projects classified in this matter, gender equality is not consistently mainstreamed and has not been critical in project design. This is deemed by this evaluation to be an accurate classification given the nature of the Project.

²⁴ UNDP TURKEY. Gender Screening Tool for Project Development and Implementation.

- 148 The gender analysis carried out for planning the project also included matters regarding women's participation in the Project. Although not strictly related to gender – equality in a broad sense, there has been a wide-ranging participation of women in activities and management of the Project. This has been at all levels and at all institutions involved, and it is related to women's in – country expertise in the areas relevant to this project. Sexdisaggregated data on participants was harnessed and it indicated parity participation.
- 149 The usefulness of the gender analysis can be drawn in the sense that it highlighted several gender differential issues regarding chemicals and women. For instance, this document indicated that "Especially, persistent organic chemicals have more adverse impact on women health, rather than men health due to their different body types. POPs deteriorate health due to disrupting hormone-enzyme mechanisms. This makes women more vulnerable against POPs exposure. The behavioral factor also reinforces the exposure of women to pollutants and make them more vulnerable based on their traditional family roles that includes primary duties like shopping from local bazaars, food preparation, etc." In that sense it can be said that this analysis has been helpful since it has put these little discussed matters on the agenda. Yet there is no evidence that gender has been a cross-cutting factor in the application nor implementation of this project.
- 150 Falling under the umbrella of the "leave no one behind agenda," i.e. rights-based approach, cross – cutting issues were part of this intervention, including health and environmental rights. Via the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) articulations there have been several cross-cutting matters included, as seen in the design and relevance sections in this report. A key aspect is the relation of the intervention to health (exemplified by SDG-3: "Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all at all ages), water (SDG-6: "Clean water and sanitation") as well as in production/consumption patterns (SDG-12: "Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns").
- 151 Lastly and specifically, project design invokes (and implementation applies) the principles included in SDG 12.4: "By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment".

SUSTAINABILITY

152 A project's sustainability is understood to be the extent to which the net benefits of an intervention continue, or are likely to continue, once an intervention has ended.

- 153 For this section of the report sustainability will be analysed under two broad umbrellas of achievements: the products and outputs related to legal and normative matters and for the products and outputs related to training/capacity building.²⁵
- 154 Regarding the technical assistance provided for normative upgrading, it is very well understood by this evaluation (and by all stakeholders engaged in dialogue) that a project does not adopt nor implement a legislation. Therefore, whatever analysis is made of sustainability is at the product level with an examination of the benefits that might accrue in the future when or even if the legislation is approved.
- 155 The analysis by stakeholders is that the technical content of the normative-related assistance is of high quality. Furthermore, all stakeholders consulted (from the most varied institutions) indicated that there is a high perspective of the draft legislation to be approved by parliament presently (2024 or 2025).
- 156 That being said, however, there are several forewarnings pointed out, not only for approval but for eventual adoption and implementation of the legislation(s) and other policy changes. Although no technical changes of proposal are foreseen (given that the proposal is very specialized in its technical aspects and not open by their nature to political debate) some aspects of the draft legislation are seen to be open for negotiation. Regarding the financial aspects of application, for instance, it was indicated that financing the proposed legislation if approved and implemented would be a point of debate during its sanctioning process. Private sector might give rise to reactions given that it will be costly to implement and the burden will fall on them to a large degree. Therefore, it is foreseen that petitioning from private sector might occur since it will be costly to implement. Further, the need for a financial public plan that supports implementation is also debated. It is also is indicated that the approved policy should be forward looking, dealing also with systems and structures to implement and to be in the vanguard of international practice for integrated chemical management giving rise to catalytic and upscaling/replication processes.
- 157 At another level this matter was also identified by monitoring processes carried-out by the Project. The financial sustainability of remediation of POPs contaminated sites (as this was observed by project monitoring) is thought to be a major factor in future success of the legislation if approved and adopted for enforcement. Regarding this, the monitoring report stated: *"Project is already planning to capitalize on the need for a financing mechanism for emergency remediation of contaminated sites in its final report but it is recommended that the project consider utilization of potential savings to develop a task for delivery of preparatory studies to that end."* This same monitoring report indicates that the relevant authorities have not taken nor are expected to take financial measures to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action. This was pointed out for unavailability of financial resources for urgent responses in clean-up. These and other similar matters

²⁵ Since the pilot's components were not applied, then it would be a futile exercise to address sustainability of what has not ensued.

regarding the debates already ensuing as how will the application of the proposed legislation be funded, indicates that financial sustainability is an issue that some partners are considering and which could be included in sustainability and follow up exercises (such as an exit strategy). This is also a result of monitoring processes since the matter was more forcefully added after monitoring flagged financing (including for urgent cases) as a key factor to include in sustainability and follow-up.

- 158 Regarding institutional and individual capacity building, on which the Project placed a strong emphasis, there are several challenges but also opportunities. In the first place, the software updating and upgrading that has been taking place is seen as sustainable given that it streamlines many of POPs management issues, and therefore has an inherent incentive to be sustained over time.
- 159 However, there were other challenges identified for sustainability. For instance, the individual capacity building that took place has an intrinsic challenge due to rotation of personnel particularly in the public sector. The high rotation of government personnel implies that, many times, people who received training would be rotated to another area of government and would not be able to use the training in the new posts. Although at the personal capacity building this could be positive since the person involved would have knowledge, it is problematic as institutional building given that there is the risk that institutional capacity is not maintained over time.²⁶ While of course these matters are beyond the domain of a project and a project cannot do anything about them *per se*, yet it is something that (by being aware of these circumstances) future programming could impel mechanisms to transfer capacity to new or rotating personnel, generating long-lasting KM products and leaving a record of easily accessible capacity building materials for rotated personnel. This could be faced with several end-of-project and follow up actions (as indicated in the upcoming recommendations section) to reduce the risk of having this capacity lost.
- 160 Catalysing behavioural changes in terms of use and application, by the relevant stakeholders, of capacities developed is seen as a "wait and see" event in the sense that many key stakeholders (from national government, provincial governments, and the private sector included) indicate that the use and application of the technical capacity is contingent upon the approval of new normative and new policy. Although project management indicates (and which is corroborated in reports) that technical assistance considered both instances: that is, with the status quo (i.e. with legislation as is now) *and* with the potential changes that would occur with policy change, key stakeholders did not construe this as such. Therefore, the contribution of sustained institutional changes, such as the uptake of technologies, practices, or management approaches that the Project promoted and with which provided technical assistance, is seen largely as revolving around new policy approval. Therefore, the perception of sustainability at times pivots around that.

²⁶ This finding is of course relevant with regards to this project evaluation, and not a comment on how government functions since this is not the purpose of this assessment nor is this within its scope.

161 A challenge that is being confronted for sustainability is that the Project does not have yet an effective exit strategy. The project is developing elements of an exit strategy, such as documents on integrated chemicals management means that should be implemented for better avoidance of contaminated sites. The Technical Assistance Team (TAT) did adaptive management for an assessment report on circularity and POPs and this report proposes an effective integrated chemicals management to be implementable in the future for better management of POPs contaminated sites and is a follow-up/exit strategy element. A road map will also be submitted, at the end of the project as an exit strategy component. It is understood therefore that instruments to be conceived as an exit strategy are being developed at the time of this evaluation and will be ready by project end. But it would have been more positive to have such an instrument from an earlier stage to have been able to implement whatever measures need to be implemented before project end to catalyse change.

CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

- 162 The *Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants* (*POPS*) Project is nearing completion. It is a project that had to face several externalities and internal issues to be completed as best possible.
- 163 Project *design* was affected by a deficiency regarding the sites the project would identify and remediate (that is perhaps one of the very roots of the intervention since these pilots were to be the demonstrative factors of the intervention). Other design matters have to do with issues of the implementation architecture as well as unclear assumptions particularly regarding sites and public-private spheres of action regarding POPs
- 164 It had to deal also with very serious externalities that no one could have foreseen. Such as the COVID-19 pandemic and a severe earthquake in 2023. Additionally, it also had to contend to complex implementation architecture while coordinating, as much as this was possible, the requirements of three strong actors: MoEUCC, EUD, and UNDP. This provided a learning opportunity for some individuals and institutions, but also in some ways diminished efficiency and caused delays.
- 165 Yet, there has been a perseverance, adaptive management, and working deeply with the technical assistance components so that the Project could show outputs and –above all— promises for net benefits to continue accruing once this intervention has ended.
- 166 Regrettably, the pilot remediation sites component (also called works component) did not come to realisation. Yet the ground work and general framework for eventual remediation has been laid which could hopefully be used in the future, adapting of course to redirected circumstances.
- 167 The technical assistance areas of work have been fruitful. In the first place in accompanying Türkiye in the search of updating, upgrading, and modernising legislation to deal with POPs within an integrated manner that not only undertakes identification of the problem, but promote remediation and push for cohesive management of chemicals. This to be done to keep with regional and international commitments the country is party to, as well as attending to current and foreseen future country needs.
- 168 Furthermore, several upgrading and updating tasks have been successfully undertaken. Such as those that deal with software. Additionally, technical assistance in specific issue was provided, responding to the country's needs and a robust number of institutions and individuals have been capacitated in several issues related to POPs.
- 169 A robust strength and best practice of the Project has been the work of the management unit, reinforced by the contribution of significant technical expertise in the field. Management, in as much as possible within the realm of what it could control, generated and applied a robust set of adaptive management measures when the circumstances called for this.

- 170 There are strong expectations that the draft legislation (within the context of the technical assistance provided by the Project in this area) will be approved before long. Although no technical changes are foreseen in the text, it is expected that there will be some policy debates. This is, overall, a foreseen catalyst for future work for the institutions involved in this project in their diverse capacities.
- 171 The design and implementation processes as indicated above have contributed to a criteria analysis in the following paragraphs. Project design was *relevant* in addressing the MoEUCC's capacity enhancement needs to align governmental strategies and actions with those of EU legislation and practices and to enforce legislative alignment. The Project was also fully aligned and relevant vis-à-vis a full cadre of national strategies and priorities that respond to needs and priorities of the country, even when examining national strategies in meeting with international commitments (mainly the Stockholm Convention but also related to other such international multilateral environmental agreements dealing with chemicals). Project design indicates that the intervention is fully aligned with UN and UNDP priorities (and therefore contributing to them). It is relevant and contributing to UN and UNDP mandates current at the time of design and those current at the time of implementation. Therefore, the Project –in its design and strategy—is fully relevant.
- 172 Regarding *effectiveness*, the result has been varied. The project achieved several objectives and targets as put forth in the results framework (original and revised versions) and other planning documents. The capacity building and technical assistance activities were at a product level fully achieved while the works components were not. As seen in the text, several contributing factors aided in this, while a few hindering factors stalled attainments. In conclusion, although the outputs that were achieved were of good quality, other outputs were not delivered on a timely basis. Ownership, adaptive management, and technical quality of outputs were some of the main contributing factors to effectiveness (as well as efficiency). While the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions and the February 2023 earthquake in Türkiye were the main events that negatively impacted upon the achievement of project results as seen under the criteria analysis of effectiveness (again, similarly impacting upon efficiency). Whereas increased capacity in terms of POPs identification and improved followup through enforcement of relevant legislation(s) is not fully measurable with the available tools, nor has the legislation proposals generated within the Project been approved and consequently nor implemented, at some levels it is not possible to assert effectiveness in those terms. Yet, there is some evidence that there has been effectiveness to a degree by declaration of trainees (either after workshops or training sessions or to this evaluation process) to that effect. The ownership articulated (not only by the public sector but also by non – state actors) are indicative of supporting factors for the effectiveness that was achieved to a degree. This is further supported by the fact that key stakeholders as well as final beneficiaries were largely fairly satisfied with the implementation and results of the Project that were indeed achieved, even in terms of the partnership support. Notwithstanding this, there were several questions raised as to improving effectiveness in the future.

- 173 With respect to *efficiency*, it can be stated that (as indicated above and in pertinent text in the body of the report) outputs for technical assistance were delivered in a timely manner (barring issues such as externalities) and with high quality. The works component was not delivered. Therefore, the technical assistance components have ensured value for money if analysed vis-à-vis efficiency criteria while the works component does not stand-up to a value for money analysis. Resource mobilization was as planned and the Project ensured value for money regarding the technical assistance components achieved. Funding was sufficient for the achievement of those results (as seen in Figure 3: Project Budget and expenditure as of October 2023 in Euros). Ownership by implementing partners impacted positively on the efficiency of the Project. The synergies between other UNDP initiatives were identified early on in project planning stages, and they have contributed to efficiency in the sense that there has been harmonisation while duplication of efforts has been avoided. Project management has worked well for the achievement of results, both in the sense of seeking –and obtaining high quality in the technical assistance component and in seeking that the works component would be implemented -although it did not due to several reasons indicated in the text of this report--. The latter, i.e. not being able to implement works component, also meant that time and resources were used for this while delaying other expected outputs, such as those related to legislation support. Although some stakeholders indicate that having several partners in key roles was clear, others indicate that this was complex and that -at timescoordinating and combining rules and decision – making processes was intricate and slowed down efficiency in implementation. Project monitoring systems were impelled according to UNDP rules, including output verification missions and corresponding reporting. This provided management with data to learn and to adjust implementation (the latter as far as possible barring circumstances that the Project could not control nor was it responsible for). However, the only evaluation in the broad sense is the current exercise since the Project did not have a mid-term evaluation. This responded to UNDP rules but -if there would have been one such review— is a complicated concept to interpret at this point. Furthermore, site selection and procedures for tendering were also a factor on efficient planning and implementation, which (as seen in lessons learned and further in future programming recommendations sections) might be decided before contract signature with participation of stakeholders to improve efficiency.
- Sustainability (or the prospect of sustainability) is a delicate aspect and criteria to assess at this point vis-à-vis the achievements made thus far. Although several of the conditions are there for sustainability, others are not or are contingent upon processes beyond the Project itself. For instance, regarding the proposed legislation that the Project has worked very intensively upon throughout the intervention, it is expected to be approved in the intermediate future with debate ensuing in several aspects. The expected debates will be regarding financing of its implementation but major technical changes are not foreseen. However, the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits are not there yet since (as seen by many partners) they pivot upon approval and there is not planning there thus far in this aspect. As it has been pointed

out by monitoring processes, by stakeholders' inputs to this assessment, and as analysed by this evaluation process, financial and economic aspects for implementing this future legislation –if approved—are not present at the time to ensure sustainability and to guarantee that –through economic resources—systems, structures, staff and / or other requisites achievements would be financially sustained in the longer term. Technical assistance components have aimed at upgrading and supporting technical know-how for the identification and remediation of contaminated sites with POPs, and this has taken place. Barring issues that might arise out of staff rotation and/or governmental divisions not interacting in an integrated manner to deal in a unified format with the issue at hand, a degree of institutional capacity is there and to which the Project has contributed. The Project does not have an effective exit strategy yet; it is in the process of developing one and developing components for sustainability. Sustainability factors (governance, financial, etc.) are features that –if present in the exit strategy—could through uptake by government assure sustainability.

175 The catalytic roles that the Project may have had are closely related to potential sustainability. If policy change occurs (not only theoretically but also in the implementation of new and upgraded policy), then this is a catalytic role that can be attributed to partners and to the Project in the immediate future. Since the works component did not take place, there is no direct link to uptake of demonstrated technologies, practices nor management approaches in the future that could be attributed to the Project. Nevertheless, the preparatory analysis that took place when seeking sites could --if this knowledge is used--have a catalytic role in the future. The same is accurate regarding capacities developed. That is, in all the above, if and when implementation fully takes place of some of these variables (policy, technological upgrade, capacity uptake) could ensure achievements attained thus far or in the immediate future to contribute to the identification and remediation of contaminated sites with persistent organic pollutants in Türkiye.

176

LESSONS LEARNED

177 If project design is not thorough in all its aspects, there are negative impacts upon implementation, effectiveness, and efficiency. Project design needs to be thorough in the sense that all components need to be set upon this stage. Operative design (and successful implementation) is directly linked to the analyses and preparation set at design. Surveying at design potentially benefits a project not only by implementing agencies, but also with the cooperation of the public and private sectors to avoid lengthy reforms, failings and cancellations. For instance, contaminated sites to be worked with need to be determined at the at the beginning of project design and detailed issues of articulation between different partners should also be set. Assumptions need to be candidly explored for these to be acknowledge from the very beginning of planning and corrective measures implemented.

- 178 Streamlined implementation architecture is a necessity, so that there are not multiple actors implementing and thus avoiding conflicts, discrepancies, and multi-layered rules. While keeping with donors' design indications, national partners' requisites, and UNDP implementation modalities might prove challenging, these must be acknowledged early on to have successful implementation and avoid bureaucratic delays that can affect project performance. Streamlining also implies that all partners know what working within these modalities imply and attempt to avoid delays and misunderstandings. Streamlining also implies –in general—in keeping complex architecture to a minimum.
- 179 Procurement and tendering issues, if not addressed properly and streamlined, can have a series of interlinked effects. Protracted and convoluted procurement, tendering, and decision-making processes and issues, especially when several actors are involved, have multiple adverse impacts.
- 180 The lack of fluid information exchange between and among the private and the public sector hinders transparency and proper application of a project, especially when the connection between the two is a cornerstone of an issue. With the understanding, therefore, that public private partnerships are key for integrated hazardous waste management projects (including POPs, evidently) that deal with industry and private companies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 181 Following are recommendations divided into three different types: for conclusion of the Project, for follow up, and for future programming. These are based both on supporting and learning from positive aspects of this project, or in attempting to correct course in further programming and future projects.
 - Recommendations for the conclusion of the Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) Project, focused on UNDP.
- 182 (1) Rapidly develop and disseminate broadly to all actors involved in the project the remaining products that are to be generated (such as knowledge management products, exit strategy, and outstanding technical papers) not only to have a solid legacy but also to give transparency and visibility to achievements.
- 183 (2) Generate events (seminars perhaps) and mechanisms/products (KM) in the remaining period of implementation to aid in anchoring capacity built and for this not to be lost due to staff rotation in different public sector institutions.
 - Recommendations for follow-up to the Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) Project, focused on UNDP and the Government of Türkiye.
- (3) Generate dialogues between the Government of Türkiye and UNDP to promote the debate of, adoption and implementation of legislation regarding POPs that has been promoted by the Project, aiding parliamentary negotiations, consultations with different private and public stakeholders, and identify existing gaps.
- 185 (4) Commence to contemplate and perhaps plan for follow-up, replication and upscaling of the achievements while being forward looking in the changing field of POPs management (considering integrated visions, circularity, changing perspectives, etc.).
 - *Recommendations for future programming.*
- 186 (5) Design should be more specific in all project aspects (contaminated site determination, for example) and streamlined in other aspects such implementation architecture reducing the number of implementing partners to a workable minimum, and should be clear in streamlining rules and procedures specificity when coordinating among different institutions and their different guidelines.
- 187 (6) Design should also carefully explore sequencing (i.e. if one component is contingent upon another) and plan accordingly, in order not to have conflicts nor delays due to this.
- 188 (7) Design should also include elements of flexibility, attending that varying circumstances occur in the field, and not being inordinately strict.
- 189 (8) Results frameworks should place an emphasis on results and outcomes mainly, not only on activities and products. The indicator set a results framework should be robust, with

outcome indicators that can allow for measuring performance and facilitate implementation and planning based on progress towards results/outcomes/effects. The framework should be set at design, adjusted yes --if necessary-- but and not changed repetitively nor retrofitted within the lifespan of a project.

- 190 (9) A project's exit strategy should be developed early on in project implementation/inception. Albeit adapted as project progresses, yet –by generating it early in implementation— the early adoption of an exit strategy should allow for the generation of mechanisms for its own establishment and not leaving it as a postscript to an intervention. If left for the end of a project there is a strong risk that it would never be never applied due to a lack of mechanisms to apply or due to its lacking ownership. An exit strategy should be forward looking and should include different aspects of sustaining achievements (institutional, financial, etc.).
- 191 (10) Develop a greater number of KM products to solidify technical assistance processes, to foster sustainability, and to bridge issues that might arise out of staff rotation. These products should be developed and disseminated as activities concurrently as the technical capacity activities ensue and not gathered all at the end of a project. This will also aid in visibility and transparency of products, and generate improved institutional capacity. It will correspondingly aid in increasing or strengthening capacity at the local or sub national level, fostering institutional and individual strengthening in areas where are needed the most.
- 192 (11) Complex projects should have a mid-point review or assessment. Yet, if this is not included in monitoring plan, it should be necessary and sought when delays or issues with implementations arise. The aim of this assessments would be to have an opportunity to correct a project's course if or as needed.
- 193 (12) Projects with intricate components and multiple partners (even multiple partners within the same institution) need to have internal communication mechanisms to integrate different relevant areas of government within a particular project. This sort of mechanism should be set without adding unnecessary bureaucratic steps to implementation but for better communication, coordination and articulation to be maintained within and among institutions involved in what are, after all, integrated problems that need to be dealt in an integrated manner.

REPORT ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through / GPN ExpRes

Services/Work Description: This Terms of Reference (ToR) specify the details for the assignment of an Individual Contract for Final evaluation of the "Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)" Project co-financed by the European Union and the Republic of Türkiye, implemented by UNDP Türkiye Country Office (CO) in close cooperation with the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC). The project commenced in 2019 with a focus on the management of contaminated sites through enhancing implementation capacity of the EU POPs Regulation and the Soil Contamination Strategy and aims to protect environment and improve the quality of life by reducing the adverse effects of POPs and other hazardous substances. The evaluation will focus on the assessment of the activities implemented and whether the activities led to the achievement of the planned results and objectives (in accordance with the Project Document, Donor Agreement and associated modifications made during implementation). As a result of this evaluation, identification of the lessons learned, and recommendations is expected from the evaluator to improve the quality of the planning, preparation and implementation of subsequent projects in future.

Project/Programme Title: 00107442 – "Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)" Project

Consultancy Title: Final Evaluation of "Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)" Project

Duty Station: Duty Station for the Assignment is home-based. The Consultant will be requested to travel to provinces where the Project has been implemented as indicated in the expected interview schedule.

Estimated number of working days: Approximately 25 days

Expected start & end dates: December 2023 – 05 April 2024 (starting date is indicative and may be updated considering actual contract signature date)

1. BACKGROUND

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the UN's global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life.

UNDP Climate Change and Environment (CCE) Portfolio's strategy is focusing on promoting change at scale through investing in national capacity to respond in addition to piloting and prototyping development solutions that have the potential to lead to transformational change. Also, a key element of the strategy is to apply the integrated ecosystem approach, to help establish mechanisms to value ecosystem services with a view to addressing the market failures to fully reflect the true value of ecosystem services.

"Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with POPs Project" under CCE Portfolio is funded by the European Union and the Republic of Türkiye under IPA II Programme and has been executed by UNDP in partnership with the MoEUCC, General Directorate of Environmental Management. The project aims to improve environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of POPs and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites through enhancing the implementation capacity of EU POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination Strategy. In order to achieve the project objective, and address the barriers, the project's intervention has been organized into three components:

- Component 1. Technical and institutional capacity strengthening for management of POPs contaminated sites,
- Component 2. Identification and classification of contaminated sites with POPs and Pilot remediation activities,
- Component 3. Increasing institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites.

During the implementation phase, considering the COVID-19 impact as well as the February 2023 damages of earthquake, the project was granted an additional 18 months of time extension with an addendum, several notifications with revised budgets and new activities designed considering the urgent needs of the MoEUCC until 05 April 2024.

The project aims to contribute one of the trivets of general objective of the EU IPA Environment and Climate Change Sector Operational Programme (IPA-2) (ESOP) that is environmental protection through increasing the capacity of the MoEUCC for protection of soils from POPs and other dangerous pollutants. The project is also fitting the respective output of the ESOP which is the "Legislative reform and capacity building advanced in the areas of climate action, air quality, civil protection, marine environment, horizontal legislation and nature protection" since it will contribute capacity building for implementation of POPs Regulation and Point Source Contaminated Sites Legislation. Multi-annual Action Programme for Environment and Climate Action 2014-2016 and National Action Plan for EU Accession Phase-II (June 2015-June 2019) clearly state that Chemicals sector is one of the major sectors for putting EU Acquis into practice in the country.

Türkiye signed the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in 2004 and ratified it in 2009. In order to fulfill its obligations under the Convention Türkiye prepared its National Implementation Plan (NIP) that includes the inventory of the country and the necessary action plans for implementation of the convention in the country. The inventory of POPs in the country and action plans in the NIP were reviewed with the GEF support in 2013 since there were addition of 9 new POPs in the annexes of the convention in between 2004-2011. As it is indicated in the NIP, one of the prior areas of the country on implementation of the Convention and the POPs Regulation is contaminated sites management since the country is in a fast-growing period and has intensive usage of such chemicals in various industrial sectors which may increase the uncontrolled contamination of soil with these chemicals.

Türkiye implemented the EU Project on "Implementation of POPs Regulation in Türkiye" which is the implementing legislation of EU for the Stockholm Convention and at the moment is preparing the POPs By-law for publication as an output of this project. The prepared By-law was adopted in 2018. The EU Project supports Türkiye to implement the fundamental legislation revision studies on POPs that is providing necessary framework measures and limits for POPs management. However, it does not consist specific provisions for implementation of the POPs Regulation such as management of POPs stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites.

Under these circumstances, Türkiye will start implementing the obligations of the Stockholm Convention (SC) and related EU POPs Regulation (EC) No 850/2004, which is the implementing regulation of EU for SC, in the upcoming years very tremendously and will need technical assistance for effective implementation of it. For this purpose, an EU Project for implementation of POPs Regulation in Türkiye was conducted in 2013-2015 to harmonize the SC and related EU Regulation in Turkish acquis with a By-law on POPs. However, this project and its output draft By-law is not covering POPs contaminated sites and therefore there is still a need for a complementary project as proposed to enhance the technical and institutional contaminated sites management background all actors including policy makers, local implementing authorities and site owners and strengthen the enforcement capability of the POPs and Contaminated Sites legislation in the country. In addition, there was still a need for a legislative gap assessment to be conducted, in order to define the level of compliance of Türkiye for implementation of Stockholm Convention and related EU legislation on contaminated sites management. Under the scope of this project, legal gap assessment studies have been finalized during the 2022-2023 period.

The POPs Regulation covers the life-cycle management of POPs such as banning or severely restricting production/use/import/export of POPs chemicals, environmentally sound management of POPs stockpiles, wastes and contaminated sites. Within the scope of the regulation management of contaminated sites with POPs is the major deficiency in terms of regulatory and enforcement point of view. Due to the lack of specific European legislation, which would ensure contaminated sites investigation and remediation, other national, regional and local policy strategies have been designed for management of contaminated sites. Through Addendum No 1 of the project, additional activity has been integrated to provide reporting on circularity of POPs.

Brief Description of the Current Project:

Title of the action:	Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)		
Contracting Authority:	Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change, General Directorate of European Union and Foreign Relations Address: Mustafa Kemal Mahallesi Eskişehir Devlet Yolu (Dumlupınar Bulvarı) 9. km. No: 278 Çankaya Ankara / Türkiye Telephone: +90 312 474 03 50/51		
Organisation:	For the Contribution Agreement: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Türkiye Country Office UNDP, Oran Mahallesi, Mustafa Fehmi Gerçeker Sokak No:12, 06450, Çankaya, Ankara/Türkiye Telephone: +90 312 454 11 00 Telex/Fax: +90 312 496 14 63		
End Recipient:	Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change, General Directorate of Environmental Management, Chemicals Management Department Address : Mustafa Kemal Mahallesi Eskişehir Devlet Yolu (Dumlupınar Bulvarı) 9. km. No: 278 Çankaya Ankara / Türkiye Telephone : +90 312 474 03 37/38 Telex/Fax : +90 312 474 03 35		
Location of the action:	Türkiye		
Total duration of the action:	54 months		
Total budget for the action:	EUR 2,030,000		
EU and TR financing requested:	EU financing request: EUR 1,700,000 TR financing request: EUR 300,000		
UNDP Co-financing	EUR 30,000		
Objectives of the action:	The overall objective is to improve environmental protection and the quality of life of citizens by protecting human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites through enhancing the implementation capacity of EU POPs Regulation and Soil Contamination Strategy.		
Target groups ²⁷ :	 The following target groups can be considered under this action: The relevant staff of MoEUCC in central and provincial level from the following departments: Department of Chemicals Management Department of Water and Soil Management Provincial directorates Line ministries Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Industrial Associations and Environmental NGOs, Universities and Research Centers (METU, Kocaeli University, TUBITAK MRC, etc.) Industry especially potential target sectors that may have contaminated sites and MoEUCC-certified companies for soil sampling and remediation 		

²⁷ "Target groups" are the groups/entities who will directly benefit from the action at the action purpose level.

	 Public especially farmers, residents in highly industrialized areas In addition to target groups the following departments of MoEUCC will be the stakeholders: Directorate General of Geographic Information Systems However, in addition to this, works component will have specific target groups as it will be implemented locally: Provincial directorate of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change Pilot state-owned site owner institutions (Turkish Electricity Transmission Company [TEIAS] and Electricity Generation Company [EUAS]) Local municipalities Local municipalities Local municipalities 	
Final beneficiaries ²⁸ :	The final beneficiaries of the project are local stakeholders, MoEUCC- certified companies and vulnerable communities and citizens.	
Estimated results:	Result 1. Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites has been strengthened Result 2. Contaminated sites with POPs have been identified and classifie Result 3. Institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites have been increased	ed

Summary of Project and the Progress:

Component 0 – Inception

	Main activities	Expected output
0.1	Establishment of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) and office	Inception report Media package
0.2	Kick-off meeting (first management meeting)	Project website, project newsletters, business cards, banners, posters etc. Envisaged delivery date: 12 weeks after the project start date.
0.3	Launch event	Delivered. All outputs of Component 0, except for the posters, all materials have beep produced.

Component 1 – Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites has been strengthened

	Main activities	Expected output
	Trainings for staff that will	Training need assessment report
	be working on POPs/contaminated sites management from	Training module and reports
1.1		Envisaged delivery date: 51 months after the project's start date.
	different target groups	Delivered.

²⁸ "Final beneficiaries" are those who will benefit from the action in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

	Main activities	Expected output
Compon	nent 2 – Contaminated sites w	ith POPs have been identified and classified
1.6.	Impact on Contaminated Sites Management	Not Delivered. Incorporated with Addendum No 1 approval.
4.6	Circularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the	• A Report on Circularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites Management
1.5	Health Risk Assessment Software Programme	 Health Risk Assessment Software Programme Envisaged delivery date: 40 months after the project's start date. Delivered. The Health Risk Assessment Software Programme was developed and submitted for the use of central and provincial staff of the MoEUCC in the last quarter of 2022. An online Training on Generic Health Risk Assessment Software was held on 22 December 2022.
1.4	Establishment of Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme	 Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme Envisaged delivery date: 33 months after the project's start date. Delivered. The Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme was established.
1.3	Study visits	 Study visit reports Envisaged delivery date: 30 months after the project's start date. Not Delivered. The first study visit was held on 09-13 May 2022, the second and third visits are further postponed to the fourth quarter of 2023. The organization of the second study visit was initiated under this reporting period.
1.2	LGA/Guidance documents/publications preparation and update	 Legal gap analysis Recommendation for draft legislation A public video on general information on POPs contaminated sites Brochures on general information on POPs contaminated sites, registration and remediation information for contaminated sites, information on post-monitoring activities Revised guidelines (Technical Guidelines on Contaminated Sites Assessment, Remediation, Monitoring and Risk Assessment) A new guideline on POPs contaminated sites management Updated report forms of Annexes of Contaminated sites legislation Envisaged delivery date: 40 months after the project's start date. Not Delivered, partially delivered.
		TNA Report was completed. Training modules were completed for the five online trainings and their reports were submitted.

2.1	Update of CSIS Software	 Updated CSIS Software Analysis Document Training Report Envisaged delivery date: 54 months after the project start date. Delivered, but the CSIS software will be updated until the end of project according to revisions in the regulation. 	
2.2	Identification and Classification of POPs Contaminated Sites in Türkiye	 Workshop Report Seminar Report List of Contaminated Sites Updated CSIS with this data Envisaged delivery date: 45 months after the project's start date. Delivered. The CSIS programme does not include any government/orphan sites, this activity was separated from the pilot works rehabilitation process. This activity provided a general workflow process. 	
2.3	Prioritization of POPs/Persistent Toxic Substances Contaminated Sites for Remediation	 Prioritized list of POPs contaminated sites Workshop Report Envisaged delivery date: 30 months after the project's start date. Delivered. The CSIS programme does not include any government/orphan sites, this activity was conducted to provide reference work for future cases and separated from the pilot works rehabilitation process. 	
2.4	Selection of Two Pilot Areas among the Prioritized Contaminated Sites in Activity 2.3	 Pilot Site Selection Report Permission Correspondences Envisaged delivery date: 30 months after the project's start date. Delivered. Since the inventory of MoEUCC does not include any governmental sites or orphan sites contaminated with POPs, the selection of two pilot sites was completed in August 2021. 	
2.5 Preparation of Operational Plan for 2 pilot sites		 Technical specification and operational plan of two pilot sites Envisaged delivery date: 36 months after the project's start date. Delivered. The Operational Plan was prepared when the pilot sites were identified after several inter-governmental meetings with the institutions. However, the tender dossier including the OP for two pilot sites was revised according to risk analysis and budget estimation in the second quarter of 2023. 	
2.6 Preparation of a Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pi sites		 On-site Technical Supervision and Monitoring Supervision and Monitoring Plan Supervision Reports-operational 	

		Post Remediation Plan Recommendations Report
		Envisaged delivery date: 36 months after the project's start date.
		Delivered.
		The Supervision and Monitoring Plan was prepared when the pilot sites were identified after several inter-governmental meetings with the institutions. However, the tender dossier including the S&M Plan for two pilot sites was revised according to risk analysis and budget estimation at the second quarter of 2023.
		Recommendations respecting Post Remediation Plan
2.7	Preparation of Technical	Technical Specifications Envisaged delivery date: 36 months after the project's start date.
	Specification for 2 Pilot Sites for Pilot Application	Technical Specification was prepared when the pilot sites were identified after several inter-governmental meetings with the institutions. However, the tender dossier including the TS for two pilot sites was revised according to risk analysis and budget estimation in the second quarter of 2023.
	Implementation of Supervision Support and	Recommendations respecting Implementation of Supervision Support and Monitoring Pan for 2 Pilot Sites
2.8.	Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites	Envisaged delivery date: 36 months after the project's start date. Not Delivered. (Planned to be cancelled with an upcoming addendum)

2. SCOPE OF ASSIGNMENT

An Individual Contract (IC) on Final Project Evaluation for **"Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)"** will be initiated for preparing an independent evaluation that measures the expected results and specific objectives achieved against those stated in the Description of Action, Project Documents and associated modifications and identifies the lessons learned and recommendations relevant to the planning, preparation and implementation of a possible subsequent project.

This final evaluation has the following *specific objectives*:

To measure to what extent the project has contributed to solving 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 officially revised.

To measure the project contribution to the objectives set in the UNDP Country Program Document (CPD) for 2021-2025, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) for 2021-2025, EC's Progress Report for Türkiye's accession period, Environment Chapter, National Development Plan of Türkiye, SDGs as well as to 2023 Industry and Technology Strategy, national level policy documents such as Contaminated Soil Regulation, POPs By-Law, Mercury Draft By-Law and National Implementation Plans (NIP) for Stockholm Convention, technical guidelines for management of POPs.

To assess both negative and positive factors that have facilitated or hampered progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management, and resource allocation.

To assess the extent to which the application of the rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming are integrated within planning and implementation of the project

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 1 level (replicability) and to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components.

Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

In the light of the evaluation parameters, the Evaluation Consultant is expected to analyze data and share its findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by this analysis. As a reference point for the evaluation, the Consultant is provided with indicative evaluation questions below; which are expected to be amended, elaborated and submitted as part of the Inception Report and shall be included as an annex to the final report described below.

Relevance:

Under this parameter, the Consultant will analyze the extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, national strategies and relevant legislation:

1. To what extent was the project design relevant in addressing the MoEUCC's capacity enhancement needs to align its strategies and actions with those of EU legislation and practices and enforce the legislative alignment?

2. To what extent was the design and strategy of the project relevant to national strategies and priorities? (including clear linkage to National Development Plan, national level policy documents such as Contaminated Soil Regulation Law, POPs Law, Mercury Draft Law and National Implementation Plans (NIP) for Stockholm Convention, technical guidelines for management of POPs.)?

3. To what extent was the design and strategy of the activities are aligned with UN and UNDP priorities (UNSDCF and CPD)?

Effectiveness:

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

1. To what extent has the project achieved the objectives and targets of the results framework in the Project Document? (The Consultant is expected to provide detailed analysis of 1) planned activities and results and 2) achievement of results.)

2. What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? How might this be improved in the future?

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

4. Compared to 2019, to what extent has the MoEUCC increased its capacity in terms of identification of POPs and their better follow-up through the enforcement of the relevant regulation?

5. To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted the effectiveness of the project?

6. To what extent has the project contributed to the fulfilment of the objectives of UNSDCF priorities, CPD goals, EU alignment and National Development Plan targets?

7. In what ways have the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions and February 2023 earthquakes in Southeast Türkiye impacted the achievement of project results?

Efficiency:

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

1. To what extent were the project outputs delivered on time and with high quality?

2.To what extent has the project ensured value for money?

3.To what extent were resource mobilization efforts successful? Was funding sufficient for the achievement of results? (funding analysis)

4. What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by UNDP?

5.To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted on the efficiency of the project?

6.To what extent was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives/projects that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?

7. How well did project management work for achievement of results?

8.To what extent did project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?

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

Sustainability:

Under this parameter, the Consultant will analyze to what extent the project's positive actions are likely to continue after the end of the project:

1. To what extent will the project achievements be sustained? What are the possible systems,

structures, and staff that will ensure its sustainability? What are the challenges and opportunities?To what extent have development partners committed to providing continuing support? What is

the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?

3. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits?

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

5. 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?

6. What can be done to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes and to what extent does an effective exit strategy exist?

Cross-Cutting Issues:

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

1. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?

2. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

3. Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?

4. To what extent has the project contributed to leaving no one behind agenda?

Methodology and Approach

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the Inception Report and the Final Evaluation Report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality. It is strongly suggested that the evaluation should use a mixed method approach whenever possible – collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data using multiple sources in order to draw valid and evidence-based findings and conclusions and practical recommendations. The evaluator is expected not only to collect quantitative/qualitative data but also is highly encouraged to review all relevant reports providing quantitative data collected by project.

However, the evaluator is expected to propose and determine a sound evaluation design and methodology (including detailed methodology to answer each evaluation question) and submit it to UNDP in the inception report following a review of all key relevant documents and meeting with UNDP and project. Final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will be made through consultation among UNDP, the Evaluation Consultant and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives as well as answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with stakeholders. Methods to be used by the evaluator to collect and analyze the required data shall include but not limited to:

Desk Review: This should include a review of alliance with;

- Project document
- Result Framework/M&E Framework
- Project Quality Assurance Report
- Annual Work Plans
- Annual Reports

.

- Highlights of Steering Committee and OCU meetings
- Studies relating to the country context and situation

Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including UNDP, Delegation of the European Union to Türkiye, Government partners, UN colleagues, development partners, beneficiaries so on:

 Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed

• Key informant interviews with relevant stakeholders from government agencies, donors, UN Agencies, beneficiaries supported by project.

• All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. (The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments of individuals)

- Analysis of project 's funding, budgets and expenditure generated from Atlas and Quantum.
- Analysis and interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data available from various credible sources.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.

The evaluator will ensure triangulation of the various data sources, data and evidence will be triangulated with multiple sources to address evaluation guestions. The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the Evaluation Consultant.

EXPECTED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Partners/ Stakeholder(s) to be Interviewed	Location ²⁹	Estimated Day(s) of Interview	Method
MoEUCC, General Directorate of European Union and Foreign Relations (Contracting Authority)	Ankara	0.25	In person or remote
MoEUCC, General Directorate of Environmental Management (End Recipient) o Department of Chemicals Management o Department of Water and Soil Management	Ankara	0.5	In person or remote
Delegation of the European Union to Türkiye	Ankara	0.25	In person or remote
Sample Provincial Directorate staff trained by the project	Ankara and other selected provinces	1	In person or remote
Sample trainees from MoEUCC-certified sampling and remediation companies	Ankara and other selected provinces	1	In person or remote
Sample trainees from site owners	Ankara and other selected provinces	1	In person or remote
Pilot works component beneficiaries (State-owned site owner institutions (Turkish Electricity Transmission Company [TEIAS] and Electricity Generation Company [EUAS])	Provinces Ankara Kesikkopru, Bala, Ankara Hopa, Artvin	1	Remote
	ESTIMATED TOTAL	5	

The locations of partners and stakeholders do not rule out the probability of a remote monitoring mission if approved by the Commissioning Unit under exceptional circumstances. The names of cities are there to inform the reader about the location of stakeholders and do not mean that the Individual Consultant must pay an in-person field visit to each city indicated in this list.

Gender and Human Rights-based Approach

As part of the requirement, evaluation must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated gender equality perspective and rights-based approach. The evaluators are requested to review UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation during the inception phase.

In addition, the methodology used in the final evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, etc. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of final evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for enhanced gender responsive and rights-based approach of the project. These evaluation approach and methodology should consider different types of groups in the project intervention – women, youth, minorities, and vulnerable groups.

3. Expected Outputs and deliverables

Fir	Final Evaluation is expected to be conducted between Dec-2023 and 5Apr-2024 and take approximately 25 working				
da	days. The Evaluation Consultant is expected to submit the following deliverables to the satisfaction of UNDP:				
#	# Deliverable Due Date Review and Approvals Required				

²⁹ Location refers to where the stakeholder is located. The evaluator may or may not undertake an in-person interview depending on Covid-19 measures prevalent in the country at the time of the field work. In the case of restrictions, the evaluator has the liberty to carry out the interviews remotely.

1	Final TE Inception	17-Jan-2024	Reviewed and approved by Evaluation Manager in	Ī
	Report		consultation with the CCE Portfolio Manager	
2	Draft TE Report	19-Feb-2024	Reviewed and approved by Evaluation Manager in]
			consultation with the CCE Portfolio Manager	
3	Final TE Report* +	11-Mar-2024	Reviewed and approved by Evaluation Manager in	1
	Audit Trail		consultation with the CCE Portfolio Manager	
4	De-briefing/	18-Mar-2024	Reviewed and approved by Evaluation Manager in	
	Presentation		consultation with the CCE Portfolio Manager	

*: All final evaluation reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.

Deliverable	Indicative person/days to complete the deliverable*	Related Activity	Responsible Party	Expected Date of Completion**
		Kick off meeting	UNDP	18.12.2023
Incention Depart		Review of relevant documentation and submission of the draft Inception Report	Consultant	03.01.2024
	6	Providing feedback to Draft Inception Report	UNDP	10.01.2024
	Finalized Inception Report based on the feedback received from UNDP Data collection and interviews	Consultant	17.01.2024	
		Data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders (field mission)	Consultant 17.01.2024 – 02.02.2024	17.01.2024 – 02.02.2024
Draft Evaluation Report	14	Online Mission Wrap-Up Meeting to present initial findings	Consultant	05.02.2024
		Meeting to present initial Con findings Delivery of Draft Evaluation Report compiling findings from Con data collection and interviews Con with key stakeholders Union	Consultant	19.02.2024
		Review the Draft Evaluation Report and provide feedback	UNDP, Evaluation Reference Group	04.03.2024
Final Evaluation Report + Audit Trail	4	Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report + Audit Trail by taking into consideration the feedback from UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group	Consultant	11.03.2024
De- briefing/Presentation	1	De-briefing/Presentation to UNDP and Stakeholders	Consultant	18.03.2024

* The number of person/days are solely provided to give the Evaluation Consultant an idea on the work to be undertaken. The payments shall be realized in accordance with Section VI - Price and Schedule of Payments, irrespective of the number of person/days to be invested for the completion of each respective deliverable. ** Dates may be changed according to the actual contract start date.

1) Inception Report:

This report will be 30 pages maximum in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for carrying out the independent evaluation The report should justify why the said methods are the most appropriate, given the set of evaluation questions identified in the ToR. It will also include a mission programme which indicates proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. This document will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluation Consultant and UNDP. In principle, the report is expected to contain the outline stated in **Annex A** of this Terms of Reference.

2) Draft Evaluation Report:

The draft evaluation report will contain the same sections as the final report detailed under Annex B. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. UNDP will disseminate the draft evaluation report to the evaluation reference group in order to seek their comments and suggestions. Comments and suggestions of UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group will be collected in an audit trail and will be shared with the Evaluation Consultant for it to make final revisions.

3) Final Evaluation Report + Audit Trail:

The final evaluation report will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The report should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, questionnaires, or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality. In addition, the Final Evaluation Report should contain clear recommendations that are concrete, feasible and easy to understand. The Final Evaluation Report will be shared with UNDP to be disseminated to the key stakeholders. In principle, this report is expected to contain the sections stated in **Annex B** of this Terms of Reference. The Evaluation Consultant will also submit its answers to the Audit Trail to show the actions taken/not taken and revisions made/not made in line with suggestions and recommendations of UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group providing detailed justifications in each case.

4) Presentation/Debriefing

A meeting will be organized with key stakeholders including UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group members to present findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The meeting will be held either via ZOOM or if conditions permit in person at UNDP Türkiye Office in Ankara. The presentation will be on main findings and lessons learned but will also be forward looking in proposing recommendations that are actionable by UNDP and its implementing partners.

4. Institutional arrangements/reporting lines

UNDP has full ownership of the activity and of its final product. Thus, any public mention (including through social media) about the activity should state clearly that ownership. In addition, any public appearance or related published work related to the activity should be coordinated and approved by UNDP in advance. Likewise, any visibility material or product produced for this assignment must be in the name of UNDP.

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

The following are the key actors involved in the implementation of this Final Evaluation:

1. Evaluation Manager

This role will be conducted by the **Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management Analyst of UNDP** who will have the following functions:
Supervise the evaluation process throughout the main phases of the evaluation (preparation of the ToR, implementation and management and use of the evaluation)

Participate in the selection and recruitment of the Individual Consultant

Provide the Individual Consultant with administrative support and required data and documentation.

Ensure the evaluation deliverables meet the required quality

Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the Individual Consultant

Review the Inception Report, Draft Evaluation and Final Evaluation Reports and give necessary approvals on behalf of UNDP

Collect and consolidate comments on draft evaluation reports and share with the evaluation team for finalization of the evaluation report

Contribute to the development of management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP

Ensure evaluation terms of reference, final evaluation reports, management responses are publicly available through Evaluation Resource Center within the specified timeframe

Facilitate, monitor and report on implementation of management responses on a periodic basis

2. Climate Change and Environment Portfolio Manager will have the following functions:

Establish the Evaluation Reference Group with key project partners when needed

Ensure and safeguard the independence of the evaluation

Provide comments and clarifications on the Terms of Reference, Draft Inception Report and Draft Evaluation Reports

Ensure the Individual Consultant's access to all information, data and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who are expected to participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods

Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions

Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to key stakeholders

Be responsible for implementation of key actions of the management response

3. Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for the overall coordination and quality of the final evaluation report to be produced. It is the Evaluation Consultant who will be held accountable to UNDP in the quality of the final product. The consultant will conduct the evaluation study by fulfilling their contractual duties and responsibilities in line with this ToR, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and ethical guidelines and in full compliance with the UNDP Evaluation Policy and <u>Guidelines</u>. This includes submission of all deliverables stipulated under Article

XIII (Terms and Payments) of this ToR, to the satisfaction of UNDP. Individual Consultant's functions do not include any managerial, supervisory and/or representative functions in UNDP, end beneficiaries and implementing partners. All documents and data provided to the Individual Consultant are confidential and cannot be used for any other purpose or shared with a third party without any written approval from UNDP. The scope of work for the Consultant of this evaluation will include but not be limited to:

- To develop and finalize the inception report that will include elaboration of how each evaluation question will be answered along with proposed methods, proposed sources of data, and data collection and analysis procedures;
- To design the tools and data collection;
- To conduct data collection, analysis and interpretation;
- To develop the draft evaluation report;
- To finalize the evaluation report;
- To present of findings and de-brief
- To plan, execute and report, kickoff and feedback meetings and debriefings;
- To ensure compliance with the Final Evaluation TOR; and
- To utilize best practice evaluation methodologies

4. Evaluation Reference Group: MoEUCC (Contracting Authority and End Recipient units) and Delegation of the EU to Türkiye will function as the evaluation reference group. This group is composed of the representatives of the major stakeholders in the project and will review and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation process, as well as on the evaluation products (more specifically comments and suggestions on the draft report and final report) and options for improvement.

Reporting Line

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

Reporting Language and Conditions

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

Title Rights

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

Travel:

Duty Station for the Assignment is home-based. The Consultant will be requested to travel to provinces where the Project has been implemented as indicated in the expected interview schedule table above. All the costs associated with travel, accommodation and any other living costs shall be borne by UNDP. UNDP will arrange economy class roundtrip flight tickets through its contracted Travel Agency.

. The costs of these missions may either be;

Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the Consultant, through UNDP's official Travel Agency or,

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

Covered by the combination of both options.

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

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

As per UNDSS rules, the IC is responsible for completing necessary online security trainings and submitting certificates and travel clearance prior to assignment-related travels.

"Interviews" referred in this Terms of Reference comprises such telecommuting and online conferencing tools as well. All travel arrangements shall be subject to pre-approval of the UNDP.

Travel:

- International travel will be required to Turkey during the TE mission;
- The BSAFE course <u>must</u> be successfully completed <u>prior</u> to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <u>https://dss.un.org/dssweb/</u>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

Responsibilities of the evaluators:

- The consultants should have the needed skills to carry out the assignment. The evaluation will be fully independent, the consultants will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analysing data for the outcome evaluation,
- Responsible for the follow-up on attaining all documents and reports as needed.

Responsibilities of UNDP:

• To facilitate the evaluation process, the UNDP M&E and KM Analyst (Evaluation Manager) will assist in connecting the evaluator with the senior management, and key stakeholders. In addition, the UNDP will assist in organizing the field visits and meetings. During the evaluation, UNDP will help identify key partners for interviews by the evaluation team.

However, in the unlikely case of a resurge in COVID-19 pandemic cases and subsequent restrictive measures posed by the government of Türkiye, at UNDP's discretion, field visits and interviews defined under Expected Interview Schedule might be held virtually through telecommuting and online conferencing tools, or any other alternative method to protect the safety of consultant, key actors and informants whilst ensuring the successful conduct of evaluation mission. "Interviews" referred to in this Terms of Reference comprises such telecommuting and online conferencing tools as well. All travel arrangements shall be subject to pre-approval of the UNDP. In the event that field visits cannot be performed, the travel, accommodation and any other living expenses pertaining to relevant deliverable shall not be paid to the Consultant.

COVID-19 Specific Measures:

The Consultant shall review all local regulations, as well as that of UN and UNDP concerning the measures, he/she must take during performance of the contract in the context of COVID-19. The Consultant shall take all measures against COVID-19 imposed by local regulations as well as by UN and UNDP during performance of the contract to protect his/her health and social rights, as well as UNDP personnel, Project Stakeholders and third parties. Pursuant to "Clause 12- Indemnification" of UNDP General Terms and Conditions for Contracts, the Consultant shall indemnify, defend, and hold and save harmless, UNDP, and its officials, agents and employees, from and against all suits, proceedings, claims, demands, losses and liability of any kind or nature brought by any third party against UNDP, including, but not limited to, all litigation costs and expenses, attorney's fees, settlement payments and damages, based on, arising from, or relating to COVID-19 measures that must be taken by the Consultant in the context of the contract. UNDP shall not be held accountable for any Covid-19 related health risks or events that are caused by negligence of the Consultant and/or any other third party.

Facilities To Be Provided by UNDP

UNDP Türkiye CO won't be providing a facility for the Consultant to work during the contract. UNDP will provide background materials for Evaluation Consultant's review, reference and use. Neither UNDP nor any of the project partners are required to provide any physical facility for the work of the Consultant. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g., working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection, etc.) and at the discretion of UNDP and/or the relevant project partners, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the Consultant. UNDP and/or the relevant project partners will facilitate meetings between the Consultant and other stakeholders, when needed.

Evaluators' Ethics

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

- **Anonymity and confidentiality**. The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility**. The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Evaluation Consultant and Project Team in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The Evaluation Consultant must corroborate all assertions and disagreements.
- **Integrity.** The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence**. The Evaluation Consultant should ensure its independence from the intervention under review and must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.

- Incidents. If problems arise during the interviews, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to UNDP. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by UNDP in this Terms of Reference.
- Validation of information. The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the Consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports/deliverables.** If delivery of the reports/deliverables is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is lower than of the quality desired by UNDP, the Evaluation Consultant will not be entitled for any payment regarding that specific report/deliverable, even person/days for submission of the report/deliverable has been invested.

5. Experience and qualifications

I. Academic Qualifications:

Required:

- Bachelor's degree in engineering, applied science, environmental sciences, chemistry, or any other relevant discipline or field. (5 points)

Asset:

- Master's or Ph.D. Degree in relevant areas such as engineering, applied science, environmental sciences, chemistry, or any other relevant discipline or field. (5 points)

II. Years of experience:

Required:

- Minimum 7 years of overall professional experience in research design, field work, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research strategies, including but not limited to focus groups, surveys and interview techniques. (25 points)

Asset:

 More than 10 years of overall professional experience in research design, field work, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research strategies, including but not limited to focus groups, surveys and interview techniques. (3 points)

III. Language:

Excellent command of spoken and written English. (5 points)

IV. Competencies:

Required:

- Minimum 5 years of professional international and/or national experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, research or review of development projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator (25 points)
- Experience in evaluation of POPs and/or contaminated sites projects/programmes. (15 points)
- Experience in EU-funded Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) project/programme design, implementation, monitoring or evaluation (10 points)

Asset:

- More than 7 years of professional international and/or national experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, research or review of development projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator (3 points)
- 3-5 evaluations, assessments, research or programme/project reviews in environment or hazardous waste/chemicals projects/programmes as evaluation team member, sole evaluator or team leader. (1 point) OR

- 6-9 evaluations, assessments, research or programme/project reviews in environment or hazardous waste/chemicals projects/programmes as evaluation team member, sole evaluator or team leader. (2 points)
 - OR
- Minimum 10 evaluations, assessments, research or programme/project reviews in environment or hazardous waste/chemicals projects/programmes as evaluation team member, sole evaluator or team leader. (3 points)
- Authorship of article(s)/research paper(s) on programme/project evaluation (techniques, approaches etc) or/ environment and/or chemicals and waste sector. (1)

Notes:

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

6. Payment Modality

The contract price is a fixed price regardless of extension of the herein specific duration. The amount paid to the Evaluation Consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax, etc. The daily fee amount proposed in the price proposal for the Consultant should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed) etc. UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa etc. It is the applicants' responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters. Consultant will not receive any additional payment for whatsoever reason.

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

Payment for deliverables shall be affected by UNDP within 30 days upon issuance of Confirmation of Service Receipt for deliverables, and acceptance and approval of the related invoice by UNDP. If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the Consultant to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the Consultant has invested time to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Deliverable	Percentage of Payment	Condition of Payment
1. Inception Report	10 % of the Total Contract Amount	
2. Draft Evaluation Report	60 % of the Total Contract Amount	Payment shall be made within thirty (30) days from the date of approval by UNDP Evaluation Manager in consultation with the CCE Portfolio
3. Final Evaluation Report + Audit Trail	20 % of the Total Contract Amount	wanager

Payments will be affected to the Consultant in line with the percentages listed in the following table, upon acceptance of deliverables by UNDP.

|--|

In case a Turkish national is awarded the contract, the payment shall be effected in TL through conversion of the US\$ amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer. Otherwise, the payments shall be effected in US Dollars.

Without submission and approval (by UNDP) of the above listed deliverables in due time and quality, the Evaluation Consultant shall not be entitled to receive any payment from the UNDP even if time has been invested in this assignment.

Annexes:

Annex A - Outline of the Inception Report

- 1. Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
- 2. **Evaluation objective, purpose and scope.** A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
- 3. **Evaluation criteria and questions.** The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
- 4. **Evaluability analysis.** Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
- 5. **Cross-cutting issues.** Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analyzed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
- 6. **Evaluation approach and methodology,** highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods,³⁰ sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
- 7. **Evaluation matrix.** This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
- 8. A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
- 9. Detailed **resource requirements** tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites

³⁰ Annex 2 outlines different data collection methods.

10. **Outline of the draft/final report** as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.

Annex B - Outline of the draft and final reports

- 1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:
 - Name of the evaluation intervention.
 - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
 - Countries of the evaluation intervention.
 - Names and organizations of evaluators.
 - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
 - Acknowledgements.
- 2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports on second page (as one page):

Project information				
Project/outcome title				
ATLAS ID				
UNDCS Outcome and CPD				
Output				
Country				
Region				
Date Project document				
signed				
Project Dates	Start	Planned End Date		
Project Dates				
Total Committed Budget				
Project expenditure at the				
time of evaluation				
Funding Source				
Implementing Party				
	Evaluation Information	1		
Evaluation type (project/				
outcome/thematic/country				
programme, etc.)				
Final/midterm review/ other				
	Start	End		
Period under evaluation				
Evaluators				
Evaluator e-mail address				
Evaluation Dates	Start	Completion		

3. Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

- 5. Executive summary (four-page maximum). A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
 - Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
 - Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
 - Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
 - Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.

6. Introduction

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated now, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention).
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.
- 7. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The

description needs to provide enough detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:

- Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- Explain the expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDCS priorities, and objectives, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other programme or country-specific plans and goals.
- Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Include data and an analysis of specific social groups affected. Identify relevant cross-cutting issues addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
- Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).
- 8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.
 - Evaluation scope. The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
 - Evaluation objectives. The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will
 make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation
 will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
 - **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the criteria used in the evaluation.
 - Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should
 detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers
 to these questions address the information needs of users.
- 9. Evaluation approach and methods. The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:
 - Evaluation approach.

- Data sources: the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame. If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
- Data-collection procedures and instruments: methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
- Performance standards: the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations: the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).³¹
- Background information on evaluators: the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.
- 10. Data analysis. The report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.
- 11. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect gender equality and women's empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues, as well as possible unanticipated effects.
- 12. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment as well as to disability and other cross-cutting issues.
- 13. Recommendations. The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or

³¹ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation,' June 2008. Available at <u>http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines</u>.

similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects. Recommendations regarding disability and other cross-cutting issues also need to be addressed.

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

Annex C – Documents to be Reviewed

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

- · Revised UNDP Evaluation Policy and Guidelines
- Independent Evaluator Induction Package
- · UNDP Guidelines on "Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit"
- UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2018-2021)
- UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (January 2021)
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020)
- Guidance on Evaluation Institutional Gender Mainstreaming (2018)
- · UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
- · UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations
- · UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025
- UNSDCF 2021-2025 and UNDP Country Programme Document 2021-2025
- 5 years National strategic development plan
- 11th National Development Plan
- Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) II Indicative Strategy Document for Turkey (2014-2020)
- EU IPA Environment and Climate Change Sector Operational Programme (IPA-2) (ESOP)
- Stockholm Convention

Project Documents, which will be provided after Contract Signature

- Project Documents (Description of Action Document and annexes)
- · Addendum and revised Project Documents
- · Inception, Activity and Annual Progress reports
- · Annual Work Plans
- Steering Committee Minutes
- · Training, workshop, meeting reports and records,
- · Result Framework/M&E Framework of the Project
- Monitoring Mission Reports (Output Verification Reports)
- Project Quality Assurance Reports
- ATLAS and QUANTUM Risk Registers

Annex-D LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROVED WITH ADDENDUM NO 1

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Protect human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites.	 12.4.2 (a) Hazardous waste generated per capita (kg per capita) *[SDG indicators are published with a two-year time lag, hence 2018 statistics are reported in 2020, 2019 statistics reported in 2021 and 2020 statistics reported in 2022] 	 European Commission's Regular Reports from 2019 to 2022 European Environment Agency's State of Environment Reports Statistical data on environment and climate change Progress in the implementation of Sector Operational Programme: Environment and Climate Action Progress in the implementation of National Action Plan for EU Accession Progress in the implementation of Multi-annual Action Programme for Türkiye on Environment and Climate Action 	 Stable political climate and macro-economic situation Strong commitment and dedication of the stakeholders to participate and cooperate throughout project implementation Strong stakeholder coordination during project implementation Convergent views and decisions among stakeholders and relevant institutions Sufficient number of assigned personnel in charge of the project within relevant institutions Sufficient number of experienced and high qualified experts with satisfactory knowledge and perception of the Turkish context for each sector which will be dealt with within this project Coherence between the training subjects/campaigns and the target group
Specific objective	Türkiye's capacity on implementation of EU POPs Regulation enhanced.	 A health risk assessment tool and software developed to determine the adverse health impact of POPs on local populations. 	 European Commission's Regular Reports from 2017 to 2020 Statistical data on environment and climate change Monitoring Reports Project Progress Reports Project Final Report 	

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Expected results	Result 1. Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites has been strengthened	 Approximately 490 staff were trained and certificated Operationalization of existing legislative instruments on POPs/POPs contaminated sites for their effective implementation Recommendations for draft legislation on contaminated sites and POPs by-law submitted to MoEUCC Technical guidance documents on POPs produced for an effective implementation of legislation %85 Staff members declared training content was useful to their work Study visits held to EU Countries were organized for information/experience exchange on contaminated sites remediation and soil pollution prevention 	 Study visit materials, evaluation report and participants list Training of trainees programme materials, evaluation report and participants list Training materials, evaluation report and participants list Training materials, evaluation report and participants list Number of certificates given to the participants Project Inception Report Activity Evaluation Reports Project Progress Reports PSC Meeting Minutes Project Final Report Project Evaluation 	 National and local institutions are committed to contaminated sites management. Owners of pilot sites are willing to cooperate in the project activities. Other national and local stakeholders are supporting project activities and participating. Trained staff members (national and local) remain in their posts during the entire duration of the project.
	Result 2. Contaminated sites with POPs have been identified and classified Result 3. Institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites	 CSIS is updated with the legislation requirements and its is written with post gre sql A methodology to identify and classify POPs contaminated sites is in place 2 POPs contaminated sites identified. Two POPs contaminated sites remedied state-owned sites remedied Technical specification, 	Reports	
	have been increased	operational plan, supervision plan documents prepared for two POPs contaminated sites remediation		

	Objectively verifiable Intervention logic indicators of achievement		Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	1. Technical and	Means	Cost	Assumptions
Activities	Institutional Capacity for Management of POPs Contaminated Sites Has Been Strengthened 1.1. Trainings for staff that will be working on POPs/contaminated sites management from different target groups 1.2. LGA/Guidance documents/publications preparation and update 1.3. Study visits 1.4. Establishment of Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme 2. Contaminated Sites with Pops Have Been Identified and Classified 2.1. Update of CSIS Software 2.2. Identification and classification of POPs contaminated sites in Türkiye 2.3. Prioritization of POPs/Persistent Toxic Substances Contaminated Sites for Remediation 2.4. Selection of Two Pilot Areas among the Prioritized Contaminated Sites in Activity 2.3 2.5. Preparation of Operational Plan for 2 pilot sites 2.6. Preparation of a Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pilot sites 2.7. Preparation of Coperational Plan for 2 pilot sites 2.7. Preparation of Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pilot sites 2.7. Preparation of Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pilot sites 2.7. Preparation of Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pilot sites 2.7. Preparation of Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pilot Sites 3. Works Component: Pilot Remediation Activities	 Project Coordination Unit (PCU) Technical Assistant Team (TAT) Short term experts (STEs) Stakeholder engagement activity (e.g. consultative meetings, bilateral meetings, workshops, study tours) costs Assessment, research, study costs Web-based platform and software development and maintenance costs Training costs Project office costs Knowledge material development, visibility and dissemination costs 	 Covering the human resources, costs for travels, local office and services - details are indicated in the Budget for the Action. 	 Factors outside project management's control that may impact on the output-outcome linkage.

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Relevance	How relevant is the project with regard to national policies, and corporate mandates? To what extent the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, national strategies, and relevant legislation and policies?	To what extent was the project design relevant in addressing the MoEUCC's capacity enhancement needs to align its strategies and actions with those of EU legislation and practices and enforce the legislative alignment? To what extent was the design and strategy of the project relevant to national strategies and priorities? (including clear linkage to National Development Plan, national level policy documents such as Contaminated Soil Regulation Law, POPs Law, Mercury Draft Law, and National Implementation Plans (NIP) for Stockholm Convention, technical guidelines for management of POPs)? To what extent was the design and strategy of the activities are aligned with UN and UNDP priorities (UNSDCF and CPD)? Were the Project objectives relevant to the needs and priorities of the country, having in mind political, social, legal, and institutional context of the country?	Project planning documents Corporate documents.	Desk review of documents	Coherence of priorities and needs of Türkiye included in project design, keeping with country-level context. Alignment with national development priorities and with UN, UNSDCF, CPD and UNDP corporate mandates as well as EU accession agenda and directives.	Document analysis

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub- Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Effectiveness	To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved, or are likely to be achieved.?	To what extent has the project achieved the objectives and targets of the results framework in planning documents? Including analysis of (i) planned activities and results and (ii) achievement of results. What have been the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? How might this be improved in the future? Have any good practices, success stories lessons learned, or transferable examples been identified, describing them and/or documenting them as possible? Compared to 2019, to what extent has MoEUCC increased its capacity in terms of POPs identification and improved follow-up through enforcement of relevant regulation(s)? To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the	Monitoring reports Stakeholders Questionnaires (carried out as pre-post-test within training reports).	Desk review of documents Key informant interviews and/or focus group discussion	Key achievements Hindering factors for achievements Factors aiding achievements. Adaptation to pandemic- related modality of implementation and its limitations Issues related to earthquake Assessment by key project stakeholders Satisfaction level of trainees and the increase in their knowledge and enhancement in their occupational practices and activities. Effectiveness of the Helpdesk navigator set up by the project.	Document analysis Quantitative analysis by using logical framework and related indicators as benchmarks to tally project progress in implementation. Qualitative analysis applied to the information harnessed by interviews using thematic analysis of responses Quantitative and qualitative and qualitative analysis of questionnaires already applied (for instance those that measure uptake and stakeholder satisfaction and results of pre- posts tests) Validation and triangulation

	implementing		
	nartner impacted		
	the offectiveness of		
	the project?		
	To what extent has		
	the project		
	contributed to the		
	fulfilment of the		
	chiestives of		
	objectives of		
	UNSDCF priorities,		
	CPD goals, EU		
	alignment and		
	National		
	Development Plan		
	targets2		
	la what were !		
	in what ways have		
	Covid-19 pandemic		
	restrictions and		
	February 2023		
	earthguake in		
	Türkiye impacted		
	the achievement of		
	project results?		
	what have been the		
	contributing and		
	what have been the		
	hindering factors in		
	achieving or not		
	achieving results?		
	Can effectiveness		
	be accepted to the		
	continuation of or		
	linkage with other		
	initiatives?		
	To what extent are		
	key		
	stakeholders/final		
	beneficiaries		
	satisfied with the		
	Implementation		
	and results of the		
	Project, specifically		
	in terms of the		
	partnership support		
	and what are		
	specific remaining		
	issues in the area of		
	issues in the died Of		
	concern?		
	Does the existence		
	of acquis have a		
	leverage role that		

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub- Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Efficiency	To what extent resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and the results have been delivered with the least costly way possible?	To what extent were outputs delivered in a timely manner and with high quality? To what extent has the project ensured value for money? To what extent were resource mobilization efforts successful? Was funding sufficient for the achievement of results? (funding analysis) What was progress in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed by UNDP (total amounts and percentage of total) ? To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted on the efficiency of the project? To what extent was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives/projects that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?	Project Planning Documents Monitoring Reports Financial Reporting Auditing reports Stakeholders	Desk review of documents Key informant interviews and/or focus group discussions	Document content where governance structure reporting, minutes of meetings, etc. Content in donor reporting documents Quantitative analysis of expenditures Adaptive management Content in financial and budget allocation documents Key stakeholder assessments Documented changes effected in the project document/ work plans/ management arrangements in response to challenges Project planning instruments	Document analysis Quantitative analysis by using logical framework and related indicators as benchmarks to tally project progress in implementation. Qualitative analysis applied to the information harnessed by interviews using thematic analysis of responses Validation and triangulation

How well did		
project		
management		
work for		
achievement of		
results?		
To what extent did		
project M&F		
systems provide		
management with		
a stream of data		
that allowed it to		
learn and adjust		
implementation		
accordingly2		
What type of		
(administrative		
(auministrative,		
nnancial, and		
managenal)		
obstacles did the		
project face and to		
what extent have		
this affected its		
efficiency?		
What unplanned		
externalities arose		
and how did they		
affect efficiency?		
What have been		
the contributing		
and what have		
been the		
hindering factors		
in achieving or not		
achieving results		
efficiently?		
Can efficiency be		
associated to the		
continuation of or		
linkage with other		
initiatives?		

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub- Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Sustainability	To what extent the project's positive actions are likely to continue after the end of the project?	To what extent will the project achievements be sustained? What are the possible systems, structures, and staff that will ensure its sustainability? What are the challenges and opportunities? To what extent have development partners committed to providing continuing support? What is the risk that level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits? To what extent can the project be replicated and/or scaled up? 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? What can be done to maximize the likelihood of	Stakeholders Legal documentation analysis applied to the information harnessed by interviews using thematic analysis of responses	Key informant interviews and/or focus group discussion Desk review.	Reporting to donor, corporate, and for implementation partners of sustainability arrangements Existence or not of a sound exit strategy and if there are specific post – project arrangements to sustain results Drafting and or adoption of policies	Document review Thematic analysis of interviews.

	sustainable outcomes		
	and to what extent		
	does an effective exit		
	strategy exist?		
	What machanisms if		
	anyfinancial and/or		
	institutional, have		
	been put into place to		
	assure continuation		
	of results after		
	project ends?		
	p. 0)000 0		
	What catalytic rolos		
	has the project had		
	has the project had		
	and what is their		
	relation to		
	sustainability, such as		
	(a) catalysed		
	behavioural changes		
	in terms of use and		
	application, by the		
	relevant		
	stakeholders of		
	capacities developed:		
	(b) contributed to		
	institutional changes,		
	for instance		
	institutional uptake		
	of Project		
	demonstrated		
	technologies,		
	practices, or		
	management		
	approaches:		
	(c) contributed to		
	nolicy changes (on		
	policy changes (off		
	paper and in		
	implementation of		
	policy);		
	(d) contributed to		
	sustained follow-on		
	financing (catalytic		
	financing) from		
	government, private		
	sector, donors etc.?		

Other	Key Questions	Specific Sub- Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Future-looking concepts, lessons learned and recommendations	What can be recommended for follow up and/or future programming?	What are after-Project possible priority interventions and general recommendations, which could further ensure sustainability of Project's achievements and contribute to the identification and remediation of contaminated sites with persistent organic pollutants in Türkiye and elsewhere? What could be possible after-Project priority interventions and general recommendations related to policy influencing, which could further ensure sustainability and scaling up of Project's achievements? What general recommendations can be made, supporting the positive aspects of this project, or attempting to correct course, in further programming and future projects? Have there been any lessons learned from design and implementation?	Stakeholders	Interviews Document analysis	N/A	Thematic analysis of interviews

ANNEX 3: TRAINING PRESENTATIONS

Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

The training presentations in Turkish language which were publicized at the project web site are as follows:

Sectoral Training: <u>Toprak Kirliliğinin Kontrolü ve Noktasal Kaynaklı Kirlenmiş Sahalara</u> <u>Dair Yönetmelik Kapsamında Sektörel Eğitim – 24-25 Ekim 2023 – Kalıcı Kirleticiler</u> (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Risk Assessment and Alternative Remediation Technologies Training: <u>23-27 Ocak 2023</u> <u>– Risk Değerlendirmesi ve Alternatif Temizleme Teknolojileri Eğitimi – Kalıcı Kirleticiler</u> (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Consultation Meeting on Technical Guidelines: <u>Teknik Kılavuz İstişare Toplantısı – 6 Eylül</u> <u>2022 – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)</u>

Remediation Technologies, Remediation and Monitoring Training: <u>Temizleme</u> <u>Teknolojileri, Islah ve İzleme Eğitimi Sunumları – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)</u>

Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Training: <u>Sağlık ve Ekolojik Risk Değerlendirilmesi</u> Eğitimi Sunumları – 11-12-13 Ekim 2021 – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)

Detection of Soil Pollution Load and Assessment Training: <u>8-10-12 Şubat 2021</u> <u>tarihlerinde "Toprak Kirlilik Yükünün Tespiti ve Değerlendirilmesi Eğitimi" çevrim içi olarak</u> <u>yapılıyor – Kalıcı Kirleticiler (kalicikirleticiler.com)</u>

The presentations for the Legislation Training and Workshop Legislation Revisions were not publicized online or delivered to the participants to prevent the misunderstanding during information exchange, since the revision is ongoing.

The video on soil sampling in Hopa and laboratories who carry out soil sampling analysis: <u>https://we.tl/t-eL8x1LAA4V</u>

ANNEX 4: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

FIELD GUIDE

FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF THE

IDENTIFICATION AND REMEDIATION OF CONTAMINATED SITES WITH PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPS) PROJECT

IN TURKIYE

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIELD GUIDE AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

- The queries below are guiding questions for key informant interviews and for group discussions.
- The following are guiding questions that will be presented according to the type of interlocutor with whom the evaluator is engaging with
- They can give rise to re-questions or follow-up questions as the interview develops.
- Questions are open ended. Interviews are qualitative and semi-structured.
- The evaluation questions operationalize this assessment's guiding questions regarding achievements and criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, etc.) as seen in the matrix above.
- Interviews can be conducted either individually or in groups. The interview methodology is the same for either instance (i.e. open-ended questions based on the assessment questions).
- The difference between individual and group interviews is that for the latter (in groups) the participation and response of the various actors in the group will be sought, that is, that not only one or one person responds, and that information is also generated about the group dynamics to inform the evaluation process and adapt to the group dynamics.
- The modality of the interviews and group discussions is as follows:
 - If possible, a member of project staff will make the introduction of the evaluator, to leave the interview afterwards as to preserve anonymity.
 - The evaluator will introduce the evaluation itself, explaining general factors such as that it is a qualitative process where the stakeholders' points of view are sought and not necessarily data given that other tools are better suited for this.
 - It will be indicated that the evaluation fulfils a mandate of UNDP/donor, etc., and that it is not an audit and that it is not carried out because there is a problem at all with the project.
 - The stakeholders will be assured of the anonymity of responses, that no one is sited nor quoted, and that responses are voluntary in the sense that if anyone does not want to answer a particular question, nor participate in this process they are free to say so.

GUIDANCE QUESTIONS FOR KEY INFORMANTS (MOEUCC, EUD AND UNDP)

- 2. How relevant is the Project for Türkiye? What gap has it filled (for instance, in terms of individual and institutional capacity, policies, etc.)?
- 3. What have been, in your opinion, the major achievements obtained by the Project? How effective have these been? Have these been achieved efficiently?
- 4. What have been the main problems or challenges, in your opinion, with the Project?
- 5. How does the project link and/or interconnect with other initiatives, if any?
- 6. How was the connection between the site level and the broader national level?
- 7. Has the Project included aspects besides its main purpose? That is, has it included a gender perspective, a rights perspective, etc.?

8.	What mechanisms are in place, or will be in place, to assure sustainability? That is, how can or how will the results be maintained in time?
9.	Does the Project leave any lessons learned? That is, knowing what you know now what would you recommend that it would have been done differently?
10.	What would be your recommendations, for programming of similar projects in the future or for the sustainability of what the POPs Project has achieved?
11.	Any other comments or issues you would like to add, please do so.

ANNEX 5: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED OR CONSULTED

MOEUCC, GENERAL DIRECTORATE OF EUROPEAN UNION AND FOREIGN RELATIONS (CONTRACTING AUTHORITY)

MoEUCC, General Directorate of Environmental Management

- Department of Chemicals Management
- o Mr. Nihat Yaman, Head of Chemicals Management Unit
- Ms. Bursev Doğan Artukoğlu, Chemicals Management Unit, Unit Manager
- Ms. Pinar Saylam: Architect in Chemicals Management Department

Department of Water and Soil Management

- Mr. Menderes İşçen, Head of Water and Soil Management Unit
- o Mr. Mustafa İlker Okurcan, Water and Soil Management Unit
- Ms. Asuman Girgin, Water and Soil Management Unit, Unit Manager
- Department of IPA Programme and Head of EU Financial Assistance
- Mr. Efed Parlak
- o Ms. Ceren Uncu Ağaçdiken, Contract Manager

UNDP

- Ms. Meral Mungan Arda, CCE Portfolio Manager (former Project Manager)
- o Mr. Nurettin Cemil Gokpinar, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
- o Ms. Gizem Bal, Project Associate
- Ms. Zeynep Ozay, Project Assistant/Interpreter

DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION TO TÜRKIYE

• Ms. Özge Gökçe Aktaş, Sector Manager

PROVINCIAL DIRECTORATE STAFF TRAINED BY THE PROJECT

- o Ms. Jale Sezen, Engineer in Tekirdağ Province
- Mr. Mustafa Lütfü İlkbahar, Engineer in İstanbul Province
- o Mr. Harun Aras, Engineer in Kocaeli Province
- Ms. Sümeyra Yaka, Tekirdağ Province

SAMPLE TRAINEES FROM MOEUCC-CERTIFIED SAMPLING AND REMEDIATION COMPANIES

- Ms Dilara ÖZTÜRK, Environmental Engineer at INTERGEO
- Mr. Alaattin Özcan, General Manager, INTERGEO company
- o Mr. Serkan İktü, Head of Sustainability & Environmental Services, TORA Company

SAMPLE TRAINEES FROM SITE OWNERS

- Mr. Hidayet Acar, Technical Manager, PETDER
- Mr. Şilan Karasaç, Manager, OPET Petrolcülük A.Ş
- Ms. Evin Kayıkçılar, Engineer, BOTAŞ

PILOT WORKS COMPONENT BENEFICIARIES (STATE-OWNED SITE OWNER INSTITUTIONS)

- Mr. Bülent AŞICI, Environmental Engineer, Turkish Electricity Transmission Company [TEIAS]
- Ms. Leyla AKPINAR, Technical Chief, Electricity Generation Company [EUAS]
- Mr. Eyyüp DURMAZ, Electricity Generation Company [EUAS]
- Mr. Burak Yontar, Environmental Coordinator, OPET Petrolcülük A.Ş

ANNEX 6: LIST OF TARGET GROUPS FOR PARTICIPATION CONSIDERED FROM DESIGN ONWARD

- Relevant staff of MoEUCC in central and provincial level from the following departments:
 - o Department of Chemicals Management
 - o Department of Water and Soil Management
- o Provincial directorates
- Line ministries
- o Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
- o Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources
- Industrial Associations and Environmental NGOs, Universities and Research Centres (METU, Kocaeli University, TUBİTAK MRC, etc.)
- Industry especially potential target sectors that may have contaminated sites and MoEUCC-certified companies for soil sampling and remediation
- Farmers, residents in highly industrialized areas

In addition to target groups the following departments of MoEUCC were to be stakeholders:

Directorate General of Geographic Information Systems

Works component specific target groups as it will be implemented locally:

- Provincial directorate of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change
- Pilot state-owned site owner institutions (Turkish Electricity Transmission Company [TEIAS] and Electricity Generation Company [EUAS])
- Local municipalities
- Local people living around the selected pilot contaminated sites
- •
ANNEX 7: ACHIEVEMENT OF ACTIVITIES FOR EXPECTED RESULT 1 AND FOR EXPECTED RESULT 2 OF March 2023

Activity No.	Activity Name	Progress
0	Inception Phase	
0.1	Establishment of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) and Office	Completed
0.2	Kick-off Meeting	Completed
0.3	Launch Event	Completed
1.1.1	Central and Provincial Level Staff Training (Online)	
1.1.1.1	Training on Determination of Soil Pollution Capacity for Assessment	Completed
1.1.1.2	Training on Determination of the Cleaning Targets	Completed
1.1.1.3	Training on Contaminated Sites Monitoring	Completed
1.1.1.4	Detection and Assessment of Pollution Load to the Soil	Completed
1.1.2	Central and Provincial Level Staff Training (Hybrid)	
1.1.2.1	Training on Health Risk Assessment	Completed
1.1.2.2	Training on Alternative Remediation Technologies for Contaminated Sites with POPs	Completed
1.1.2.3	Workshop on Recommended Draft Legislation of Contaminated Sites Legislation and POPs By-Law	Completed
1.1.2.4	Contaminated Sites Information System Training	Completed
1.1.2.5	Training on Legislation	Completed
1.1.2.6	Additional Training on Risk Assessment and Alternative Remediation Technologies (5 days, 120 participants)	Completed
1.1.3	Training for Companies Certified by MoEUCC with Proficiency on Contaminated Site Remediation	Completed
1.1.4	Sectoral Trainings for Potential POPs Contaminated Site Owners Selected from Contaminated Sites Registration System	Completed
1.2	Legal Gap Assessment (LGA)/Guidance Documents/Publications Preparation and Update	
1.2.1	Conducting LGA for Determination of Deficiencies of the Existing By-Laws on POPs and Contaminated Sites Management	Completed
1.2.1.1	Assessment of Legal Instruments and Preparing Legal Gap Analysis	Completed
1.2.1.2	Recommended Draft Legislation on Contaminated Sites Legislation and POPs By-Law	Completed
1.2.1.3	Workshop on By-law on POPs legislation (1-2 days, 15 participants)	Completed
1.2.2	Preparation of Dissemination Materials	Ongoing
1.2.3	Current Guidelines for Document Elaboration	Ongoing

1.2.3.1	Elaborating on Soil Pollution of the Technical Guide	Ongoing
1.2.3.2	Updating of the Report Forms Provided in the Annexes (3, 5, 6 and 7) to Soil Contamination By-law	Ongoing
1.2.3.3	Analysis of Relevant International Guidance Documents that are Specific to POPs Contaminated Sites and Preparation of a Technical Guidance Document on POPs	Completed
1.2.3.4	Consultative Meeting on the Report on Chemicals Management to ensure better POPs and PTS management (1-day, 50 participants)	To be initiated
1.3	Study Visits	
1.3.1	Study Visit to an EU country with Contaminated Sites with Different Pollutants and Soil Remediation Techniques	Completed
1.3.2	Study Visit to Soil Unit of European Environment Agency or Joint Research Center in Institute for Environment and Sustainability (ISPRA)	Completed
1.3.3	Study Visit to an EU country with Contaminated Sites with Different Pollutants and Soil Remediation Techniques	To be initiated
1.4	Establishment of Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme	
1.4.1	Organization of a One-day Workshop	Completed
1.4.2	Establishment of a Helpdesk Navigator Program	Completed
1.4.3	Putting the Internet Website of the Helpdesk into Operation	Completed
1.5	Health Risk Assessment Software	Completed
1.5 1.6.	Health Risk Assessment Software Circularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites Management	Completed To be initiated
1.5 1.6. 1.7	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on ContaminatedSites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent ToxicSubstances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategyand Road Map	Completed To be initiated To be initiated
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS Software	Completed To be initiated To be initiated
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and Utilization	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and UtilizationUpdate of CSIS Software	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed Ongoing
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and UtilizationUpdate of CSIS SoftwareOrganization of a Training About the Fully Developed CSIS Software	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed Ongoing Ongoing
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.2	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and UtilizationUpdate of CSIS SoftwareOrganization of a Training About the Fully Developed CSIS SoftwareIdentification and Classification of POPs Contaminated Sites in Türkiye	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed Ongoing Ongoing
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.2 2.2.1	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and UtilizationUpdate of CSIS SoftwareOrganization of a Training About the Fully Developed CSIS SoftwareIdentification and Classification of POPs Contaminated Sites in TürkiyeOrganization of a One-Day Workshop to Define the Scope of Contaminants and Sectors	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed Ongoing Ongoing Completed
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.2 2.2.1 2.2.2	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and UtilizationUpdate of CSIS SoftwareOrganization of a Training About the Fully Developed CSIS SoftwareIdentification and Classification of POPs Contaminated Sites in TürkiyeOrganization of a One-Day Workshop to Define the Scope of Contaminants and SectorsIntegration of these Data into CSIS	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed Ongoing Ongoing Completed Completed
1.5 1.6. 1.7 2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.2 2.2.1 2.2.2 2.2.3	Health Risk Assessment SoftwareCircularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites ManagementBetter Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strategy and Road MapUpdate of CSIS SoftwareAnalysis of Current Registration System and Inventory System and underlying Infrastructure and UtilizationUpdate of CSIS SoftwareOrganization of a Training About the Fully Developed CSIS SoftwareIdentification and Classification of POPs Contaminated Sites in TürkiyeOrganization of a One-Day Workshop to Define the Scope of Contaminants and SectorsIntegration of these Data into CSISPreparation of a List of Classified Contaminated Sites in Türkiye	Completed To be initiated To be initiated Completed Ongoing Ongoing Completed Completed Completed

2.3	Prioritization of POPs/Persistent Toxic Substances Contaminated Sites for Remediation	
2.3.1	Organization of a One-Day Workshop to Define the Parameters for Prioritization of Contaminated Sites	Completed
2.3.2	Prioritization of POPs/Persistent Toxic Substances Contaminated Sites	Completed
2.4	Selection of Two Pilot Areas among the Prioritized Contaminated Sites in Activity 2.3	Completed
2.5	Preparation of Operational Plan for 2 Pilot Sites	Completed
2.6	Preparation of a Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites	Completed
2.6.1	Operational On-Site Technical Supervision Including Reporting of the Work for 2 Pilot Sites	Completed
2.6.2	Recommendations Respecting Post Remediation Plan for 2 Pilot Sites	Completed
2.7	Preparation of Technical Specification for 2 Pilot Sites for Pilot Application	Completed
2.8	Implementation of Supervision Support and Monitoring Plan for 2 Pilot Sites	To be cancelled
0	Closure Event	To be initiated

ANNEX 8: TE AUDIT TRAIL

Comments received by the evaluator by key stakeholders were put in an Audit Trail format. The comments were incorporated on the draft Final Evaluation. The Audit Trail is listed as an annex in this Final Evaluation report but not attached to the report file, following UNDP indications.

ANNEX 9: LIST OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- EU. Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) II Indicative Strategy Document for Turkey (2014-2020).
- EU. IPA Environment and Climate Change Sector Operational Programme (IPA-2) (ESOP).
- http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.
- https://kalicikirleticiler.com/en/completed-projects/
- https://kalicikirleticiler.com/en/identification-and-remediation-of-contaminated-sites-withpersistent-organic-pollutants-project/
- https://onceliklikimyasallar.csb.gov.tr/en/regulation-on-persistent-organic-pollutants-i-5245
- https://onceliklikimyasallar.csb.gov.tr/en/turkish-national-implementation-plant-nip-i-5253
- https://www.fao.org/global-soil-partnership/resources/highlights/detail/en/c/1668243/
- https://www.undp.org/turkiye/projects/identification-and-remediation-contaminated-sitespersistent-organic-pollutants-pops-project
- Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). Annex I. Description of Action.
- Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). IPA-POPs Description of Action. 2ndVersion Notification No.8.
- Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). IPA-POPs Description of Action. 3rd. Version.
- Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). IPA-POPs Description of Action. 3rd. Version. Revised Work Plan.
- Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). Activity Report No. 1.
- Identification and Remediation of Contaminated Sites with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). Output Verification Report. IPA POPs_2022.04.12.
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.1 Training Needs Assessment Report- -27102020
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.1.1 Training Report No.1 12.2020.
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.1.2 Training Report No.3 03.2021.
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.1.3 Training Report No.4 04.2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.1.4 Training ReportNo.2 02.2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.1 Training ReportNo.1 10.2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.1 Training ReportNo.2 11.2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.2 Training ReportNo.1 11.2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.2 Training ReportNo.2 12.2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.3 1stWorkshop Report-Summary Jan2022
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.3 2ndWorkshop Report-Summary Mar2022
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.3 4thWorkshop Report May2022
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.3 5thWorkshop Report June2022
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.4 CSIS-Training Report March2021
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.2.6 Training Report Jan.2023
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.3 Certified Companies Training Report
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.1.4 Training Report OCT2023
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.2.1.1 LGA-Meeting Report 15.12.2022
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.2.1.2 Regulation Workshop Report

- IPA POPs Project. A.1.3.1 1stSVReport 05.2022
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.4.1 Workshop Report
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.4.2 Expert Report HDSP.
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.5 JHRS Report
- IPA POPs Project. A.1.6 POP Circularity Preliminary Analysis Report 20231124
- IPA POPs Project. A.2.1.1 Help Desk Analysis Document Final.
- IPA POPs Project. A.2.2.1 Final Expert Report No 9 31 July 2023.
- IPA POPs Project. Steering Committee Minutes. 1 MoM.
- IPA POPs Project. Steering Committee Minutes. No. 2. MoM
- IPA POPs Project. Steering Committee Minutes. No. 3. MoM.
- IPA POPs Project. Steering Committee Minutes. No. 4. MoM.
- IPA POPs Project. Steering Committee Minutes. No. 5. MoM.
- IPA POPs Project. Steering Committee Minutes. No. 6. MoM. Meeting Minutes Final.
- IPA POPs Project. Training On the Regulation on Control of Soil Pollution and Sites Contaminated By Point Sources. Training Report. 15-17 November 2023.
- IPA POPs Project. Training On Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Training Report.
- IPA POPs Project. Training Report_1_3 November 2021
- IPA POPs Project. Training Report 11 13 October 2021
- IPA POPs Project. Training Report 15 December 2021
- IPA POPs Project. Training Report 22 24 November 2021.
- IPA POPs Project. Work Plan PR4.
- IPA POPs Project. Work Plan PR4. Addendum.
- IPA-POPs Project. 7th Steering Committee Minutes.
- IPA-POPs Project. 8th Steering Committee Minutes.
- IPA-POPs. 1st Progress Report.
- IPA-POPs. 2nd Progress Report.
- IPA-POPs. 3rd Progress Report.
- IPA-POPs. 4th Progress Report.
- IPA-POPs. Inception Report.
- IPA-POPs. Inception Report. Annexes.
- IPA-POPs. Project Presentation. PPT. December 2023.
- OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use. 2019.
- UN Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.
- UNDP Country Programme Document for Turkey CPD (2021-2025).
- UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (January 2021).
- UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025.
- UNDP TURKEY. Gender Screening Tool for Project Development and Implementation.
- UNDP. Gender Equality Strategy (2018-2021).
- UNDP. Guidelines on "Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit."
- UNEG. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020).
- UNEG. Guidance on Evaluation Institutional Gender Mainstreaming (2018).
- UNEG. Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.

- UNEG. Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- UNEG. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. June 2008
- United Nations Country Team in Turkey (2021), United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework 2021-2025, Ankara.
- UNSDCF 2021-2025.

ANNEX 10: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Protect human health and environment from adverse effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other hazardous substances especially in contaminated sites.	 12.4.2 (a) Hazardous waste generated per capita (kg per capita) *[SDG indicators are published with a two- year time lag, hence 2018 statistics are reported in 2020, 2019 statistics reported in 2021 and 2020 statistics reported in 2022] 	 European Commission's Regular Reports from 2019 to 2022 European Environment Agency's State of Environment Reports Statistical data on environment and climate change Progress in the implementation of Sector Operational Programme: Environment and Climate Action Progress in the implementation of National Action Plan for EU Accession Progress in the implementation of Multi- annual Action Programme for Türkiye on Environment and Climate Action 	 Stable political climate and macro-economic situation Strong commitment and dedication of the stakeholders to participate and cooperate throughout project implementation Strong stakeholder coordination during project implementation Convergent views and decisions among stakeholders and relevant institutions Sufficient number of assigned personnel in charge of the project within relevant institutions Sufficient number of experienced and high qualified experts with satisfactory knowledge and perception of the Turkish context for each sector which will be dealt with within this project Coherence between the training subjects/campaigns and the target group
Specific objective	Türkiye's capacity on implementation of EU POPs Regulation enhanced.	 A health risk assessment tool and software developed to determine the adverse health impact of POPs on local populations. 	 European Commission's Regular Reports from 2017 to 2020 Statistical data on environment and climate change Monitoring Reports Project Progress Reports Project Final Report 	
Expected results	Result 1. Technical and institutional capacity for management of POPs contaminated sites has been strengthened	 Approximately 490 staff were trained and certificated Operationalization of existing legislative instruments on POPs/POPs contaminated sites for their effective implementation Recommendations for draft legislation on contaminated sites and POPs by-law submitted to MoEUCC Technical guidance documents on POPs produced for an effective 	 Study visit materials, evaluation report and participants list Training of trainees programme materials, evaluation report and participants list Training materials, evaluation report and participants list Number of certificates given to the participants Project Inception Report Activity Evaluation Reports Project Progress Reports PSC Meeting Minutes Project Final Report 	 National and local institutions are committed to contaminated sites management. Owners of pilot sites are willing to cooperate in the project activities. Other national and local stakeholders are supporting project activities and participating. Trained staff members (national and local) remain in their posts during the entire duration of the project.

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		 implementation of legislation %85 Staff members declared training content was useful to their work Study visits held to EU Countries were organized for information/experience exchange on contaminated sites remediation and soil pollution prevention 	 Project Evaluation Reports 	
	Result 2. Contaminated sites with POPs have been identified and classified	 CSIS is updated with the legislation requirements and its is written with post gre sql A methodology to identify and classify POPs contaminated sites is in place 2 POPs contaminated sites identified. 		
	Result 3. Institutional experience for remediation of POPs contaminated sites have been increased	 Technical specification, operational plan, supervision plan documents prepared for two POPs contaminated sites remediation 		
	1. Technical and Institutional Capacity for	Means	Cost	Assumptions
Activities	Management of POPs Contaminated Sites Has Been Strengthened 1.1. Trainings for staff that will be working on POPs/contaminated sites management from different target groups 1.2. LGA/Guidance documents/publications preparation and update 1.3. Study visits 1.4. Establishment of Helpdesk Navigator Software Programme 1.5. Health Risk Assessment Software Programm 1.6. Circularity of Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Impact on Contaminated Sites	 Project Coordination Unit (PCU) Technical Assistant Team (TAT) Short term experts (STEs) Stakeholder engagement activity (e.g. consultative meetings, bilateral meetings, workshops, study tours) costs Assessment, research, study costs Web-based platform and software development and maintenance costs Training costs Project office costs Knowledge material development, visibility and dissemination costs 	 Covering the human resources, costs for travels, local office and services - details are indicated in the Budget for the Action. 	 Factors outside project management's control that may impact on the output- outcome linkage.

Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Management 1.7. Better Management Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances through an Integrated Chemicals Management Plan Strateg and Road Map2. Contaminated Sites with Pops Have Been Identifie and Classified 2.1. Update of CSIS Software 2.2. Identification and classification of POPs contaminated sites in Türkiye 2.3. Prioritization of POPs/Persistent Toxic Substances Contaminated Sites for Remediation 2.4. Selection of Two Pile Areas among the Prioritized Contaminated Sites in Activity 2.3 2.5. Preparation of Operational Plan for 2 pil sites 2.6. Preparation of a Supervision and Monitoring Plan for 2 pil sites 2.7. Preparation of Technical Specification f 2 Pilot Sites for Pilot Application	of h gy d l ot ot ot		

ANNEX 11: CODE OF CONDUCT SIGNED BY EVALUATOR

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³²

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

Name of Consultant: Maria ONESTINI

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

Signed at Siena, Italy on February 19 2024

Signature: Mar Co

³² www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct