



COUNTRY EVALUATION:
ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

TURKEY





COUNTRY EVALUATION: ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS TURKEY



Copyright © 2004
United Nations Development Programme
Evaluation Office
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017, USA
www.undp.org/eo

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors
and do not necessarily represent those of the United Nations
and the United Nations Development Programme.

October 2004

Design: Suazion, Staten Island, NY
Production: AK Office Supply, New York, NY

Contents

Foreword	1
Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	9
A. Rationale for the Evaluation	9
B. Methodology	10
2. Turkey – Country at a Crossroads	13
A. A Turbulent Political Context	13
B. A Volatile Economy	14
C. Great Challenges of Sustainable Human Development	15
D. EU Accession as an Overarching Goal and Opportunity	17
E. Conclusion	18
3. UNDP's Strategic Positioning and Programme Relevance	19
A. Turkey's National Development Goals and Programmes	19
B. UNDP Cooperation in Turkey: Evolving Strategic Directions	21
C. Issues and Challenges for the UNDP's Strategy in Turkey	24
D. An Overall Perspective on UNDP's Strategy and Relevance	31
4. Human Development Results and UNDP Contribution	33
A. Governance	34
B. Regional Disparities and Poverty	41
C. Environment and Energy	48
D. Gender	51
E. Disaster and Emergency Response and Preparedness	54
F. Concluding Observations on Development Results	56
5. Resources, Methods and Approaches	59
A. Resource Availability and Application	59
B. Results Based Management – RBM	60
C. Operational Modalities	62
D. Monitoring and Evaluation	63
E. Dissemination and Public Advocacy	64
F. Concluding Observations on Resources, Methods and Approaches	64

6. Conclusion: Overall Results, Lessons Learned and Recommendations	65
A. UNDP Contributed to Important Development Results in Turkey	65
B. Systemic Lessons from Less Successful Initiatives and the Challenges for the Future	66
C. Recommendations for the Future	69
 Annexes	 73
1. Terms of Reference – Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results, Turkey	73
2. Turkey: SRF Outcomes – Outputs	78
3. Map of Intended Development Results	82
4. Abbreviations and Acronyms	84
5. List of Key Persons Met	87
6. Documentation and References	89
7. Turkey – Comparative Human Development Data	91
8. UNDP Turkey Vision	92
9. List of Major Reports, Conferences Produced, Conferences Organised and New Institutions Set Up on/in Turkey by UNDP since 1998	97
10. List of Media and Public Appearances in 2003	99
11. UNDP Turkey Country Office Organigram (January 2004)	104
12. Turkey Country Map	105

Foreword

The Assessment of Development Results (ADR) report for Turkey presents findings by the UNDP's Evaluation Office through the work of its ADR Evaluation Team in January 2004. It represents an important, integral part of the UNDP's Results Based Management (RBM) system, which focuses on the UNDP's contribution to broader development results and outcomes. The ADR is an independent, forward-looking assessment of UNDP support in the last five to seven years, and is designed to inform future programme directions. The focus is on assessing the UNDP's contribution to the development priorities of Turkey based on outcomes in core thematic areas of support, the lessons learned, and identification of possible areas of future support.

This ADR concludes that, like Turkey itself, the UNDP programme is at an important crossroads. In that context, it states that the UNDP has an important role to play in the present and future Turkey, and highlights a number of results produced in the key thematic areas of governance, poverty, gender, environment and crisis response. The Report also suggests, however, that a further focus on these core thematic areas, implemented through a strong combination of international and national expertise, would further enhance the UNDP's comparative advantages. In terms of strategic issues related to the delivery of the programme, the Report suggests that activities where the UNDP has a purely administrative involvement should be avoided, that there is a need to reduce the potential for "layering" in execution and implementation arrangements between the UNDP and the actual project activities on the ground, and that the UNDP needs to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of its interventions more systematically. At this crossroads, renewal of partnerships for substantive programme collaboration as well as financial contributions is needed, focusing on core thematic areas, and the core partnership with the Turkish Government will be the key entry point for all such endeavours.

In researching and preparing this ADR, the UNDP Evaluation Office is greatly indebted to the ADR Evaluation Team Leader Mr. Johannes Linn, as well as to Professor Dr. Ayşe Ayata, Mr. Rajeev Pillay and Mr. Knut Ostby, the ADR Evaluation Team members and key contributors to the Report. Other important contributions were made through the in-depth studies on regional disparities and poverty, and on local governance and capacity building, conducted by Prof. Dr. Yusuf Ziya Özcan, and by Prof. Dr. Çelik Aruoba with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nesrin Algan and Mr. Tezcan Abay, respectively. Within the Evaluation Office, the preparation of this Report was facilitated by technical and administrative support from Mr. Anish Pradhan and Ms. Elvira Larrain. Mr. Fa-Tai

Shieh and Mr. Niclas Wigforss provided key input through the desk research performed at the outset of the ADR exercise.

Crucial to the research and preparation of the Report was the generous assistance as well as the open sharing of information by the UNDP Country Office team in Turkey, led by the Resident Representative, Mr. Jakob Simonsen and the Deputy Resident Representative Ms. Claire Van der Vaeren. We are aware that the mission took place at a time when several operational issues compounded each other, and deeply appreciate the time and efforts taken to make this mission a success. The strong interest and support from the team in the UNDP's Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) led by the Regional Director and Assistant Administrator, Mr. Kalman Mizsei and the Deputy Director Ms. Marta Ruedas, is also highly appreciated.

This Report would not have been possible without the strong interest and support of the Turkish Government at the central as well as the local level. Of particular value was the involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs represented by Ambassador Oktay Özüye, Director General for Economic Affairs, and Mr. A. Asım Arar, Head of Department for Multilateral Economic Affairs, and of the State Planning Organisation represented by Dr. Ahmet Tıktık, Undersecretary and Mr. Kemal Madenoğlu, Director General for Social Sectors and Coordination. The ADR Evaluation Team also received excellent and highly appreciated collaboration from representatives of the Turkish civil society and private sector, from donor representatives, and from representatives of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), including the International Finance Institutions (IFIs).

By providing an external, critical assessment of development results and strategic positioning, it is the intent of this ADR to provide lessons learned as well as recommendations that may be used for improved development results in Turkey in the future. The Report will be widely distributed, and through its findings and recommendations it is our hope that it will offer help and advice not only to the UNDP's own activities in Turkey, but also to the Turkish Government as well as to donors, UN agencies, civil society and other partners. Finally, some of the findings are of a systemic nature and may be used as input for future policies of the UNDP at a corporate level, and would also be of key interest to the UNDP's partners worldwide.



Saraswathi Menon
Director
Evaluation Office

Executive Summary

Straddling the borders of Europe, Asia and the Middle East, Turkey is a pivotal country in a geographical, political, historical as well as cultural sense. During the 20th Century, Turkey has made great strides as a regional, political and economic power. It has been a member of the United Nations (UN), of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) for decades, and now stands on the threshold of starting its membership negotiations with the European Union (EU). But Turkey also has a history of political and economic tensions since World War II and a legacy of regional and social disparities that represent major human development challenges for the country.

The UNDP has worked in and with Turkey for about fifty years. This Assessment of Development Results (ADR) reviews the most recent five years of UNDP's support for Turkey in the context of the country's current and future development challenges and against the backdrop of the UNDP's long-term relationship with Turkey.

3

PURPOSE AND APPROACH OF THE ASSESSMENT

At this time, the UNDP is in the process of reassessing its programme in Turkey. A key purpose of this ADR is therefore to help design a strategy for enhancing the UNDP's performance and strategically positioning and focusing its support within Turkey's national development priorities and UNDP corporate policies. This strategy will be based on lessons learned from a review of the UNDP's past and current activities. In addition, the ADR serves as a vehicle for quality assurance of the UNDP's interventions in Turkey and for the UNDP Administrator's substantive accountability to the Executive Board.

Based on a review of current and past programmes, on discussions with stakeholders and on an assessment of the UNDP's comparative advantages within the current human development challenges and goals in Turkey, the ADR evaluates the UNDP's strategic positioning and the status of outcomes, the factors affecting outcomes and its contribution to outcomes within five key human development areas: governance, poverty reduction, environment, gender, and crisis response. Recommendations are designed to be forward-looking and to suggest the best use of the UNDP's comparative advantages in today's Turkey.

Given the limited time and resources available to the ADR Evaluation Team, and given the fact that it could draw on only a few recent evaluations of the UNDP's individual programmes and projects in Turkey, this ADR is by necessity limited in scope and depth. Nonetheless, the Team believes

that its observations are broadly representative of the effectiveness of the UNDP's support and that its recommendations can serve as a useful input into the UNDP's current strategic review and planning process in Turkey.

TURKEY – A COUNTRY AT A CROSSROADS

Turkey has made great strides over the last four decades in creating a better human development condition for its citizens, with significant improvements in life expectancy, school enrolment and adult literacy, and substantial increases in per capita incomes. As measured by the UNDP's Human Development Index (HDI), Turkey has moved from "low level" to "medium level" in human development. However, Turkey was ranked 96th among 175 countries for the 2003 HDI, lowest among OECD members and EU accession candidates, mainly because it still faces very serious shortfalls in education and health achievements. The incidence of absolute poverty in Turkey is low, but regional disparities are very significant. In addition, Turkey faces challenges of inclusion, in particular of women, and it is vulnerable to natural disasters and environmental damage. Turkey also still faces the major tasks of improving its governance and public administration at the national and local levels. An ongoing, comprehensive review of Turkey's ability to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 is expected to show a significant risk of potential MDG shortfalls for Turkey in selected areas. The main issue facing Turkey, however, is likely to be serious regional and gender disparities hidden in countrywide aggregates.

For decades, Turkey's economy has been subject to high inflation, recurring crises and relatively low long-term growth. However, its outlook has improved over the last three years due to the implementation of a tough programme of macroeconomic stabilisation and structural reforms. The credibility of this programme has been enhanced by the Government's ownership of the reforms and its commitment to move forward quickly on the path towards EU accession.

Turkey is now poised to move forward in meeting its dual challenge: (a) applying the strict criteria of the *Acquis Communautaire* of the EU and building suitable legal and institutional structures, including at the provincial and local levels; and (b) improving the social and environmental conditions of the country, so as to create an internationally competitive economy and to achieve a high level of sustainable human development. At the same time, Turkey can play an increasingly important role as a force for peace and economic prosperity with its non-

EU neighbours. This will be critical for Turkey's own future as well as for the future of a stable world.

UNDP – ALSO AT A CROSSROADS IN TURKEY

Over the years, the UNDP has strived to position itself in its work in Turkey in a way that responds effectively to twin demands – the demands of Turkey as its partner, and the demands of the UNDP's own evolving institutional priorities. A review of recent Turkish national planning documents shows a consistent set of overarching themes, with an increasingly sharper focus on four key national goals:

- Meeting the political and economic criteria for EU accession
- Macroeconomic stability and sustained economic growth
- Reform of public administration and governance, including decentralisation
- Reduction of poverty and regional disparities

In addition to these four central priorities, there are other recurring national priorities, such as reduction in unemployment, developing the country's human resources, improved infrastructure services and environmental protection, and enhancing Turkey's role as a regional power and financial centre.

In the volatile political and economic environment in Turkey during the years 1998-2003, the UNDP's overall strategy, while not always consistently stated, was broadly responsive to the Government's priorities and focused on key human development and capacity building areas. Recently, the UNDP sharpened its strategic focus on five key human development areas: governance, poverty, environment, gender and disaster and crisis response. The UNDP supported Turkey with major flagship programmes, especially on important issues of regional disparity and sub-national governance, in the environmental and gender areas, and in calling attention to Turkey's urgent human development challenges through a succession of National Human Development Reports (NHDRs).

Like the country itself, the UNDP is now at a crossroads in Turkey. The new heavy emphasis on EU accession and the accompanying resource flows from the EU present five special challenges for the UNDP in Turkey:

- **Creating value added in a changing environment:** To provide value added to Turkey's EU accession process and efforts to meet its long-term human development challenge, the UNDP needs to project a clear set of core business lines. It must build on the credibility and experience it has gained in the

development of local Government and Civil Society Organisation (CSO) capacity, in both the less developed regions of Turkey, as well as in other countries. This will help the Government facilitate the flow of EU funds, and can be used as a platform for supporting appropriate policy development. To this purpose, the UNDP will have to adapt existing flagship programmes and develop new ones as needed.

- **Developing a clearly defined strategy in response to multiple stakeholder demands:** With its special mandate to promote human development and the achievement of the MDGs, the UNDP needs to seek innovative ways of bringing its corporate comparative advantages to bear in the Turkish context. The UNDP will need to ensure a strong focus on its core business lines, building on its track record and drawing on the best possible expertise and knowledge from national and international sources.
- **Pushing for visibility and advocacy of the human development challenge:** The UNDP can build on its good track record of NHDRs, organisation of flagship conferences and establishment of important institutional capacity to help ensure that public and private attention remains clearly focused on Turkey's key sustainable human development challenges.
- **Managing key partnerships:** The UNDP must aim to leverage its limited resources through effective partnerships. The most important among them is partnership with the Government and with other national, local and provincial public institutions. With other partners also there is room for selectively strengthening cooperation, including with the UN system, the EU, the World Bank (WB), other international partners, and with academic and private organisations and CSOs.
- **Maximising results from pilot projects by assuring sustainability and scaling-up:** UNDP programmes generally work at a small scale and in a piloting mode. To assure outcomes with a regional or national scope the UNDP must assess the sustainability and scaling-up potential of its programmes, evaluate the replicability of successful pilot projects and seek to translate its experience and lessons learned into broader policy and institutional changes.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT RESULTS AND LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE

Over the last five years and beyond, the UNDP has contributed new ideas and agendas, built institutional capacity and achieved significant and lasting human

development results in a number of areas by applying its limited resources flexibly, responsively and generally on a sustained basis. The main achievements can briefly be summarised as follows:

- **Governance:** Given Turkey's centralised Government structure and limited local participation, the UNDP has played an important role in catalysing greater participation and empowerment of local Government and communities through its flagship Local Agenda 21 (LA 21) programme. The key initiative under LA 21 – participatory city councils – is now expected to be incorporated in a new legal framework for local governance.
- **Poverty:** Turkey has faced major challenges in the areas of poverty, regional disparities, and human development. The following are some of the UNDP's key responses to help the Government meet these challenges:
 - The UNDP was instrumental in turning a major regional development initiative in Turkey's Southeast, the Southeast Anatolia Sustainable Human Development Programme (GAP), from one that focused on infrastructure development into a programme geared to support much more broadly human development in the region. While regional disparity remains a serious issue in Turkey today, some catching-up in areas supported by GAP has been noted. The UNDP was also able to apply a number of the lessons from the GAP programme to a companion project in Eastern Anatolia – Linking East Anatolia to Progress (LEAP).
 - At the national level, the UNDP's NHDRs succeeded in transmitting the international human development debate to a national audience, focusing on regional disparities and gender inequities as key issues. The creation of the Human Development Centre in İstanbul with the UNDP's support provides the institutional capacity for lasting analytical, advocacy and advisory services to Turkey in this important area.
- **Environment:** In Turkey, environmental concerns were not integrated in the national policy debate in the past, nor did they figure prominently in public investment and regulatory reform. The UNDP has contributed to getting environmental issues more prominence and building environmental policy and management capacity in the Government and among civil society. It did this by intensively engaging in

Turkey's preparatory work for the 2002 Johannesburg Sustainable Development Summit and through the administration of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme. The UNDP's support was instrumental in achieving Turkey's ratification of the Climate Change Convention.

- **Gender:** Despite some significant achievements since the creation of the Turkish Republic, gender disparities have remained significant in Turkey into the 21st Century. Over the last ten years, the UNDP has contributed to increasing awareness on gender issues in Turkey, both at the national and at the local level, and helping to build institutional capacity in the Government and in civil society for achieving equity and inclusion for women in Turkey.
- **Disaster and Crisis Response:** Turkey has been hit by major disasters and crises in recent years, particularly by major earthquakes and by a potential refugee crisis in the wake of the 2003 Iraq war (which fortunately did not materialise). The UNDP was successful in helping to mobilise and coordinate the capacities of the UN agencies in close cooperation with those of the Government and civil society in responding to these crises.

The **key ingredients** of successful engagement by the UNDP in these areas have been as follows:

- **Formed effective coalitions** with national, regional and local authorities, with civil society, the international donor community, UN agencies and International Financial Institutions (IFIs) in dialogue and collaboration
- **Found reliable international funding** partners
- **Stayed engaged** over long periods
- **Created local institutional capacity** to support advocacy and operational activities
- **Responded quickly** to crisis situations with concentrated focus and full deployment of its institutional resources, even at the risk of neglecting some of its ongoing longer-term development initiatives.

Some of the UNDP's initiatives were less successful, and even some of the more successful ones faced difficulties. The following are the main lessons for the UNDP as it responds in future to the key systemic challenges identified above for Turkey:

- **Focus and Selectivity:** The two Country Cooperation Frameworks (CCFs) reviewed for this ADR suffered from an excessive scope and fragmentation of effort.

This was reinforced by ad hoc responses to various stakeholder requests, including from UNDP Headquarters, and also by the need to retrofit country priorities into a globally defined set of goals through the UNDP's Results Based Management (RBM) tools. Over the last year, the Turkey Country Office has successfully begun to narrow the focus of its strategic agenda, although there remain areas where tough choices will have to be made.

- **Government Ownership:** For some UNDP projects, lack of Government commitment and unwillingness of the implementing agency to disburse the Government's funding as agreed led to early project cancellations or lack of sustained progress. Turnover in Government counterparts has been frequent and has complicated and weakened UNDP programme impact. To ensure a strong Government ownership in present day Turkey, the challenge will be for the UNDP to find ways to make its programme clearly supportive of the EU accession process, but at the same time retain its own thematic vision and identity.
- **Monitoring and Evaluating for Sustainable and Scaled-up Results:** Adequate monitoring and evaluation at the project level has been scarce and has mainly consisted of self-reporting by project managements. Assessments of baseline institutional and social conditions appear to have been rare, monitoring of progress has been of mixed intensity, and end-of-programme evaluation has been either non-existent or of relatively low quality. This limited the scope for well-informed review and decision making by the UNDP and by the Government and its partners in terms of whether or not particular programmes and initiatives deserve to be continued, whether they have the potential to survive and be scaled-up, and whether they show promise of longer-term development impact.
- **Implementation Modalities:** One major line of activity during the 1990s was for the UNDP to serve as an implementing agency for WB loan-funded projects through Management Service Agreements (MSAs). The UNDP did not get involved in the substantive aspects of the project preparation and implementation and hence its value added was limited. Also, no significant administrative capacity was created in the Government, due to the layering in project implementation created by use of Project Implementation Units. For these reasons, the MSAs are now being phased out. A similar layering problem, however, has also been observed in other

programmes where systemic UNDP restrictions against direct implementation by the UNDP (mandated by the Executive Board) require it to channel funds through other implementing agencies, even where it itself is a recipient of partner funds for programme implementation. This has raised programme implementation costs and introduced unnecessarily complicated implementation structures. The ADR Evaluation Team therefore believes that Country Offices should have more leeway to use direct implementation modalities.

- **Mobilising and Managing Resources:** From the early 1990s, core programme funding (i.e., UNDP's own resources) has diminished significantly and an increasing number of the UNDP's activities have had to mobilise financial support from other donors and from the Government. The relatively large volumes of project funds implemented outside the UNDP's core thematic focus have limited its capacity to pursue core thematic areas of work. Future mobilisation of programme resources will need to focus on the core thematic areas where the UNDP has a substantive comparative advantage.
- **UN Coordination:** Coordination of UN agencies and their activities has long been a big challenge for the UN system. Turkey's recent experience has been no exception. The new instruments of Common Country Assessment (CCA) and UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) were too broad-gauged, unfocused and costly, and had a limited impact on the effective day-to-day cooperation by UN agencies in Turkey. A new, action-oriented approach that is focused on Turkey's EU accession and MDG agenda is now underway. This will help orient the UN agencies in a more visibly common strategic direction.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

This Report concludes that the UNDP stands at a crossroads in Turkey. For about five decades, the UNDP has supported the country on its turbulent path to development and progress. Over the last ten years in particular, the UNDP has made significant contributions in key human development areas, such as strengthening local governance and helping to reduce regional disparities, and working to build gender and environmental awareness and capacity. Now the UNDP has to decide what its future role in Turkey is, on what lines of business and operational modalities to concentrate, and how to rebuild its own resource base,

which is under serious stress.

The ADR Evaluation Team has concluded that **there clearly continues to be a significant role for the UNDP in Turkey**. This conclusion was supported by repeated and consistent comments by interlocutors met during the mission. The challenge is now to **focus on the UNDP's comparative advantages**, and to **continue the new, action-oriented approach towards the Turkey EU accession and MDG agenda**. To make this engagement productive and sustainable, the ADR proposes the following set of recommendations for the UNDP and its partners in Turkey:

- Build systematically on the core message of the UNDP's new mission statement:
"UNDP works in Turkey for democratic governance and growth without poverty, in support of EU accession and for the achievement of the MDGs."
- Focus on the five established core business lines of the UNDP in Turkey: governance, poverty, environment, gender, and disaster and crisis response. Use this focus as a selectivity screen when assessing all new initiatives, whether these emerge from partners in the country or from UNDP Headquarters.
- Leverage the UNDP's experience in participatory and transparent capacity building for local Governments and communities and in dealing with regional disparities, both in Turkey as well as in other countries. Combine the UNDP's international standing, capacity and experience with the strong national capacity and networks that it has built over the years in Turkey.
- Systematically pursue the sustainability and scaling-up potential of UNDP programmes and projects. A very important part of this effort will be systematic monitoring and evaluation.
- Ensure the establishment and maintenance of major and sustained partnerships, especially with the Government, the EU, and the UN Country Team (UNCT). Continue reviving the collaborative efforts of the UNCT, focusing on a clearly defined set of common goals.
- The authorities should stand ready to meet with the UNDP at a high level and at regular intervals to ensure that new UNDP programme priorities are in line with national priorities, that commitment to agreed priorities is sustained and that systemic issues impeding effective implementation on both sides are addressed.
- The Government needs to commit its own resources

(both financial and personnel) in support of the partnership with the UNDP in a predictable and effective manner, and also ensure disbursement of committed resources in a timely manner.

- UNDP Headquarters must ensure that its priorities are formulated so as to minimise frequent changes in the structure and content of the UNDP's agenda. It must also ensure that any UNDP Headquarters directives for specific initiatives in Turkey are consonant with the UNDP's comparative advantage and real partner needs in the country.
- Furthermore, UNDP Headquarters should support a move towards more direct execution of the UNDP's programmes and thus help increase its efficiency in Turkey by avoiding the need for institutional layering of the UNDP's assistance.

1

Introduction

Turkey is a country at a crossroads, where East meets West and North meets South and where a modern state meets deep-rooted traditions. A number of human development issues still face the country, but in many ways Turkey is different from the traditional developing country. Turkey's Government has made EU accession the centrepiece of its foreign and domestic policies. To help it meet this goal, it aims to agree with the EU on a date for the start of membership negotiations by the end of 2004. In order to help meet Turkey's EU challenge, the EU is scaling-up its technical cooperation and financial assistance. The UN agencies, including the UNDP, are also supporting Turkey's accession process, as the Copenhagen Criteria are founded on international governance standards, democratic principles and universal goals of human development that are consistent with UN covenants and conventions.

The purpose of this introductory chapter is to present the rationale for the *Turkey Country Evaluation – Assessment of Development Results* (ADR) and to explain the methodology used. The remainder of this Report is divided into four main chapters. Chapter 2 presents a brief outline of the national context. Chapter 3 locates the UNDP in terms of its strategic positioning and the relevance of its programmes. Chapter 4 presents the development results achieved in Turkey and the UNDP's contributions towards them. Chapter 5 discusses issues relating to resources, methods and approaches used by the UNDP in carrying out its mandate. Finally, Chapter 6 summarises the overall findings and recommendations for the future based on this country evaluation.

A. RATIONALE FOR THE EVALUATION

Like Turkey, the UNDP programme in Turkey is at a crossroads. Major changes have taken place in the country environment and in the UNDP's own focus and capacities at both the global and country level. The UNDP has shifted its global focus from its past role as the central funding pool for UN agencies to become the UN's global development network. It advocates for change, connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. Its focus is now to help countries meet their human development aspirations and the MDGs by working with countries in five key areas: democratic governance; poverty reduction; crisis prevention and recovery; energy and environment; and HIV/AIDS.

In Turkey, the UNDP's programme has changed over the years both in response to Turkey's own changing goals and priorities and in response to its own evolving institutional priorities. The UNDP is currently in the

process of reassessing its programme in Turkey. The purpose of this evaluation is to help in the design of a strategy for enhancing performance and strategically positioning and focusing UNDP support within national development priorities and UNDP corporate policy directions.

Based on a review of current and past programmes, on discussions with stakeholders and on an assessment of the UNDP's comparative advantages within the current human development challenges and goals in Turkey, the evaluation concludes that key strategic areas for UNDP support to Turkey in the future would focus on five thematic areas: governance, poverty reduction, environment, gender and crisis response. The ADR seeks to identify the status of outcomes, the factors affecting outcomes, the UNDP's contribution to outcomes and the strategic positioning employed within these five strategic areas. The time period covered is primarily from 1998 to the present, but the analysis takes a longer-term view where this is relevant, and puts a strong emphasis on evaluating lessons learned so they may be used for future strategies. Recommendations are designed to be forward-looking and to suggest the best use of the UNDP's comparative advantages in today's Turkey.

B. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this evaluation is an integral part of the UNDP's RBM approach, focusing on outcomes, which are defined as changes in specific conditions through contributions from various development actors.¹ A major aim of the ADR is to draw a credible link between overall development results and the UNDP's contribution to their achievement. It is focused on determining "higher level" results by evaluating outcomes, with a principal focus on the UNDP's contribution. The emphasis on higher level results is intended to improve understanding of the outcome, its status, and the factors that influence or contribute to change. The evaluation was designed to facilitate the identification of different outcomes and their interrelationships, which, in turn, should expedite the assessment of the overall achievements in a given country – whether at the outcome or a longer-term impact level. Following from this, the evaluation attempts to explain the UNDP's contribution to results. However, the approach also considers project level outcomes as far as possible. Verifiable results achieved through UNDP involvement represent an important reality check on the impact that the UNDP has in practical terms and there

are important lessons to be learned about how the UNDP operates, about the opportunities and constraints it faces, and about its effectiveness as a client-oriented institution. Therefore, this country evaluation also includes a "bottom-up" analysis for a sample of the most important programmes, projects and non-project activities.

The overall objectives of the ADR are to

1. Support the UNDP Administrator's substantive accountability function to the Executive Board and serve as a vehicle for quality assurance of UNDP interventions at the country level.
2. Generate lessons from experience to inform current and future strategy and programming at the country and corporate levels.
3. Provide programme stakeholders with an objective assessment of results that have been achieved through UNDP support and partnerships with other key actors for a given multi-year period.

The preparatory work for the evaluation started with extensive desk research including programme mapping and documentation review by the UNDP Evaluation Office. This was followed by an exploratory mission to Turkey, which consisted of direct consultations with the UNDP Country Office and key stakeholders. The exploratory mission aided in determining the focus of the evaluation as a basis for the Terms of Reference (TOR).

In preparation for the main evaluation mission, two targeted, detailed background studies were commissioned:

- *In-Depth Study on Regional Disparities and Poverty*, by Prof. Dr. Yusuf Ziya Özcan, Department of Sociology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara
- *In-Depth Study on Local Governance and Capacity Building*, by Prof. Dr. Çelik Aruoba, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nesrin Algan and Mr. Tezcan Abay, Ankara University, Faculty of Political Sciences

This background work entailed the review of programme and project documentation, interviews, focus group discussions and field visits. The results of these studies were available to the ADR Evaluation Team at the outset of the main mission and served as a valuable input into the analysis of the focus areas of governance and poverty.

The main evaluation mission took place in January 2004 and lasted two weeks. The ADR Evaluation Team consisted of four members: one national external consultant, two international external consultants, and one member of the UNDP's Evaluation Office. The Team consulted a wide range of stakeholders from the

1. For more detailed information on methodology see the TOR in Annexe1.

Government, private sector, civil society, donors, UN and IFIs. To validate and broaden observations made in Ankara and İstanbul, the Team also made field visits to projects in Diyarbakır and Mardin in Southeast Anatolia.

Following standard evaluation procedures developed by the UNDP's Evaluation Office for ADRs, the Team drew on three major sources of information: perception, validation, and documentation. This is in keeping with the concept of 'triangulation', i.e. balancing perceptions with other methods of corroboration. The evaluation used various criteria (see Box 1.1) to assess results, drawing on qualitative and quantitative information. Unfortunately, the Team found that in the past, very few external evaluations of UNDP programmes and projects had been conducted in Turkey. As a result, the Team had to carry out its own, albeit limited, assessment of project-level effectiveness. Given the limited time and resources available to the Team, these assessments were by necessity of an impressionistic nature. Nonetheless, the Team believes that its observations are broadly representative of the effectiveness of the UNDP's support and that the recommendations contained in this Report can serve as a useful input into the UNDP's current strategic review and planning process in Turkey.

BOX 1.1: CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE UNDP'S PROGRAMME RESULTS

- UNDP's relevance and strategic role in national development efforts
- National ownership of UNDP programmes
- Clear links of programmes to UNDP's global strategic positioning
- Strategic links between UNDP interventions and macro-economic policies, the MDGs and EU accession priorities
- Strong scope for learning, replication and scaling-up of projects and programmes
- High quality (i.e. transparent, accountable and innovative) partnerships
- Positive contribution by the UNDP to national level policy analysis, formulation and implementation processes
- Positive contribution by the UNDP to capacity building for sustainable human development
- Timely and effective monitoring and evaluation of lessons learned, including failures and lost opportunities
- Strategic resource mobilisation, coordination and application in programmes

2

Turkey – Country at a Crossroads

Turkey shares borders with Greece and Bulgaria in Europe, with Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia in the Caucasus and with Iran, Iraq and Syria in the Middle East. Occupying an area of 775 sq. km, the country covers the whole Anatolian Peninsula (on the Asian side of the Bosphorus Strait), East Thrace (on the European side of the Bosphorus) and islands in the Marmara and Aegean Seas. (See Map, Annexe 12.)

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly introduce Turkey's political and economic context, its human development challenges and its path towards EU accession.

A. A TURBULENT POLITICAL CONTEXT

Turkey underwent a far-reaching political transition in the 20th Century. The Republic of Turkey was founded on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who ruled as President of the Republic until his death in 1938. A multi-party democracy was installed in 1945, and in 1950 the first free election was held. As a result of political, social and economic instabilities, the multi-party regime was interrupted by a number of military coups.

During most of the decades since World War II, including the 1990s and into the new millennium, Turkey has been governed by fractious and unstable coalition Governments, with repeated political and economic upheavals. Most recently, in July 2002, the Government of Prime Minister Ecevit experienced a severe political crisis in the midst of a major macro-financial crisis. As a result, early elections were called for in November 2002. In a landslide victory, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) gained 34.2% of the votes, securing 363 of 550 seats in parliament. Of the eighteen parties running in the elections, the social democrat Republican People's Party (CHP) was the only other party to win parliamentary representation. The parties that governed the country in the 1990s failed to pass the 10% threshold needed to enter the parliament. This outcome was explained by public disillusionment over their capacity to bring Turkey much needed political and economic stability.

Although the AKP is an offshoot of the Welfare Party (RP), which was banned in 1997 for Islamist activities, the AKP's moderate, non-confrontational rhetoric and policy agenda made it attractive to a diverse array of the population.² Since the AKP assumed power in November

2. Cagaptay, S., "The November 2002 elections and Turkey's new political era", Middle East Review of International Affairs 6.4: (2002).

2002, and the AKP party leader, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, took over as Prime Minister in early 2003, the Government has consistently pursued political and economic stability and reform in the quest for the overarching national goal of Turkey's accession to the EU. As a result, the AKP has been able to strengthen its popular support and it scored a clear victory in the municipal elections in April 2004. At this point it is expected that AKP will continue in power until at least the next national parliamentary elections in 2007.

B. A VOLATILE ECONOMY


Turkey is a large middle-income country, with purchasing power parity GDP per capita at about USD 5,890 in 2001.³ Some two-thirds of its population of almost 70 million lived in urban areas in 2001. Agriculture accounts for 16% of its GDP, industry for 24%, and services for 60%. Turkey's economy grew at an average annual rate of 4% between 1965 and 2001, with its real per capita GDP growing at just under half that rate due to rapid population growth. This long-term growth performance makes Turkey less successful than many of its competitors among the dynamic, emerging market economies located mostly in East and Southeast Asia and Latin America. Korea, Thailand and Malaysia grew two to three times more rapidly in per capita terms over the same period, and Brazil, India and Chile also outperformed Turkey, with average annual per capita GDP growth rates well above 2%.⁴

A key reason for Turkey's less than stellar economic performance has been the fact that its growth was highly volatile over the last two decades with repeated booms and busts, accompanied by persistently high inflation. At the core of this pattern of instability were the growing fiscal imbalances in Turkey, especially in the 1990s, with high and growing public sector deficits, borrowing requirements and hence substantial increases in total public debt.⁵ In addition, substantial hidden public liabilities were accumulated in an unsound banking sector, with many large and inefficient public banks and poorly supervised private banks becoming increasingly insolvent. Matters came to a head in the late 1990s after the 1997-98 financial crisis in East Asia and Russia had

severely reduced the trust of international capital markets in emerging market economies. The knock-on effect of the regional and worldwide economic slowdown exposed Turkey's weak macroeconomic fundamentals. Two major earthquakes during the second half of 1999 further damaged Turkey's outlook, resulting in a severe economic contraction that year.

Recognising the long-term unsustainability of the economy's trends, the Turkish authorities initiated a major economic reform programme in 1999. This included an exchange-rate based disinflation programme and encompassed ambitious structural reforms, including a banking sector workout, fiscal and public sector reforms, as well as agricultural and energy sector reforms and privatisation. Initially, confidence in the Turkish economy rebounded and it recovered dramatically in 2000. However, accumulated financial imbalances, political wrangling among the Government coalition partners and continued international market jitters plunged Turkey back into economic crisis starting in late 2000. During 2001, Turkey's economy contracted by 7.5%, while the public debt-to-GDP ratio reached almost 100%. This led the Government in May 2001 to abandon the exchange rate anchor and to announce a new, even more ambitious economic programme involving dramatic fiscal stabilisation, further banking, energy and agricultural sector restructuring, and an intensified privatisation and public sector reform programme. These macroeconomic and structural reforms were complemented by efforts to strengthen the social safety net to help protect the most vulnerable population groups from the negative impact of the

CHART 2.1: REAL ANNUAL GDP GROWTH



Source: World Bank, 2003 estimated

3. UNDP, "Human Development Report 2003", p. 238. Turkey was marginally ahead of Romania with a PPP GDP per capita of USD 5,830. At current exchange rates, Turkey's GNI per capita was about USD 2,500 in 2002, according to World Development Indicators.

4. The World Bank, "Country Economic Memorandum", October 2003; and The World Bank, "Turkey Country Brief", September 2003.

5. *Ibid.*

economic crisis.⁶ The Government's reinforced programme was supported by extensive financial and advisory assistance from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the WB, with IMF commitments for the period 1999-2004 totalling over USD 30 billion and with a total of USD 2.5 billion disbursed by the WB in quick-disbursing loans between 2000 and 2003.⁷

The events of September 11, 2001 and continued domestic and regional political uncertainties in 2002 kept Turkey's economic outlook in a high state of uncertainty during much of 2002. However, the cumulative impact of the reforms actually being implemented and the increased domestic political stability after the November 2002 elections have now set Turkey on a more sustainable path of economic stability and recovery. GDP growth rebounded to 7.9% in 2002 and is estimated at 5.8% for 2003. Inflation has also dropped dramatically from a 50-80% range in the last few years to below 20% in 2003. With the Government clearly committed to a continued strict fiscal policy stance and structural reforms, the outlook now is that a virtuous cycle of fiscal stabilisation, real interest rate declines, a reduced public sector debt overhang and increasing confidence should help maintain GDP growth on a relatively strong and stable path (at or above 5% per year). Of course, there is no guarantee that this favourable outcome will actually materialise. Turkey remains vulnerable to external shocks, with its continued high debt levels, short track record of policy performance and heavy dependence on a potentially fickle tourism boom. Moreover, the positive outlook depends on continued strict fiscal management and the effective implementation of ambitious economic reforms.⁸ Perhaps the best hope for this optimistic scenario materialising lies in Turkey's clear ambitions to place itself firmly on a track towards EU accession.

C. GREAT CHALLENGES OF SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Despite its volatile political and economic history Turkey has made great strides over the last four decades in creating a better human development environment for its citizens. Between 1965 and 1998, Turkey's adult literacy increased from 53% to 84%, and its combined school enrolment ratio rose from 44.9% to 61%. Life expectancy has improved from 53 to 69.3 years, and per capita GDP at purchasing power parity from USD 791 to USD 6,468.

Nonetheless, Turkey still faces major challenges in creating high and sustainable human development conditions for its population.

Using the most aggregate comparative measure of the level of human development, according to the **2003 Human Development Index (HDI)**, Turkey ranks 96th (among 175 countries).⁹ This places Turkey among the "medium level" HDI country performers, but at the lowest ranking among the OECD countries and among the EU accession candidates, as well as behind such neighbouring countries as Albania, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine. Turkey does better (in 80th place) when ranked according to per capita income only. By the same token, Turkey does worse on health and educational indicators than countries with lower per capita income, which demonstrates the important challenge that Turkey faces in the social dimensions of human development.

As far as **education** is concerned, today's young people in Turkey are much better educated than earlier generations, as all indicators of educational achievement have increased significantly over the last 20 years. (See Comparative Human Development Data, Annexe 7.) Literacy rates are over 80%, compared with 30% in 1950, and the gap between the gender groups has been closing. However, educational indicators (literacy, average years of schooling, gross school enrolment ratios, public expenditure on education and girls' enrolment ratios) in Turkey rank below the average indicators for middle income countries (Annexe 7). What is more, the quality of education in Turkey is uneven. It suffers from an emphasis on rote-learning and centralised multiple-choice examinations, outdated curricula, a lack of educational facilities, a failure to encourage student initiative and independent thinking, poorly trained and poorly rewarded teachers, and large class sizes. In rural areas, schools can be severely under-equipped, and in some cases they barely function. Fortunately, as of August 1997, Turkey started with a fundamental and far-reaching reform of its education system, which has dramatically raised the educational service standards for most children, including girls.¹⁰ However, for Turkey to close the remaining education gap, especially with regard to its European neighbours, it clearly needs to continue to pursue educational reforms and investments with great intensity.

6. *Ibid.*

7. The World Bank, "Turkey Country Assistance Strategy", October 2003.

8. OECD, "Economic Outlook No. 74: Turkey Summary", November, 2003; The World Bank, "Country Economic Memorandum", October 2003.

9. UNDP, "Human Development Report, 2003". The HDI combines rankings of per capita income at purchasing power parity, life expectancy and education. Turkey's ranking in 2003 represents an 11- step decline from 85th place in HDR 2002, which is explained by the per capita income decline of the recession year 2001 (the last year for which information was available for HDR 2003).

10. The World Bank, "Country Assistance Strategy", October 2003, p. 15.

TABLE 2.1: BASIC DATA FOR TURKISH GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS

Regions	Share of total Pop in 1997 (%)	GDP per capita (000 in 1987 prices)	Share of total GDP on average (1991-97) (%)	Share of total value-added in the manufac. industry on average (1980-2000) (%)	Share of total public investment on average (1980-2000) (%)	Share of total private investment incentives on average (1991-1997) (%)
Aegean	13.44	2172	15.61	15.72	14.04	11.68
Mediterranean	12.82	1657	12.18	8.15	14.08	11.67
Marmara	25.75	2618	36.56	59.60	28.76	46.27
Central	16.83	1616	16.57	9.37	21.61	13.99
Black Sea	12.48	1271	9.55	4.64	7.07	5.33
S. East	9.75	952	5.43	1.88	7.96	8.29
East	8.93	683	4.09	0.59	6.58	2.77

Source: Karadağ, Deliktaş and Özlem 2003, p.7¹¹

TABLE 2.2: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX BY REGION

REGIONS	1975	1997	CHANGE
Aegean	0.573	0.757	0.184
Mediterranean	0.528	0.713	0.185
Marmara	0.627	0.801	0.174
Central	0.549	0.736	0.187
Black Sea	0.504	0.694	0.190
S. East	0.447	0.612	0.165
East	0.446	0.612	0.166
TURKEY	0.530	0.720	0.190

Source: UNDP Human Development Report Turkey 2001, p. 21

Health conditions have also improved significantly in Turkey in recent decades. Life expectancy increased from 62 years in 1980 to 70 years in 2000, infant mortality declined from 103 per 1000 live births to 38 over the same period, and immunisation rates and access to physicians tripled and doubled respectively (Annexe 7). Again, however, health conditions and service standards in Turkey are well below those of comparable developing countries and even more so compared to the more developed countries. In contrast to the educational system, reform of the excessively complex and inefficient health care and financing system of Turkey has not yet seriously begun.¹² It is clearly one of the most urgent human development challenges that Turkey faces today.

Turning then to comparative measures of **poverty**, incidence of extreme poverty (the share of the population living on under USD 1 a day) is very low at less than 2%, but as the poverty threshold is raised, the poverty rates

increase dramatically (to 18% for USD 2.15 a day, and to 42% for USD 4.30 a day). Moreover, inequality in Turkey is high (with a Gini coefficient of 46 in 2001). According to recent poverty research carried out under the auspices of the UNDP, it appears that “new poverty” is on the rise, i.e., poverty that is long-term in nature and not easily remedied by access to traditional support networks of family and friends, which in the past have helped keep poverty a temporary state for many poor.¹³ A strategy to combat the many and changing causes of poverty in Turkey requires a consistent and pervasive pro-poor growth strategy that combines employment-creating growth with improvements in regional disparities, access to social services and safety nets for the disadvantaged and excluded population groups.

One particularly striking aspect of inequality in Turkey is the great **regional disparities** (see Table 2.1), as reflected by high regional income differentials and by regional differences in poverty incidence.¹⁴ According to the UNDP HDR Turkey 2001, regional disparities have increased since 1975 as measured by region-specific HDIs (Table 2.2).¹⁵ These regional disparities are of long historical standing, and are due to differential natural and human resource endowments and due to the better access to world and regional markets of the coastal regions along the Mediterranean Sea. However, they are also the result of a relative neglect of the Eastern and Southeastern regions of the country by successive Governments. More recently, however, and with UNDP assistance, increasing attention has been paid to the issue of regional disparity and in the course of preparation for EU accession this

11. “The Effects of Public Infrastructure on Private Sector Performances in the Turkish Regional Manufacturing Industries”, Working Paper, Department of Economics, Ege University, 35040, Izmir, Turkey

12. *Ibid.*

13. A. Bugra and C. Keyder, “New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey”, UNDP, Ankara, 2003.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

15. UNDP, “Human Development Report Turkey 2001”, Ankara, 2001, p. 19.

issue will likely receive even more attention in the future.

One of the population groups traditionally excluded and disadvantaged in Turkey have been **women**. The development process has tended to exclude women from economic opportunities and entitlements, particularly in distant rural areas and in informal settlements of metropolitan cities. There have been improvements in women's living standards, including life expectancy (which increased from 64 to 72 years between 1980 and 2000) and youth illiteracy for girls (which dropped from 20.2% to 6.0%). However, with the exception of life expectancy, all available indicators tend to be worse for women than for men, and generally Turkey does worse on gender indicators than comparable middle-income countries (Annexe 7).

Another important set of challenges for Turkey in creating sustainable human development involves **vulnerability to natural disasters and environmental sustainability**, where it appears that Turkey has a long way to go. Turkey is particularly vulnerable to devastating earthquakes, as witnessed by the earthquakes of 1999 and estimates of exposure to seismic risks. According to a recent UNDP report, Turkey is in fourth place (after Armenia, Iran and Yemen) among earthquake-prone countries in terms of its relative vulnerability.¹⁶ In the environmental area, Turkey is challenged by its rapid population increase, by industrialisation and urbanisation, and by the explosive growth of tourism, which is threatening its environmentally vulnerable coastal areas.

A final overarching issue that Turkey faces through all dimensions of its human development challenge is the need for continued improvement in **governance**. One of the goals of the founder of the Turkish Republic was the establishment of a modern, efficient Government. Unfortunately however, Turkey's state bureaucracy has been characterised by strong centralisation, excessive control over key aspects of the economy, and inefficient public resource management. As part of its overall structural reform programme, in 2001 Turkey started a comprehensive reform of its public sector, with a focus on accelerated privatisation, public administration reform, decentralisation and anti-corruption.¹⁷

These many dimensions of sustainable human development are well captured by the **MDGs**, which cover eight areas in total, of which seven are directly and highly relevant to Turkey's sustainable human development challenges: eradicate poverty and hunger,

achieve universal primary education, promote gender equality and empower women, reduce child mortality, combat communicable diseases, and ensure environmental sustainability. The Turkish Government and the UNDP have commissioned the preparation of the first comprehensive MDG Report (MDGR) for Turkey, to be prepared by the Human Development Centre in İstanbul in 2004. Preliminary indications are that it will be difficult for Turkey to attain some of the MDGs by 2015 unless it redoubles its human development efforts. The main issue facing Turkey, however, is likely to be serious regional and gender disparities hidden in country-wide aggregates.

D. EU ACCESSION AS AN OVERARCHING GOAL AND OPPORTUNITY

Relations between the EU (then the European Economic Community) and Turkey began with the so-called Ankara Agreement signed in 1963, which initially focused on the establishment of a customs union.¹⁸ In 1987 Turkey applied for EU membership. Turkey's customs union with the EU came into effect in 1996. In 1997, the Luxembourg European Council confirmed Turkey's eligibility for accession to the EU, and in December 1999, the European Council in Helsinki welcomed "recent positive developments in Turkey, as well as its intentions to continue its reforms towards complying with the Copenhagen criteria. Turkey is a candidate State destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States."¹⁹

For its part, Turkey has been moving forward with the implementation of important and courageous steps to meet the Copenhagen criteria. In October 2001, parliament passed a package of 34 constitutional amendments that included improving the freedom of speech and other political reforms. In parallel, the Government's economic reform programme, implemented since 1999 and reinforced at the height of the financial crisis in 2001 with IMF and WB assistance, has propelled Turkey towards meeting the economic requirements of the Copenhagen criteria. Progress was further reinforced, especially on the political front, under the new AKP Government since November 2002.

18. The information in this subsection is based principally on information contained in the EU's website for Turkey, www.deltur.cec.eu.int.

19. According to the EU Turkey website, "[T]he decisions taken at Helsinki were an important watershed in EU-Turkey relations. Turkey, like other candidate countries will benefit from a pre-accession strategy to stimulate and support its reforms... The Accession Partnership [with Turkey] was formally adopted by the EU Council on 8 March 2002, is a roadmap for the priorities for Turkey in making progress towards meeting all the criteria for accession to the EU... On the basis of this Partnership Agreement Turkish Government has adopted on 19 March 2001 its National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis*". *Ibid.*

16. See UNDP "Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development", 2003, Section 4 A (v)

17. The World Bank, "Country Assistance Strategy", October 2003, p. 13

The Copenhagen European Council in December 2002 gave a clear political roadmap for Turkey and held out the prospects for opening membership negotiations by December 2004. Following this, in May 2003 the Council accepted a revised Accession Partnership, which included a substantial increase in financial assistance for the period 2004–2006 linked to the priorities in the Accession Partnership.²⁰ The Accession Partnership is essentially a strategy for preparing Turkey's membership to the EU and, more particularly, in bringing together the various forms of aid offered by the EU within the Accession Partnership framework. It is also intended to familiarise Turkey with the EU's procedures and policies by offering it the opportunity to participate in Community programmes. An important instrument that underpins the Accession Partnership is the National Programme for Adopting the Community *Acquis* (NPAA), which was introduced in March 2001. Others include joint instruments of medium-term economic priorities, the National Development Plan and other sectoral programmes.²¹

The EU Regular Report on “*Turkey's Progress Towards Accession*” (November 2003) acknowledges the progress made by Turkey in meeting the criteria, but urges added impetus in work towards the remaining reforms and implementation of existing policies.²² The EU itself has stepped up both its financial and advisory support for Turkey in this effort. EU financial support between 2004 and 2006 is programmed to rise steadily, amounting to a total of Euro 1.05 billion in grants. The support is designated for institution building and investments to help prepare for accession, implement the *Acquis* and support socio-economic development in Turkey. One of the key challenges for Turkey in the coming years will be to prepare for the effective absorption of these funds and subsequent financial flows from the EU, which will mostly flow to regional and local authorities and will likely be targeted to help reduce regional disparities

within the country. This will undoubtedly require a significant degree of decentralisation and strengthening of regional and local authorities' administrative capacity, which are currently very weak.

EU accession has become the driving force for political and economic reform in Turkey. At the same time, Turkey's other neighbours are of importance, especially Syria, Iraq and Iran due to their proximity, size and potential impacts on Turkey. Her relation with these neighbours is especially important with regard to trade, oil and gas transport. But Turkey also has important opportunities and challenges in cooperating with the countries of the South Caucasus, and with Russia. These countries offer important trade and investment opportunities, especially as the economies of the former Soviet Union are recovering from their deep transition recession. Turkey's unique position at the crossroads of East and West, North and South, provides it with special opportunities and challenges to ensure a peaceful and prosperous development in this crucial, volatile region.

E. CONCLUSION

In sum, Turkey faces prospects of domestic political stability, but remains exposed to the risks of its location in a turbulent neighbourhood, as the 2003 Iraq war has once again made abundantly clear. Turkey's economic outlook has improved greatly since the 2001 financial crisis, due to rigorous implementation of a tough macroeconomic and structural reform programme. The credibility of this programme has been enhanced by the Government's strong ownership of reforms and by its commitment to move forward quickly on the path towards EU accession. Turkey now confronts the dual challenge of:

- Meeting the strict criteria of the *Acquis*, which will require major efforts to build legal and institutional structures consistent with EU standards.
- Improving substantially the human development conditions of the country through progress in the social, environmental and governance areas so as to reduce inequalities and better the lives of all its citizens, and meet the essential MDGs to which Turkey has also subscribed.

At the same time, Turkey can and must play an increasingly important role as a force for peace and economic prosperity with its other non-EU neighbours. This will be critical for Turkey's own future as well as for the future of a stable world.

20. “2003 Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession”, European Commission, 2003.

21. Two important documents from the Turkish side are: Republic of Turkey, “Pre-Accession Economic Programme 2003”, Ankara, August 2003; and Republic of Turkey, “Preliminary National Development Plan (2004–2006)”, Ankara, December 2003. Together, these documents lay out the government's economic strategy for gaining EU accession.

22. EU President Prodi in his speech to the Turkish parliament on January 15, 2004 put it as follows: “In its November Report, the Commission highlighted those areas where more progress is needed such as the strengthening of the independence and efficiency of the judiciary, the overall framework for the exercise of fundamental freedoms, the full alignment of civil-military relations on EU standards as well as the improvement of the situation in the Southeast.” He mentions separately in his speech the importance of resolving the issues surrounding the division of Cyprus.

3

UNDP's Strategic Positioning and Programme Relevance

Against the backdrop of the changing national context and challenges of Turkey, the UNDP has tried to position itself in a way that responds effectively to twin demands – those of Turkey as its partner and those of its own evolving internal institutional priorities. In doing so, the UNDP in Turkey has faced a number of trade-offs and tensions. How well it has addressed and resolved these is the topic for this chapter. After briefly reviewing the evolution of Turkey's national development goals and the UNDP's evolving strategic response, this chapter assesses the UNDP's overall strategic challenges and responses in Turkey.

19

A. TURKEY'S NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND PROGRAMMES

Turkey's national economic and social goals have traditionally been reflected in its National Development Plans. The Turkish Government began to publish Five-Year National Development Plans in 1963, with the establishment of the State Planning Office (SPO) under the 1960 Constitution. The Plan receives parliamentary approval and is therefore a legal document. The SPO takes the lead in the Plan's preparation, although other offices of the state, universities and non-governmental stakeholders are also consulted. Currently, the 8th Five-Year National Development Plan (2001-2005) is under execution.

Since the acceptance of the 8th Plan by parliament, Turkey experienced a major economic crisis and there has been a change of Government. While adjusting specific projections in light of the changed economic circumstances, the new Government has not altered the broad concepts of the Plan, but has reinforced its emphasis on EU accession as the main goal of development. In this respect, three other recent Government documents are also considered here for a full understanding of Turkey's development goals: the Programme for the 59th Government and its Urgent Action Plan, the National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis* (NPAA) and the Preliminary National Development Plan.

(i) The 8th National Development Plan (2001-2005)

The introductory statement of the 8th Plan summarises Turkey's

overarching development goals in terms of improvement in the quality of life and living standards of people, continuous and stable economic growth process, societal transformation with the goal of EU membership, and integration with the rest of the world to ensure that Turkey will attain a more influential and respected role globally and regionally.²³

The Plan's key priorities for these goals in the medium-term are as follows:

- Achieving high and sustainable growth through macroeconomic stability and an improved investment climate
- Initiating structural reforms to achieve a high-technology, internationally competitive economy in agriculture, industry and services, built on the transition to a modern knowledge economy
- Developing Turkey's human resources and increasing employment opportunities through improved education and health services
- Improving infrastructure services and environmental protection
- Reducing regional and social differences with enhanced regional development and social assistance programmes
- Accelerating efforts to meet the Copenhagen criteria, and adoption of the *Acquis Communautaire*

(ii) The Programme of the 59th Government and Its Urgent Action Plan²⁴

The Programme of the 59th Government,²⁵ while not explicitly referring to the 8th Five-Year Development Plan, is broadly consistent with the basic provisions of that Plan. The AKP Government's priorities are the following:

- Complete the rehabilitation and reconstruction process of the economy
- Restart sustainable economic growth
- Reduce poverty and unemployment
- Reduce and reshape the state and its institutions, in terms of function, authority and accountability within the confines of universal values, modern standards and effective implementation
- Reduce the bureaucracy
- Create the conditions that will enable Turkey to become a regional economic power and financial centre

Together with this programme the Government also declared its "Emergency Action Plan." This action plan is more detailed and sets time limits for implementation of the proposed measures. Much of the action plan is oriented towards macroeconomic stability (such as cuts in public spending and privatisation). However, there are also measures for poverty reduction (such as supporting the Social Solidarity Fund by increasing its budget and by redefining principles of spending, reducing unemployment, and helping families who live under the poverty line) and for governance and decentralisation (such as passing the Local Administration Law, passing the Law of Rights of Information for Citizens, eliminating corruption and instilling total quality principles and good governance systems in public services).

(iii) The National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis*²⁶ and the Preliminary National Development Plan²⁷

After the Helsinki Summit, and in accordance with the candidacy process for membership in the EU, the Government prepared a NPAA in response to the Accession Partnership Document. The NPAA was first published in 2001 and a revised and detailed version was published in July 2003.

The NPAA is a detailed document of 884 pages. It defines each one of the legal changes, programmes, capacity building attempts, implementing agencies, funding commitments from EU and Turkish Government sources, as well as the required amendments in the legal system. There are 29 harmonisation areas where amendments are required, each with sub sections and different priorities designated under them.

With the NPAA, Turkey has agreed to comply with the Copenhagen political criteria. And indeed, since 1999, Turkey has taken some important measures to meet these criteria, including abolishment of the death penalty, lifting the state of emergency in all provinces, and expansion of the freedom of expression, thought and press. In addition, laws have been amended to reinforce gender equality, to protect cultural diversity and to guarantee the right to learn and broadcast in traditional languages and dialects. The "advisory only" role of the National Security Council has been reaffirmed. Turkey also signed or ratified various UN and European Court of Human Rights conventions including the UN

23. Long Term Strategy and 8th National Development Plan (2001-2005), <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/viii/plan8i.pdf>, 2003

24. The programme of the 59th Government, <http://www.basbakanlik.gov.tr/english/59programmeme.htm>, 2003.

25. All Governments in Turkey before they get a vote of confidence, have to submit a "Government programme" to the parliament.

26. Republic of Turkey National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis*, <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/NPAA/up.htm>, 2003.

27. The Republic of Turkey Preliminary National Development Plan (2004-2006), <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/p-ndp.pdf>, 2003.

Convention on All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the ILO Convention Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

The overarching economic priorities of the NPAA are macroeconomic stability, creating a functioning market economy and improving its competitiveness. Special emphasis is placed on reducing the role of the public sector and on public administration reform, improving the role of independent regulatory bodies and enhancing the investment environment, including the promotion of foreign investment, and decentralisation in economic decision making to reduce regional disparities and empower the local authorities' decision-making process.

In addition to the NPAA, the SPO also prepared the Preliminary National Development Plan (PNDP) in response to one of the requirements of the European Commission. The PNDP covers the period 2004-2006 as an annexe to the NPAA. It establishes a strategic framework for programming pre-accession financial assistance for Turkey. Therefore this document is more focused than the National Development Plan. It covers only the EU accession related areas and is limited by funding constraints.

Summary

This review of successive Turkish planning documents shows a consistent set of overarching themes with an increasingly sharper focus on four key national goals:

- Meeting the political and economic criteria for EU accession
- Macroeconomic stability and sustained economic growth
- Reform of public administration and governance, including decentralisation
- Reduction of poverty and regional disparities

These goals respond well to the development challenges that Turkey faces today. Now the main task ahead for the Government is to assure the effective implementation of its goals and programmes in a constrained resource environment.

For the UNDP, the challenge is how to position itself strategically so that it responds effectively to the Government's priorities while staying true to its overarching human development mandate. It must also focus on channelling its own limited resources to those areas where it has a real comparative advantage.

B. UNDP COOPERATION IN TURKEY: EVOLVING STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

The UNDP has been active in Turkey since the 1950s as a partner of successive Governments and other stakeholders. Since 1986 it has implemented over 80 programmes in Turkey, of which 22 were ongoing in early 2004. The UNDP is currently operating under the CCF 2001-2005, which succeeded the 5th Country Programme 1995-1999. Between these two programme periods, a Country Review of the UNDP's programme was carried out in 2000 as an input into the preparation of the CCF. The CCF also benefited from the preparation of the UN agency-wide CCA in December 2000 and the UNDAF of March 2001.

This section briefly reviews the shifting strategic positioning of the UNDP as it adapted itself to changing country circumstances and needs, as well as to changing global priorities of the UN and of the UNDP. The subsequent section summarises key strategic issues and challenges for the UNDP.

(i) The 5th Country Programme 1995-1999

The 5th Country Programme 1995-1999 was drawn up in 1994. It comprised a broad-gauged programme in five major areas, presented in a manner which clearly linked each item of support to the national programme priorities of the Turkish authorities, reflecting the consultative approach adopted in its preparation:

- **Implementation of the Global Agenda for Development**, which included as key elements the preparation of NHDRs, as well as work on the National Agenda 21, on the National Action Plan for Social Development and the World Summit for Social Development, on the National Action Plan for Women and the World Conference on Women, and on coordination of other UN agencies.
- **Urbanisation and the 2nd Conference on Human Settlements**, which included the preparation for HABITAT-II and support for environmental institution building and management.
- **Social Development and Reduction of Disparities**, which covered support for development in the GAP region, alleviation of the impacts of structural adjustment, gender and development, and science and advanced technology development.
- **Support for Turkish Development Aid Activities**, under the Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC) Programme.
- **Other Areas of Support**, which included the work under MSAs with the WB, humanitarian

programmes, including disaster management, support for Turkey as a regional support centre, and support for the UN Drug Control Programme (UNDCP).

The themes of “poverty” and “poverty reduction” do not figure explicitly in the 5th Country Programme. This reflects the fact that in 1994, when the Programme was prepared, the Turkish authorities were not inclined to subscribe to poverty reduction as an explicit objective, and UNDP priorities were less clearly directed to poverty reduction than is the case today. Of course, many aspects of social development and reduction of disparities were consistent with a poverty reduction strategy as is reflected in the fact that many of the initiatives started under the 5th Country Programme could readily be subsumed under the poverty agenda of the subsequent CCF.

Of special note is that many of the flagship programmes that have dominated the UNDP’s activities appear in the 5th Country Programme: National Agenda 21 (which gave rise to LA 21 following the HABITAT-II Conference), the GAP Region Programme, the work on environment and gender issues, disaster management, and the preparation of NHDRs and support for TCDC.

At the end of the 5th Country Programme 1995–1999, an extension was made to continue programmes for another year through 2000. This was to enable the first CCF to be harmonised with the programme cycles of other UN Development Group (UNDG) agencies as well as Turkey’s 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2001–2005).

(ii) CCA and UNDAF

In connection with UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan’s reform programme launched in 1997, Turkey was selected as a pilot country for testing a new approach for improved UN inter-agency cooperation. This included preparation of a CCA as well as a UNDAF.

The preparation of the CCA for Turkey was started in 1998, but delayed due to the intervening earthquake which absorbed most of the UNDP’s and other UN agencies’ time and resources during 1999. It was finally published in December 2000. The CCA consists of a detailed review of eleven UN conventions, conferences and summits and assesses the progress with implementation under each of them. The CCA concludes by identifying four priority areas for UN involvement in Turkey:

- Governance and participatory development
- Reduction of socio-economic and regional disparities
- Gender equality
- Increased awareness of UN conventions and support for their implementation

The CCA did a thorough job in laying out for each of the eleven areas reviewed the expectations, commitments, progress with legal and institutional reforms, status and issues. However, there is no discussion of overlaps across areas, and few specifics of progress against monitorable results targets. There are hundreds of recommendations without any prioritisation or sequencing.

Based on the CCA, the UNDAF was prepared and published in March 2001. It covers the activities and programmes of the UN Resident Coordinator, International Labour Organisation (ILO), Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), UNDCP, UNDP, UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UN Information Centre (UNIC), UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and UN Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO). The key goal for the UNDAF was to focus on the full implementation of the UN conventions. There was a notable absence of any reference to the Government’s own development programme embodied in the 8th Five-Year Development Plan (although this was referenced in the CCA, which the UNDAF drew upon). The UNDAF proposed to pursue the four priority areas identified by the CCA for UN involvement in Turkey (see above). For each area, objectives were defined, implementation strategies presented and a list of agency-specific contributions or actions included. In the case of the UNDP, 34 action items were listed in the UNDAF.

The UNDAF also included detailed steps for follow-up, including the setting up of four working groups (one per priority area), with participation of the Government, Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and private partners. Action plans were to be prepared for each area and annual reviews were to be conducted by the UNCT jointly with the Government.

Judging from the comments made by current members of the UNCT to the Turkey ADR Evaluation Team during its January mission to Turkey, the CCA and UNDAF exercise was not as effective as envisaged. Individual agencies continued their own programmes largely independently from one other, the follow-up steps often fell by the wayside, and there was little apparent ownership of the Government or other Turkish stakeholders in the process. Apparently the only lasting result of the UNDAF exercise was the setting up of four inter-agency working groups dealing with cross-cutting priority issues: gender, HIV/AIDS, sustainable rural development and food security, and MDGs. A new UNDAF process is now underway (see below).

(iii) Country Cooperation Framework 2001-2005

The CCF 2001-2005 is a succinct statement of objectives and programme areas. It states at the outset that it is based on national priorities identified in Turkey's 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005), and also draws upon results from the Country Review (see Box 3.1), NHDR and on the preceding CCA. It further states that it gives priority to those areas where the UNDP is best positioned to contribute to the country's national development efforts to achieve sustainable, equitable and participatory development.²⁸

Although the CCF continues with some of the activities initiated under the 5th Country Programme, it is refocused to contribute to the **sustainable human development** of Turkey in the following two programme areas, under which the main activities were to be grouped:

- (1) **Reduction of disparities**, consisting of
 - The GAP programme
 - The LEAP programme (designed to reduce vulnerabilities in Eastern Anatolia)
 - Environment
 - Gender
 - Poverty Strategies Initiative (poverty data collection)
- (2) **Governance and decentralisation**, consisting of
 - Governance programme (civil service reform, civil society capacity building, policy dialogue)
 - LA 21 – ongoing programme to be scaled-up
 - Disaster preparedness
 - Human settlements programme

In addition, the CCF identifies five cross-cutting themes for implementation as areas of special concern:

- More effective use of NHDRs as policy and advocacy tools
- Expansion of TCDC and the emerging donor role of Turkey
- Mainstreaming information and communication technology in line with Government plans
- Furthering the integration of GEF programme objectives and resources
- Continued efforts to mainstream gender in all projects

The CCF does not have specific programmes to support EU accession, but it highlights that cooperation

BOX 3.1: COUNTRY REVIEW 2000

In March/April 2000 a review of the UNDP-Turkey Country Programme was undertaken for the UNDP. The overall assessment of the evaluation was that the UNDP has a comfortable relationship and mutual respect with the Government, but that a certain loss of dynamism could be discerned in the relationship. The UNDP programme was judged to be broad gauged to the point of spreading itself too thin, with too much focus on technical support and too little on policy advice. A multiplier effect was thought to be most visible in the case of the LA 21 initiative.

For the future programme, the Team had the following advice:

- Avoid fragmentation
- Measure results and impacts and evaluate programme progress more systematically
- Focus more on the poor, on EU accession, and on new, innovative issues
- Raise the UNDP's visibility at the senior levels by a greater focus on policy issues

In terms of programme management, the Review Team advised that quicker approval of programmes and projects, systematic management of information and programme monitoring and a resource mobilisation strategy were required. The Team commented on the absence of coordination among UN agencies.

with the Turkish Government and its civil society partners in critical social and human development areas is expected to facilitate Turkey's accession to the EU.

Again, it is worth noting that while the broad classification of strategic goals shifted compared to prior strategy statements, the main flagship activities that were noted earlier continued to form the backbone of the CCF.

Finally, the CCF positions itself for the application of RBM drawing on Strategic Results Frameworks (SRFs) and Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs) (see below), proposes to apply systematic monitoring and evaluation supported by an enhanced management information system and envisages a significant increase in the mobilisation of third party resources.²⁹

A number of aspects stand out in reviewing the CCF 2001-2005:

- The links to the Government's priorities are not as clearly articulated as in the 5th Country Programme.
- There is no reference to the UNDAF exercise or its priorities.
- The number of priorities is reduced to two overarching areas, but there appears to have been no significant cut-back in the number of tasks pursued.
- Poverty reduction is still not an explicit goal.

28. Second CCF for Turkey (2001-2005), Executive Board of the UNDP and the United Nations Population Fund, First Regular Session 2001.

29. Third party resource mobilisation did increase during this period, but was offset by declines in resources mobilised from MSAs. Modernisation of the management information system had to await the introduction of a new UNDP-wide system on January 2004. Application of systematic monitoring and evaluation is yet to happen. (For further detail on all three aspects see Chapter 5.)

- The expected development results are only vaguely identified.

(iv) Strategic Results Framework

The SRF was introduced to Country Offices by the UNDP in October 2000. It is designed to capture the UNDP's major areas of intervention and the broad development outcomes to which it is contributing at the country level through its programme outputs. The SRF is an internal planning, reporting and management tool for the UNDP, based on the CCF and on current country priorities. It is meant to be used for strategic planning and performance assessment through the ROAR to its Headquarters. These country reports are then consolidated into a global ROAR presented to the UNDP's Executive Board. (See also Chapter 5.)

Based on the global framework of UNDP goals, the specific sub-goals and strategic areas of support selected and elaborated for the Turkey SRF have changed over the years, but have generally included the following four main goals:

- Governance
- Poverty
- Environment
- Gender

In addition, at various times "Special Development Situations" and "UN Support" have been included among the main goals.

The link between the four recurring priority areas in the SRF and the priority areas of the CCF is unclear. It is noteworthy that the SRF framework clearly specifies poverty reduction as an overarching goal while the CCF does not.

(v) New Directions since 2001

In 2003, under new Country Office management, the UNDP began an in depth process of repositioning itself. Starting with a "visioning exercise" informed by a partnership opinion survey, the Country Office has now finalised a Vision Statement (see Annexe 8), which can be summarised as follows:

"UNDP works in Turkey for democratic governance and growth without poverty, in support of EU accession and for the achievement of the MDGs."

All ongoing and new initiatives are now grouped under the four main SRF thematic areas mentioned

above, representing the UNDP's strategic thrust:³⁰

"Improve governance, reduce poverty, achieve gender equity, protect the environment."

In addition, the current management has started to reduce the number of activities in the ongoing portfolio. However, the key flagship products, which formed the core of the UNDP's programme over the last ten years, still remain.

At the same time, the UNDP Resident Representative, in his capacity as the UNDP Resident Coordinator, has revived the UNCT process with a view to (a) reinvigorating the existing four working groups and (b) preparing a new UNDAF process. As mentioned below, these new initiatives, conducted in the context of the Government's EU accession policies, appear highly promising.

C. ISSUES AND CHALLENGES FOR THE UNDP'S STRATEGY IN TURKEY

The preceding summary overview of the UNDP's statements of strategic priorities and themes in Turkey show that there have been frequent shifts in the documents describing the UNDP's positioning, especially in the last five years. It appears that these shifts have not been related principally to changes in country needs or in Government priorities. Rather, it seems they were a response to shifting strategic postures of UNDP management in Turkey and at Headquarters.

Despite these changes in strategy statements, key planks of the underlying programme seem to have changed remarkably little over the years, as major programmes supported by the UNDP – GAP, LEAP, LA 21, Environment for Development, GEF Small Grants Programme, gender initiative(s), TCDC, NHDRs, disaster assistance, etc. – continued to form a lasting core of its activities. These activities and their results will be reviewed in depth in Chapter 4.

The good news in all this is that there now seems to be a convergence of key strategy themes for the UNDP as it has started to engage in a fundamental repositioning that is in tune with Turkey's efforts to gain EU accession and with an enhanced focus by the UNDP in Turkey on

30. The UNDP Turkey web-site (www.undp.org.tr), however, uses yet another framework for categorising programmes by focusing on the UNDP's six thematic practice areas: democratic governance, poverty reduction, crisis prevention and recovery, energy and environment, information and communications technologies, and HIV/AIDS. These are complemented by four priorities: MDGs, gender mainstreaming, partnership and policy assistance, and TCDC. This approach is mandated by UNDP Headquarters as part of a world-wide effort to present a uniform corporate strategic framework.

the MDGs. This section discusses the major issues and challenges that the UNDP faces in this repositioning effort.

(i) Strategic Challenge 1: Responding to Multiple Stakeholders with a Clearly Defined Strategy

The strategic positioning of the UNDP in Turkey, a middle-income country with a proud history, considerable Government sensitivity to the acknowledgement of some social issues, including the existence of poverty and gender disparities, and with access to a wide range of financing, has proven to be a major challenge throughout the period under review. In attempting to position its programme to maximise its own relevance and to secure a niche in an arena dominated by much larger donors, UNDP Turkey has been faced with competing and often shifting demands from three different sources:

- a) **UNDP Headquarters:** In 1994, with EB/94/014, the UNDP adopted poverty alleviation, the environment and natural resource management and gender as its core thematic areas of focus. This was linked to a revised system of core programme resource management in 1995 (DP/95/023). In 1998, the UNDP widened the scope of its focus areas to include: poverty elimination, governance, the environment, gender and post-conflict recovery and reconstruction. The UNDP in Turkey was under pressure to focus its programmes in these core areas while attempting to manage domestic priorities expressed by the Government. In addition, in 2000/2001, the UNDP was accorded principal responsibility within the UN system for monitoring the achievement of the MDGs. This required the UNDP office to embrace and advocate for a set of global targets and issues that, despite support from the Turkish Government in the international context, have so far had little traction in Turkey itself.³¹
- b) **The Government of Turkey:** Turkey, as a long-standing member of NATO and the OECD and given its great, long-held interest in EU accession, has been keen to portray itself more as a developed than as a developing country. As a consequence, Turkey has until recently been reluctant to move poverty, HIV/AIDS or environmental issues to the centre of its policy agenda. This had restricted and

delayed UNDP Turkey's ability to explicitly re-orient its programme to comply with corporate priorities decided upon by the Executive Board while at the same time preserving Government support. Similarly, as MDGs and the action plans of many key global conferences are perceived to be of relevance only to developing countries, and not necessarily to Turkey, the Government has so far tended to accord them relatively low prominence.


- c) **Large Donors and EU Accession:** The UNDP has been, and continues to be a minor donor in Turkey. Over the period of time in question, there have been three principal donors who have heavily influenced the context and priorities of development cooperation. Into and throughout much of the 1990s, the WB was the main donor for investment programmes. The economic and financial crisis of the late 1990s through 2001-2002 saw a rapid spike in IMF balance of payments assistance and a refocusing of national priorities on economic structural reform. At the same time, the enhanced prospects of EU accession since 1999 have resulted in an increase in and changing focus of EU assistance,³² in support of a dramatic reorientation of priorities towards preparation for accession and the normative and institutional changes required to fulfil the *Acquis*. Most development issues in Turkey are now viewed through the EU accession optic. In this environment, it is clear that the UNDP, with its limited resources, needs to focus its attention on a few priority areas where it has demonstrated comparative advantage and meets a clear Government priority or can have a catalytic advocacy role.

One natural reaction to such divergent pressures from multiple stakeholders could have been to dilute the focus of the programmes through ad hoc response spread across many areas. While this has been a problem for the UNDP in the past (see Chart 3.1 below), it has, over time, succeeded in focusing its programme. The UNDP has moved from a situation in 1998 when only a minor part of its programme resource expenditures were linked to core thematic practice areas, to 2003 when the majority of programme funds were devoted to activities in core practice areas. It has also moved from a situation prior to the 2000 mid-term review when the programme had 32 planned outcomes to the current situation where it is

31. UNDP Headquarters has occasionally injected other priorities into Country Office programmes. During the last two years, for example, Headquarters promoted the "Global Compact" for a socially responsible private sector worldwide, including in Turkey, and it suggested to the Country Office in Turkey to develop a programme of advisory support on macroeconomic management and restructuring.

32. EU funding is estimated to amount to Euro 1.3 billion in grants from the European Commission and Euro 2.5 billion in loans (from the European Investment Bank) for the period 1999-2006. These amounts could increase if an agreement is reached on starting membership negotiations later in 2004.

CHART 3.1: UNDP PROGRAMME BUDGET TRENDS



framed in the context of eleven expected outcomes. While some of the increased focus has been cosmetic and has involved retrofitting of existing projects and programmes into a smaller number of outcomes in the SRF (some by the country office and some by Headquarters) to fulfil Headquarters reporting requirements, it also does represent a real reduction in the overall fragmentation of the programme and a genuinely increased concentration around key UNDP thematic areas.

Looking ahead, the UNDP in Turkey will need to ensure that it is, and is seen to be clearly supportive of Turkey's overarching goal of EU accession, while at the same time assuring that it is responsive to the UNDP's institutional mandate of a focus on sustainable human development and the achievement of the MDGs. These two sets of objectives are broadly consistent and complementary at the conceptual level. Indeed, in practical terms there is also much in common between the UNDP's focus on regional disparities (see Box 3.2), good governance, building local participatory capacity and improving environmental

institutional capacity and EU accession-related concerns. The ADR Evaluation Team believes that it would be useful for the UNDP to carry out small analytical pieces of work, which lay out in the case of Turkey how the approaches of the MDGs and the EU accession criteria are mutually related and reinforce each other.³³ Moreover, in some other areas, such as the focus on poverty reduction and gender equity, the overlap between the EU and UNDP mandates may be less clear. Here, it will be important to stress complementarities and the value added that the UNDP's contribution can make. In this it will be essential that the UNDP avoid being viewed as just another contractor for the EC and also refrain from substituting for, or competing with, national institutions for EC resources. This requires the UNDP to strengthen its own perceptions of the value added that it provides.

Furthermore, the UNDP in Turkey will have to decide whether it will continue, adapt or replace the long-

33. This was a recommendation made by a participant in the Stakeholder Meeting in Ankara on 7 September, 2004.

standing flagship programmes that have made up the core of its activities over the years. In doing so, the key consideration will have to be what the UNDP's unique areas of comparative advantage are and how it adds value through its involvement.

(ii) Strategic Challenge 2: Creating Value Added in a Changing Environment

Because of the UNDP's relatively limited core resources and the high administrative cost of running its Country Office in Turkey, it is forced to aggressively mobilise resources in the form of trust funds, third party and Government cost sharing in support of programmes in its core practice areas. In order to do so, it is essential for the UNDP itself to recognise and then to project clearly the value added that it can provide:

- **Projecting a Clear Set of Core Business Lines:** One of the problems in the past has been the lack of a clear definition of UNDP's core "business lines" in Turkey. This is because of a lack of clearly articulated or frequently changing strategic directions and a multiplicity of diffuse activities, many of which were too small to allow for critical mass. As a result of the recent "visioning" exercise, it appears that UNDP Turkey has now defined for itself a limited set of core business lines in four thematic areas: governance, poverty, environment and gender, with a fifth line, disaster and crisis assistance response, as needed.
- **Track Record and "Brand Recognition":** The UNDP in Turkey has clearly gained maximum traction and recognition through its advocacy of human development (the NHDRs), its support for broader participation and transparency and its work to reduce regional disparities. While there may be pressures and opportunities for the UNDP to work in other areas, it is recommended that UNDP Turkey should build on the areas of its recognised strengths. This will serve as a springboard for scaling-up existing programmes, strengthening the capacity of local institutions to manage EU funding and ensuring greater involvement in policy development related to decentralisation, participation in decision-making, reduction of regional disparities, and the strengthening of local institutions including CSOs.
- **Offering Substantive Capacity:** The UNDP's value added is no longer as a source of funding, but as a source of substantive capacity. While the UNDP's current consultant fees do not always enable it to buy the best experts available in any given field, and while the UNDP office in Turkey does not in itself possess

BOX 3.2: REGIONAL DISPARITIES, EU ACCESSION AND UNDP SUPPORT


The reduction of regional disparities is likely to be a high priority in the period running up to EU accession and beyond, due to a number of factors. Key among them is the risk, following accession, of major migration flows to other parts of the EU caused by regional disparities. Another key factor is the need for absorptive capacity at the regional level of EU cohesion funding, which would become available at both the pre and post accession stages. This priority should enable the UNDP to build on the considerable experience and credibility it has gained especially in Southeastern and Eastern Anatolia. The approach taken in future, however, will have to be different from that of the past. The vast majority of EC resources provided in these two regions will be transferred through local Government institutions and CSOs. To leverage these resources, the UNDP should use its experience and expertise to:

- Strengthen the capacity of the institutions of local Government and CSOs, thereby raising their absorptive capacity and ability to efficiently manage resources
- Assist local Government in the identification and formulation of development projects and programmes in Southeast Anatolia and Eastern Anatolia
- Engage in a policy dialogue with the EC, local Government, regional administrations and Ministry of Interior on issues pertaining to regional disparities including local governance, participation, transparency and poverty alleviation.

sufficient capacity, it should use its network of projects in the region and elsewhere in the world, its Sub-Regional Resource Facilities (esp. in Bratislava) and its Headquarters units as extended sources of substantive capacity for Turkey. This requires a corporate commitment to making better use of substantive resources available to UNDP through its global network.

- **Bringing International Expertise to Bear:** Linked to the previous points is that perhaps one of the strongest comparative advantages that the UNDP possesses is its access to international experience and expertise. Yet UNDP Turkey has tended to be used principally as a source of funding for the application of national expertise. It is the impression of the ADR Evaluation Team that because of past reluctance by the UNDP and the Government to look outside for expertise, comparative development experience is sorely needed. National expertise is of course a valuable input for capacity building and policy advice, but the UNDP would provide more value added by effectively packaging a combination of national and international capacity in key areas where experience gained elsewhere would be of particular value.
- **The "United Nations Factor":** As steward of the Resident Coordinator system and as the lead agency in fostering the implementation of action plans derived from global compacts, the prestige associated with the involvement of the UN is a significant factor

FIGURE 3.1: HARNESSING UNDP'S CAPACITY FOR TURKEY



that the UNDP can continue to leverage for change – particularly in areas which have not received much external assistance such as in sub-provincial units in the poorer regions of the country. This has been an important factor in gaining popular and official support for institutional change at the local level (perhaps the most striking example of this is LA 21).

- **Therefore a New Way of Doing Knowledge Business:** An office such as UNDP Turkey, which has relatively limited capacity, must be able to readily access capacity at the regional and global levels through the UNDP's own offices (Bureau for Development Policy (BDP), Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR), Sub-Regional Resource Facility (SURFs), its projects and programmes (national and international experts in regional and national projects), and a broader network or roster of sources of expertise (academic institutions, think tanks, consulting firms and NGOs). It needs to see itself at the hub of concentric circles of knowledge management and capacity building in Turkey by reaching out and bringing in all relevant expertise from inside and outside the country (Figure 3.1).

(iii) Strategic Challenge 3:

The Importance of Visibility and Advocacy

Visibility on high-priority issues and in the policy dialogue at the national level is an important factor in determining the UNDP's ability to mobilise additional resources in support of its priorities. The UNDP has most successfully achieved a degree of visibility through:

- **Successive NHDRs:** NHDRs produced on a three-year cycle, starting in 1990, have garnered considerable

attention and have provided a platform for UNDP's policy dialogue at the national level.

- **Participation in and/or Organisation and Funding of Conferences:** The UNDP has made extensive use of conferences to gain visibility for issues of central concern to its mandate and programme in Turkey. It has either participated in, or funded and participated in, a number of conferences and roundtables of direct relevance to the achievement of its goals in Turkey (see Annexe 9).
- **The Establishment of Institutional Capacity:** The UNDP has done this in centres with either an advocacy function or with influence over the development agenda such as:
 - LA 21 Citizen Houses in various cities
 - Entrepreneur Support Centres in Diyarbakır, Adıyaman, Sanlıurfa, Mardin, Gaziantep
 - Middle East Technical University Disaster Management Research and Implementation Centre (Ankara)
 - Sustainable Development Association in Erzurum, East Anatolia
 - Youth Centres in Southeast Anatolia
 - CISCO Networking Academies in Diyarbakır and Erzurum, Eastern Anatolia
 - Entrepreneur Support Centre in Erzurum

In the past year, the UNDP Resident Representative has also appointed an 8-member UNDP Turkey Advisory Board. It consists principally of prominent Turkish academics, parliamentarians, journalists and individuals from the private sector in their personal capacities, who “guide” and advise the Resident Representative in the identification and implementation of the UNDP's

programme. The role and effectiveness of this Board is as yet unclear as it is in its initial stages. It is likely that in order to be fully effective such a Board will require the continuous and intensive attention and substantive backstopping of the senior management of the UNDP Country Office.

(iv) Strategic Challenge 4: Managing Key Partnerships

With scarce resources and limited capacity in a large country, partnerships are critical for the UNDP's effectiveness. But as in many other dimensions, a clear sense of priorities is also essential for selecting and nurturing partnerships, since not all potential partners can and should be equally attended to. The most important partnership for the UNDP is with the Government and its principal agencies and with its UN sister agencies. Selected other donors, private sector counterparts and CSOs are also important partners when the joint programmes are aligned with the UNDP and Government core priorities.

- **The National Government:** The effective implementation and financing of the UNDP's programme depends critically on the ownership and support by key national Government Ministries. While the UNDP has had a direct relationship with line Ministries, regional administrations and the Prime Minister's office in Turkey, its principal counterparts have been the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the SPO. The MFA does not play a significant role in domestic economic and social policy, and in the last few years, the SPO has had a much-reduced role, leaving other Ministries in the forefront. As a result, the UNDP's access to economic and social policy decision makers has also been limited. With the SPO's apparently enhanced role under the current Government, it is hoped that this access might improve. In the past, frequent turnover of staff, which is characteristic of the Turkish system due to party affiliations with newly elected Governments, has presented many problems for UNDP programme implementation. With the current Government expected to be firmly in place for some years, hopefully this will be less of an issue in the foreseeable future.
- **Regional and Local Government Agencies:** Despite its relatively small size, the UNDP has gained particular credibility and importance through its close programme partnership with large regional agencies (GAP) and regional programmes (LEAP). Further restructuring of these regional administrations is

currently underway, and the role that the UNDP has played within their geographic areas of concern positions it well to play an important part in this process in future. Grassroots programmes through LA 21, LEAP and GAP have created a strong platform for the UNDP with local Governments at the municipal and provincial levels and by extension, with the Ministry of Interior. Despite the relatively limited volume of financial resources involved, the UNDP has gained a considerable repository of goodwill and trust that should be used as leverage in the arena of policy dialogue.

- **The United Nations System in Turkey:** Coordination of the UN system has been most effective and has received the most praise in the context of emergencies, first the earthquake and then the Iraq war. The UNDP, under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator and with the active participation of the Deputy Resident Representative was seen to have made a valuable substantive as well as administrative contribution to the success of UN response in both instances. Since the bombings in Iraq and more recently in Turkey itself, the UNDP has also taken the lead in security issues, and has devoted considerable capacity of its office to this issue. Regular coordination has been less successful to date, since UN agencies are relatively unfamiliar with each other's programmes and projects and synergies have not been sufficiently explored. It is expected that greater, more substantive collaboration could lead to benefits at the project and programme level, greater leverage in policy dialogue and more room for the pursuit of priorities defined by the General Assembly and other UN organs. For instance, greater coherence among the UN agencies should enable more effective and active pursuit of concerns such as the MDGs and human rights conventions as they apply to the work of UN agencies. Furthermore, joint advocacy based on a common understanding of policy priorities should enable greater priority being attached to issues such as poverty alleviation in both the poor regions and in urban centres, population issues, internal migration, the role of women in society and effective environmental resources management. This could further be strengthened by UN agencies reserving funding to a common pool on specific issues such as gender and disaster management. As noted earlier, the UN agencies consulted do not view the 2001 CCA and the UNDAF as effective coordination

vehicles for creating a common conceptual and operational framework for the disparate programmes and perspectives of UN agencies in Turkey. However, the recent effort led by the Resident Coordinator to consult and develop a common approach substantive framework in the context of EU accession has received strong support.

■ **The EU and other International Official Partners:**

As mentioned earlier, the EU (and its house bank, the EIB) is a partner whose importance is rapidly increasing, both because of the importance of the EU accession agenda and because of its rapidly rising financial and technical support. The UNDP has accordingly increased its cooperation with the EU and has been earning recognition as a valued partner, especially in working with sub-national authorities and CSOs. Among other donors, the WB remains an important potential partner where coordination in advisory and technical assistance remains essential, even as the past cooperation in regard to MSAs on WB financed projects is no longer expected to play a role. Other donors, such as the Dutch and the Swiss, with whom the UNDP has cooperated effectively in the past, continue to be important contributors, but may be expected to limit or phase out their assistance over the coming years, as EU funding to Turkey is scaled up.

■ **Other Partners – Academic Institutions, CSOs and Private Firms:**

Academic institutions and CSOs represent important partners of the UNDP for analysis, advocacy, capacity building, and in selected cases, for programme and project implementation. Private firms, similarly, can be important clients (as in the case of business advisory services under the Entrepreneur Support and Guidance Centres (GİDEM) programme) or partners in funding programmes (such as with CISCO on technology training). In selecting these partners, the key is not to spread the UNDP's limited capacity too thin, and to select partners who have maximum effectiveness, capacity building potential and catalytic impact.

and of a pilot nature. For UNDP supported development solutions to be regarded a success, they must ideally be sustainable without UNDP or similar external support, financial or professional, and they must be replicable or able to be scaled-up to the point where they can resolve problems not only in a one-off, limited manner, but at a scale that deals with the generic issue.

Many obstacles can get in the way of sustainability and scaling-up as specific cases in the next chapter will demonstrate. For example, for the otherwise very successful business advisory service project under the GAP-GİDEM programme, UNDP project salary levels are relatively high for national experts and operational costs are, as a consequence, a significant burden. Moreover, the GİDEM approach is unlikely to survive unless revenue is mobilised through the charging of fees for services and unless the centres are linked to a microfinance scheme. Yet, in a number of instances such as this one, legal, policy and attitudinal obstacles may be faced in the achievement of long-term solutions for sustainability. These issues are currently under review by the UNDP and its partners. (For more information on the GİDEM programme see Chapter 4.)

Of course, if projects are not sustainable, they do not offer a hope for replication or scaling-up. But even if individual interventions are judged to be sustainable, that may not be sufficient to ensure scaling-up. For this, broader legal, financial and institutional changes may be necessary. A good example of successful scaling-up is the City Council model initially piloted under the LA 21 programme in a small number of cities. After the successful pilot, it was rolled out to more cities and the general approach is currently being incorporated in the legal framework regulating municipal Governments. Two important aspects have contributed to the replicability of these initiatives: Ownership by key stakeholders, and cost-efficient capacity building. (For more information on LA 21 see Chapter 4.)

Many of the pilot programmes, such as LA 21, also create opportunities for spin-offs. For instance, the creation of participatory decision-making capacity at the local level creates opportunities for a forum that could be used for decision-making on aspects of local environmental resource management or on aspects of importance to gender roles and the advancement of women's concerns. Consideration should also be given to creating linkages and synergies with the programmes of other UN agencies. For instance, UNICEF programmes for street children that operate in some of the same municipalities covered by LA 21 could be linked more

(v) Strategic Challenge 5: Maximising Results with Limited Resources – Sustainability and Scaling-Up

At this point, the main strategic question is one that is absolutely central for the UNDP: How to ensure that its projects and programmes are sustainable beyond the period of direct support and how to scale-up their impact, since most of the UNDP interventions are relatively small

substantively with the youth components of UNDP's LA 21 programme to mutual benefit.

Considerations of long-term sustainability, scaling-up and spin-off have to be taken more fully into account at the very outset of programme design in order to ensure that UNDP programmes have a lasting impact. Moreover, monitoring and evaluation during programme implementation is essential. This will help ascertain whether or not the expected benefits were realised, whether they are sustainable and whether and how they can be scaled up.

D. AN OVERALL PERSPECTIVE ON UNDP'S STRATEGY AND RELEVANCE

In the volatile political and economic environment in Turkey during the years 1998-2003, the UNDP has been seen as a relevant and important player on the development scene in Turkey. Its overall strategy was broadly relevant and focused on key human development and capacity building areas. While its strategy statements lacked a clear and continuous line of consistent goals and approaches, the underlying programme was responsive to key development challenges, especially in helping Turkey address important issues of regional disparity and weakness of sub-national governance, in the environmental and gender area, and in its advocacy role in calling attention to Turkey's urgent human development challenges through a succession of NHDRs. The UNDP also sharpened its programmatic focus on key human development challenges – governance, poverty, environment and gender – while continuing with substantive contributions through major flagship programmes. How

the UNDP has risen to its strategic challenges over the last five years and the results it has achieved in key areas of engagement in Turkey is the subject of the next chapter.

Looking towards the future, Turkey is now at a crossroads and so is the UNDP in Turkey. The new emphasis on EU accession and the accompanying resource flows from the EU present special challenges not only for Turkey, but also for the UNDP in Turkey, with its limited financial resources and capacity and with its special mandate to promote human development and the achievement of the MDGs. In order to effectively position itself, the UNDP needs to seek innovative ways of bringing its corporate capacity to bear in the Turkish context and to use the credibility it has gained in the development of local capacity, particularly in less developed regions of the country, to help the Government facilitate the flow of EC funds and use it as a platform for support to policy development. The UNDP needs to understand clearly the areas in which it provides value added to both Turkey and the EU accession process and build on them. It must always assess the sustainability and scaling-up potential of its programmes and the replicability of effective pilot projects. Creation of a longer-term niche for the UNDP in local governance and grassroots development and poverty reduction requires it to both adapt existing as well as develop new flagship programmes. The UNDP will also need to re-orient its key partnerships, placing greater emphasis on local Government, regional administrations and CSOs, while maintaining strong ownership and support by the national Government and the EU.

4

Human Development Results and UNDP's Contribution

Over the recent years, the UNDP's strategic directions in Turkey have crystallised around four main human development themes: **governance, poverty, environment and gender**. In addition, the UNDP has played a major role in **response to crises and disasters** of natural or man-made origins in Turkey and the region. It is therefore appropriate to assess progress and the UNDP's contributions under these five headings.

In each of these five areas, we focus principally on the progress and achievements of flagship programmes and activities that have been notable for their continuity over the years, for the size of the effort involved by the UNDP and its partners and, one would hope and expect, for the results they achieved. In addition, this chapter collects and assesses under the five thematic areas, a selection of smaller, non-flagship programmes and projects, so as to reflect the richness and complexity of the UNDP's engagement in Turkey and to provide an assessment of the UNDP's overall approach and track record.

Two limitations should be flagged at the outset of this assessment: First, as noted in Chapter 1, the ADR Evaluation Team could only draw upon a few serious evaluations of the UNDP's programmes and projects in Turkey. It therefore had to rely on quick reviews, perceptions and judgments, rather than well-founded, in-depth evaluations. One of the recommendations of this report is that the UNDP should strengthen its programme and project evaluation practices in Turkey. Second, there are probably linkages and synergies among thematic areas and programmes that would, if fully capitalised on, enhance the effectiveness of the UNDP's programme in supporting human development progress in Turkey. Since the UNDP's programming and organisation in the Turkey Country Office seems to have been structured in "silos" around individual programmes managed by senior programme officers, rather than around cross-cutting teams, important potential linkages and synergies may well have been missed. The current reorganisation and staff renewal effort which is underway in the Turkey Country Office aims to create the teamwork and spirit which will allow and encourage the staff and management to consider and utilise such cross-cutting links and synergies.

A. GOVERNANCE³⁴

The system of governance in Turkey has traditionally been highly centralised, run out of Ankara by a strong national bureaucracy that dominates over weak, dependent provincial and local Governments. For decades, moreover, the state institutions have been resistant to serious change and Governments have been reluctant to draw on external advice and assistance for the reform of the administrative systems of Government.

Decentralisation and local Government has been a particularly sensitive area as a result of the strong traditions of unitary and centralised governance. CSOs and NGOs were also not encouraged for many years.

Changes have, however, taken place in recent years as a result of structural reform imperatives arising from the economic crisis and more recently as a result of priorities relating to EU accession. The Government has recognised the need for reforms and the benefits of partnering with external agencies in order to modernise Turkey's state structures and to comply with the requirements for the EU accession. Since virtually all of the EU assistance programmes now require the channelling of financial flows to and through regional and local administrations, a major requirement for EU accession will be the strengthening of the capacities of these sub-national institutions for effectively administering EU-funded programmes.

The UNDP has been among the first external institutions involved in Turkey on sub-national governance issues through its flagship LA 21 programme. In this sensitive area, the UNDP adopted a successful catalytic approach, which relied extensively on national technical inputs and capacity in the early stages of programme design and implementation. At the same time, it also brought to bear its international experience to facilitate the introduction of initiatives that are innovative and new in the Turkish context. The UNDP has also been engaged in other areas of governance and institution building – national public administration reform, e-Government, capacity building for South-South cooperation, certain human rights initiatives, macroeconomic and structural reforms, and private sector development – but apparently with much less intensity and lasting success. In addition, there are governance aspects in other projects and programmes, such as the UNDP's support for GAP and LEAP, which are reviewed in a subsequent section.

Governance programmes have constituted an important part of the UNDP's activities in Turkey. Since 1995, a total of just under USD 8 million has been programmed, including approximately USD 1 million of core TRAC resources and about USD 2 million from Capacity 21.

(i) Local Agenda 21

GENERAL BACKGROUND FOR THE LA 21 PROGRAMME

Under the CCF (2001-2005), the LA 21 programme was the UNDP's main instrument for the promotion of good governance and local democracy in Turkey. The programme itself drew on the UNDP's links with global environmental initiatives, such as the Rio Conference, and was a direct result of the participation of Turkey's Government and mayors in HABITAT II, the major environmental UN Summit, which was held in Turkey in 1996.

The main element of the LA 21 programme entails the establishment of City Councils, which are city level participatory mechanisms for decision-making. These Councils have brought together community-based organisations, NGOs, labour unions, academics, the private sector, individual citizens and the local Government into a consultative forum that raises and discusses issues of direct concern to the communities themselves. In addition to the core local governance component, several other components have been implemented as described below.

In addition to providing support for the creation of City Councils, LA 21, with active inputs from the UNDP, also helped set up the Youth Association for Habitat and Agenda 21. This initiative offered young people the opportunity to develop leadership and project management skills, familiarity with EU structures and with information technology, as well as an understanding of the need for participating in local opinion formation and democratic processes. LA 21 also helped the formation of local youth platforms that cooperate at the national level.³⁵

The LA 21 project is “nationally executed” by the International Union of Local Authorities – Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East (IULA-EMME), which is based in İstanbul, Turkey. The first phase of the LA 21 programme (September 1997 – December 1999) involved nine pilot cities of varying sizes in all parts of the country.

34. This section draws in part on preparatory work done by Prof. Dr. Çelik Aruoba, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nesrin Algan and Mr. Tezcan Abay in advance of the ADR mission.

35. The ADR Evaluation Team was made aware of this aspect of the LA-21 programme by a representative of the Youth Association for Habitat and Agenda 21 at the Stakeholder Meeting in Ankara on 7 September 2004.

Building on the achievements of the first phase, two subsequent phases were funded: Phase 2 involved a replication and extension to 50 municipalities (January 2000 – June 2003); Phase 3 involves the institutionalisation of LA 21 processes and mechanisms at the local and national levels (July 2003 – present). Phase 3 of the programme (TUR/03/004) has a total approved budget of USD 1,933,333 including USD 1,400,000 in cost sharing. Over the years, other components were added to replicate and extend the project model. One such component focused on the Yaylak Plain, and was funded with cost sharing from the Nordic Investment Bank. Another focused on local capacity building for disaster prevention and preparedness, and was supported with cost sharing from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.

Despite the repeated approval of new project phases, the programme has not been subject to a systematic, in-depth evaluation, except for a specific evaluation of the disaster preparedness component. An in-depth evaluation is scheduled under the current phase, however, and is incorporated in the project budget.

As part of the pilot stage, a series of basic documents including *“Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide”* edited by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), a handbook on Local Neighbourhood Authorities, the quarterly Project Newsletter, informative books, brochures and leaflets, reports, proceedings of meetings, posters and other documents have been published and/or translated into Turkish and distributed by IULA-EMME and project partners. Frequent awareness-raising symposia, working group meetings and sectoral roundtables were held in all of the pilot cities.

LA 21 activities, especially the fledgling City Councils created under the pilot stage, caused some friction with members of the existing Municipal Councils who no doubt saw them as treading on their turf. In response, the Ministry of Interior issued a Decree on LA 21 on 19 March, 1998 supporting the City Council model and allaying any fears that the responsibilities of the Municipal Councils were being usurped.

RESULTS OF THE LA 21 PROGRAMME

As a result of these efforts, by the end of the first phase of the project the number of local authorities applying to participate in the project was well over the number initially envisaged. Although the exact list of LA 21 towns varies from document to document, the total number of towns that have created City Councils and follow the general principles of the LA 21 programme had increased to 50 by January 2004, and are widely dispersed throughout the country.

The UNDP has succeeded in mobilising a significant volume of resources for the LA 21 programme, which is viewed by most of the donors and partners of the UNDP in Turkey as a success story. Approximately USD 2 million was mobilised from the so-called “Capacity 21” funds from UNDP Headquarters and a further USD 4.5 million was mobilised from the Governments of Turkey, Canada, Denmark, France and Switzerland.³⁶ LA 21 exemplifies UNDP Turkey’s ability to leverage its own limited resources and effect changes in Turkey that have far wider implications than the management of environmental assets alone. It helped to increase significantly the level of participation of CSOs and private citizens in decision-making, and also increased the level of decentralisation of governance in Turkey.

At the broadest level, the UNDP LA 21 programme has, through its catalytic approach, spread a locally adapted model of City Councils largely spontaneously and through local initiative from nine pilot initiatives to over 50 cities throughout the country. While the structure of the City Councils varies between cities, they have generally all involved:

- Members of the provincial Government, sometimes including the governor
- Members of the municipal Government usually including the mayor
- Members of the Municipal Councils
- Elders
- Members of the business associations and chambers of commerce
- Members of local NGOs
- Women’s groups, associations and foundations
- Trade unions
- Members of youth organisations
- Academic institutions that have a local presence
- Mukhtars or local traditional leaders or neighbourhood heads

Participation in City Councils is voluntary. They vary in size between 100 participants in small cities to around 800 in the largest ones. As such they have required additional organisation in order to keep them manageable. The City Councils are variously chaired by Mayors or other senior officials of local Government and are supported by an organisational committee that helps manage the agenda and issues placed before the Council. In most instances, the organisational committees are led by an active local Government official, such as the Secretary-General of the Municipal Council as in the case

36. The lion’s shares were Turkey’s contribution of USD 3 million and Switzerland’s contribution of USD 1.3 million.

of Diyarbakır. Furthermore, most City Councils have established sub-committees or working groups to consider specific issues decided on in plenary and are tasked with reporting back to the Council as a whole. In the cases examined, these sub-committees have tackled relatively non-controversial issues such as tourism, culture and urbanisation, environment and health, women and children, and youth. Notably, they appear in general not to have focused on economic issues, such as business development or (un)employment.

The City Councils have had demonstrable effects on the management of resources. In some cities, investments or projects that exceed a certain threshold percentage of the municipal budget (e.g. 10% in the case of Diyarbakır) are required to be discussed by the City Councils. Furthermore, in some instances, small funds have been established with local contributions for projects generated by the City Councils. While the City Councils generally have only an advisory role to play, it is clear that in small cities their views are of importance to Government officials who want to be re-elected to office.

As such, the City Councils have made important contributions, as they have:

- Increased the transparency of decision-making by bringing more information and the discussion of issues into the public domain – at least pertaining to those responsibilities within the purview of local authorities
- Raised the accountability of local authorities and elected officials to the public
- Served to bridge some political differences between appointees of the central Government and locally elected officials
- Laid a foundation for participatory management of municipal projects

Fuelled by the UNDP's decision to present the LA 21 programme in Turkey as one of its global success stories at the Johannesburg Conference in 2000/2001, the programme received national recognition. Indeed, while the UNDP has had no direct role in the preparation of the new draft laws on local administration, the City Council model as developed under the UNDP programme has been included in the current draft law as an institution to be legally sanctioned for replication all over the country.³⁷

Several small projects have also been developed and implemented by City Councils. While it was not possible to assess the overall impact of these projects, they reflect a remarkable degree of local initiative and engagement at the local level that is historically unprecedented in Turkey. The following is a sample of projects undertaken by City Councils in recent years:

- Bursa: “*Preservation of Cumalıkızık*”, encompassing the development and implementation of the LA 21 action plan in the historical village settlements in the province; “*Rehabilitation of the Nilüfer River Basin*”, requiring the participation of local stakeholders at all levels, including the polluting industries
- İzmir: “*Strengthening of Local Neighbourhood Authorities using GIS*”, seeking the effective utilisation of modern technology in enhancing broad-based community participation
- Antalya: “*Sustainable Eco-tourism Development*”
- Çeşme: “*Gum Arabic Tree Project*” (currently being implemented with the support of UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme)
- Ağrı: “*Preventive Health Care*”
- Diyarbakır: “*Rehabilitation and Urban Regeneration of Inner-City Walls Area*”; “*Establishment of Vocational Training Centres for the Youth*”; “*Preventive Care for Pregnant Women*”, particularly with respect to the detection of Hepatitis B and anaemia
- Afyon: “*Increasing the Urban Uses of Thermal Energy*”, expanding the use of thermal water to heat the city;
- Aliğa: “*Industrial Wastewater Management*”
- Çanakkale: “*Clean Energy*”, with particular emphasis on wind and solar energy
- Foça: “*Nature-boat*”, equipping a community-owned sailboat to serve as a mobile biodiversity conservation centre
- Harran: “*Green Harran*” eco-city planning, tourism and urban infrastructure development
- Kastamonu: “*Job Opportunities for the Disadvantaged Women in Kastamonu*”, promoting the development of women's cooperatives; “*Rehabilitation of Karaçomak River*”, including not only water management, but also urban regeneration in the adjacent areas
- Zonguldak: “*Urban Wastewater Management*”

UNDP'S ROLE IN LA 21

The UNDP has played an important catalytic role in the development of the LA 21 model. It has brought an international dimension and leverage to a process that has involved the introduction of new models of local participation, often in politically sensitive areas of the

37. The current draft now states: “In the provinces the City Councils are established with the help of (the) municipality. In this council, members of provincial privy council, municipal council, representatives of professional organisations, labour unions, universities (if they exist in the province), related NGOs, state offices and institutions and mukhtars participate. City Councils have to establish the principles of human rights, rule of law, sustainable development, transparency, environmental consciousness, social solidarity, accountability, participation and decentralisation in the city. The “views” that emerge in the City Council are evaluated in the next meeting of the Municipal Council.” Draft Law on Local Administrations, Volume III, Para 86, p. 106, Prime Minister's Office Ankara, 2004 (unofficial English translation).

country. Local officials and citizens have displayed considerable pride in their association with the UNDP and, through it, with the international community. While some have questioned the UNDP's and IULA-EMME's non-prescriptive approach to structuring the City Councils, or structuring their agendas, it is probably correct to say that maximum community ownership has been achieved through a process oriented approach.

The LA 21 programme has been a flagship programme that, along with one or two other notable initiatives, put the UNDP on the development map in Turkey. It has gained the UNDP considerable profile and credibility as a partner at the local level in a programme that is viewed by the central Government, the local authorities, donors and national CSOs alike as a success.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S INVOLVEMENT IN LA 21 AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The UNDP's LA 21 programme has been process oriented. The involvement of the UNDP and IULA-EMME has emphasised the creation of process management systems, rules of procedure, and the encouragement of open debate and wide participation. Composition of the City Councils, focus of the working groups and sub-committees and the types of issues addressed have not been influenced greatly by the UNDP or project staff. This has in part been dictated by the limited capacity at both the UNDP and at IULA-EMME,³⁸ and in part by a conscious decision to maximise local ownership by allowing implementation of the programme to take its own course.

The main obstacle to the LA 21 Programme is the lack of institutionalisation. The fact that the principles of City Councils are to be enshrined in Turkish law represents significant progress at the national level, but there is still a lack of institutional capacity for country-wide implementation. It is also not yet clear whether the City Council model will be sustainable in the sense of representing a lasting forum for citizen participation, accountability and transparency. For this reason, there must be a focus on the restructuring of the Programme on the levels of related national establishments and the UNDP Country Office.

In order to achieve this goal the UNDP should continue its capacity building and fund raising assistance to the Programme by playing a coordinating and catalytic

role in a transparent and participatory manner. In fact, what is considered highly innovative in the Turkish context has already been tried out repeatedly elsewhere in the world. Participatory, community-based mechanisms for planning and decision-making have been created with UNDP assistance all over Asia, the Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC) region and Latin America and have been extensively evaluated, with both conceptual and operational lessons drawn and codified. The experience gained can easily be transferred and adapted to the Turkish context with a more extensive and effective use of both international and national expertise. It is **recommended** that project staff, consultants and UNDP staff from elsewhere should be drawn on to relate and transfer their experience and provide advice in the implementation and more particularly, the effective institutionalisation of LA 21 in Turkey.

Ultimately, the enthusiasm and democratic spirit created as a result of the LA 21 initiative will survive in the longer term if the communities themselves have the ability to influence the use of budgetary and other resources at the local level. There is a risk that the benefits of the LA 21 will eventually peter out in the majority of cities, as has already happened in a few. However, in order to guarantee the sustainability of the City Council model, it is **recommended** that any scaling-up or continuation of the UNDP's involvement should include an explicit consideration of how the City Councils can be effectively brought into the decision making process on the use of local Government budgetary resources.

There is also an urgent need to create linkages between the City Council component of the LA 21 programme and the management of development under the newly decentralised system of formal Government. For instance, the UNDP should consider working with the Government to automate revenue and budget management by the local Government and to make the information relatively accessible to the communities being served. Current draft legislation is also quite vague when it comes to the role of the City Councils. This could be further codified and strengthened with more active involvement of the UNDP in policy dialogue and policy development with the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Interior.

Despite some of the limitations mentioned above, the experience, respect and credibility gained in the poorer and more disadvantaged regions of Turkey under the LA 21 programme constitutes a major asset for the UNDP going into the period of EU accession. Special transfers within the EU to sub-national regions that are

38. For much of the period in question, the UNDP had only one national professional officer involved in backstopping this complex programme. At present, the same function is performed by one Programme Assistant. At IULA-EMME, the Programme Coordinator and one Finance Officer are responsible for the implementation of the entire programme.

underdeveloped constitute a major portion of the EU's annual expenditures. Creation of capacity to manage these resources is therefore an essential prerequisite that the UNDP is particularly well placed to address. The UNDP should intensify its support to local institutions, including, but not exclusively limiting itself to the City Councils, in order to increase capacity to:

- Plan and manage development
- Manage local finances
- Ensure adequate oversight and accountability
- Automate essential functions and processes of local Government
- Strengthen local CSOs with a view to supplementing the role of the Government in all of the above and strengthening checks and balances

Once again, an explicit linkage needs to be made to the development of policy at the national level and the UNDP needs to bring to bear all of the instruments and capacity available to it in this regard. This includes the NHDRs and capacity available to it at the regional and global levels (see Chapter 3, Section C).

(ii) Other Governance Programmes Supported by the UNDP

Aside from the LA 21 Programme, its major governance flagship, a number of other UNDP initiatives and programmes can be loosely categorised under the heading of governance and capacity building. They do not together represent a comprehensive or well-structured programme of support for governance reform and capacity building, and some of these initiatives proved to be dead-ends which either never got off the ground or were prematurely terminated for various reasons.³⁹ Nonetheless, lessons can and should be learned from these overall, less successful UNDP initiatives.

E-GOVERNANCE PROJECTS

Two projects have been implemented under this rubric:

- TUR/02/001 – Communication Automation for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (total approved budget USD 500,000)
- TUR/03/003 – the Yalova City E-Governance Project (total approved budget USD 450,000)

The project with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is one of the two principal counterparts of the UNDP in Turkey, involved the establishment of a local area network; upgrading of software systems to Microsoft Office; creation of a system of electronic archiving, faxing and correspondence management; and standardisation of the system across both the Ministry in Ankara and its representations around the world.

It appears that project implementation has progressed well. However, it is difficult to ascertain the contribution of the project with reference to the intended outcomes as stipulated in the SRF as the project-level monitoring and evaluation systems do not appear to be in place.

The Yalova E-Governance project on the other hand was intended to automate budget and revenue management and was closely linked to the UNDP's LA 21 programme in the same area. However, as of January 2004 project start-up was delayed due to problems with the assignment and management of Government cost sharing under the project.

ADVISORY SUPPORT FOR ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING AND MANAGEMENT

During the height of Turkey's financial crisis in 2001, UNDP Headquarters was concerned that the UNDP was not sufficiently involved and visible in helping to address key macroeconomic and structural reform issues through technical assistance and advisory support to the key economic Ministry at the time, the Treasury. Accordingly, the Resident Representative was instructed to offer UNDP support to the Senior Treasury officials and a mission of UNDP technical staff from its Bratislava office was sent to Ankara in May 2002 to ascertain in what areas the UNDP's assistance might best be deployed. The mission tentatively recommended four areas for consideration: support for the banking supervisory board, for the privatisation process, for attracting foreign direct investment, and for social safety net programmes.

As it turned out, the UNDP's initiative did not catch the attention of the Government because during the height of the crisis of 2001/2002 senior Treasury officials were too preoccupied in managing the crisis and working with their principal financiers and advisers, especially the IMF and the WB. With the election of a new Government in November 2002 and the handover from one Resident Representative to another at the UNDP in the spring of 2003, the initiative did not progress substantially. However, during the course of 2003, UNDP Country Office staff continued to formulate a

39. In addition to the activities reviewed below, two other potentially important governance initiatives were started but not completed. First, a programme for the reform of national public administration was developed up to the stage of implementation, but never actually carried out because of problems with government cost-sharing contributions. Second, the UNDP provided some assistance with the setting up of a national *ombudsman* office, but this initiative was also abandoned. The ADR mission was told that this was due to the fact that with the EU accession agenda human rights matters became a principal issue for EU-Turkish relations.

proposal for a USD 2 million programme of advisory work following in essence the outline provided by the May 2002 mission. Discussions with SPO about the programme were initiated in late 2003. When the ADR mission visited in January 2004 it was informed by the Resident Representative that the proposal was to be dropped, since the need for the advisory work was no longer apparent. With the financial crisis having largely passed, with much of the proposed work having already been accomplished and with other partners better qualified to provide this assistance in any case, scarce UNDP resources would better be used elsewhere. The ADR Evaluation Team whole-heartedly agreed with this conclusion and only wondered whether it should not have been reached earlier and whether this was an area that the UNDP should have embarked on in the first place.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (TCDC)

The first phase of the UNDP's programme to assist Turkey in developing its technical cooperation with other developing countries was initiated in 1988. Turkey had been identified as a "TCDC pivotal country" by a report endorsed by the UN General Assembly resolution 50/119 because of its special potential for supporting South-South cooperation at the regional and interregional level. TCDC activities supported by the UNDP in Turkey have involved exchange of consultants, arrangement of study tours on a reciprocal basis, improvement of Turkish development assistance capacity and design and implementation of development assistance projects. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as the Turkish International Cooperation Agency (TICA) were responsible for the implementation of the first phase of this programme.⁴⁰ In 1998 a second phase was initiated with the Turkish SPO in charge. After revisions of the programme agreed to in 2000, a total of USD 1 million was expected to be spent by 2004, of which half was to be provided by the Government in the form of cost sharing. The CCF 2001-2005 also contained a reference to this programme, but it did not provide a very clear description of activities to be supported or motivation for its continuation.⁴¹

40. TICA was founded in 1992. Prior to this date the Turkish Agency for Cooperation (TAC) carried out this responsibility.

41. However, the SRFs 2001 and 2002 and the most recent list of ongoing projects dropped all reference to TCDC goals and activities. At the same time, the Ledger of Approved Project Budget for the month of January 2004 still contains a sizeable allocation for the continuation of this programme through 2004. This is just one example of the confusing nature of the management information that the ADR Evaluation Team encountered in trying to assemble a definitive picture of UNDP's Turkey programme.

By the end of 2003, the total to be spent under the second phase of the programme had increased to USD 1.1 million, but only USD 407,000 had actually been spent. Much of this has apparently been spent to support the setting up the Human Development Centre in Istanbul. The link between the Centre and the TCDC agenda is unclear, since the principal purpose of the Centre is to support the preparation of the NHDRs and MDGRs for Turkey. Beyond this, the results achieved through the TCDC programme are uncertain. By all accounts TICA needs considerable strengthening as a development cooperation agency and the ADR Evaluation Team came across no record or evaluation of outcomes from the other TCDC activities. Nonetheless, and even though the SPO appears to have paid little attention to the implementation of this programme in the past, SPO officials informed the ADR Evaluation Team that they remain strongly committed to a continuation of these activities. According to Country Office staff, a new work plan is under preparation and a new project director is being recruited. So it would appear that the programme is poised to continue. In view of the unclear rationale for it and its uncertain outcomes to date, the ADR Evaluation Team **recommends** that a careful evaluation of past results, as well as a review of planned outcomes/outputs be urgently carried out before substantial new resources are devoted to this programme.

SUPPORTING THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Although the Turkey CCF (2001-2005) contains no specific reference to UNDP support for private sector development, the recent Vision Statement for UNDP Turkey includes this among the priorities listed. This is a new priority, and it has emerged partly based on UNDP Headquarter-led initiatives. The UNDP Turkey website also refers to private sector development.⁴² There are three dimensions to the UNDP's support of the private sector:

- 1) The UNDP Country Office promotes the application of the Global Compact⁴³ principles in Turkey. It does this by organising conferences to promote the understanding of the principles and by establishing coalitions of companies and other

42. www.undp.org.tr/gc.asp. But note that there is no reference to this focal area in any of the SRFs/ROARs or in any of the budget documents seen by the ADR team. According to information provided by the Country Office subsequent to the main ADR mission, the Partnership with the Private Sector initiative is funded by a number of sources, including the Global Compact Secretariat, ILO, KOSGEB and TİSK and through the GİDEM project.

43. The strategic goal of the Global Compact is to encourage the alignment of corporate policies and practices with internationally accepted values and objectives. The core values of the Global Compact have been distilled into nine principles in the areas of human rights, labour standards and the environment. These principles are drawn from three internationally recognised declarations.

stakeholders to collaborate on development issues such as the reduction of corruption, the strengthening of the rule of law and the protection of human rights.

- 2) The UNDP promotes dialogue among stakeholders, including business, civil society and Government. The aim is that this dialogue will trigger action to create a policy environment that supports sustainable and broad based economic development.
- 3) At the local level, the UNDP supports select business partnerships based on local priorities, such as small business development and urban environment issues (e.g., through the GİDEM programme under GAP, see above, Section 4.A.(ii)).

One successful UNDP partnership with a private firm is the cooperation between CISCO and the UNDP in supporting several CISCO academies in Turkey. This involves a university level, two-year vocational training programme, producing networking experts. According to the CISCO officer involved, this has been a successful cooperation and could lead to further cooperation with the UNDP in the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) area.

Since Turkey has a vibrant private sector and its continued development will be key for Turkey's long-term success, the UNDP is well advised to continue looking for effective partnerships with private firms and ways to support private sector development. However, there is a risk that such partnership initiatives will carry the UNDP well beyond its core areas of strategic engagement and institutional capacity. The ADR Evaluation Team therefore **recommends** that the UNDP focus its collaboration with and support for the private sector in the core areas of its work in Turkey, rather than adding to its already ambitious programme.

General Conclusions for the Governance Initiatives

In an environment in which external involvement in institutional change at the local level has been difficult to achieve, the UNDP has played a remarkably important role in catalysing greater participation at the level of local Government through its flagship LA 21 programme. It has achieved this by maximising national ownership and by interfering as little as possible in the mechanisms established by local authorities and the public. It has also resisted any involvement in the establishment of priorities for consideration by the City Councils. This approach has resulted in the rapid, if informal, proliferation of the City Council mechanism as a forum for broadened

participation in decision-making. This mechanism and the credibility gained by the UNDP in local governance reform have positioned it for:

- More active involvement in advocacy and policy development with respect to local governance, using LA 21 as a platform.
- Better exploitation of potential spin-off projects and programmes using the City Councils as a priority-setting and planning mechanism to oversee and ensure full local ownership of project activities undertaken by the UNDP itself or by other UN agencies. For instance, UNICEF may wish to consider exploring synergies between its programme of support to street children with priorities set by youth committees working in City Councils, and the UNDP may wish to consider more active use of the gender committees as a mechanism for mainstreaming gender concerns in economic and political development.
- Building on its experience under the LA 21 programme – particularly in disadvantaged regions of the country – in order to build institutional capacity to more effectively utilise resources that will be channelled through local institutions as the process of EU accession progresses.
- Developing e-systems that further increase the access of City Councils to budgetary and revenue information, improve the management of local Government finances, and more effectively link the City Councils together.

The recognition gained under the LA 21 programme should enable the UNDP to secure cost-sharing for this purpose. However, in order to ensure that this is the case, the UNDP will need to improve current project and programme monitoring and evaluation and be able to provide much more intensive and credible substantive support to the programmes themselves.

The UNDP's success under the LA 21 programme contrasts with a much less successful track record by it in other areas of governance reform and capacity building. First, there has been no clearly discernible strategy for engagement in this thematic area. A number of initiatives, which in principle could be seen as complementary and mutually reinforcing, were started and terminated almost at random and with little apparent reference to each other. Second, while there have been limited benefits to some of these initiatives, or benefits are expected to materialise (e.g., the setting up of the HD Centre under the TCDC programme, the e-Government

project for the MFA, some of the private sector-related activities), most of the initiatives have had no apparent lasting results. Since the UNDP is engaged in experimental and high-risk initiatives by the very nature of its mandate, such outcomes are not necessarily a sign of failure. What is essential, however, is that key lessons are being learned from these cases. In the view of the ADR Evaluation Team, a realistic assessment of the commitment of key partners (the Government, implementing agencies, etc.) is an essential prerequisite. Effective prioritisation of initiatives and attention by Country Office management at key junctures of project decision-making are also important. This requires effective monitoring and evaluation by the UNDP, which does not seem to have taken place for these cases. This again points to the clear need for the UNDP's management in Turkey to ensure that such monitoring, evaluation and learning actually takes place.

B. REGIONAL DISPARITIES AND POVERTY⁴⁴

During much of the 1990s, poverty reduction was not explicitly included in either the National Development goals of Turkey, or in the UNDP's country programmes. However, with the UNDP's increasing focus on human development and with the ascent of the MDGs on the international scene, UNDP Turkey focussed increasingly on this issue. Starting in the late 1990s, the UNDP highlighted poverty reduction in its agenda for Turkey. NHDRs published since then have been effective as advocacy instruments in focusing public opinion on problems related to poverty. The 2001 NHDR in particular drew attention to the poverty problem and to the underlying persistent regional and gender disparities. The relatively low rank of Turkey in the HDI was also often cited in the media.

For a long time, the Turkish Government also did not focus explicitly on poverty reduction, even though many official documents discussed income disparities and the consequences of the increasing gap between income groups. They also focused on unemployment as an important social problem to be combated, as well as on some of the social problems associated with poverty such as poor health, low levels of education and social disorder. Nevertheless, throughout the 1990s, there was never explicit consideration or direct targeting of poverty as an official policy of the Turkish Government.

By 2000, however, the Turkish authorities were ready to acknowledge poverty as an outright national

development challenge. Accordingly, the 8th Five-Year Development Plan explicitly incorporates poverty reduction into national planning. It declares: "The main principle is to implement economic and social policies in harmony, which are aimed at increasing economic growth, eliminating absolute poverty, alleviating relative poverty and approximating the income of the poor segments to an average welfare level" (Paragraph 911, p. 111). The same document also establishes a direct link between poverty and income inequality by stating: "The main objectives are to reduce inequalities in income distribution and thus alleviate poverty, and to enable each segment of the society to gain a fair share from the welfare increase" (Paragraph 910, p. 111). The need to combat poverty as a social and economic problem was further recognised after the economic crisis in 2001, which brought the social problems resulting from the crisis to the centre stage of domestic politics and the concern of international agencies, such as the UNDP and the WB.

In contrast to poverty reduction, alleviation of the vast regional disparities experienced in Turkey has been part of its national development goals since the 1960s. Indeed, Turkey has had Regional Development Administrations specifically addressing this issue in the SPO, as well as a special regional agency for Southeast Anatolia (the GAP Regional Development Administration). Data on regional disparities (see Chapter 2) show that despite huge GAP investments, the less developed regions have received less public investment than their share of population and retained their relatively low HDI and GDP per capita. In recent years, research on the income levels of different regions has broadened the focus on regional disparity beyond Southeast Anatolia. As a result, more attention is now also paid to East Anatolia and the Black Sea region.

Many of the programmes presently grouped under the UNDP's poverty goal started as projects designed to combat regional disparities parallel to Turkey's Development Goals. As the UNDP focused more explicitly on poverty reduction, these ongoing projects were subsumed under the poverty reduction theme. Meanwhile, the UNDP has played an effective role both in highlighting poverty as a social problem and in transforming the Turkish Government's regional development approach from infrastructure projects to programmes and policies that are more 'human development' friendly.

This section first reviews projects and programmes addressing regional disparities. It then turns to programmes concerned specifically with poverty reduction.

44. This section of the report has made extensive use of the background paper prepared by Prof. Dr. Yusuf Ziya Özcan entitled "In-depth Study on Regional Disparities and Poverty", January 2004.

(i) Programmes Addressing Regional Disparities

Two major programmes addressing regional disparities have been supported by the UNDP in recent years: the GAP programme, which concentrates on Southeast Anatolia, and the LEAP programme which supports Eastern Anatolia. This section first reviews the experience under GAP, followed by a detailed discussion of a major sub-programme under GAP in support of small and medium business development. The section then reviews the experience under LEAP.

SUPPORT FOR THE GAP ADMINISTRATION

The Southeast Anatolia Project (GAP) started in 1977. At that time, it was a vast integrated infrastructure project of dams, hydroelectricity and irrigation. It aimed to improve the regional as well as national economy by infrastructural investment and improvements in agriculture. In 1996, the UNDP initiated an umbrella programme entitled “Strengthening Integrated Regional Development and Reducing Socio-Economic Disparities in the GAP Region” (TUR/95/004). All the stakeholders, including the leadership of the GAP administration, agree that by introducing new dimensions and concepts, the UNDP brought a paradigm change in the way GAP was conceived.

The first major contribution of the UNDP was to bring in the concepts of “sustainability” and “human development”. Since 1995, the GAP administration has perceived itself to be a comprehensive development agency, where carrying out infrastructure projects is only one of its targets. “Community ownership” and “participation” were adopted due to deliberate efforts by the UNDP. The second GAP Master Plan,⁴⁵ adopted in 2002, was prepared with significant help from the UNDP. In this plan, all the stakeholders, including the vulnerable local groups, participated in the decision making process, so much so that they changed not only the order of the targets, but proposed their own targets instead of the preset targets of the GAP administration. With the economic crisis of 2001, the GAP administration further emphasised that their project targets vulnerable groups and aims at becoming an umbrella organisation to combat regional poverty.

Aside from helping to reshape the overall direction of the GAP administration programmes, the UNDP was also deeply engaged in shaping the learning processes for capacity building of the GAP bureaucracy. This enabled both the local branches of GAP as well as the central

GAP organisation in Ankara to become well acquainted with the new social and environmental concepts and to manage related studies and initiatives as part of the overall GAP programme. In addition, the participatory processes supported by the UNDP helped develop CSO capacities, as CSOs learned to network and felt empowered by being part of the international development community.

Since 1995, the UNDP has also been involved in supporting 29 small projects, such as projects designed to strengthen rural education, participatory urban rehabilitation, municipal waste water disposals in small and medium size communities, urban-rural integration and community development programmes. Many other UN agencies have also participated: UNICEF was involved in establishing 28 ÇATOMs (Multi Purpose Community Centres) projects and is now involved in the Campaign for Sending Girl Children to School. The ILO was involved with a project for children working on the street, with “start your own business” programmes for women, as well as with youth centres. UNIDO helped at various stages for Small and Medium-Size Enterprise (SME) promotion in the region.⁴⁶ While the impact and sustainability of individual projects such as these could not be ascertained by the ADR Evaluation Team – with the exception of a malaria prevention project, which proved successful in the short term, but unsustainable in the long-run (see Box 4.1) – there is little doubt that the overall changes in the direction and impact of the GAP programme as a result of the UNDP's assistance have been substantial.

Finally UNDP, together with the Swiss Government, also supported the Youth Association for Habitat and Agenda 21 in carrying out the Social Development Programme for Youth in Southeast Anatolia in the context of the GAP regional development programme. Under this initiative local youth centres were established, which are estimated to have reached more than 30,000 young people in this region.⁴⁷ While successful in this respect, and probably an effective means to engaging young people in the broader social development agenda, it is not clear whether the youth centres serve as effective means of poverty reduction.

46. Regional development issues have been attractive to other donors as well. Besides the UNDP core funds, the Swiss Development Agency and the EU have contributed to GAP programmes and projects. The Turkish Government has also contributed to the enhancement of programmes.

47. The ADR Evaluation Team was made aware of this aspect of the GAP programme by a representative of the Youth Association for Habitat and Agenda 21 at the stakeholder meeting in Ankara on 7 September 2004. Another participant in the Stakeholder Meeting expressed the view that it would be important to also develop programmes in support of working youth, since the youth centres were seen to support mostly middle class youth. No evaluation of UNDP's involvement in this component was carried out.

45. <http://www.gapturkiye.gen.tr/gap/index.htm/>

At present, the GAP administration is going through a major restructuring process as a result of both the current Public Administration Reforms, as well as the EU's Regional Disparities Programme. New regional institutions are to be established and new regional programmes will be funded with EU support. There appears to be great enthusiasm in the Government for continuing the partnership with the UNDP for addressing regional disparities with new projects. A proposal for a pilot rural development project in the region with EU funds is currently under consideration. It would seem only natural for the UNDP to bring its comparative advantages to bear by remaining a major substantive partner for the national and regional authorities in this important area.

ENTREPRENEUR SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE CENTRES (GİDEM)

The GİDEM Approach and Experience

The GİDEM initiative, a major sub-programme under GAP, deserves special attention, since it received sustained support from the UNDP and represents an interesting effort to help regional development through strengthening the economic base of a backward region. Indeed, the experience with this sub-programme was replicated not only elsewhere in Turkey (in the LEAP programme), but is also intended to be shared in some countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia.

GİDEMs were established through a UNDP-GAP partnership in 1997 in five centres of Southeast Anatolia: Gaziantep, Diyarbakır, Mardin, Adıyaman and Şanlıurfa. The first phase of the project, which was funded by the UNDP, was finished in 2002. The same year, following a six-month interim period, the EU provided funds for the project in all centres, except for the one in Gaziantep as this had already been replaced by an EU Business Development Centre. The UNDP became the project execution body for the second phase.

Although there has been considerable continuity, GİDEM activities differed somewhat across the two phases. Between 1997 and 2002, there was great diversity in the projects within and across centres. Many of the projects were targeted at smaller enterprises with significant involvement and local ownership from the Regional State of Emergency Governor's Office (Olağanüstü Hal Valiliği). Besides providing business advice services, GİDEMs were involved with many diverse activities, from compiling the Inventory of Industries in the province, to many small-scale projects

BOX 4.1: STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL CAPABILITIES OF MALARIA SERVICES IN TURKEY – A SUCCESSFUL PROJECT THAT PROVED UNSUSTAINABLE

In the late 1970s, especially after irrigation was introduced in the GAP region, there was a gradual recurrence of malaria in Turkey, reaching epidemic proportions in the 1990s. In 1998, 36,824 cases were recorded. The project entitled "Strengthening the National Capabilities of Malaria Services in Turkey" was developed by the UNDP Country Office in 1998. This project was carried out by the National Malaria Control Directorate (Ministry of Health) in cooperation with WHO. The GAP-RDA became the executing agency.

All of the expected outputs were successfully achieved. With the help of WHO international consultants, a regional strategy and a plan of action were developed. The Adana Malaria Institute, the closest to the region, was provided with laboratory supplies.

The Ministry of Health welcomed most of the improvements. However, the human capacity building component of the project experienced difficulties. Even though the individuals trained had showed great aptitude, enthusiasm and dedication, the turnover in personnel was overwhelming. Only 10-20% of the trained group stayed in the region.

The Diyarbakır Malaria and Tropical Diseases Research and Training Center was established independent of the project. Even though this center may prove to be a great asset, how much of the experience and knowledge accumulated in Adana is actually being transferred to this new center is in doubt.

The project has certainly updated the technical knowledge and human capacity for malaria services in Turkey. Nevertheless, it is very difficult to assess the impact of this project on the region. One very important reason for this outcome was that the Ministry of Health did not have a regional action plan, and could not retain the trained personnel in the region. It is not apparent that the UNDP and the government ever took stock of the lessons learned from this project.

aimed at income generation. In view of the minimal capacity for project proposal writing and implementation, GİDEMs provided a readily available advisory resource. They were also asked to help develop projects for employment and income generation in areas ranging from silk production to the making of pavement stones, and to organise a market for the handicrafts of local women.

This flexibility, enthusiasm, responsiveness and good technical support made Diyarbakır GİDEM a highly sought organisation, so much so that in the six-month interim period between two sources of finance, the governor's office and the local business community partly supported the project. Meanwhile, the other four GİDEM offices were closed until they received EU funding.

In the second stage (started in September 2002), GİDEMs have focused more on business development, although they have also helped the local authorities and NGOs with many of their projects despite their overload. At present, GİDEMs concentrate on business

development services, which is parallel to the expectations of the EU. In this second stage there is a more integrated coordination of projects, stricter monitoring, and focus on a smaller number of projects. GİDEM conduct market research, feasibility studies, SME analysis and project profiles for their clients. A typical GİDEM centre offers small investors ideas for business development, helps with business start up or reorganisation, and gives advice on how to access financing. They also help NGOs and Government offices increase capacity through training programmes. GİDEM consultants are encouraged to actively search out clients by going to their offices, even though this may be difficult due to the shortage of staff. Each GİDEM has ‘opportunity windows’ for special projects that are designed specifically for that province.⁴⁸

On average, GİDEM offices provide 130 case services a month. According to detailed business reports of the GİDEM centres, during the six months between May 2003 and October 2003, 1851 businessmen, 362 NGO members and 252 civil servants benefited from GİDEMs’ information services, and 207 businessmen and 14 NGO members benefited from GİDEMs’ consultancy and advisory services. They also organised 2-3 training events a month, in each of which 20-150 businessmen took part. The training programmes range from courses on “Creating and Employing Qualified Manpower” to general information programmes such as “Trading with Syria” or “Doing Business with UN System”, specific training such as “Cotton Sowing and Growth” or training in “Silver Craftsmanship”, besides more general business information courses such as “Starting up Business”, “Quality Assurance Systems”, or “Project Preparation Techniques”. Such general business courses are usually repeated on demand in various GİDEMs. The GİDEM consultants themselves also receive training periodically.

Assessment of the GİDEM Approach and Its Prospects

Despite internal variation between different offices in different provinces, GAP/GİDEM is considered to be a highly successful endeavour.⁴⁹ There seems to be great demand for GİDEM services. All the stakeholders agree that their services should continue, and they should be supported by the state and international funds, by Chambers of Commerce and Industry, by Small Businessmen Associations and by local authorities. The GİDEM

model has also been used elsewhere, including in the LEAP project (see below). Provincial Governments in other regions of Turkey, such as Siirt and Batman, have also been reported as trying to establish business advisory centres with their own resources, modelled on the GİDEM approach.

While no hard numbers are available on new business growth and employment creation, many GİDEM clients have indicated that they improved their business and increased their employment or started up business to employ new people. This indicates that GİDEMs are helping to reduce regional disparities and generate income by improving business capacity in the region and improving the visibility of the business community in their provinces. However, despite their success, the GİDEM approach faces a number of so far unanswered questions for the future.

Although business clients have great praise for GİDEM activities, many of them have complained that they cannot in fact fully apply the advice they get from GİDEM due to financial problems. GİDEMs can advise on credit opportunities, but businessmen find it difficult to produce collateral. There is low interest credit available for SMEs from state resources, but they usually prove to be too limited. GİDEMs are unlikely to reach their full potential unless the centres are linked to effective credit and finance schemes that can support new investments and business restructuring in the regions. As a stopgap measure, GİDEMs have managed to attract Euro 2.2 million of EU funds to be distributed as grants for funding investments in the region. While these grants are being disbursed, and based on the experience with this scheme, it would be appropriate to develop a more permanent approach to facilitate suitable financing for firms in the less developed regions.

Aside from the issue of investment finance, GİDEMs are facing other serious sustainability problems. At present, the operating cost for the centres are high because they are using highly qualified and expensive national consultants and the centres do not generate sufficient revenues to support themselves once external grant support runs out upon completion of the second project phase. The project management contracted for international consultancy services in September 2003 to advise on the issue of sustainability, and 14 potential revenue streams were suggested (service fees, subscription fees, donor programme delivery, GİDEM programme delivery, consultancy provider financial package, success fees, equity, rental income, corporate sponsorship training programmes, specialist

48. A number of projects are operating successfully, such as the Entrepreneurship Center at the Dicle University. Adıyaman Textile Vocational Training Center is ready to open very soon. There are already demands from 68 SMEs for training.

49. The GAP/GİDEM office located in the city of Diyarbakır received special praise for visibility and effectiveness.

equipment, employee training and opportunity banks). Paying for the consultancy services at cost covering prices does not seem to be acceptable to businessmen. They have indicated a willingness to pay only nominal fees, which would help, but would not be enough to cover costs. In addition, the present legal status of the GİDEMs makes it difficult for them to accept fees and/or ownership by some of the taxpaying private institutions.⁵⁰

There remains some, albeit limited, time to address these important questions and to find an institutional home for GİDEMs, and hence draw on the considerable potential of the GİDEM model at a large scale in future. There is little doubt that with Turkey's effort to secure eventual EU accession, the issue of regional disparities will remain a very important matter for Turkey and for the EU. The creation of Regional Development Agencies might provide an attractive institutional umbrella for GİDEMs in the future.

LINKING EASTERN ANATOLIA TO PROGRESS (LEAP)

Another Regional Disparities Project supported by the UNDP has been the LEAP Project. Similar to the GAP project, LEAP is also expected to help poverty reduction by creating jobs, generating incomes, providing better services of health and education, and thus reducing the impact of poverty in a relatively underdeveloped region.

The East Anatolia Region began to draw attention in the 1990's as one of the least developed regions in Turkey. Unlike Southeast Anatolia, it lacked an established regional development programme and agency since it did not have the hydropower and irrigation potential of the GAP region. The LEAP project was designed in the mid-1990s as an alternative approach to help support the regional development of Eastern Anatolia.

LEAP, which started in 1997, is relatively more recent in origin, less ambitious and has less funding than the projects in the GAP region. Developed with the help of Swiss contributions and UNDP expertise, LEAP is designed as a human development project, incorporating concepts such as good governance, poverty reduction, local capacity building and participatory development. At present, the project is carried out by Atatürk University as the coordinating unit. It consists of three main components: the participatory rural development component has been contracted out to an NGO, SÜRKAL (Sürdürülebilir Kırsal ve Kentsel Kalkınma Derneği/Sustainable Rural and Urban Development

Association); the other two components, the entrepreneurship development centre and the tourism development component, are implemented directly by the University.

Participatory Rural Development Sub-Project

SÜRKAL started this sub-project by asking the stakeholders in the region why East Anatolia remains underdeveloped despite significant infrastructural investment by the state. They came to three conclusions:

- (i) There is little participation and ownership of infrastructural investment projects by the local population.
- (ii) There is little communication between different stakeholders, including the state and community.
- (iii) Some sections of the population are resistant to change.

As a result, the project focused on how to increase participation for development. In this respect, six district development committees and 28 village project groups were initiated in 18 villages, where the village mukhtars, volunteers, state officials and municipality representatives work with experts and professionals. For each village, a baseline study was conducted, an action plan was designed, pilot projects were implemented and some technical demonstrations were provided. The projects focus on improving agricultural productivity and animal husbandry, which are important economic activities in the region. For example, SÜRKAL introduced new fodder crops such as clover, sainfoin and vetch, provided veterinary services and taught improved techniques of animal husbandry.

SÜRKAL has conducted two types of educational programmes. The first type was oriented towards the state officials, mukhtars, municipality representatives and professionals. It focussed on the concept of sustainable participatory development and its importance in community mobilisation and ownership in development. In view of the fact that the Turkish state has traditionally been very centralised and control oriented, such a change of mentality is crucial. The second type of educational programme has been conducted at the village level on various subjects ranging from the protection of nature and

BOX 4.2: A LESSON IN GENDER EQUITY

After attending one such course, an elderly man said "Before that course I had no idea that women undertook economically productive work, I thought what they did was only to look after children and cook. Now I realise their importance. So now I am calling my wife by her name, rather than calling her 'avrat' (wife)." (Report by Prof. Dr. Yusuf Ziya Özcan)

50. This appears to be a general problem in Turkey.

natural resources to land use, use of fertilizers, fodder crop cultivation, triticale planting and the vaccination of animal stock. In a few villages, courses on family planning, hygiene and home economics were oriented mainly towards women, although a few men also attended (Box 4.2).

The LEAP project has been instrumental in both introducing the concept of sustainable participatory development in the region, as well as building up the capacity of SÜRKAL, which is one of the very few development NGOs in Turkey. LEAP serves about 3000 villagers. The direct economic impact of the project on the region is difficult to assess because the project is relatively new and such programmes take time to be fully adopted by the villages. It is possible that the villages will perpetuate the project committees and District Development Committees set up, since this will facilitate their continued participation and resource mobilisation. However, sustainability and scaling-up of the project will only be assured if and when a national agency or a Regional Development Agency takes on the responsibility for continuation of this sub-project.

Entrepreneurship Development Centre (GİMER)

As of January 2004, GİMER had been functional for one year. It is based on the experience of GAP/GİDEM as a model. It has served 126 SMEs in its first year, helping them to choose technology, find markets (three companies have found export markets), improve their capacity and access credit. A few start-ups have occurred with GİMER's help, and it has organised a few training programmes, including one for women aimed at creating a Women Entrepreneurs Association.

The centre has established international links, two with the neighbouring countries of Azerbaijan and Georgia to improve the export capacity of local business, and another with Purdue University/US to build their internal capacity as a business development centre.

Atatürk University wants to continue managing the programme and aims at employing some of the present staff within the university for that purpose. They believe they have a strategy to maintain GİMER as a sustainable institution, but have had to give up the idea of replicating the project in Kars as originally intended.

Rural Tourism Development Project

This project is at the inception and planning level rather than in full implementation. So far, the project coordination centre has tried to establish local ownership and develop an action plan with the help of national and international experts. As the idea is very new in the

region, the centre organised study visits to other Turkish tourism sites, such as Nevşehir in Capadocia and Olympus in Antalya.

The coordination centre hopes to mobilise EU regional development funds and funds from the Social Risk Mitigation Project of the WB for this component of the LEAP. Only then can it have a real chance of sustainability.

Assessment and Future Prospects for LEAP

The three project components of LEAP have been prepared with significant inputs and care. In each of the projects, baseline studies were conducted, international as well as national experts were consulted and action plans were discussed with the stakeholders. The procedures for monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes, however, have not been established.

The LEAP project works with smaller funds and resources than GAP/GİDEM projects, which enables the project to be more sustainable. As the costs are limited, they can be more easily covered by income generated within the province, for example, by the adoption of the Business Development Centre by the University. However, the lower costs are due to limited expenditures, which means that the services provided are likely to be more limited.

(ii) Poverty Reduction Initiatives

CURRENT INITIATIVES

Initiatives directly targeting poverty issues are relatively more recent in the UNDP Country Programme. However, in line with SRF (2002) goals there has been an increasing focus on policy formulation and advice for poverty reduction, and the future pipeline projects also tend to concentrate on this theme.

The most important contribution of the UNDP to poverty alleviation has been the publication of NHDRs since 1990, the last one being for 2001. The NHDR has highlighted the problems of poverty and social capital in Turkey in a comparative framework, with comparisons to other countries as well as with regional comparisons within Turkey. In recent years, the HDI has been applied to 86 provinces in Turkey, indicating the differences in geographic disparities. The NHDR has been the entry point for many policies on poverty.

The NHDRs have been very effective in creating awareness on poverty issues, as well as on gender discrimination, infant mortality, problems with health services and education. The comparative framework

within which the data is presented makes the reports especially useful for policy makers. Also, the media pay special attention to the ranking of the countries and how they highlight particular human development problems faced by Turkey.

The advocacy role of NHDRs is certainly very valuable and has helped focus the attention of the state bureaucracy and international organisations, including the WB, on important human development issues. There is certainly an important role for the UNDP in conducting baseline studies, mapping poverty, determining the groups left out of the social security system as well as socially excluded vulnerable groups. The stakeholders who were interviewed by the ADR Evaluation Team agreed that beyond advocacy, the UNDP could also assist with policy formulation and provide advice to decision makers in the specific areas covered by NHDRs.

Besides the NHDRs, the UNDP in recent years has also been directly involved in specific cases of poverty reduction analysis and advocacy projects. It has funded two baseline studies, each discussing two different regions: (a) Buğra and Keyder 2003⁵¹ discuss the weakening social protection amongst the urban poor, where a new poverty is emerging as a function of social exclusion. They argue that direct (state) intervention is necessary to overcome this poverty, whether in the form of direct income benefits or employment or strengthened social security systems; (b) the other study was conducted by the Social Science Foundation and is a review of the Poverty Reduction Programmes in Southeast Anatolia. Each of the poverty reduction strategies currently applied in Turkey is analysed with a critical perspective. Although each programme may have its own shortcomings, the report agrees that there is need for intervention by state agencies to address Turkey's regional poverty problem.

The UNDP also organised a workshop on poverty policy formulation where experts from universities, the bureaucracy, international organisations including UN agencies and the WB, came together. The participants agreed that this meeting was an important step in both developing an understanding of different approaches in poverty studies as well as in establishing a policy dialogue. The UNDP can use its neutral and legitimate bases for establishing a network of poverty studies.

FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR POVERTY PROJECTS

As previously mentioned, EU accession is now the most important development goal for Turkey. Even though

poverty reduction was emphasised in Turkish Government documents after the 2000 economic crisis, this theme is not per se amongst the stated priorities for EU accession. Therefore, unlike the Regional Disparities Programmes, it is less likely that the EU will be a significant future partner in this area. Combating poverty, however, is at the core of the MDGs that have also been adopted by Turkey. In line with what is suggested earlier in this report, there may be a potential for UNDP in exploring mutual relationships between the EU and MDG agendas.

Even though the percentage of poor in the population is lower in the urban and developed western areas of Turkey than in the less developed sections such as the Southeast and Eastern Anatolia, the absolute number of poor people in these more advanced regions is actually larger than those in the poorer regions. Therefore, poverty reduction should also become an explicit goal of development policy for the western metropolitan centres, including İstanbul. This provides the UNDP with the new challenge of developing urban-based pilot projects. After the economic crisis, the WB proposed the Social Risk Mitigation Project/Loan, which is currently being implemented in Turkey. One option for future UNDP efforts would be to link up with this project.

A good example for future prospects can be seen in the "Micro Finance in Turkey" project, which is in the UNDP pipeline. As a basis for this project, the UNDP commissioned Kiendel Burritt from UNCDF⁵² to prepare a report entitled "*Micro Finance in Turkey*". This report draws attention to the need for micro finance mechanisms for income generating activities, and also highlights deficiencies in the legal system that call for changes in the legal and regulatory framework. The report and associated stakeholder conferences and donor meetings are a good example of a policy advice and advocacy strategy for the UNDP.

Similarly, the pipeline project, "National Pro-poor Policy Debate and Poverty Social Policy Forum" is another example of poverty-reduction oriented programmes.

The limits of UNDP's core funding resources are well known, but the need for UNDP intervention in poverty programmes is also well acknowledged. The most plausible niche, given the present constraints, is to become a policy advisor and have a significant impact by mobilising the existing accumulated knowledge and adding further investigation and modelling where necessary.

51. Buğra A and Ç Keyder (2003) "*New Poverty and Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey*", report prepared for the UNDP, Ankara.

52. K. Burritt (2003) "*Micro Finance in Turkey, A Sector Assessment Report*", UNDP Publications, No. 2, Ankara.

(iii) General Conclusions for the Poverty Agenda

Throughout its efforts in the areas of poverty and regional disparities, the UNDP's most important contribution has been in introducing new ideas leading to paradigm shifts and building institutional capacity and awareness for the implementation of these new ideas. This mission is certainly to be maintained and further emphasised.

The UNDP Country Office has a very good track record and accumulated knowledge and experience in projects addressing regional disparities. The big challenge for the two flagship projects, GAP/GİDEM and LEAP, however, remains their sustainability. Funding and institutional ownership are the big constraints. The UNDP, together with its partners, needs to focus urgently on the challenge of sustainability and scaling-up. With the EU accession process underway, regional development will be one of the priority goals in Turkey. The UNDP should capitalise on its experience and seek a role in assisting the establishment of Regional Development Agencies, which in turn could become umbrella institutions for assuring sustainability and scaling-up of the GAP/GİDEM and LEAP experiences.

Poverty reduction is now an important development goal for Turkey. Turkish Government officials, NGOs and other stakeholders have mentioned the need for policy advice, instigating new ideas and projects as well as coordination of the existing projects. The UNDP can carve out an important role here for its policy advice, as it is recognised as an independent, experienced and highly qualified international partner. Linking this effort explicitly and effectively to Turkey's EU accession agenda and to the implementation of the UNDP's MDG analysis and advocacy efforts will be a key challenge for the UNDP in the years to come.⁵³

C. ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Environmental issues have long been accorded a relatively low priority in Turkey by the Turkish people, the authorities and the international community alike, even as Turkey's vulnerable eco-system has been placed under increasing stress by high population growth rates, rising incomes and energy consumption, intense development activities related to growing urbanisation and booming

tourism.⁵⁴ However, as sustainable development has become a worldwide concern, it has also gradually been reflected in Turkey's policy debates. Turkey's Five-Year Development Plans, starting with the 6th Plan for 1991-95, have included environmental strategies, and the 7th Plan for 1996-2000 explicitly addressed sustainable development issues in a comprehensive manner. The 8th Five-Year Development Plan 2001-2005 states that "it is essential to protect human health, ecological equilibrium and cultural, historical and aesthetic assets in economic and social development" as part of its plan for sustainable development.⁵⁵

Although the 8th Plan identified some areas of progress (including improvements in the legal and institutional framework, the preparation of a National Environment Strategy and Action Plan - NEAP - in 1998 and heightened public awareness of environmental issues), it also stressed a number of continuing areas of concern which were to be addressed in the course of the 8th Plan period:⁵⁶

- Rising environmental threats, especially in the coastal areas
- Ineffective environmental monitoring and management systems
- Inadequate mainstreaming of environmental policies into economic and social policies
- Insufficient public awareness, education and participation
- Unclear accountabilities and limited implementation capacities at the ministerial and local levels

During the 1990s, the UNDP was involved in various ways in supporting Turkey's growing attention to environmental matters. Together with the WB, it contributed to the preparation of the NEAP, it played an instrumental role in implementing the LA 21 (see above), and it administered an important Small Grants Programme of the GEF since 1993. In 2000, the UNDP, together with the Ministry of Environment, initiated a new flagship programme, the National Programme on Environment and Development (NPED), which consisted of three components: i) preparation and follow-up for the Johannesburg Summit 2002; ii) a sustainable energy and atmospheric protection initiative (in support of Turkey's accession to the Convention on Climate

53. Subsequent to the January mission, the ADR Evaluation Team was informed by RBEC that Turkey will produce a "Joint Inclusion Memorandum" for the EU, in collaboration with the EU's DG Employment and Social Affairs. These memoranda are designed to prepare accession countries for their participation in the EU's approach to social inclusion. A workshop was held in late April 2004 on aligning the EU social inclusion process and the MDG process for Turkey. A number of recommendations were made as a result of this workshop, whose findings and conclusions can be found on the website <http://mdgr.undp.sk>.

54. There has been one environmental issue that has long attracted a high degree of attention in Turkey, viz. the environmental risks associated with the rapid expansion of oil tanker traffic through the Bosphorus straits. This preoccupation has led consecutive Turkish governments to strongly support the development of alternative oil transport routes, including the construction of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline.

55. The Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Environment, and UNDP, "National Report on Sustainable Development 2002", Ankara 2002, p. 22.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 22

Change); iii) a national initiative to combat desertification. According to data provided by the UNDP Turkey Country Office, in the period 1998-2003 a total of USD 2.9 million was devoted to funding of these environmental initiatives.

(i) The National Programme on Environment and Development (NPED) and the Johannesburg Summit 2002

Following the broad guidelines set down in the 8th Plan and in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, 2002, the Turkish authorities mounted a major effort to prepare a comprehensive and participatory review of Turkey's sustainable development challenges and options. This took place under the aegis of the NPED, jointly managed by the Ministry of Environment and the UNDP. The preparatory process involved broad participation of and dialogue among public, private and NGO stakeholders who came together in roundtables, workshops and consultative events, as well as electronically in a Turkish language "e-group."

This process is widely credited with "the establishment of a platform for stakeholders to discuss vital themes in sustainable development, the completion of a *National Report on Sustainable Development*, compilation of *Highlights of Best Practices* and the other printed material to be distributed at the summit."⁵⁷ The fact that this intense preoccupation with sustainable development occurred at a time of high financial and economic crisis makes it all the more remarkable. Unfortunately, it appears that this level of public excitement and involvement in environmental issues was not maintained after the Johannesburg Summit. This seems largely due to a loss of leadership and staffing changes in the Ministry of Environment after it was merged with the Ministry of Forestry by the new Government elected in November 2002.

The UNDP was directly involved and instrumental in Turkey's preparation for the Johannesburg Summit. It operated in close partnership with the Ministry of Environment in the context of the NPED to which it contributed key staff and financial resources. It therefore shares substantial credit for the success of the process and the results achieved in terms of increased public awareness and participation, and in terms of credible publications for and participation by Turkey in the Johannesburg Summit.

The UNDP's post-Summit efforts were hampered by a number of factors. First, the lack of an effective ministerial counterpart made progress difficult. Second, the Assessment Report on the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which was prepared in May 2003 under the UNDP's guidance, did not come up with a cogent agenda for next steps of implementation.⁵⁸ Third, the UNDP's own senior staff transitions during 2003 meant a reduced capacity to provide leadership in this area. Fourth, insufficient budgetary allocations under the project, according to an internal UNDP assessment, have impeded progress. For all these reasons, the workshop planned for the review of the Assessment Report and the preparation of the next phase of the NPED were substantially delayed and had not been completed by January 2004.

(ii) Other Initiatives under the NPED: Support for the Convention on Climate Change and the National Initiative to Combat Desertification

Aside from the successful preparation for the Johannesburg Summit, the most important success of the NPED and of the UNDP was undoubtedly the support for Turkey's ratification in October 2003 of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Under the aegis of the NPED, workshops were held, research, partnership and advocacy initiatives carried out and an expert roster established. The UNDP played a very active part in advocating Turkey's ratification. Looking ahead, there is an ambitious agenda for moving forward with the implementation of the Convention in Turkey.

Another component under the NPED involves support for the implementation of the UN Convention on Desertification in the framework of an integrated approach that is consistent with the NEAP, Agenda 21 and other regional and international agreements. The main objective was the development of a National Action Programme, which has been completed but remains to be launched. Under the aegis of the NPED, the UNDP was also successful in convincing the National Coordination Unit on Desertification to include not only governmental, but also non-governmental representation among its membership.

57. UNDP Turkey website www.undp.org.tr/DEnergyAndEnvironment_D1.asp. The Turkey ADR mission found wide agreement on this assessment among interviewees

58. UNDP, "World Summit on Sustainable Development, Plan of Implementation," Assessment Report, Ankara, May 2003. While this 200-page report contains a detailed, itemised comparison of sustainable development intentions under the 8th Five-Year Plan, the National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis*, the National Report to Johannesburg, the NEAP, the National Agenda 21 and the Programme for Transition to a Strong Economy, it does not offer any real guidance or priorities for next steps forward.

(iii) The GEF Small Grants Programme

The goal of the UNDP's GEF Small Grants Programme (GEF/SGP) is to improve the condition of the environment by protecting biological diversity and international waters.⁵⁹ It is based on the presumption that global environmental problems can be solved by local communities who, with small amounts of funding (up to USD 50,000), can undertake activities that have a significant impact on the condition of the environment and their sustainable livelihood. Globally, the GEF/SGP is operational in over 50 countries and is coordinated out of UNDP New York Headquarters. In Turkey, GEF/SGP has operated since 1993 out of the UNDP Turkey Country Office on a decentralised basis, and is managed by the GEF/SGP National Coordinator in consultation with the National Steering Committee.⁶⁰ The Committee consists of representatives of Government, environmental NGOs and academia. It provides overall guidance and strategic direction for the programme and screens and selects projects for grants awards. In the ten years since its inception, some 50 projects were supported throughout Turkey in areas such as eco-tourism development, coastal zone management, threatened species protection, protected area management, raising public awareness, environmental education and capacity building. Since 1998, about USD 1.4 million have been distributed in small grants.

Based on the experience of the first five years of the Turkey GEF/SGP programme, the second programme (1999-2004) is intended to ensure scaling-up and sustainability of its impact, and to promote effective linkage of the environmental objectives in protection of biodiversity and international waterways to sustainable livelihood and local development.

(iv) New Environmental Initiatives under Consideration

Three new environmental initiatives have recently been started or are currently under consideration by the UNDP Turkey Country Office. First, a small grants window, administered by the UNDP, has been approved for ecologically sustainable enterprises in connection with the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline project. Second, a GEF Medium Size Project to help develop and support the Küre Mountains National Park is under preparation. Third, a major effort to assist in the preparation of the environmental components of the 9th Five-Year plan,

consistent with the EU accession requirements, is under consideration.

(v) General Conclusions for the Environment Agenda

In the SRF 2002 for Turkey, two overarching goals are listed for the environmental area:

- 1) Improved capacity of authorities to plan and implement integrated approaches to environmental and energy development that respond to the needs of the poor.
- 2) Global environmental concerns and commitments integrated in national development planning and policy.

The UNDP's involvement in the successful preparation for the Johannesburg Summit, in the ratification of the Convention for Climate Change, and its support of a large number of small environmental projects through the GEF/SGP programme undoubtedly contributed to progress in achieving the two goals above. However, lack of progress with the implementation of the NPED over the last 12-15 months raises questions about the sustainability of the results achieved. In particular, it appears that much of the capacity that had been built in the Ministry of Environment may have been eroded due to institutional and staffing changes during 2003. And it is still not clear to what extent there is ownership and leadership within the Government to move forward energetically with a national environmental programme. Also, while the GEF/SGP has undoubtedly supported many worthwhile small projects and NGOs,⁶¹ it is unclear whether the entire programme has resulted in sustainable and scaled-up environmental action, either by creating lasting CSO capacity or by producing irreversible benefits significant on a national scale with global impacts.

These judgments regarding the sustainability and significance of impacts of UNDP activity in the environmental area are by necessity tentative, since the Turkey ADR Evaluation Team did not have access to any independent evaluations of the major initiatives. However, judging from the feedback received both from UNDP personnel and others, the assessment made here appears to be quite widely shared.

For the future, it is clear that Turkey will continue to face important environmental challenges, not least because it will want to meet as quickly as possible the requirements of EU accession in regard to environmental

59. See UNDP Turkey website, www.undp.org.tr/Gef_sgp.htm.

60. According to the UNDP Resident Representative, the GEF/SGP team, while physically located in the UNDP Country Office, operates largely independently and without close strategic or managerial supervision from the Resident Representative or his Deputy.

61. During its field visit to Diyarbakır, the Turkey ADR Evaluation Team met with one NGO representative whose organisation had received a small grant from the GEF/SGP. She enthusiastically supported the programme, without which her organisation could not have embarked on a project to help preserve a particular bird species.

standards. Judging from the experience of other EU accession countries, this will require very significant action in policy, legal and regulatory and institutional reforms, as well as major investments. Given the UNDP's involvement in the environmental area, especially through the NPED and the GEF/SGP, it is in principle well placed to support the Turkish authorities in meeting the EU accession requirements in the environmental field. However, this requires a clear recognition by the Turkish authorities, and especially by the Ministry of Forestry and Environment, that urgent and concerted action is needed in reviving the NPED. It will require adequate funding, which can perhaps best be sought in close collaboration with the Government, from EU financing and from the GEF. It will also require effective partnership with other international agencies, especially the WB. Finally, the UNDP Turkey Country Office will have to allocate senior staff capacity to support this area if it is to remain, or become again, one of the key planks of UNDP support for Turkey.⁶²

D. GENDER

Gender equality has always been a controversial issue in Turkey, full of contradictory indicators and sentiments. Until the 1980s, neither Turkish Governments nor other stakeholders, including women's groups, were seriously aware of gender inequalities, nor was this issue discussed in the political arena. While Turkey has a high participation of women in professions, granted the suffrage right to women in the 1930s and is apparently the only Muslim country with equal rights of inheritance and divorce for men and women, it still faces significant gender inequalities in property ownership, literacy ratio, labour force participation, political representation and visibility. According to the most recent NHDRs for Turkey, very significant gender disparities exist, especially in the less developed parts of the country (the Southeast and Eastern Anatolia). Moreover, there are significant violations of women's human rights, such as honour killings, in these regions.

Academic circles, mainly feminists with western education, first drew attention to this problem in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in 1986 helped popularise gender sensitivity. The establishment of a national machinery for promotion of gender equity

was mandatory in CEDAW. However, the formal establishment of the General Directorate on the Status and Problems of Women took until 1990. The legal status of the Directorate is still controversial and there were significant difficulties in finding qualified personnel. From the beginning, the UNDP undertook a significant role in capacity building and establishing the relevant conceptual framework for policy formulation and advocacy.

This valuable contribution of the UNDP is recognised by NGO's, the Government, universities and all the other beneficiaries and was mentioned in the Review of the UNDP Country Programme in 2000 (see Box 3.1, Chapter 3). This contribution fell into two distinct phases – a phase with targeted support for gender-specific activities followed by a phase of mainstreaming. These two phases are discussed in turn.

(i) National Programme for the Enhancement of Women Integration in Development (TUR/92/006)

In 1992, the UNDP launched a project called the National Programme for the Enhancement of Women Integration in Development, which was an 'umbrella' technical assistance programme. It lasted until 2003 and it is still open financially. This project helped the Government develop human, technical and financial resources to enable Turkey to improve and enact its gender strategies. The programme had various activities that can be classified under four headings:

ACTIVITIES TO BUILD THE CAPACITY OF THE GENERAL DIRECTORATE AND OTHER RELEVANT GOVERNMENT OFFICES

The UNDP started to support institution building at the national level in the gender area in 1992 and has continued with programmes of capacity building support ever since. The staff of the General Directorate was introduced to the conceptual framework of international conventions thanks to the efforts of UNDP experts and documents. The UNDP facilitated the participation of bureaucrats and consultants in international conferences and conventions and it helped the national machinery in formulating its own policies and defending them in international platforms such as the Beijing Conference.

There was a significant deficiency of gender disaggregated data, which made it difficult to assess the existing inequalities in Turkey. With the help of the UNDP, a special division was established in the State Statistical Institute, and its staff was trained to gather such data. Many other state offices, including the SPO,

62. It is also recommended that all aspects of GEF funded programmes that are administered by the UNDP are to be fully mainstreamed by the Turkey Country Office management, i.e., managed as if they were part of the UNDP's regular programme and strategically and operationally integrated with other UNDP programmes as appropriate.

were encouraged with the help of this UNDP programme to incorporate gender as a dimension of their work. Some, such as the Ministry of Health, later incorporated gender into their targets.

ACTIVITIES TO BUILD INDEPENDENT EXPERT CAPACITY AND RESEARCH IN GENDER STUDIES

Under the UNDP Programme, agreements were reached with four universities. These enabled three of them to establish education programmes geared towards an MA degree in Gender and Women Studies, while the fourth university conducted courses towards certificates in gender awareness and income generating activities for women. Since 1996, the graduates of these programmes have constituted an important capacity in Turkey within universities, the bureaucracy, the private sector and NGOs.

Within this agreement, numerous research studies were conducted on different aspects of gender. This resulted in a better understanding of women's problems, especially in the periphery (villages, small towns, amongst urban poor) and contributed to gender awareness. Some of the capacity built up was later spun off to WB research that was oriented towards developing employment capacity for women (Women's Employment Promotion Project 1994) under a loan given to the Turkish Government for 'Education and Employment'.

ACTIVITIES ORIENTED TOWARDS AWARENESS RAISING, ADVOCACY AND SUPPORT FOR NGOS

Women's associations have existed for many decades in Turkey. However, many of them were either charity organisations or were not equipped with the contemporary concepts of gender awareness.

With UNDP contributions, gender sensitivity training programmes were conducted for NGOs, labour unions, municipalities, associations, professionals, political parties, police, Ministries and legal institutions. Moreover, a number of training programmes were conducted for women to empower them in politics and income generating activities, including skills training. Funds were also directed to small projects carried out by NGOs to establish Women's Centres that would have an inbuilt continuing education system, as well as provide a nursery, library, and health centre for the urban poor and for advocacy activities.

ACTIVITIES FOR ESTABLISHING INTERNATIONAL LINKAGES

With this project, many Turkish academics, experts and consultants had the opportunity to go abroad and learn

about the experiences of other countries. International experts were also brought in to develop research, establish training programmes, and help in policy formulation. The most important contribution of the UNDP in international activities, however, was to develop Turkey's own priorities toward the Beijing Conference in 1995 and facilitate the participation of the State Delegation and NGO's.

OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAMME

The overall impact of the targeted gender programme was highly favourable with lasting benefits:

- There was a paradigm change in the outlook on gender issues
- Significant capacity was built in the bureaucracy, universities, local Governments, unions, professional associations and NGOs
- Advocacy groups were organised and became effective
- Policies were formulated around certain legal changes, including the civil code, which was achieved in 2001

(ii) Gender Mainstreaming

After the Beijing Conference, the UNDP gradually began to adopt gender mainstreaming as its global policy to combat gender inequalities. This meant that gender issues were to be addressed not through free-standing targeted initiatives, but rather in the context of other programmes on a broad basis. By 2001, this approach was reflected in documents of the UN in Turkey, e.g., in UNDAF (2001-2005) and CCA 2000.

While the UNDP was 'mainstreaming' gender (which also meant direct projects on gender were very limited, as was the budget for those projects), the Turkish Government was elevating EU accession as its principal national goal. EU requirements and the *Acquis* are particularly weak in regard to gender issues as they are mainly limited to employment. There is a very small chapter on Women and Family in the 8th Five-Year Plan⁶³ which states that there will be precautions taken so that women can benefit from equal opportunities, improve their education and participation in the development process, working life and decision making mechanisms. In the present Government's statements on national development programmes and priorities, gender issues are almost nonexistent except for a phrase in which their motherhood role is emphasised.

63. Long Term Strategy and 8th National Development Plan (2001-2005), Item 814, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/viii/plan8i.pdf>, 2003.

In the UNDP Country Office's new Vision Statement gender is mentioned, but not further elaborated on in the accompanying references. The unavoidable conclusion appears to be that gender issues are no longer as much of a national and UNDP priority as they were through much of the 1990s. The question remains whether gender mainstreaming has worked in the programmes and projects supported by the UNDP. This is considered in the following section.

GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN ON-GOING UNDP PROJECTS

- **GAP/GİDEMs:** In the first phase of the project, there were some income-generating activities for women. In the second phase, as the GİDEMs evolved more into professional business development agencies, activities oriented towards women decreased because apparently there was little demand from women. Only the Diyarbakır GİDEM is planning some training programmes specifically for women.
- **LEAP Projects:** The project coordinator admitted that they find it difficult to integrate women into their projects because of "traditional setbacks" (i.e., the traditional gender roles are hindering women's participation in activities since they cannot or will not attend mixed-gender meetings or because their husbands do not give them permission to leave their homes). The Entrepreneurship Development Centre managed to convene a training programme to teach organisational skills to women entrepreneurs. In the Participatory Rural Development Programme, baseline studies for women in three villages were carried out, and women were given training courses on home economics and agriculture. Even though women (usually professional women like nurses and teachers) are integrated into the District Development Council, they are evidently absent in the Village Project groups, and they do not participate in activities unless they are exclusively for women. Therefore, they are left out of the core of the project.
- **Local Agenda 21:** Every town/city establishing a council for LA 21 is asked by the coordinating unit, IULA-EMME, to establish a working group for women. This section of the LA 21 is supported by the Dutch-financed Societal Transformation (MATRA) Programme, under the project entitled "Enhancing the Role of the Women and the Youth in Local Partnerships and Networking for Transparency". As a result, each of the existing councils has a women's

working group, even though their success and permanence vary. Women's working groups try to empower women to participate in the local decision making processes. They design their own rules and working principles. Women's working groups in LA 21 have conducted numerous activities, ranging from aerobic classes to organising training programmes for income generating skills, from gender awareness courses to literacy classes. LA 21 has empowered women's groups to deal with local issues and solve them through access to the Government and municipalities. With UNDP generated funds, they organised a national festival in Bursa (2003) to compare their activities, and also to participate in a range of cultural activities. At present, there is a national council of women's working groups, which holds meetings in different cities through a rotation system.

GENDER THEMATIC WORKING GROUP

Under the leadership of the UNDP, a gender thematic working group of UN agencies was set up as an outcome of a UNDAF exercise.⁶⁴ This working group of the UNCT meets periodically, albeit at irregular intervals. The UN agencies, other than the UNDP, have projects targeting women within their respective interest areas. For example, ILO is planning to train women for the textile industry and is hoping to use GİDEM facilities in Adıyaman; UNICEF is carrying out a campaign for education of the girl child; UNIFEM has contributed funds to a project on domestic violence. However, there seems to be little coordination amongst the agencies, and they are also reluctant to contribute funds to the thematic group.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING

With some notable exceptions (in particular under the LA 21 project), one must conclude that gender mainstreaming has not been as effective as the earlier targeted capacity building programmes. While well intentioned as an idea, in practice gender issues get sidelined and neglected in the context of larger programmes. This tendency is reinforced where gender issues are not central on the agenda, as is the case now for the Turkish Government and for the EU.

64. UNDAF (2001-2005) recognised there are serious gender inequality problems in Turkey in education, health care, political participation and economic resources. The document further drew attention to regional disparities as well as rural-urban differences. It also developed useful gender objectives and strategies.

(iii) General Conclusions for UNDP's Gender Work

It appears that 'gender mainstreaming' continues to be the main policy of the UNDP in Turkey. The largest budgeted project is on Gender Equality, Mainstreaming and Policy Development. The other pipeline projects target women more directly, but have significantly less funding. They are oriented towards awareness raising and advocacy, including capacity building for greater involvement of women in local politics, and the translation of the optional protocol on CEDAW and its dissemination in parliament.

During the 1990s, the UNDP was a very important agent for introducing gender awareness and establishing national machinery and capacity building in the Government and civil society. Not only were the projects directly supported by the UNDP effective, but the legitimacy attained by being part of an international community helped women. The subsequent switch to a gender mainstreaming approach appears to have reduced the UNDP's effectiveness as an agent for change in this important area of advocacy and capacity building.

Gender is not one of the priority development goals of the present Government. Also, overcoming gender disparities is not a clear priority among the EU requirements set for Turkey's accession process, as the *Acquis* is particularly weak in gender issues. This makes it that much more important for the UNDP to re-establish its leadership role in advocating for explicit and targeted efforts to improve the rights and lives of women in Turkish society. Women's NGO's are still extremely weak, and many of them are not sustainable without international funding.

In principle, policies of mainstreaming are very important since they may enable scaling-up for gender policies. However, mainstreaming also involves a very delicate balance. If there is no strict planning, monitoring and follow up, and the executing agencies are not gender sensitive, or do not have the capacity, there is a danger that mainstreaming will be entirely ineffective. Indeed, the lessons from the UNDP's gender mainstreaming experience are that this is a serious danger in the case of Turkey.

The ADR Evaluation Team therefore **recommends** that the UNDP should continue to develop advocacy programmes and projects that directly target gender issues. Given the low priority that this issue has been accorded in recently published Government programme statements, NGO support and coordination with other international agencies should be considered as partnership

strategies. Among the specific areas where support could be given are the following: support for women's professional groups and associations, for improvements in the penal code, for victims of honour crimes and of violence against women, for programmes designed to improve women's literacy, and for greater awareness of gender issues in the general public and among the political leadership. Finally, the UNDP should seek, together with its partners, to strengthen the gender components of its governance and poverty programmes and address gender issues explicitly and systematically in its major analytical studies (including the NHDRs and MDGRs).

E. DISASTER AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS

Turkey is a country that has been prone to natural disasters, especially earthquakes, but also floods. According to a recent UNDP report⁶⁵ on natural disasters, Turkey is in fourth place (after Armenia, Iran and Yemen) among earthquake-prone countries in terms of its relative vulnerability. It ranks 35th among 95 countries in terms of relative vulnerability to floods. In recent years Turkey has also been affected by wars and insecurity, both on its own territory (in Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia) and in neighbouring countries, especially Iraq. Thus, the economic impact of natural and man-made disasters and the human suffering of earthquake and flood-affected people, of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) have been a recurring challenge for the Turkish authorities, Turkish civil society and the international community, especially the UN agencies. The UNDP has been assisting Turkey in coping with these challenges for many years, both in emergency response once disaster struck and also in improving the country's disaster preparedness and management systems.

(i) Earthquakes

Since 1998, Turkey was struck twice in quick succession by major earthquakes. On 17 August 1999, a major earthquake struck the Marmara region in Western Turkey, followed by a second major earthquake in the Bolu province, also in the Marmara region. The first earthquake was estimated to have caused some 15,000 deaths, left almost 25,000 injured and 675,000 people homeless. The second earthquake affected an estimated 80,000 people. The UNDP responded quickly to both

65. UNDP, "Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development", www.undp.org/bcpr/disred/rdr.htm, 2004.

disasters by immediately establishing sub-offices and antenna offices in the affected areas. These centres ensured effective coordination with local and central authorities, and provided support to UN agencies', donor countries' and NGO's activities in the disaster stricken region. International and national UN Volunteers were recruited to help staff these offices. UNDP emergency funding provided by UNDP Headquarters (USD 200,000) and by the UN Office for the Coordination of Human Affairs (OCHA; USD 100,000) was mobilised to help fund immediate humanitarian and logistical support activities. The UNDP also reoriented several of its regular programmes and launched new ones to help fill gaps between emergency and reconstruction assistance, with special attention given to social, environmental and good governance aspects of the recovery-related activities.⁶⁶ Much of the UNDP's Country Office capacity was apparently devoted to this important task of emergency response, displacing other ongoing activities (such as the preparation of the CCA). In view of the urgency and scale of the human disaster, this was certainly an appropriate decision and according to partners and other observers, the UNDP's emergency response activities were effective and highly valued.

Aside from providing emergency support in connection with earthquakes, since 1994 the UNDP has also been assisting Turkey with improving its disaster management and preparedness system. Before the 1999 earthquakes, this involved the establishment of a Disaster Management and Research Centre in the Middle East Technical University, and enhancements in Turkey's disaster management capacity through improvements in the existing institutional and legislative structure, research and studies in disaster preparedness and management, and training of Government officials at the local and central levels.⁶⁷ After the 1999 earthquakes a number of additional activities were initiated:

- The funding of a series of consultancies in the areas of disaster and emergency management system and capacity building needs assessment in support of a major WB project for earthquake reconstruction and disaster preparedness (USD 153,250).
- Execution in 2000 of two EU/ECHO funded projects designed to strengthen the coping capacities

of populations affected by the Marmara earthquake through training in basic skills and techniques for earthquake preparedness and through the establishment of legal advice and referral services for earthquake victims (USD 364,334).

- Implementation of a sub-project under the LA 21 Programme entitled "*Local Capacity Building for Disaster Prevention and Preparedness*", with assistance from the Swiss Government. This was designed to increase public awareness and preparedness for earthquake risks in three disaster-prone Western provinces through public awareness training campaigns and establishing a cadre of qualified trainers (USD 825,709). This sub-project is near completion.⁶⁸
- Preparation of a "*United Nations Disaster Management Plan for Turkey*", published on 1 July 2003. This document assembles relevant information about the roles and capacities of the various UN agencies located in Turkey that would be mobilised in response to a disaster event in the country. It also lays out how the UN Disaster Management Team (UNDMT) is supposed to operate. The report does not address in any detail the disaster preparedness capacities of the Turkish authorities.

It is not clear whether the UNDP's efforts to assist Turkey in building a strong disaster response capacity have had any significant lasting results. Some analytical and institutional capacity has certainly been built in various institutions responsible for disaster preparedness but, as the July 2003 "*United Nations Natural Disaster Management Plan*" document states, "at present there are different laws and regulations organising the division of responsibilities in disaster management among the national organisations and the boundaries among the areas of jurisdiction of these are as yet not clear." (p. 29) In particular, there appear to be continuing uncertainties about the relative roles and capacities of the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement on the one hand, and the Prime Minister's Office on the other.⁶⁹ This is unfortunate, since Turkey remains under serious threat of

66. Special UNDP initiatives (some jointly with ECHO) in the earthquake region included the development of a regional management plan for rubble, improving the sanitary conditions and solid waste management system, use of clean and renewable energy in the UNDP-OCHA tent city, the establishment of Social Centers and Women's Support Centers, and support for micro enterprises. See www.undp.org.tr/CCrisisPreventionAndRecovery_C3.asp.

67. This programme was entitled "*Improvement in Turkey's Disaster Management Systems - TUR/94/006*" and was executed by the General Directorate of Disaster Affairs of the Ministry of Public Works.

68. An evaluation of this sub-project was carried out in October 2002 by a consultant who concluded that the project was on track in achieving its objectives of raising earthquake awareness and preparedness, as well as establishing a cadre of qualified trainers. But the evaluation raised the issue of sustainability, since it wasn't clear who would be responsible for continuation of the programme or expansion to other parts of the country.

69. The situation was not helped by a disagreement between the UNDP and WB in the aftermath of the 1999 earthquakes about whether to support the Ministry of Public Works in its established disaster coordination function (which had previously been supported by the UNDP) or whether to set up a new coordinating unit in the Prime Minister's Office (the option promoted by the WB under its large reconstruction project on the grounds that the Ministry of Public Works could not effectively carry out the interagency coordination function). Unfortunately, it appears that even now neither of the two entities seem to have a clear mandate or capacity to carry out this key function.

further earthquakes. As far as the UNDP's engagement is concerned, disaster management and preparedness has dropped out of the Turkey SRF 2002, presumably as part of the increased selectivity in the UNDP programme. Since other international agencies, in particular the WB,⁷⁰ are continuing to assist the Turkish authorities in this area, this decision reflects an appropriate division of labour, although it is regrettable that the UNDP is unable to build on its long years of involvement in an area that remains of very serious concern in Turkey.

(ii) The Iraq War

In the months leading up to and following the 2003 Iraq War, the UNDP took the lead in coordinating the preparation of international agencies (especially the UN agencies) for the impact on Turkey and neighbouring areas from what was expected to be a possible repeat of the 1990 Gulf War, when substantial refugee flows created a major human emergency in Southeastern Turkey and Northern Iraq. The UNDP and the UNCT cooperated closely with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in making contingency preparations for a major refugee influx. They also developed channels of communication with other concerned Government agencies, as well as with relevant NGOs. Fortunately, as it turned out, no significant refugee crisis developed and hence the contingency plans never had to be put into action.

A subsequent joint review by the Turkish authorities and the UNCT of lessons learned from this experience of emergency preparations (carried out in June/July 2002) concluded that much of the preparation process was well managed. However, further coordination, especially among and with national authorities on the ground, would be desirable, as would a clarification of the role of NGOs during a crisis, and a possible simulation exercise of general crisis preparedness, involving also UN agencies in New York and Geneva. That such a joint review was carried out was in itself a noteworthy and salutary fact, which appears to have been a first in Turkey and bears repeating in similar future situations.⁷¹

(iii) Internally Displaced People (IDPs)

As a follow up to the mission of Mr. Francis Deng, Representative of the Secretary-General on IDPs in May 2002, the Government of Turkey requested the assistance

of the UNCT in addressing the issues of the return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs in Southeastern and Eastern Anatolia (SEA). Following the Iraq War, this matter received new impetus when the Government requested the joint assistance of the UN, EU and WB to address the IDP issue as part of a broader effort to support the economic and social development of the SEA region. Based on its prior engagement in the region and its ability to quickly mobilise some, albeit limited, resources for analytical and possible piloting purposes, the UNDP is very appropriately taking a lead in helping to develop an approach to what is understandably a sensitive and difficult issue in Turkey.

(iv) General Conclusions for Crisis and Disaster Response

In Turkey, the UNDP has been successful in responding to emergencies and crises especially earthquakes, to the Iraq war, and now in preparing to assist the Turkish authorities in dealing with the IDP situation. In these crisis situations the UNDP and the UN system are at their best in responding quickly, effectively and in an overall well coordinated manner. The recent joint review with the Government on the Iraq war response is also an instance of best practice. The fact that during periods of protracted crisis response the UNDP is diverted from its long-term core activities is inevitable and needs to be accepted. But this also reinforces the notion that the UNDP needs to have a critical mass of budget and staffing resources in a country like Turkey if it is to function effectively, both in maintaining its engagement in core long-term activities and in maintaining its ability to respond effectively to crisis situations.

The UNDP's long-term efforts to assist Turkey in disaster management and preparedness capacity building seems to have resulted in few sustained results to date. This is mostly because of a lack of readiness by the Turkish authorities to address this subject in a decisive manner, but is also probably because of disagreements among international institutions and a lack of a clear model of how to scale-up limited interventions. Due to a need for focus, the UNDP's decision to disengage from this area is appropriate. Fortunately, this coincides with plans by the WB for a major engagement; hence the good groundwork by the UNDP will not be lost.

F. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS ON DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

Over the last decade Turkey has made significant progress in the key human development areas of governance, reduction of regional disparities and poverty, environment,

70. According to the WB's Country Assistance Strategy of October 2003 a "Seismic Risk Mitigation Project" is under preparation with a special focus on mitigating seismic risks in Istanbul and further strengthening the national capacity for disaster preparedness. The World Bank Institute is also considering the continuation of its engagement in this area in Turkey.

71. The ADR Evaluation Team did not come across a similar review following the crisis response after the 1999 earthquakes, for example.

gender and the fight to contain natural and man-made disasters. The UNDP has contributed to progress in key areas, most notably by:

- Putting a spotlight on Turkey's important human development challenges and advocating for change through the NHDRs
- Building local capacity for participatory governance under the LA 21 programme
- Converting regional infrastructure programmes in less-developed regions into programmes that comprehensively address Turkey's regional disparities in human development in the context of the GAP programme
- Raising environmental awareness, building Government and CSO capacity, and funding with the GEF many small projects in the area of environmental protection
- Raising awareness on and building national capacity to address important gender issues
- Responding promptly to national disasters and crises by assuring the effective coordination of UN support to national crises responses.

In the implementation of these and its other programmes, the UNDP faced many challenges from which important lessons can be learned for the future. These are:

- To be selective and focused in programme initiation, ensuring that the UNDP works in areas of its relative strengths
- To secure Government and other national stakeholders' ownership of the programmes initiated with UNDP support – some potentially important programmes were not completed due to lack of ownership by the implementing agencies
- To ensure that the successful programmes are sustainable and can be scaled up for lasting results and wide-ranging impact
- To monitor all programmes, whether successful or not, and evaluate their results for lessons learned on which future initiatives can be built

In addition to these challenges, the UNDP also confronted issues of resource mobilisation and operational modalities. These will be explored in the next chapter.

5

Resources, Methods and Approaches

Strategic positioning and programme results for development are directly linked to and dependent on the resources that an organisation such as the UNDP in Turkey can mobilise, and are related to the methods and approaches it uses to deploy these resources. The following sections discuss how these more operational aspects influence overall development results, and aims to draw some conclusions and recommendations in this regard.



A. RESOURCE AVAILABILITY AND APPLICATION

(i) The General Resource Picture

Over the long period of the UNDP's presence in Turkey, the resource picture has changed significantly at several junctures. Before 1990, the UNDP was seen as the key funding source for a number of projects. The Government looked to the UNDP for funding of ad hoc activities as well as strategic initiatives, and UN agencies looked to the UNDP as a financier of projects initiated by them. A major shift took place in the early 1990s, when the UNDP started new types of initiatives in two directions. On the one hand, it used a more strategic approach, for example through a broad-based umbrella project, which eventually helped to shift the focus of the Government GAP programme from infrastructure to a sustainable human development focus. On the other hand, the UNDP went outside its own sources of funding, and initiated the first in a series of MSAs, where the Government decided to channel WB funds through an implementation support arrangement with the UNDP and UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS). Since that time, MSAs as well as other non-core funding sources have represented the majority of financial programme resources managed by the UNDP Turkey office.

(ii) External Resources

Funding from the Government of Turkey has played – and continues to play – a large and dominating role in the UNDP's portfolio. To a large extent, the Government channels funds from WB loans through the UNDP in connection with MSAs. The benefits for the Government and the WB have been ensuring accountability and efficient implementation through UNDP systems and procedures, while the advantages for the

CHART 5.1: DONORS (1998–2005)**CHART 5.2: SOURCES OF UNDP TURKEY PROGRAMME FUNDS**

UNDP have been to maintain a certain level of critical mass in its programme and administration. Third party sources have also played important roles, such as Switzerland, EC and GEF.

The Chart 5.1 illustrates the distribution of funding sources since 1998.

For the UNDP, the implementation of MSAs has largely involved the delivery of administrative services such as procurement and contracting. For MSAs as well as for some programmes funded through cost-sharing, the substantive focus has been on the periphery of the core focus areas of the UNDP's own country programme. Since 2000/2001 however, as the importance of MSAs as

a funding source declined, there was an increasing focus of financial resources on poverty and governance. The current programme's financial picture has a much stronger relevance to key UNDP thematic areas than was the case in the 1990s (see Chart 3.1 in Chapter 3). Chart 5.2 demonstrates the shift towards using cost sharing and trust funds to a much larger extent than before, which allows for a stronger integration of externally funded programmes into the mainstream of UNDP thematic focus areas.

(iii) Future Resource Outlook


The outlook for 2004-2005 depends partly on the efficiency in delivery of approved external funding. To ensure an increase in the delivery efficiency, the Turkey Country Office needs to overcome constraints created by absences of several key senior staff for large parts of 2003, and it needs to successfully follow up on the thorough review and adjustment of business processes that took place at the end of 2003. To illustrate this situation, Chart 5.3 represents estimates of delivery of funds from different sources. It should be noted that this Chart represents a conservative estimate of approximately 50% delivery of currently approved programme funds for 2004-2005. If the current effort to re-build the UNDP's capacity on the programme side in Turkey goes smoothly, a significantly higher delivery might be expected.

Many interlocutors stressed the fact that the UNDP's services continue to be in high demand in Turkey. The comparative advantages mentioned include the position of the UNDP as an impartial and substantive dialogue partner, its ability to supplement and build Government capacity, and its expertise in local level governance and development. It is clear that a significant niche exists for the UNDP since neither larger or smaller donors, nor the Government, have the same ability to implement the requisite programmes at the local level and help build the needed capacity over the longer term. This should create a significant potential for future resource mobilisation. Hence in response to this demand for its services, the UNDP urgently needs to develop a sustainable funding strategy. This is also discussed in Chapter 3.

B. RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT – RBM

In Turkey, the UNCT went through the UNDAF process in 2000, producing an UNDAF document for 2001-2005. This was followed by the UNDP's preparation and approval of a CCF document, also for 2001-2005.

Based on the UNDAF and CCF, the UNDP office prepared SRFs for 2001 and 2002. In addition to

CHART 5.3: PROGRAMME FUNDING UNDP TURKEY (2004-05 ESTIMATES)

responding to the UNDAF and CCF, the SRF also took into account the existing portfolio of ongoing and pipeline projects, based on an evolution of the project portfolio over a number of years in consultation with Government counterparts. This exercise required retrofitting a number of project initiatives into the predefined framework of the SRF. In consequence, 32 outcomes were introduced to cover the rather broad areas of intervention intended for the UNDP through the scope of the UNDAF/CCF, and to honour existing relationships with Government entities in relation to ongoing and pipeline projects.

While reporting on the results achieved under the SRF for 2001 and 2002, the Country Office recognised that the original instruments were too broadly defined and started to take steps to reduce the number of intended outputs and outcomes. The RBEC also commented that further focusing was required, and in the beginning of 2003 the SRF was revised down to 11 outcomes (compared to the original 32). These resulting outcomes are listed in Box 5.1.

In spite of the added focus created by reducing the number of intended outcomes to the 11 listed in Box 5.1, it was felt that a further review of the programme focus was required. This was reflected in the report from the Comprehensive Audit performed by the UNDP's Office of Audit and Performance Review (OAPR) in late 2002, and was also a reflection of needs for focus and simplification proposed in the Country Review from early

BOX 5.1: INTENDED OUTCOMES DEFINED IN THE LATEST STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF)

- 1) Increased use by decision makers of sustainable human development concepts in policy formulation and implementation
- 2) Legislation adopted to enable the participation of CSOs in the formulation and implementation of economic and social programmes at the sub-national level
- 3) Improved efficiency and equity in the delivery of public services
- 4) The policy and planning framework of the country to incorporate a comprehensive approach to and specific targets for reduction of human and income poverty
- 5) The national policy framework reformed to achieve universal access to basic services
- 6) Improved capacity of authorities to plan and implement integrated approaches to environmental management and energy development that respond to the needs of the poor
- 7) Global Environment concerns and commitments integrated in national development planning and policy.
- 8) Policy statement and strategies incorporate gender equality as a specific objective.
- 9) Legislation for the reduction of domestic violence and trafficking in women and children enacted and enforced
- 10) Collaborative UN system support for monitoring progress towards MDGs
- 11) Sustained and more effective country level mechanisms within the RCS for substantive analysis, advocacy, planning and programming

2000. Consequently, the Country Office entered into a "visioning exercise" in the spring of 2003, commissioning a special study by an external researcher and discussing a new vision through an office retreat. As a result, a new Vision Statement was created for UNDP Turkey (see

Chapter 3).

A key question is how these various instruments have influenced programming strategies and programme outcomes in Turkey. Since 2000, and perhaps even before that, there has been a succession of initiatives to simplify and focus the programme. In spite of such initiatives, a wide range of thematic areas and project activities have continued to exist, and the necessary focus in the project portfolio has not emerged until recently. One reason for this conundrum seems to be the high dependency on external project financing. As a result of this, the UNDP took on many projects that were outside its core thematic focus areas because they could attract outside funding, were based on Government requests and served a useful development purpose. The process of delivering such a broad and multifaceted project portfolio has unfortunately rendered the RBM instruments such as the SRF less relevant as core management tools. Due to their lack of relevance, it appears that the office has been without effective management information systems for an extended time. Consequently, it has been difficult to ensure coherence between higher-level intended outcomes and actual project level activities and results, and equally difficult to demonstrate that the frequent changes in strategic priorities contribute to higher-level goals.

Another aspect of the disconnect between the SRF and other RBM tools and the actual evolution of the programme portfolio, is of a more systemic nature. The overriding Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF) goals as reflected in the SRF Goals and Strategic Areas of Support are defined for a four-year period at a time, in this case 2000–2003. As Turkey launched a new CCF in 2001, and several major events such as political changes, earthquakes and the financial crisis affected country and UN priorities, the predefined SRF was rendered less relevant. Trying to bring the SRF in line with rapidly changing country and UN priorities became a burden rather than a help in programme management, and the tools were reduced to a function of Headquarters reporting. It is likely that this situation applies in many countries beside Turkey, as many countries would experience significant changes in priority setting over a four-year period. Hopefully, the next cycle of SRFs under the MYFF starting in 2004 will be approached with more flexibility, allowing the Country Offices to utilise it as a more genuine management tool.

The good news is that the Country Office is already taking key steps to address this issue. The Vision Statement mentioned above is guiding the further tightening and development of the project portfolio, and

allows for an overriding set of goals that the Country Office can focus on while developing future projects. One challenge will be to translate the Vision Statement into an operational management tool, including a new SRF. Another (and perhaps more important) challenge will be to reconcile the need for increased focus on the UNDP's core thematic areas and comparative advantages, with the need for continued mobilisation of resources for these programmes at a reasonable volume. However, given the high relevance of the UNDP's new vision for Turkey's core development agenda, it is probable that this balance will be found.

C. OPERATIONAL MODALITIES

(i) Project Implementation and Execution Arrangements⁷²

The UNDP Country Office in Turkey has shown great versatility in using the different implementation and execution arrangements available to it to suit the needs of individual projects. UN agency execution was prominent in the past, with the UNDP serving in its traditional role as a central funding agency for UN technical cooperation. Like in most other countries where the UNDP operates, its role as a funding source for projects executed by other UN agencies has been diminishing and has now reached a stage where it is a minimal, almost negligible part of the active implementation arrangements. The major reason for this is the high priority given to seeking leadership by the host Government in the execution of projects. However, implementation or execution by UN agencies is still used on a selective, case-by-case basis, where their specific capacities are required.

Involvement by the Turkish Government and its various administrative units in project execution started at an early stage, well before the period under review in this evaluation. It has been systematically increasing, and continues to show a growing trend.

In the past, national execution has been mostly through central Government agencies, but in recent years, implementation or execution by sub-national Government entities as well as by academic institutions and NGOs has emerged as an important option. In all these cases, the UNDP Turkey Country Office has offered significant support for the operational elements of implementation,

72. The UNDP-specific term "Execution" refers to one agency (normally the Government or UN) taking overall responsibility for the implementation phase of a project, including substantive results as well as financial management and accountability. The UNDP-specific use of the term "Implementation" describes more in general the process, but can also specifically mean responsibility for delivery of inputs for one part of a project.

and recently a systematic cost-recovery policy has been introduced to cover the costs of the UNDP for providing these services.

In addition to creating an increased ownership by the Government for the programmes in question, the evaluation mission found that genuine capacity building is also taking place through national implementation and execution. It creates a capacity for operational project work in the entities involved, which may be useful for implementation of other projects funded by the Government or by other donors in the future. While there were also examples where a lack of ownership by the responsible Government entity led to delays in implementation or lack of sustainability, in general the ADR Evaluation Team recommends that the trend for increased national ownership is continued. When a partnership is formed around genuine ownership, the advantages far outweigh the risks. It is important to note, however, that the issue of national ownership does not have to be directly tied to national execution. National ownership may also be achieved when the UNDP takes direct administrative responsibility for implementation, as discussed below as well as in Chapter 3, Section C.

(ii) Direct Execution by the UNDP

This modality has so far been used rather sparingly by the UNDP in Turkey. While much UNDP direct support is provided for national execution as well as for MSAs, the fact remains that ultimate accountability for the implementation under these modalities lies either with the Government or with UNOPS. Part of the reason is historic, and part is tied to the procedural constraint that direct execution by the UNDP is only to be used in special circumstances. However, for those programmes where direct UNDP execution was used, it was clear to the evaluation mission that significant benefits occurred.

In the case of alternative mechanisms, the UNDP is required to go through other actors to put operational activities such as contracting, procurement, payment, recruitment etc. into practice, and can only do this directly when it is done on behalf of others. This has a tendency of creating an unnecessary number of layers between funding and implementation of an activity, and the mission became aware of several examples where this was perceived to have led to administrative cost increases, operational delays as well as weaknesses in monitoring and reporting.

For the future, it appears worthwhile for the UNDP to move towards direct execution of projects in Turkey. While the Government and other national entities should be closely involved with a project to ensure ownership and

capacity building, a carefully targeted, wider use of direct execution would enable the UNDP to better serve the Government and people of Turkey through more effective implementation of programmes, as well as by provision of its global knowledge services in the field of development.

(iii) Management Service Agreements (MSAs)

In Turkey, MSAs⁷³ have represented a significant part of the volume of projects executed. The Government has asked the UNDP to implement these rather large projects because of its capacity to offer suitable and flexible arrangements for implementation support. Most of the MSA projects were outside the UNDP's main thematic focus as described by the CCFs or Country Programmes, but from the early 1990s, the UNDP had reduced access to funding, and was faced with the choice of either significantly reducing office capacity, or taking on additional tasks such as these MSAs.

An important point to note is that the MSAs have been operated in relative isolation from the UNDP's overall programme, and opportunities for synergies have been lost. The lack of links to overall programme development efforts have prevented the use of MSA-related capacity and experiences in new programme development. The last MSA is now coming to an end, with indications that neither the WB nor the Government will initiate new arrangements, as it is not seen as an effective contribution to Government capacity building. One of the most important lessons learned from more than one decade of implementing MSAs in Turkey is that major endeavours must be integrated within the overall programme, if the UNDP is to offer the best possible service to its clients.

D. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The UNDP's system for programme and project monitoring is based on close cooperation and distribution of work between UNDP core staff and the management of each project. In Turkey, responsibility for the implementation of projects has to a large extent been delegated to Government entities through national execution arrangements. In some projects, a dedicated project management has operated the project in a more or less independent manner, while in other cases project operations have depended on core staff of the Government entities. In all cases, operations and

73. MSAs are special arrangements where the UNDP in collaboration with UNOPS provides management and operational services according to a specific formula and legal agreement with the Government to support implementation of large projects, in this case based on WB financed loans taken by the Government for implementation of specific project activities.

monitoring of project activities have been dependent on support from the UNDP Country Office.

Monitoring and evaluation in Turkey have taken several different forms: preparation of progress reports by project staff, visits to the project site by UNDP staff, and review meetings conducted jointly by the UNDP and the Government. A significant number of project progress reports have been generated for the key projects related to GAP, LEAP and LA 21, but they do not seem to offer a full coverage for the project time periods, and few progress reports for other projects are available. In general, the progress reports are generated by project management and stress achievements in the field. Comments from some donors indicate that this reporting system has not been able to sufficiently pick up operational or other problems with a view to take timely corrective action or to draw lessons for future project extensions. Visits to project sites by UNDP staff appear to have taken place only on an occasional basis, and review meetings with the Government also appear to have taken place relatively infrequently.

Only one recent evaluation report was available to the ADR Evaluation Team, studying lessons learned from the LA 21 sub-project on disaster prevention and preparedness. No complete project evaluations or outcome evaluations appear to have been performed over the last five years. In response to the RBM methodology, ROARs have been prepared, commenting on progress against outcomes specified in the SRF. Unfortunately, the link between broad thematic outcome targets and specific project activities and results is not clear in the SRFs/ROARs and the descriptive text in the ROARs is not detailed or specific enough to allow identification of lessons learned, or to take corrective action based on unforeseen operational or substantive issues.

The use by management of outputs from monitoring and evaluation activities appears to have been restricted by a limited capacity on the substantive programming side. Over the last five years, a majority of the staff in the UNDP Turkey office have been engaged in administrative support for MSAs, in operational support for the UNCT, in disaster response after two major earthquakes, and in operational support for preparedness related to the Iraq conflict. As a consequence, very little capacity was set aside for substantive, analytical monitoring and support to ongoing programmes, or to future programme development. The office business processes are currently being re-engineered to ensure a stronger focus on core programme issues. A major challenge for the office in its new structure will be to ensure that lessons learned are carried forward, allowing future programmes to build on successes and achievements.

E. DISSEMINATION AND PUBLIC ADVOCACY

For an organisation like the UNDP, dissemination of key messages is crucial to carrying out its mandate for advocacy related to central issues, such as MDGs, where consensus and participation are absolutely needed for results. Advocacy activities by UNDP Turkey are organised through the following areas:

- Global and National HDRs
- Policy discussions at the country level, based on MDGs and the human development concept
- Private sector partnership
 - corporate social responsibility, leading “UN Global Compact” activities in Turkey
 - seminars organised under the leadership of the UNDP to introduce the private sector in Turkey to “Business Opportunities with the UN System”
 - contribution to Government/NGO level initiatives to improve FDI flow into Turkey
- Opportunistic/pragmatic approach in events/reports/Headquarter messages/relevant UN issues and Human Development Centre activities
- Programmatic activities

In general, this has been a very successful area for the UNDP in Turkey, especially since the creation of a Public Information Officer post in 2001. One indicator is the impressive list of media and other public appearances, as shown in Annexe 10. The UNDP is frequently referenced in the media and in speeches by politicians, and is widely recognised as a competent and impartial advocate for human development issues.

F. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS ON RESOURCES, METHODS AND APPROACHES

One of the biggest challenges that the UNDP faces in managing its operations at this key juncture in Turkey relates to continuing to rebuild substantive advisory and analytical capacity in the Country Office, through which it can take a full part in the development policy dialogue in Turkey. Urgent action is needed to get a firm handle on this issue, enabling the office to contribute to Turkey’s twin challenges – EU accession and deepening human development. Adapting, modernising and strengthening other operational modalities (RBM, implementation arrangements, monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination and advocacy) will also be important. In the area of monitoring and evaluation, there is a need for a thorough review of current systems and practices. In the other areas, promising new initiatives have been taken, for example through the visioning exercise, and these should move forward on an urgent basis.

6

Conclusion: Overall Results, Lessons Learned & Recommendations

This concluding section pulls together the main findings of the review of the UNDP's involvement in Turkey's human development efforts over the last five years. It offers a summary overview of the results and lessons learned from the UNDP's engagement in Turkey and outlines the major challenges and recommendations for the future.

It is important to remember that these conclusions are based on what was by necessity limited analytical and fieldwork by the ADR Evaluation Team, with very few project and programme-specific evaluation inputs available. Accordingly, the conclusions and the recommendations should be seen as indicative only, although it is hoped that they provide the UNDP's management and Board, as well as the Turkish authorities and other stakeholders, with relevant and timely input to strategic decision making and operational planning.

65

A. UNDP CONTRIBUTED TO IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENT RESULTS IN TURKEY

Over the last five years and beyond, the UNDP has contributed new ideas and agendas, built institutional capacity and achieved significant and lasting human development results in a number of areas by applying its limited resources flexibly, responsively and generally on a sustained basis. It has been able to do this with both programme as well as administrative budget resources. The main achievements can briefly be summarised as follows:

- **Governance:** In a difficult environment in Turkey where centralised Government and limited local participation was the rule for decades, the UNDP played an important role in catalysing greater participation and empowerment of local Government and communities through its flagship LA 21 programme. The key initiative under LA 21 – participatory City Councils – is now expected to become a lasting feature of local governance through the new legal framework that is being promoted by the Government.
- **Poverty:** Turkey has faced major challenges in the areas of poverty, regional disparities, and human development:

- The UNDP was able to link up with a major regional development initiative in Turkey's Southeast - the GAP programme - to help address significant regional disparities in Turkey. It was instrumental in turning the GAP programme from one that focused on infrastructure development into a programme geared to support human development in the region in a much broader sense. Beyond this, the UNDP's support for a number of projects, especially for small and medium business development, for rural and urban development, and for the development of women's and youth initiatives, set examples for the development of the local economy and social capital. While regional disparity remains a serious issue in Turkey today, some catching-up in the areas supported by GAP has been noted. The UNDP was also able to apply a number of the lessons from the GAP programme to the LEAP project in Eastern Anatolia.
 - At the national level, the UNDP's NHDRs were instrumental in transmitting the international human development analysis and debate to a national audience, focusing especially on regional disparities and gender inequities as key issues. It also helped Turkey engage in a dialogue about how to promote broad-gauged human development in key areas such as poverty, education, health and social development. The creation of the Human Development Centre in İstanbul with the UNDP's assistance provides the institutional capacity for lasting analytical, advocacy and advisory support to Turkey in this important area.
 - **Environment:** In Turkey, environmental concerns have traditionally not been integrated in the national policy debate nor have they figured prominently in public investment and regulatory reform. The UNDP helped gain environmental issues more prominence and built some environmental management and policy institutional capacity in the Government and among civil society. This was achieved through the UNDP's intensive engagement at the national level in Turkey's preparatory work for the 2002 Johannesburg Sustainable Development Summit and through the administration of the GEF Small Grants Programme. The UNDP's support was instrumental in achieving Turkey's ratification of the Climate Change Convention.
 - **Gender:** Despite some significant achievements in bringing about gender equality in Turkey since the creation of the Turkish Republic, gender disparities have remained significant in Turkey into the 21st Century. Over the last ten years, the UNDP has contributed significantly to increasing the awareness of gender issues in Turkey, both at the national and at the local level. It has helped build the institutional capacity in the Government and in civil society that is needed for lasting progress in achieving equity and inclusion for women in Turkey.
 - **Disaster and Crisis Response:** Turkey has been hit by major disasters and crises in recent years, particularly by serious earthquakes and by a potential refugee crisis in the wake of the 2003 Iraq war (which fortunately did not materialise). The UNDP was successful in helping to mobilise and coordinate the capacities of the UN agencies in close cooperation with those of the Turkish Government and civil society in responding to these crises.
- The key ingredients of successful engagement by the UNDP in these areas have been as follows:
- It was able to build effective coalitions with national, regional and local authorities, with civil society, the international donor community, UN agencies and IFIs in dialogue and collaboration.
 - It was able to bring in reliable international funding partners.
 - It stayed engaged over long periods.
 - It linked its national and local engagement successfully with global UN and UNDP initiatives.
 - It brought together national and international expertise and experience.
 - It helped create local institutional capacity in support of the advocacy and operational activities.
 - It responded to crisis situations quickly and with concentrated focus and full deployment of its institutional resources, even at the risk of neglecting some of its ongoing longer-term development initiatives.
- ## B. SYSTEMIC LESSONS FROM LESS SUCCESSFUL INITIATIVES AND THE CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE
- As documented in earlier sections, some of the UNDP's initiatives were less successful, and even some of the more successful ones faced difficulties. Important lessons can be derived from these experiences about the key systemic challenges that the UNDP faces in its work in Turkey:

- **Focus, Selectivity and Catalytic Impact:** Relative to Turkey's size, the UNDP has had, and will continue to have, very limited resources, both in terms of core programme funds and in terms of administrative budget and staff. It is therefore essential that these limited resources are deployed in a way that avoids the UNDP spreading itself too thin. They must be targeted in areas where the UNDP can clearly add value and act as a catalyst, where it does not duplicate or compete with others that have equal or greater capacity, where it can bring to bear its unique brand of international legitimacy and expertise in combination with a strong national staff contingent and national partner networks. One way in which the Country Office could assure an effective approach to the challenge of selectivity is to develop and systematically apply a set of "decision filters" in reviewing and deciding on new programmes and initiatives. These filters would include the just-mentioned criteria as well as others, including whether or not a proposal (a) clearly supports the mission of the UNDP in Turkey; (b) falls in the five priority thematic areas; (c) has strong Government ownership; (d) builds on UNDP's comparative advantage and track record; and (e) attracts adequate resources for achieving critical mass. The two country programmes reviewed for this ADR all suffered from an excessive scope and fragmentation of effort, which was reinforced by numerous ad hoc responses to various stakeholder requests, including those arising from changing internal UNDP priorities (e.g., Private Sector Compact and the Economic and Restructuring Initiative). Over the last year, the Turkey Country Office has made successful efforts to sharpen the focus of its strategic agenda, although there remain areas where tough choices must be made.
- **Ownership:** A key ingredient of success or failure was the extent to which the Government and key counterpart agencies were committed to a programme. For example, in the case of the GAP programme, the UNDP worked with the GAP administration, which was fully committed to the initiative. On the other hand, the national governance reform programme had to be cancelled partway into its implementation due to a lack of Government commitment and disagreements between the implementing agency and the UNDP about the strategic vision for the programme. In the case of the Environment for Development

Programme, there was commitment to the preparation for the Johannesburg Summit, but subsequently, attention flagged in the Ministry of Environment. The upheaval in internal management and staffing caused by the merger of the Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Environment caused further delays and disruption. Unfortunately, turnover in Government counterparts has also been frequent in other agencies and has significantly complicated and weakened UNDP programme impact. Assuring and maintaining counterpart attention, commitment and ownership will always be a major challenge for the UNDP, especially now that EU accession dominates the political and economic reform agenda in Turkey and as significant EU resources will flow to Turkey, next to which the UNDP's financing will pale in comparison. The challenge will be for the UNDP to find ways to make its programme clearly supportive of the EU accession process, but at the same time retain its own thematic vision and identity. The UNDP will also have to convince the Government and other stakeholders that the MDG agenda, with its focus on poverty reduction and human development, on gender inclusion and environmental sustainability – topics that may not always be central to Turkey's EU accession objective – remain very important for Turkey's long-term development.

- **Sustainability and Scaling-up:** Many of the UNDP's project initiatives in Turkey involve relatively small or pilot interventions, even when part of a larger programme (such as GAP, LEAP, etc.). A key issue confronting the UNDP in such small projects is whether or not the approach that is applied is sustainable over time without the external support of the UNDP and, if it is successful and sustainable, whether it can be replicated or scaled-up so that the impact of the initiative goes beyond a temporary and merely localised effect. In the case of the LA 21 programme, the City Council initiative appears to have met both the sustainability and scaling-up challenge to a considerable degree. It has established a legal framework, the City Council model has been replicated in a large number of localities and these Councils have continued to exist where they have been introduced. The key to this success seems to be a combination of strong local ownership with cost efficient approaches. Of course, the long-term impact of LA 21 in terms of bringing about a fundamental, widespread and lasting empowerment

of local Governments and communities remains to be seen. In the case of GAP/GİDEM, as in a number of other programmes, the UNDP and the project management recognised the importance of exploring sustainability issues and scaling-up opportunities. But for other programmes (e.g., the Malaria project, the GEF Small Grant Programme, etc.) it is not clear that these issues were ever seriously considered. Finding opportunities to link project interventions with policy advice and national institution building and vice versa, are key elements of a successful sustainability and scaling-up strategy.

■ **Monitoring and Evaluating for Lasting Results:**

All development programmes, and especially those which aim to pilot innovative approaches, need to be monitored and evaluated against baseline benchmarks to determine whether they are indeed models that are sustainable and replicable. Unfortunately, it appears that in Turkey, the UNDP has paid little attention to this requirement. Serious assessments of baseline institutional and social conditions have been rare, monitoring of progress of mixed intensity, and end-of-programme evaluation either non-existent or of relatively low quality. It is therefore not surprising that there appears to have been relatively little well-informed review and decision making by the UNDP and by the Government and its partners in terms of whether or not particular programmes and initiatives deserve to be continued, whether they have the potential to survive and be scaled up, and whether therefore they show promise of longer-term development impact. Even where – and perhaps especially where – projects fail, as has been the case with the national governance initiative, a “post-mortem” needs to take place so lessons can be drawn. If the reasons for the failure turn out to have been avoidable or of a systemic nature, appropriate conclusions need to be drawn for future projects. Too many UNDP initiatives seem to have simply petered out (e.g., initiatives on human rights, transparency, malaria, national governance, disaster preparedness, to name but a few), without a serious stock taking of what has been achieved and what lessons have been learned. Fortunately, there have also been cases where monitoring and evaluation has been carried out, as for example in the case of GAP/GİDEM. There the project management team commissioned an external technical assessment of the sustainability of the programme with a view to design approaches that would put it on a lasting

footing. The UNDP needs to invite the collaboration of the Government to establish a practice where drawing lessons from past programmes takes place routinely.

- **Results Based Management (RBM):** Part of the reason for the UNDP’s reduced attention to project monitoring and evaluation is the institutional shift to RBM at a country-wide level, combined with a deliberate down-playing of monitoring and evaluating results of individual projects and programmes as reflected in the SRFs and ROARs implemented since 2001. These tools of RBM have not yet been put to effective use, and in the judgment of the ADR Evaluation Team, are not likely to be used effectively in the absence of good project-level monitoring and evaluation and careful articulation of top-down/bottom-up results chains.

- **Implementation Modalities:** At its origins, the UNDP was mostly a central fund that channelled voluntary contributions by member states to other UN agencies. Now it is a development agency in its own right, and it also assists other donors and the Government with the implementation of their programmes. One major line of activity that was developed during the 1990s was for the UNDP to serve as an implementing agency for WB loan-funded projects through MSAs. However, these arrangements suffered from two weaknesses. First, the UNDP did not get involved in the substantive aspects of the project preparation and implementation and hence its value added was very limited. By the same token, the contribution of this work to the UNDP’s broader development objectives in Turkey was also very limited. Second, since the WB projects also set up Project Implementation Units outside the relevant Government Ministries, the capacity building impact – even in the narrow administrative domain – was limited and the administrative arrangements appeared to involve unnecessary layering and costs. Hence, MSAs are now being phased out. A similar layering problem, however, has also been observed in other programmes (e.g., LEAP). UNDP prohibitions against direct implementation by the UNDP (mandated by the Executive Board) require it to channel funds through other implementing agencies, even where it itself is a recipient of partner funds for programme implementation. This has raised programme implementation costs, hence introducing unnecessarily complicated implementation structures. The ADR Evaluation Team believes that Country Offices should have

more leeway to use direct implementation modalities.

- **Mobilising and Managing Resources:** From the early 1990s, core programme funding (i.e., UNDP's own resources) has diminished significantly and more and more of UNDP's activities required financial support from others, in particular other donors and the Government. With this shift in programme funding, the UNDP has faced difficulties maintaining the momentum of substantive programme focus in line with the momentum of actual project implementation. The relatively large volumes of project funds implemented outside the UNDP's core thematic focus have limited its capacity to pursue core thematic areas of work.
- **UN Coordination:** Coordination of UN agencies and their activities has long been a big challenge for the UN system. Turkey's recent experience has been no exception. The new instruments of CCA and UNDAF were too broad-gauged, unfocused and costly, with limited impact on effective day-to-day cooperation by UN agencies in Turkey. A new, more modest, focused and action-oriented approach, which has started with a team building exercise for the UNCT in Turkey, focusing on building trust and mutual understanding among the various agency heads, is now underway. A common orientation of the UN agencies towards Turkey's EU accession and MDG agenda will also help steer the UN agencies in a more visibly common strategic direction.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

In many ways, Turkey stands at a watershed. Important and difficult strategic decisions have to be made in the forthcoming months and years, which will determine the long-term future course of the country. The most important decisions relate to how best to prepare for and assure a smooth path to EU accession. But there are others, including how to maintain the recently regained financial stability and growth momentum, how to close the deep human development gap that divides Turkey from its OECD (and EU) partners, how to preserve the fragile ecological and cultural heritage of Turkey, and how to ensure the empowerment and inclusion of all Turkish people through a process of decentralisation and local capacity building. Of course, events external to Turkey will also play a role in how its future unfolds: the attitude of the EU and its member countries towards Turkey's membership, regional war and peace, the world economic trends and capital markets, the risk of natural disasters, to name but the most important. Fortunately, Turkey can

expect some help from the international community in coming to grips with these internal and external challenges. In this context, the UNDP is an international resource that fortunately has been in Turkey for decades and continues to be a key potential partner for the Turkish authorities and other stakeholders in Turkey.

If Turkey stands at a watershed, so does the UNDP in Turkey. Having for over four decades supported Turkey on its turbulent path to development and progress, and having over the last decade in particular made significant contributions in key areas – strengthening local governance, helping to reduce regional disparities, and working to build gender and environmental awareness and capacity – it now has to decide what its future role in Turkey is, on what lines of business and operational modalities to concentrate, and how to rebuild its own resource base which is under serious stress.

It is in this difficult and complex context that the ADR Evaluation Team endeavours to make some recommendations. These recommendations are aimed not only at UNDP's Country Office in Turkey – although it clearly has a key role to play in assuring that the UNDP's path in Turkey is properly charted – but at other actors as well. The Turkish Government, UNDP New York Headquarters, the UNDP's partners in Turkey, especially the UN agencies, but also the EU and the WB as well as other donors, are all actors who can and should consider how best to work with the UNDP to assure its greatest possible effectiveness for Turkey's benefit.

The ADR Evaluation Team has concluded that **there clearly continues to be a significant role for the UNDP in Turkey**. This conclusion was supported by repeated and consistent comments by interlocutors met during the mission. The challenge is now to **focus on the UNDP's comparative advantages**, and to **continue the new, action-oriented approach towards Turkey's EU accession and MDG agenda**. To make this engagement productive and sustainable, the ADR proposes the following set of more specific recommendations:

- **Build on the core message of the UNDP's new mission statement:**

“UNDP works in Turkey for democratic governance and growth without poverty, in support of EU accession and for the achievements of the MDGs.”

This is a concise and effective mission statement that will serve the UNDP well. One of the key tasks and challenges in delivering on this vision in the immediate future will be for the UNDP to demonstrate the relevance of the MDGs to Turkey.

There is currently little understanding and not much apparent interest in Turkey in the MDGs, as all eyes are turned to the EU accession challenge. However, the ADR Evaluation Team believes that Turkey faces major long-term challenges in meeting the MDGs and that doing so is indeed consistent with and complementary to Turkey's goal of successful integration with Europe.

- **Focus and build on the four established core business lines of the UNDP in Turkey: governance, poverty, environment and gender. Maintain the UNDP's capacity for coordinating emergency responses in case of natural disasters or other crises.** These are key areas for Turkey's long-term development. They are areas where the UNDP in Turkey has a strong track record, and they are at the core of its institutional mandate worldwide. While there are other international and local partners working in these areas, the UNDP has a clear role to play as further explained in the next recommendation. In addition, the UNDP in Turkey must continue to stand ready to play the coordinating role in case of natural disasters or other crises.
- **In these four areas, leverage the UNDP's experience in participatory and transparent capacity building for local Governments and communities and in dealing with regional disparities.** Given Turkey's history with a highly centralised state, the country faces major challenges both in its own modernisation and in preparation for EU accession. It must strengthen what are currently very weak, decentralised capacities at the regional, local and community level, and it has to close the gaps between the more and the less advanced regions in the country in the face of major regional disparities. Turkey and its major international funding partners (the EU, EIB, WB, major private investors such as BTC, etc.) will benefit from the UNDP's track record as well as its international experience and competence in these areas. Looking ahead, the UNDP will have to consider how best to adapt longstanding flagship programmes, or whether to open up new programmes responsive to the new challenges and opportunities in Turkey.
- **Assess all new initiatives, whether driven by UNDP Headquarter priorities, by Government or partner demands, or by the UNDP Country Office, against whether they pass the filter of the preceding three recommendations of the UNDP's priorities and comparative advantage in Turkey.** The UNDP will

always be subject to pressures to take on new tasks and new priorities. Given its limited resource base, there will be the risk of being stretched too thin across too many areas and activities. Hence clear focus and disciplined selectivity will be critical for the UNDP's long-term effectiveness. So, for example, new initiatives of cooperating with the private sector should be channelled and designed to coincide clearly with one or more of the four core areas of the UNDP's priorities in Turkey.

- **Build on the UNDP's international standing, capacity and experience in contributing to Turkey's development challenge while continuing to strengthen the strong national capacity and networks that the UNDP has built over the years in Turkey.** The UNDP has demonstrated that it can successfully connect international advocacy with national capacity building and project support. In recent years, however, it has not utilised as much of its international expertise in local programmes as might have been desirable and necessary for adding maximum value, given the UNDP's international standing, competencies and capacity. For the future, it therefore needs to package international and national expertise for optimal programme design and national capacity building. The Turkey Country Office needs to draw actively on UNDP Headquarters, the UNDP office in Bratislava and, as relevant, on other agencies to ensure effective international inputs into its work in Turkey.
- **Systematically evaluate and pursue the sustainability and scaling-up potential of UNDP programmes and projects.** The UNDP's effectiveness will depend critically on its ability to leverage relatively small and limited interventions into sustained and scaled-up efforts that go beyond the small pilot projects, training events or conferences. This requires a combination of the following inputs:
 - systematic extraction and dissemination of lessons learned through monitoring and evaluation of all programmes and projects
 - exploring and promoting policy, legal and regulatory reforms based on project-level experience
 - advocacy at the national or regional level in support of such reforms
 - linking up with, or supporting the creation of, institutional capacity in regional or national Government agencies or in CSOs, which will carry the agenda beyond the UNDP's pilot engagements

- **Ensure the establishment and maintenance of major and sustained partnerships, especially with the Government and with the EU, since much of the UNDP's leverage and resource mobilisation for the core areas of engagement will depend on the readiness of these partners to work with the UNDP.**

The Government and the EU will be the main agents of change and financial supporters for the programmes and initiatives with which the UNDP can further Turkey's progress in the four core areas of engagement. In fact, since most of the EU's financial resources (as well as WB, EIB and similar loan proceeds) will be channelled through Government Ministries and regional and local public authorities, the UNDP's key client and key source of funding (aside from its own limited core resources) will be the Government. Therefore, it will need to ensure that it has a clear understanding of Government priorities, institutional and financial mechanisms, and has the Government's full commitment to the programmes that it supports. The UNDP and the Government should consider regular, high-level programme review meetings with all key Government clients to ensure that there is a solid mutual understanding on programme priorities and to deal with systemic issues and concerns that interfere with effective programme implementation on both sides. There may well be other sources of support and funding that the UNDP Turkey Country Office may want to explore, especially by cooperating with the growing private and philanthropic sector in Turkey. But it should make sure a clear focus remains on core thematic areas and partners, to avoid running the risk of dissipating its limited capacity with little to show for in the end.

- **Revive the UNCT's work by stressing cooperative teamwork, providing for a clearly focussed set of common goals and operational priorities, and bringing in additional key international actors, especially the EU and the WB.** Over the past few months, the UNDP Resident Representative, in his capacity as UN Resident Coordinator undertook, together with the heads of other UN agencies, a new effort to revive the interest in coordinated and collaborative work by the UNCT. This initiative is on the right track and must be actively supported by all participants. The ADR Evaluation Team recommends that the Resident Coordinator and the UNCT (a) focus on EU accession and MDG advocacy as overarching common goals; (b) eschew the preparation of all-encompassing reports and

complex programmatic statements; (c) identify a narrow set of common areas of interest and activities with clearly articulated follow-up actions; (d) effectively monitor implementation of these actions; (e) annually update cooperative plans in consultation with key governmental counterparts; and (f) seek the active participation of other key agencies, such as the EC and the WB, as associate members of the UNCT. Furthermore, the UNCT must pool the limited amount of programme funds to strengthen the work of key inter-agency working groups.

- **The UNDP Country Office needs to adapt its operational modalities for project implementation to operate efficiently in helping to build local capacity, deploying demonstration projects and programmes, and scaling-up its operations.** The UNDP needs to avoid the layering of implementing agencies and entities that currently characterises many of its activities. This means a move towards direct execution in more of its projects. Aside from assuring that the UNDP is, and is seen to be, an efficiently operating development agency, this will contribute to building local capacity and ensuring that opportunities for scaling-up are being pursued.
- **The Government and the UNDP should regularly meet at a high level to ensure that new UNDP programme priorities emerge in line with national priorities, that agreement on priorities and commitment to agreed priorities are sustained and that systemic issues impeding effective implementation on both sides are addressed.** The UNDP can function effectively in Turkey only if it has the clear support of and commitment from the Government. Without this, there is a risk that the UNDP will soon cease to function as a significant development partner for Turkey. Considering the substantial challenges that Turkey still faces in the four core areas of the UNDP's engagement, this would be a serious loss for Turkey at a critical juncture.
- **UNDP Headquarters and the Turkey Country Office must work together in developing the new vision and strategies for the UNDP's work in Turkey.** The Turkey Country Office is currently going through a major exercise in recalibrating its vision, strategy and business model for Turkey. It will need the full support of UNDP Headquarters in this exercise. There are three areas in which this support is especially critical:
 - 1) Assure that Headquarter priorities are formulated in a way to minimise the perception and reality of excessively frequent changes in the

structure and content of the UNDP's agenda. Also, make sure that any Headquarter directives for specific initiatives in Turkey are consonant with the UNDP's comparative advantage and real partner needs in the country.

- 2) Provide ready access to international expertise and substantive skills to complement the strong national expertise in the Country Office.
- 3) Support a move to more direct execution of the UNDP's programmes and thus help increase its efficiency in Turkey by avoiding the need for institutional layering of UNDP's assistance.

The ADR Evaluation Team believes that the UNDP Management in New York and in Ankara is well equipped to respond to the challenges which the UNDP faces in the coming years in Turkey. Some of the recommendations summarised above were already under consideration at the time of the ADR mission or are being considered now for implementation. With these directions, the Team believes that UNDP can and will continue to make a significant contribution in the coming years to Turkey's achievement of its ambitious economic, social, environmental and institution-building goals.

Annexes

ANNEXE 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE – COUNTRY EVALUATION: ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS, TURKEY

A. Background

The Evaluation Office (EO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has launched a series of country evaluations, called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs), in order to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of the UNDP's contributions to development results at the country level. Undertaken in selected countries, the ADRs focus on outcomes and critically examine achievements and constraints in the UNDP thematic areas of focus, draw lessons learned and provide recommendations for the future. The ADRs will also recommend a strategy for enhancing performance and strategically positioning UNDP support within national development priorities and UNDP corporate policy directions.

The overall objectives of the ADRs are:

- Support the Administrator's substantive accountability function to the Executive Board and serve as a vehicle for quality assurance of UNDP interventions at the country level.
- Generate lessons from experience to inform current and future programming at the country and corporate levels.
- Provide to the stakeholders in the programme country an objective assessment of results (specifically outcomes) that have been achieved through UNDP support and partnerships with other key actors for a given multi-year period.

An ADR was carried out in Turkey in 2003. It covered the period 1998 to 2003, i.e. the Country Cooperation Frameworks (CCFs) for 1995-2000 as well as 2001-2005. The assessment also as necessary covered preceding periods where there was evidence that support prior to 1998-2003 served as foundation for present developments. Furthermore, the assessment is forward-looking and aims to contribute to future strategic positioning of the UNDP's programme in Turkey.

B. Objectives of the Assessment

The ADR evaluation will look at the results achieved for the period of 1998 to 2003. It will take into account both envisaged results under the 1995-2000 CCF as well as the 2001-2005 CCF, as expressed in the SRF. The evaluation will consider the key results and goals in this period, as described in Annexe 2, with the main intended objectives described in the

various planning instruments of UNDP (UNDAF, CCF, SRF) and the UNDP programme portfolio. In doing so, this ADR should take a forward-looking approach and contribute to strategic planning for UNDP programme interventions in Turkey in the future. The purpose of the evaluation is to review the experience of the UNDP in Turkey, draw lessons learned and recommend improvements for strengthening the UNDP's overall performance and support to the country. In doing so, the ADR exercise will focus more in-depth on certain key topics of relevance to past as well as future UNDP contribution to development results in the country. From discussions with a range of stakeholders and review of relevant documents, it is clear that EU accession is the main priority for the Government. A forward-looking evaluation will need to include considerations relevant to the accession issue. It is equally clear, and linked to the EU accession, that regional disparities in terms of governance and poverty are key development issues in Turkey today, and need to be included as a consideration for the evaluation. The areas of East and Southeast Anatolia require particular attention due to their development situation, which is also reflected in the establishment of special Government programmes for these areas. The UNDP's experience and comparative advantages further suggests that issues of poverty as well as local governance and capacity building would continue to be key areas of involvement and hence should be subject to review. Specifically, the ADR in Turkey will:

- Provide an overall assessment of the results achieved through UNDP support and in partnership with other key development actors during 1998–2003 with specific in-depth assessments of **Local Governance and Capacity Building**, as well as **Regional Disparities and Poverty**, which were identified during the exploratory mission undertaken in September. (See In-Depth Studies TORs.) The evaluation should also cover preceding periods in order to bring out the historic presence of the UNDP in Turkey and draw links from current achievements to early UNDP interventions prior to 1998 as appropriate. The analysis should focus on how the results were achieved, identify the factors that accounted for success or failure and draw lessons, with particular attention to:
 - *Results produced, effectiveness of approach, lessons learned and resulting strategic options relating to UNDP's interventions in Local Governance and Capacity Building.*
 - *Strategic approach and targeting, as well as the*

actual results produced to date, and resulting strategic options relating to UNDP's interventions in Regional Disparities and Poverty.

The issues of EU accession as well as regional disparities with emphasis on East and Southeast Anatolia are key issues that impact the UNDP's past, present and future programme, and should be seen as cross-cutting through both the above themes.

- Provide an analysis of how the UNDP has positioned itself strategically to bring added value and responded effectively to changing national development needs and priorities with special attention to:
 - *The entry points and strategy selected by the UNDP in support of the national development agenda, especially within its areas of focus, and in particular the overarching goal of poverty reduction;*
 - *The key current strategies of the CCF: partnerships for development, moving to upstream policy support, results orientation and intended entry points within the current framework*
 - *The nature and level of cooperation with different development partners.*
- Based on the analysis of key achievements and overall findings, draw lessons and provide clear and forward-looking recommendations in order to suggest optimal strategies for the UNDP in the future.

C. Scope of the assessment

The evaluation will undertake a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio and activities during the period under review, with a more in-depth focus on **Local Governance and Capacity Building**, as well as **Regional Disparities and Poverty**. Specifically, the ADR will cover the following:

1. STRATEGIC POSITIONING

- Assess whether the programme is effectively and strategically focused and selective, responsive to key client priorities and draws on UNDP's comparative advantages. Ascertain its relevance to national development priorities, including relevance and linkages with the overarching goal of reducing poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This may include an analysis of the perceived comparative strengths of the programme and a review of the major national challenges to development. The evaluation will assess UNDP support in relation to the Government's macroeconomic and social development policies and

strategies, the 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005), as well as priorities announced by the new Government. The aim is to ascertain the added value of UNDP support in effectively contributing to and influencing national development through strategic priority setting and intervening at optimal entry points.

- Assess how the UNDP has anticipated and responded to significant changes in the national development context within its core areas of focus. In this regard, the ADR may, for example, consider key events at the national and political levels that influence and affect the development environment; the risk management of UNDP; any missed opportunities for UNDP involvement and contribution; its efforts at advocacy and policy advice; and the UNDP's responsiveness. The evaluation should bring out the choices made by the UNDP in response to Government reforms and explain the rationale behind these choices.
- Review the synergies and alignment of UNDP support with other initiatives and partners, including that of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), the Global Cooperation Framework (GCF) and the Regional Cooperation Framework (RCF), as well as other non-UN partners such as bilateral donors, EC and Bretton Woods Institutions. This may include examining how UNDP has leveraged its resources and that of others towards the achievement of results, the balance between upstream and downstream initiatives and the work on MDGs.
- The Evaluation should consider the influence of systemic issues, i.e. policy and administrative constraints affecting the programme, on both the donor and programme country sides, as well as how the development results achieved and the partnerships established have contributed to ensure a relevant and strategic positioning of UNDP support.

2. DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

- Examine the effectiveness and sustainability of the UNDP programme by: (a) highlighting main achievements (outcomes) at the national level in the last five years or so (some results have their origin in efforts prior to 1998) and the UNDP's contribution to these in terms of key outputs; (b) ascertaining progress made in achieving outcomes in the given thematic areas of UNDP's support. The evaluation should qualify the UNDP contribution to the

outcomes with a fair degree of plausibility, and consider anticipated and unanticipated, positive and negative outcomes. It should also gauge the contribution to capacity development at the national level as well as the degree of national ownership and sustainability of these results. The assessment will cover the key results and support in all UNDP thematic areas (governance, poverty, environment, gender, HIV/AIDS, ICT) and any other areas as appropriate.

- Identify and analyse the main factors influencing results, including the range and quality of development partnerships forged and their contribution to outcomes, the provision of upstream assistance and policy advice and partnership strategy and the positioning of the UNDP.
- Assess the anticipated progress in achieving intended outcomes against the benchmarks and indicators set under the SRF outcomes (see Annexe 2), the CCF objectives and proposed future programmes and, where this is relevant, against the MDG targets.
- Provide an in-depth analysis of the selected focus areas, **Local Governance and Capacity Building**, as well as **Regional Disparities and Poverty**, and identify the key challenges and strategies for future interventions in each area. These subjects have been selected based on notable UNDP involvement in the past, complexity in terms of inter-linkages and synergies with other areas and the growing challenges expected in the next stage of the country's development challenges.

3. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

- Identify key lessons in the thematic areas of focus and in strategic positioning that can provide a useful basis for strengthening UNDP support to the country and for improving programme performance, results and effectiveness in the future. Through in-depth thematic assessment, identify good practices for learning and replication and draw lessons from intended and unintended results where possible.

D. Methodology

The assessment will employ a variety of methodologies including desk reviews, stakeholder meetings, client surveys, focus group interviews and select site visits. The Evaluation Team will review national policy documents (including the 8th Five-Year Development Plan 2001-2005, the Pre-Accession Economic Development Plan as well as other documents) that give an overall picture of

the country context and relevant policy issues. The Evaluation Team will also consider any thematic studies/papers, selected project documents and programme support documents, reports from monitoring and evaluation at the country level, as well as available documentation and studies from other development partners. Statistical data will be assessed where useful. Empirical evidence will be gathered through three major sources of information: documented records, interviewee perceptions and the validation of and cross-referencing of all sources and the information gathered through a process of ‘triangulation’. (See ADR Methodology Guidelines.) Documents reviewed will include, *inter alia*, the Country Review of 2000, the National Human Development Reports (NHDRs) published for the subject time period, the Comprehensive Audit January 2003 and the Visioning/Partnership Survey.

A wide **stakeholder** consultation and involvement is envisaged, using the already completed Visioning/Partnership Survey as a starting point. The Evaluation Team will meet with Government Ministries/institutions at the central and province level, research institutions, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and private sector representatives, UN agencies, Bretton Woods Institutions, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries.

The Team will visit **field/project sites** in a representative sample of provinces and communities to ensure a balanced coverage of all the country’s regions as will be decided by the Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Office in consultation with the Country Office. In terms of methodology, the ADR will follow the guidance issued by the Evaluation Office, and will consist of preparation (with preliminary desk review, programme mapping, TOR proposal, exploratory mission to the Country Office, theme-specific desk research and local studies and research); conducting the ADR by the country evaluation mission; and use of the ADR and follow-up (dissemination, corporate discussions, Country Office management response, stakeholder consultations, learning events).

Preparatory work at the local level will be carried out in advance to provide substantive background for the Evaluation Team. These in depth studies in poverty and governance will be conducted by local research institutes or companies. The Turkish Team will also be charged with conducting select surveys of key partners through questionnaires. The in-depth study work may entail the review of available reports, collecting additional documentation, conducting select interviews, field visits

and analysis and focus group discussions. This work will be based on specific TOR in addendum to these generic terms of reference.

E. Expected Outputs

The main expected output is the comprehensive final report on “*Turkey Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results*”, including relevant annexes with detailed data. In addition, supporting studies in poverty and governance will be available.

The final report by the ADR Evaluation Team, according to the suggested outline in the ADR Methodology Guidelines should at the very least contain:

- Executive Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations
- Background, with analysis of country context
- Strategic Positioning and Programme Relevance
- Programme Performance
- Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- Findings and Recommendations
- Annexes (TOR, abbreviations, persons met, documentation reviewed or references, statistics/national development indicators etc., details on the programme portfolio, overview of official development assistance, overview of intended results for UNDP, MDG indicators and status, country map).

Towards the end of their mission, the Evaluation Team will discuss its preliminary findings and recommendations with the Resident Representative and the Country Office staff and present these to the Government and partners at a meeting of key stakeholders. The Team will use this feedback to finalise the Report.

The Team Leader is responsible for submitting the draft Report to the Evaluation Office, UNDP Headquarters, no later than two weeks after completion of the country mission.

F. Evaluation Team

The composition of the Evaluation Team should reflect the independence and the substantive results focus of the exercise. The Team Leader and all the members of the review Team will be selected by the UNDP EO in consultation with the Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC), UNDP, New York and the Country Office. The Team Leader must have a demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice and in the evaluation and management of complex programmes in the field. The Team composition should reflect a good knowledge

of the country and region, excellent experience in evaluation and particular expertise in poverty, governance, environment and gender.

The Team will comprise two international consultants, one of which will be the Team Leader, and a staff member from the UNDP EO. The staff member from the EO will bring to the Team the Results Based Management (RBM) perspective, knowledge of the ADR methodology, familiarity with UNDP operations and knowledge of the UNDP's thematic areas. One or more UNDP staff members from another office will also be part of the Team, to bring additional competencies in UNDP priorities, especially in partnership development and on MDGs. In addition, one or more national consultant(s) with broad expertise and knowledge of the national development context and in at least one thematic area of the CCF or strategic area under the SRF will support the Team. The UNDP Country Office will assist the EO in the identification of suitable national consultants for recruitment.

Furthermore, the Team will base its work on preparatory research and studies by local research institutes, and questionnaire and survey results. The local research partners will also work in close collaboration with the international team of evaluators during the main evaluation mission.

G. Management arrangements

The EO will manage the evaluation and ensure coordination and liaison with concerned units at Headquarters' level. The Task Manager of the EO will lead the ADR process, in close consultation with RBEC and the Country Office management (RR/DRR) and the designated Programme Manager or ADR focal point in the Turkey Country Office. The EO will also ensure substantive supervision of all research, and determine the Evaluation Team composition. The general timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are given below.

The Country Office will take a lead role in dialogue and interaction with stakeholders on the findings and recommendations, support the Evaluation Team in liaison with the key partners and discussions with the Team, and make available to the Team all relevant materials. The Country Office will provide overall administrative support to logistics and planning.

The UNDP EO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ADR. These will include costs related to participation of the Team leader, the international and national consultant(s) and the EO staff member, the UNDP staff member on the Evaluation Team, as well as the costs of preliminary research and issuance of the final ADR report in English. The Country Office will contribute support in kind. The EO will also cover costs of any stakeholder workshops during the ADR mission.

TIMELINE/KEY MILESTONES FOR THE TURKEY ADR EVALUATION

Milestones	Dates
Headquarter Desk review and analysis of documentation	June 2003
Exploratory mission to country by EO Task Manager	September 2003
Draft TOR finalised and distributed	End October 2003
Start of research preparatory studies and surveys at country level	End October 2003
Completion of preparatory studies and surveys at country level	January 2004
Identification/selection of external consultants	By mid November 2003
Consultations with Headquarter units and persons	September – December 2003
Country mission/Independent review by external consultants	January 2004
Submission of draft Report by Evaluation Team	End February 2004
Circulation of draft Report for feedback	End March 2004
Completion of final Report	June 2004
Issuance of final Report	July-August 2004
Consultations and follow-up	May-December 2004

ANNEXE 2: TURKEY: SRF OUTCOMES – OUTPUTS

(Plan for 2000–2003 as of 2000. This was superseded by an updated plan prepared early 2003)

Governance	
OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
<p>G1 SGN1 SASN2- Policy Dialogue Increased use by decision-makers of sustainable human development concepts in policy formulation and implementation.</p> <p>G1 SGN1 SASN4- Regional and Sub-Regional Cooperation Increased regional and sub-regional economic and political cooperation.</p> <p>G1 SGN2 SASN4- Human Rights Effective Ombudsman and other human rights oversight bodies either established and/or in operation.</p> <p>G1 SGN3 SASN1- Participation at Sub-National Level Legislation adopted to enable the participation of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the formulation and implementation of economic and social programmes at the sub-national level.</p> <p>Planning and budgeting processes at sub-national levels reformed to more effectively incorporate community level perspectives, participation and needs.</p> <p>G1 SGN3 SASN2- Decentralisation Policies Financial and human resources mobilised and allocated in support of decentralisation and local governance in rural and urban areas.</p> <p>G1 SGN4 SASN1- Civil Service Accountability Improved efficiency and equity in the delivery of public services.</p> <p>G1 SGN4 SASN2- Financial Management Auditing and oversight of Government administered budgets and funds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dialogue with key policy making bodies and civil society strengthened; advocacy mechanism in place to give attention to rights-based approaches to development and good governance. ● UNV modality merged within the support of Turkey's Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC) strategy, enhancing the portfolio of agencies and institutions from which technical know-how and expertise exchanges are realised. ● Information on structure and mandates of Ombudsman Offices worldwide disseminated and elaborated on to define best modality for Turkish Ombudsman. ● Parliamentarians are active partners in promoting good governance practices at the sub-national and local levels. ● Multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms established and sustained at the local and sub-regional levels for formulation of social-economic programmes with a view to provide best practices in advocacy of legislative change. ● Citizen's platforms are consulted by the local administrations and central Government agencies in local planning and investment processes. ● Financial resources are allocated by the local administrations, through their respective budgets, in support of local consultative mechanisms. ● Financial resources are allocated from the national budget for supporting local platforms for decision making and incorporating local CSO views in the regional development plan. ● Training programmes for the technical staff of the central and local administrations on local governance, management and finance-related issues. ● UNDP supports transparency efforts of the Government particularly through use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), including adaptable software for adoption by key service delivering line Ministries and agencies. ● Strengthened capacities of the public agencies and the CSOs to develop and implement national programmes aimed at increasing efficiency, accountability and transparency in public administration.

Poverty	
OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
<p>G2 SGN1 SASN1- Poverty Reduction Strategies The policy and planning framework of the country incorporates a comprehensive approach to and specific targets for the reduction of human and income poverty.</p> <p>G2 SGN1 SASN2- Monitoring Poverty Improved national capacity to monitor (human and income) poverty and inequality.</p> <p>G2 SGN2 SASN2- Basic Social Services The national policy framework reformed to achieve universal access to basic services.</p> <p>G2 SGN2 SASN3- Access to Technologies An enabling environment created for the emergence of a local internet focused on the small and medium enterprise service sector.</p> <p>The policy, legal and regulatory framework reformed to substantially expand connectivity to ICTs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhanced advocacy and policy dialogue for target setting, and gender disaggregated for poverty and income disparities. ● Advocacy sustained for gender disaggregation in Gini Coefficient measurements and for poverty monitoring by an expanded pool of civil society and public sector actors. ● Models tested for increasing the access of the rural poor and vulnerable populations in less developed regions to basic services and other rural services. ● Consultancy and material support to small-scale software enterprises provided. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in Turkey's software industry promoted. ● Establishment of ICT units in Multi Purpose Community Centres (CATCOMS), Youth Centres and Investment Promotion Centres (GİDEMS) in less developed regions.

Environment	
OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
<p>G3 SGN1 SASN1- Policy Framework A comprehensive approach to environmentally sustainable development integrated into national development planning and linked to poverty reduction.</p> <p>G3 SGN1 SASN2- Institutional Framework Improved capacity of local authorities, community-based groups and private sector in environmental management and sustainable energy development.</p> <p>Improved capacity of national/sectoral authorities to plan and implement integrated approaches to environmental management and energy development that respond to the needs of the poor.</p> <p>G3 SGN2 SASN1- Regional Cooperation and Coordination Improved regional capacity to coordinate and harmonise national policies and programmes for management of shared natural resources and sustainable energy development.</p> <p>G3 SGN2 SASN2- Global Conventions and Funding Mechanisms Global environmental concerns and commitments integrated in national development planning and policy.</p> <p>Improved national capacity to negotiate and implement global environment commitments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● National Agenda 21 finalised in consultation with all stakeholders and implemented in priority areas. ● LA 21 sustainable development plans formulated in 50 partner cities and priority demonstration projects supported and implemented. ● Strengthened capacities of the Ministry of Environment and other key sectoral authorities to develop and implement integrated approaches to environmental management in close cooperation with the local authorities, CSOs, etc. ● National Black Sea Strategic Action Plan for Turkey implemented in priority areas and Nutrient Reduction Strategy for Turkey approved and implemented by the Government. ● National strategies and action plans, in support of global environment commitments, developed and/or implemented through demonstration projects. ● Strengthened capacities of Government agencies and CSOs to mobilise resources from the global environment funding mechanisms, and to manage/implement such projects.

Gender

OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
<p>G4 SGN1 SASN1- Policy Dialogue Policy statement and strategies incorporate gender equality as a specific objective.</p> <p>G4 SGN1 SASN2- Advocacy and Partnerships Media incorporating gender perspectives into their reporting.</p> <p>G4 SGN1 SASN3- Tools and Methods for Women Improved quality of decision-making based on gender assessments and integration of statistics and data on gender issues.</p> <p>G4 SGN2 SASN1- National Action Plans National action plan for the advancement of women jointly adopted, implemented and monitored by Government, legislature and civil society.</p> <p>G4 SGN2 SASN2- CEDAW CEDAW and its optional accord ratified, implemented and monitored.</p> <p>G4 SGN2 SASN3- Violence Against Women Legislation for the reduction of domestic violence and trafficking in women and children enacted and enforced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Institutional and budgetary framework in support of the National Action Plan for Gender Equality effectively identified and relevant policy documents backed up with appropriate gender budgeting across sectors. ● National Strategy for gender equality and gender awareness formulated and implemented. ● National Baseline Study conducted annually on women's status in the main development sectors, under KSSGM coordination with SIS, State Planning Organisation (SPO) and private consulting organisations. ● Action areas covered in the Government's report to the CEDAW Commission are followed up under the UNDP-supported national programme for gender. ● Financial and human resources and technical capacity required for effective implementation and monitoring of Turkey's National action plan in conjunction with CEDAW. ● Relevant CEDAW objectives covered under UNDP-supported National Gender Programme implemented. ● Grassroots activities against domestic violence and honour killing generate a broad based (including media) fight against these crimes and mobilise high-level political leadership for enforcement of applicable laws.

Special Development Situations

OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
<p>G5 SGN1 SASN1- Risk Reduction Common inter-agency approaches to disaster reduction and recovery formulated and applied.</p> <p>National and international disaster reduction policy informed by knowledge on contemporary trends and issues on disaster reduction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● UN system agencies have identified a common approach to disaster reduction through participation in the Disaster Management Training Programme (DMTP). ● DMTP launched, with the aim of preparing a road map for the formulation of a National Strategy and Plan of Action for Disaster Management incorporating vulnerability and risk reduction objectives.

UNDP Support for the UN	
OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
<p>G6 SGN1 SASN2- RC Global Agenda Collaborative UN system support for monitoring progress towards Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).</p> <p>Effective use of UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) to facilitate national response to the global goals.</p> <p>Increased awareness and support at the country level for the global agenda for development.</p> <p>G6 SGN2 SASN2-Coordination Mobilisation of UN partners to adopt common positions on development issues and achieve concrete development outcomes through the UNDAF.</p> <p>Sustained and more effective country level mechanisms within the RCS for substantive analysis, advocacy, planning and programming.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Priorities of conferences that are of primary interest to the UNDP reflected in Common Country Assessment (CCA) and indicators database, allowing the UNDP to take a lead role within the country for advocacy of the MDGs, notably halving poverty by 2015. ● UNDP led/supported specific initiatives for implementation and follow-up of national commitments to global conferences reflected in the UNDAF. ● All global conferences, conventions listed under the CCA and UNDAF and which fall within the scope of the Country Cooperation Framework (CCF), referenced in a major national policy/ strategy/planning document. ● Process of UNCT collaboration strengthened for completion of the CCA/UNDAF process and related follow-up. ● UNDP a member of all thematic groups that deal with subjects of relevance to its concerns/priorities as identified in its CCF and where UNDP has been indicated as a partner in the UNDAF.

ANNEXE 3: MAP OF INTENDED DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

UNDP THEMES	CP 1995-1999 OBJECTIVES	CCF 2001-2005 OBJECTIVES	UNDAF 2001-2005 FOCUS AREAS	TURKEY SRF OUTCOMES
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support preparation of National Human Development Reports (NHDRs) Promote and strengthen Turkey's capacity in Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building for civil service reform and decentralisation process Support coordination between local and national authority levels Involvement of civil society for enhancing effectiveness and transparency Multi-actor policy dialogue and participatory development facilitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened institutional effectiveness and capacity of Government Support adoption of international governance standards and principles in the context of EU accession Decentralisation Enhanced participation and capacity of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased use of sustainable human development concepts in policy formulation / implementation Increased regional and sub-regional economic, political cooperation Effective Ombudsman and other human rights oversight bodies Legislation to enable participation of civil society in formulation and implementation of economic, social programs at the sub-national level Planning and budgeting processes reformed at sub-national level to enhance community participation Resources mobilised to support decentralisation in rural and urban areas Improved efficiency and equity in the delivery of public services Auditing and oversight of Government administered budgets and funds
Poverty Reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support development projects for implementation of Agenda 21 Regional development in Southeast Anatolia Sustainable Human Development Programme (GAP) focusing on the community level Creation of social safety nets to reduce adverse effects of structural adjustment policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened capacities for local development initiatives Employment generation Improved access to basic services Development of new economic sectors Improved disaggregated data on poverty and alignment with WSSD goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved policies and strategies that enhance access to opportunities and reduce social and economic disparities Capacity building at national and local institutions Support vulnerable groups in less developed regions Support to environmental mainstreaming in executive and legislative decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive national framework for poverty reduction Improved national capacity to monitor poverty and inequality Reformed national framework for universal access to basic services Environment created for emergence of local internet focused on Small and Medium size Enterprise (SME) Frameworks reformed to substantially expand Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulation of National Environmental Management Programme Training of environmental specialists Enhanced environmental management capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental concerns integrated into social and economic development Sustainable natural resource management practices Environmental concerns integrated in policies, particularly in energy, agriculture, tourism sectors Improved local environmental planning Implementation of national environmental action plan Scaling-up of Local Agenda 21 (LA 21) initiatives to 50 partner cities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to environmental mainstreaming in executive and legislative decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive approach to environmentally sustainable development integrated in national development planning with linkages to poverty Improved capacity of local authorities, community and private organisations in environmental management and energy Improved capacity of authorities to plan and implement environmental management and energy development approaches that respond to the needs of the poor Improved regional capacity to coordinate national policies and programmes for management of shared natural resources and sustainable energy development Global environment concerns integrated in national development policy and plans Improved national capacity to implement global environmental commitments

UNDP THEMES	CP 1995-1999 OBJECTIVES	CCF 2001-2005 OBJECTIVES	UNDAF 2001-2005 FOCUS AREAS	TURKEY SRF OUTCOMES
Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National gender policy development Support national plan of action for women Enhance national capacities for gender-specific data collection Development of gender research activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender mainstreaming in all primary development sectors Optimal cooperation with sister-agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate gender equality in public and private domains Gender mainstreaming linked to sustainable development and women's empowerment Support Government and civil society to develop framework and institutional mechanisms that promote women's empowerment and gender equality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies incorporate gender equality as a specific objective Media incorporating gender perspectives into their reporting Improved decision-making on gender issues based on quality gender data National action plan for women's advancement adopted, implemented and monitored by Government, legislature and civil society Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and its optional accord ratified, implemented and monitored Legislation on women/children trafficking and violence enforced
Special Dev. Situations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish disaster management team Science and advanced technology development Project implementation services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved disaster preparedness and mitigation Better stakeholder participation in urban development issues 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common inter-agency approaches to disaster reduction and recovery National and international disaster reduction policy based on current information
Support for the UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following up on Turkey's implementation of the Global Agenda Urbanisation and preparations for HABITAT II Joint cooperation in programmes with UN FPA, UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Health Organisation (WHO), UN Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closer sister-agency cooperation guided by international conferences Better incorporation of WSSD goals Continued implementation of the Rio Declaration on Environment and LA 21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms for advocacy of UN conventions Support to capacities and financial mechanisms to achieve global agenda Assist Government in identifying gaps in the implementation of the global agenda and mobilise societal support for realisation of tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative UN system support for monitoring progress towards Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) Effective use of UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) to facilitate national response to global goals Increased country support on the global agenda for development Mobilisation of UN partners to adopt common positions and achieve development outcomes through the UNDAF Sustained and more effective country-level mechanisms within the RCS
Cross-Cutting Themes/ Objectives	<i>None specified</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective use of NHDR TCDC and expansion of Turkey's donor role Promotion of Information Technologies for equitable sustainable human development Improved integration of Global Environment Facility objectives Gender mainstreaming in all sectors and programming Facilitation of EU integration 	<i>Note that all the above are cross-cutting issues within UNDAF 2001-2005</i>	

ANNEXE 4: ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ADR	Assessment of Development Results
AKP	(Turkish Acronym for) Justice and Development Party
APD	Accession Partnership Document
BCPR	Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)
BDP	Bureau for Development Policy (UNDP)
BTC	Baku-Tblisi-Ceyhan (Pipeline Project for Caspian Oil)
CATOM	(Turkish acronym for) Multi Purpose Community Centres
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CCPR	Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CHP	(Turkish acronym for) Republican People's Party
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CT	Country Team
DESOB	(Turkish acronym for) Diyarbakır Union of Chambers of Tradesmen and Artisans
DHKV	(Turkish acronym for) Foundation for the Conservation of Nature
DISIAD	(Turkish acronym for) Diyarbakır Association of Industry and Businessmen
DEX	Direct Execution (by UNDP)
DMRC	Disaster Management and Research Centre
DMTP	Disaster Management Training Programme
DO	Designated Official for Security (United Nations)
EC	European Commission
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian aid Office
EEC	European Economic Community
EIB	European Investment Bank
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GAP	(Turkish acronym for) Southeastern Anatolia Project
GAP/RDA	Southeast Anatolia Project/Regional Development Administration
GCR	Gender and Crisis Response
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GİDEM	(Turkish acronym for) Entrepreneur Support Centres
GİMER	(Turkish acronym for) Entrepreneur Development Centre
GÜNSİAD	(Turkish acronym for) Association of Southeast Anatolian Industrialists and Businessmen
HD	Human Development
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HDRO	Human Development Report Office

ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ICTD	Information and Communications Technology for Development
IDP	Internally Displaced People
IFI	International Finance Institution
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IULA-EMME	International Union of Local Authorities, Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East
KADER	(Turkish acronym for) Association for the Support and Training of Women Candidates
LA 21	Local Agenda 21
LEAP	Linking East Anatolia to Progress
MAREV	(Turkish acronym for) Education and Solidarity Foundation of Mardin Domiciled in Istanbul
MASBAS	(Turkish acronym for) Mardin Free Zone Corporation
MATRA	(Dutch acronym for) Societal Transformation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDGR	Millennium Development Goal Report
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MIS	Management Information System
MSA	Management Service Agreement
MYFF	Multi-Year Funding Framework (UNDP)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NDP	National Development Plan
NEAP	National Environment and Action Plan
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non Governmental Organisations
NHDR	National Human Development Reports
NPAA	National Program for Adopting the Community <i>Acquis</i>
NPED	National Program on Environment Development
NPEW	National Program for the Enhancement of Women
NSC	National Security Council
OAPR	Office of Audit and Performance Review (UNDP)
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSI	Open Society Institute
PKK	(Kurdish acronym for) Kurdistan Workers Party
PNDP	Preliminary National Development Plan
RBEC	Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (UNDP)
RBM	Result Based Management
RC	Resident Coordinator
ROAR	Results Oriented Annual Report
RP	(Turkish acronym for) Refah Partisi (Welfare Party)

SEA	Southeastern and Eastern Anatolia
SGP	Small Grant Program
SME	Small and Medium-Size Enterprise
SPO	State Planning Organisation
SRF	Strategic Results Framework
SSF	Social Solidarity Fund
STGP	(Turkish acronym for) Civil Society Development Programme
SURF	Sub-regional Resource Facility
SÜRKAL	(Turkish acronym for) Sustainable Rural and Urban Development Association
TAC	Turkish Agency for Cooperation
TCDC	Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
TEMA	(Turkish acronym for) Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats
TESEV	(Turkish acronym for) Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation
TICA	Turkish International Cooperation Agency
TOR	Terms of Reference
TÜBİTAK	(Turkish acronym for) Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDCP	United Nations Drug Control Program
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDMT	United Nations Disaster Management Team
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIC	United Nations Information Centre
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WB	World Bank
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

ANNEXE 5: LIST OF KEY PERSONS MET⁷⁴**Government of Turkey****Prime Ministry**

Mr. Emin Zararsız, Deputy Under Secretary

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Asım Arar, Department Head,
Multilateral Economic Affairs

Mr. Altay Cengizer, Minister Counselor,
Deputy Permanent Representative of Turkey
to the United Nations

Mr. Oktay Özüye, General Director for Multilateral
Economic Affairs

Ministry of the Interior

Mr. Kaythan Kavas, General Director for
Local Administrations

Treasury

Mr. İbrahim Çanakçı, Under Secretary

Mr. Mehmet Rastgelener, General Director for State
Owned Enterprises

City of Diyarbakır

Mr. Sabahattin Acar, President of Diyarbakır Barr

Mr. A. Latif Aykul, Diyarbakır Union of Chambers of
Tradesmen and Artisans (DESOB)

Mr. Kemal Buluş, President, Chamber of
Environmental Engineers

Ms. Handan Coşkun, Coordinator of Dikasm

Mr. Cemal Değer, President of Labour Union of Food

Mr. Kemal Güven, Secretary of
Environment Committee

Mr. Ersan Ilcin, Secretary of Health Committee

Mr. Denis İpacık, Assistant Secretary of LA 21

Mr. Bülent İpek, General Secretary of LA 21

Mr. Niyazi Kavar, Expert of Planning
Department of Government

Mr. Vahdettin Özkan, Vice Governor

Mr. Necati Pirinçoğlu, Secretary of History, Culture and
Urbanisation Committee

Mr. Fetih Süvari, Assistant Secretary of LA 21

City of Mardin

Mr. Yılmaz Altındağ, City Council (President of Mardin
Chamber of Architects)

Mr. Cemal Artık, City Council

Mr. Ali İhsan Aytekin, City Council (Mar-Bir-Der)

Mr. Selahattin Bilirer, City Council (MAREV)

Mr. Şeyhmus Dinçel, City Council (Mardin Association
of Tourism and Culture)

Mr. Mehmet Düzgören, City Council (General Director
of MASBAS)

Mr. Temel Koçaklar, Governor of Mardin

Mr. Hulusi Kurtuluş, City Council (President of Mardin
Union of Chamber of Tradesmen and Artisans)

Mr. Aydın Saraçoğlu, LA 21 Secretary General

Mr. Abdulkadir Tutası, Mayor of Mardin

Southeast Anatolia Regional**Development Administration**

Mr. Muammer Yaşar Özgül, President

State Planning Organisation

Mr. Kemal Madenoğlu, General Directorate for
Social Sectors and Coordination

Mr. Ahmet Tıktık, Under Secretary

Mr. Ahmet Yaman, General Directorate for
Regional Development

GAP Administration

Mr. Ahmet Saltık, SÜRKAL (Sustainable
Development Association)

Mr. Olcay Ünver, Former GAP Administration Director

UNDP

Mr. Alexander Avanesov, Programme Manager

Ms. Seyhan Aydınligil, Former Assistant Resident
Representative (Programme) and Strategic
Advisor of UNDP

Mr. Hansin Doğan, Programme Associate

Mr. Erdal Esin, former Operations Manager

Mr. Parviz Fartash, Senior Programme Advisor

Mr. Kalman Mizsei, Assistant Administrator and
Regional Director

Ms. Yeşim Oruç, UNDP Programme Manager (Poverty)

Ms. Marta Ruedas, Deputy Regional Director

Mr. Jakob Simonsen, UNDP Resident Representative
and UN Resident Coordinator

Ms. Claire Van der Vaeren, UNDP Deputy
Resident Representative

Mr. Alfredo Witschi-Cestari, Former UNDP
Resident Representative and UN Resident
Coordinator in Turkey

Mr. Usame Yalçın, Operations Manager

⁷⁴ This list does not include stakeholders consulted by the National Research Teams under the leadership of Professors Özcan and Aruoba.

National Research Team

Prof. Çelik Aruoba, Faculty of Political Science,
Ankara University
Prof. Yusuf Ziya Özcan, Middle East
Technical University

United Nations Agencies and International Finance Institutions

Mr. Celal Armangil, National Director, UNIDO
Ms. Gülay Aslantepe, ILO Director
Mr. Odd Per Brekk, Resident Representative, IMF
Mr. Ajay Chhibber, former Country Director in Turkey,
World Bank
Mr. John Innes, Principal Social Sector Specialist,
Human Development Sector Unit, Europe and
Central Asia Region World Bank Office of Ankara
Mr. Gesche Karrenbrock, UNHCR Resident
Representative
Mr. Edmund McLoughney, Resident Representative,
UNICEF
Mr. Andrew Vorkink, Country Director, World Bank,
Ankara
Ms. Sally Zeijlon, former Country Manager in Turkey,
World Bank

Development Partners

Embassies and Consulates

Mr. Eric Boer, Dutch Embassy Official
His Excellency Sjoerd J. H. Gosses, Ambassador of the
Kingdom of the Netherlands
His Excellency, Ambassador Hansjorg Kretschmer, EC
Representative to Turkey
Ms. Monica Schmutz, Swiss Embassy
Dr. Kurt O. Wyss, Ambassador of Switzerland

Non Governmental Organisations

Prof. Feride Acar, Chair of the Political Science
Department, METU, and Chair of CEDAW
Mr. Halef Berent, Expert of 75. Street Children
Rehabilitation Centre
Ms. Filiz Buluttekin, Coordinator of Diyarbakır
Mother-Child Training Centre
Mr. Shamsul Alam Khan Chawdhry, Manager of
Reduction Poverty Project (Grameen Bank –
micro-credit system)
Ms. Sunay Demircan, STGP
Dr. Sadun Emrealp, National Programme Coordinator
for LA 21 and Acting Secretary General of
IULA-EMME
Mr. Tansu Gurpinar, DHKV
Ms. Zeynep Kaya, President of Diyarbakır Environment
Volunteers Association

Mr. Osman Kazıcı, Regional Manager of Turkish
Development Foundation
Dr. Cemal Talu, TEMA
Ms. Nevin Şenol, KADER
Ms. Ela Gökalp, UÇAN SÜPÜRGE

Projects and Programmes

LEAP

Mr. Erol Çakmak, Project Director, LEAP
Prof. Ziya Yurttaş, Project Coordinator, LEAP

GİDEM Centre/Office

Mr. Murat Gürsoy, GİDEM Project Management
and Coordination Office
Ms. Neşet Karaca, Mardin GİDEM Office
Ms. Selma Yılmaz, Diyarbakır GİDEM Office
Mr. Bülent Yüce, Diyarbakır GİDEM Office

Private Sector and Local Business Community

Mr. Şehmus Akbaş, President of Diyarbakır Association
of Industry and Businessmen (DİSİAD)
Mr. Fahrettin Akyıl, President of Exchange Commodity
Mr. Osman Akyıl, Association of Southeast Anatolia
Industry and Businessmen (GUNSİAD)
Mr. Hakan Altınay, Executive Director, Open Society
Institute, Assistance Foundation, Turkey
Dr. Abdurrahman Arıman, Secretary General
of YASED
Mr. Kutbettin Arzu, President of Chamber of
Commerce and Industry
Mr. Celal Balık, Administrative Manager of GUNSİAD
Mr. Abdullah Bas, Entrepreneur
Mr. Alican Ebedinoğlu, President of Union of
Tradesmen and Artisans Chambers
Mr. Ömer Faruk Tas, Member of GUNSİAD
Mr. Gökhan Özçelik, Marketing Specialist, AYGAZ
Mr. Can Parker, President, Turkish Economic and Social
Studies Foundation (TESEV)
Mr. Cahit Pekkolay, Board of Union of Chambers of
Tradesmen and Artisans
Dr. Şerif Sayın, Director, TESEV
Mr. Deniz Sungurlu, Cisco Systems
Mr. Raif Türk, Businessman
Dr. Oktay Varlıer, Vice Chairman, Alarko
Mr. Beşir Yılmaz, Vice President, Chamber of
Commerce and Industry
Ms. Ayşe Yırcalı, Project Manager, TESEV

Other

Prof. Dr. Halis Akder, Professor of Economics
Prof. Kemal Gürüz, former Chairman of the Turkish
Science and Technology Research Institute (TUBİTAK)

ANNEXE 6: DOCUMENTATION AND REFERENCES

- A. Buğra and C. Keyder, *"New Poverty and Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey"*, Report prepared for the United Nations Development Programme, Ankara, 2003
- Cagaptay, S. *"The November 2002 Election and Turkey's New Political Era"*, Middle East Review of International Affairs 6.4: (2002)
- Ege University, Department of Economics, Working Paper, *"The Effects of Public Infrastructure on Private Sector Performances in the Turkish Regional Manufacturing Industries"*, İzmir
- Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, First Regular Session, *"Second Country Cooperation Framework for Turkey (2001-2005)"*, 2001
- GAP/GİDEM, *Progress Report*, 2003
- K. Burritt, *"Micro Finance in Turkey, A Sector Assessment Report"*, United Nations Development Publications, No.2, Ankara, 2003
- OECD, *"Turkey Summary"*, Economic Outlook No.74, November 2003
- Reference to UNDP Report, cf. Section 4 A (v)
- The EU President Romano Prodi, *"Speech to the Turkish Parliament"*, January 15, 2004
- The EU Website for Turkey: www.deltur.cec.eu.int.
- The European Commission, Regular Report, *"Turkey's Progress Towards Accession"*, 2003
- The Republic of Turkey Website, *"National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis"*, <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/NPAA/up.htm>, 2003
- The Republic of Turkey Website, *"Preliminary National Development Plan (2004-2006)"*, <http://ejtyto.dot.gov.tr/plan/p-ndp.pdf>, 2003
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Draft Law on Local Administrations, Volume III"*, Para 86, p.106 (Unofficial English Translation), Turkish Prime Minister's Office, Ankara, 2004
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Draft Law on Public Administration, Section One: The Aims, Principles and Duties of the Central Administration, Part One: Purpose, Scope, Definitions and Basic Principles, Article 1"*
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Long Term Strategy and 8th National Development Plan (2001-2005)"*, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/viii/plan8i.pdf>, 2003
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Long term Strategy and 8th National Development Plan (2001-2005)"*, Item 814, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/viii/plan8i.pdf>, 2003
- The Republic of Turkey, *"National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis"*, <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/NPAA/up.htm>, 2003
- The Republic of Turkey, *"National Report on Sustainable Development"*, Turkish Ministry of Environment and UNDP, Ankara 2002
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Pre-Accession Economic Programme"*, Ankara, August 2003
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Preliminary National Development Plan (2004-2006)"*, Ankara, December 2003
- The Republic of Turkey, *"Programme of the 59th Government"*, <http://www.basbakanlik.gov.tr/english/59Programmeme.htm>, 2003
- The World Bank, *"Country Assistance Strategy"*, October 2003
- The World Bank, *"Country Economic Memorandum"*, October 2003
- The World Bank, *"Turkey Country Assistance Strategy"*, October 2003
- The World Bank, *"Turkey Country Brief"*, September 2003
- UNDP Turkey Web Site: www.undp.org.tr
- UNDP Turkey Website, *"National Programme on Environment and Development"*, www.undp.org.tr/DEnergyAndEnvironment_D1.asp

UNDP Turkey Website, “*Private Sector Development*”,
www.undp.org.tr/gc.asp

UNDP Turkey Website, “*Turkey Global Environment Facility and Small Grant Programme*”, GEF/SGP:
www.undp.org.tr/Gef_sgp.htm

UNDP Website, “*Turkish GAP Master Plan*”,
<http://www.gapturkiye.gen.tr/gap/index.htm/>

UNDP Website, “*UNDP Response for Earthquakes of 17 August and 12 November 1999*”, www.undp.org.tr/CCrisisPreventionAndRecovery_C3.asp

UNDP, “*Human Development Report Turkey 2001*”,
 Ankara, 2001

UNDP, “*Human Development Report*”, 2003

UNDP, “*Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development*”, www.undp.org/bcpr/disred/rdr.htm, 2004

UNDP, *Strategic Results Framework*, 2001 and 2002

UNDP, “*World Summit on Sustainable Development, Plan of Implementation*”, Assessment Report, Ankara, May 2003.

United Nations, “*Disaster Management Plan for Turkey*”, July, 2003, Ankara

United Nations, “*United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*”, 2001–2005

ANNEXE 7: TURKEY - COMPARATIVE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT DATA

	TURKEY		COMPARATIVE COUNTRIES Middle Income
	1980	2000	2000
General Data			
GDP per capita (Constant 1995 USD)	1,920	3,080	1,961
GDP (PPP, constant 1995 USD)	3,656	5,730	4,877
Population Total (millions)	44.5	67.4	
HDI		0.732	0.5 – 0.8
ODA (% of central govt. expenditure)	6.5	0.4	
Education Statistics			
Adult Literacy rate (%), (age 15+)	68.4	86.5	90.1
Gross enrolment ratio (%)			
Primary level	96.4	91.9	111.4
Secondary level	34.6	73.3	75.3
Tertiary level	5.4	23.8	22.0
Public expenditure on education			
Total spending as % of GDP	2.3	3.5	4.5 (1999)
Health Statistics			
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	61	70	69
Mortality rate, infant (per 1,000 live births)	103	38	34
Population and reproductive health			
Population growth (annual %)	2.4	1.4	0.9
Total fertility rate	4.3	2.3	
Contraceptive prevalence			
(% of women 15-49)	61.5	63.9	
Health services indicators			
Physicians (per 1,000 people)	0.6	1.3	1.9 (1999)
Hospital beds (per 1,000 people)	2.2	2.6	3.7 (1999)
Immunisation, measles			
(% of children under 12 months)	27.0	86	88
Immunisation, DPT			
(% of children under 12 months)	42	85	88
Gender Statistics			
Life expectancy at birth (years)			
Male	59.0	67.0	67.1
Female	64.0	72.0	72.0
Adult Literacy rate (% of people aged 15+)			
Male	82.8	94.4	93.4
Female	53.8	78.5	86.9
Labour force participation			
Female labour force (% of total)	35.5	37.6	42.2
Girls' enrolment share			
Primary level (%)	45.4	47.0	48.0
Secondary level (%)	35.2	37.5	45.5

Sources: World Bank, UNDP

ANNEXE 8: UNDP TURKEY VISION

A. Vision Statement

The United Nations Development Programme works for Democratic Governance and Growth without Poverty.

UNDP supports Turkey's ambitious reform agenda where EU accession figures prominently.

UNDP works with the Government, civil society and the private sector to find practical Solutions to Turkey's Development challenges and Manages projects to address them.

(24 July 2003)

The UNDP supports the reform agenda of the Government of Turkey, where EU accession figures prominently but not exclusively.

The UNDP partners with Turkey's Government, civil society and private sector to support policy reform for democratic governance and for combating poverty.

The UNDP is a strategic ally for Turkey in realising its vision for more participatory, accountable and gender responsive governance and better distribution of national resources. We also recognise and promote Turkey's potential to support other countries in their development efforts.

The UNDP provides policy support and project management services for Turkey to realise these goals. We draw from our global network of knowledge and build policy lessons based on a solid tradition of technical cooperation.

The UNDP advocates the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a platform for decision makers to steer national policies and programmes towards sustainable development.

B. Elements of a Vision for the Turkey Country Office

1. UNDP SHOULD ASPIRE

To be a visible, trusted and sought after policy adviser, that can contribute to Turkey's definition of its own vision and support the implementation of the country's development priorities, where the EU accession agenda features prominently, including issues related to social inclusion and an efficient, transparent and accountable public administration.

Policy advice

Policy advice is at the heart of the new UNDP and is where the UNDP is best suited to support Middle Income countries like Turkey. UNDP's role in Turkey should thus be focused on knowledge, partnership and policy advice.

Trust

Trust will not automatically come from the neutrality, universality and independence that characterise the UNDP because it is a part of the UN.

This is due in part to the perception of the UN in relation to its intervention in the Cyprus issue, to the reluctance of national institutions to receive advice from outsiders, etc.

Instead, trust will have to come from being seen as relevant and effective in policy making. Therefore, UNDP/Turkey needs to:

- Have something of substance to say about the central concerns of the Government and of society in general, with EU accession as a key driver of these concerns. This in turn requires that the Country Office keep pace with national change.
- Break the isolation of pilot projects, take them to scale for broader national relevance and translate pilot activities into policy lessons.
- Create opportunities / a forum for policy dialogue, systematically and reliably.

Visibility

UNDP/Turkey needs to build a virtuous circle where visibility, trust and credibility reinforce each other.

Visibility and strong image building should be the first entry point in order to break out of the current impasse. This could be achieved in a number of ways, including:

- Building on existing successes better
- Making better use of high visibility opportunities (e.g. public events)
- Engaging in topics that are of concern to the ordinary citizen (e.g. where are the victims of the 1999 earthquake today)
- Finding more creative ways to work with private sector heavy weights
- Being willing to tackle issues that raise sentiments (but not too political), e.g. in the area of human rights.

The Country Office should be opportunistic and hire a professional PR firm to make this happen. The Country Office should find champions/allies among influential players including public opinion leaders and policy makers.

2. THE UNDP SHOULD BE AT THE RIGHT PLACE

AT THE RIGHT TIME

To be at the centre of the national agenda requires being in the right place at the right time. The environment is conducive for the UNDP considering that Turkey perceives itself and is also perceived as an unsettled state, with new actors at the helm who have to deliver in a relatively short time. At the same time, knowledge, which is at the heart of the new UNDP brand, is a recognised weakness in Turkey's development.

There are a number of opportunities for the UNDP to provide policy advice in areas that are central /related to national priorities. In addition to poverty analysis, reduction of social and economic disparities and local governance (which the UNDP is already pursuing) these areas could include:

- Information and Communication Technology for Development (ICTD) (e.g. from the perspective of the knowledge economy, public administration reform, public-private partnership, etc.)
- Emerging donor role for Turkey and Turkey's involvement in sub-regional organisations (e.g. Black Sea, ECO, OSCE, etc.)
- Cross-border cooperation (which is also relevant for the EU)
- Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
- National Human Development Report (NHDR), making a much stronger use of the research conducted for the NHDR and creating similar knowledge in areas where other actors are less active
- Small and Medium sized Enterprise (SME) and micro-finance or micro grants in the context of decentralisation
- Cooperation with the private sector (approaching big players in a new way)
- Anti-corruption (brought back to the forefront by the new Government)

At the same time, there are a number of constraints that need to be considered, including:

- The national partnership environment remains fragmented
- UNDP interventions under the Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) remain fragmented within each of the two pillars of the CCF (poverty and governance)

- UNDP tends to start good processes but does not complete them to the point where they can make a difference
- There is a danger of putting too many eggs in the EU basket (so there is a need to focus on the *Acquis* as a guide for the orientation of national development rather than on accession to the EU per se)

3. UNDP NEEDS ALLIES AND RESOURCES

TO CARRY THE VISION FORTH

The amount of money the UNDP has to spend does not necessarily determine whether we have a place at the central table or not, but it affects our ability to speak out. We should incorporate visibility and image building more strongly into our resource mobilisation efforts. Since it is clear that the environment is not conducive for us to rely on one or two large projects for resource mobilisation, we should diversify our efforts and:

- Focus on delivery of political commitment of the new Government
- Focus on partners who are instrumental in this delivery
- Continue to develop partnerships with new, non-traditional partners, using new instruments (e.g. privately funded Trust Funds)
- Continue to work with the WB and the EU in parallel
- Continue to work with Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), assessing the extent to which they are power brokers in society.

C. The Vision Partnership Strategy

1. STRONG UNDERSTANDING OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA AND ENGAGEMENT IN IT

- The UNDP Country Review argues that "UNDP should be able to assist Turkey in identifying opportunities that will broaden the economic base of a state in a rapidly changing global economy, in part by leading it to intellectual capital and social resources – foreign and domestic – that can augment and sustain reform". In a dynamic environment, the Country Office will be judged in part by its level of analysis, policy advice and ability to implement.
- The UNDP must be in a position to anticipate, analyse and design interventions to respond to the effects of a loss of agricultural subsidies and shrinking urban sector, rising unemployment and related austerity measures, which make it difficult for the state to provide social safety nets for the most vulnerable. From a policy perspective, the UNDP

must be in a position to engage development partners and Government counterparts to limit adverse consequences on the most vulnerable. Simultaneously, the UNDP can add its voice to the policy realm.

Action Points

- Develop Country Office advisory capacity and improve knowledge base (or allocate the time to allow this to happen)
- Chart the national investment priorities, assess the Government's loan portfolio and its performance and clarify the potential cost sharing resources available through the Government budget
- Partner with academic institutions and think tanks to commission studies to evaluate impact of economic adjustment
- Assign staff to monitor policy criteria, requirements and trends as they relate to development agenda
- Strengthen Country Office technical capacity by hiring staff capable of engaging the economic reform agenda, perhaps based in Bratislava, with a portfolio of like countries
- Help Turkey craft an integrated social policy agenda that can support its reforming economy, as stipulated in the EU accession agreement
- Provide a stronger and more assertive contribution to macroeconomic and governance reform, the current UNDP fortes at the local level
- Create a platform for dialogue with the intention of preparing a National Plan of Action for Sustainable Development
- Strengthen alignment with national partners, with multiple entry points at all levels of Government planning, CSOs, bilaterals and others to obtain the perspectives, opinions and analysis of all levels of policy makers
- Caution not to lose touch with local authorities, beneficiaries and the most vulnerable sections of society
- Secure the trust of high level policy makers and decision makers

2. MAXIMISE THE ENTRY POINTS

- Turkey is a signatory of the Millennium Declaration. This is a tool with the potential to have a positive impact on Turkey's social development. As MDGs become an accepted UN system-wide measurement tool owned by national Governments, examples of excellent initiatives are in abundance. MDG caravans, local MDG Reports (MDGR), integrating

MDGs into national development plans, costing MDGs and integrating this into a National Development budget, leveraging civil society etc. are just some of the methods to ensure that sustainable human development is an integral part of any national development strategy.

- Civil society is relatively dormant in Turkey. A MDG participation and dissemination strategy can turn this around. For example, a consortium of Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in the Philippines called Social Watch was formed to monitor the WSSD progress and commitments. This same body is now monitoring MDGs as part of a larger international network. An active civil society is a natural partner, guaranteeing national ownership and accountability.
- The MDGR, Common Country Assessment (CCA), UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (to Executive Board in 2004), and Human Development Report (HDR) all offer new entry points to create and influence policy dialogue and strengthen new and existing partnerships. These entry points can be linked to the development of new or the strengthening of existing national action plans in a variety of sectors. Personal relationships, donor round table and regular briefings and exchange of information on the 'new UNDP' are all part of this process.

Action Points

- Create a road map to involve, invigorate and disseminate MDGs from the President's office to parliamentary committees, academics, think tanks and bilaterals to communities throughout the country
- Build on President's involvement in WSSD, create a platform for policy dialogue to put MDGs firmly on the development agenda
- Seek bilateral support to strengthen MDG costing and the measurement of success in reducing vulnerabilities via funding positions in the Human Development Centre, improving disaggregated data collection, income distribution analysis and poverty measurement analysis
- Work with the State Planning Organisation (SPO) to integrate MDGs into the 9th Five-Year plan in 2005
- Use MDGs to stimulate a new partnership framework with civil society
- Create a platform by engaging the higher echelons of public policy making as well as the politicians
- Put the UNDP portfolio at the centre of the policy

debate with new tools like MDGs and the NHDR

- Find a spokesperson and champion for the flagships from the start
- Use these opportunities to broaden consultations with communities other than outside primary partners

3. DIVERSIFY THE COUNTRY OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

PORTFOLIO: NEW INTERVENTIONS

- The UNDP will continue to build on its signature programmes in the areas identified in the CCF and detailed above. It must also use the new entry points as opportunities to revise and create its flagships. Flagships can be components of EU accession that the UNDP will stand behind, in areas like decentralisation or the creation of knowledge centres. Both decentralisation and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) appear prominently in the 8th five-Year Development Plan. They also compliment the objectives of development partners like the EU and multilateral banks. The Flagship could be a new addition to the UNDP Country Office portfolio.
- The 2004 HDR is devoted to ICT. It is designed to respond to questions of how to better use ICT to catalyse social development and foster good governance locally and nationally. This will provide an opportunity to raise awareness. The report, together with the e-governance pilot project, provides considerable scope for partnership, such as in the creation of an Aid Coordination database inside HDC or ICT projects (telecentres, ICT in schools, ICT for SMEs). The NHDR provides a platform on which to build a variety of new partnerships with non-traditional partners, such as the private sector.
- In the area of the environment, the Country Office must move fast to capitalise on Turkey's recent signature of the Convention on Climate Change. The Convention will result in more vigorous environmental standards. At the same time, global environmental funding windows should provide opportunities for investments in cleaner technology and enhanced productivity consistent with sustainable development objectives.
- In the area of disaster reduction and mitigation, the Country Office was the first to promote community-level preparedness, with the underlying aim of local capacity building and enhanced civic engagement. The UNDP has partners in this field, such as the World Bank and the European Investment Bank. However, not only does the UNDP have a

comparative advantage (and this is a service line in a corporate practice area), but given the seismic activity in the region, the need to strengthen this area is evident. TRAC 1.1.3 resources can be catalytic and provide the platform for dialogue with national partners and development actors active in this area. BCPR also has a trust fund for this specific service line that the Country Office may be able to access.

Action Points

- Find entry points where the UNDP can support the Government's effort to harmonise domestic regulations with the Convention on Climate Change
- Explore flagship projects in relation to EU accession
- Create a platform for dialogue in the area of Disaster Mitigation and Reduction

4. NEW AND DIFFERENT PARTNERSHIPS

WITH BILATERALS AND MULTI-LATERALS

- Given historical ties and its neighbouring countries' desire to support Turkey as a full-fledged member of the EU, an issue based partnership strategy should be devised targeting specific bilaterals. For example, a bilateral may provide technical assistance to support SMEs and privatisation or regional integration. For Germany, Turkey is a 'priority partner country'.
- Japan's JBIC does not have a presence in Turkey similar to that of the Council of Europe Development Bank. Networking with these potential development partners to determine areas of common interest should be a component of the partnership strategy.

Action Points

- Bilateral support to strengthen office capacity, e.g. JPOs or Interns from bilateral donor countries.

5. NON-TRADITIONAL ACTORS:

CAPTURE THE PRIVATE SECTOR

- The private sector has an influential role at the regional, national and local level. The size and reach of many Turkish conglomerates equal that of many multinationals. Market liberalisation and privatisation of state entities will increase competition and the demands on these firms. For SMEs the choices are stark: to compete in an increasingly modernised economy or to exit the market.
- A variety of UN initiatives are attractive to the private sector, such as the 'Doing Business with the UN' seminars and the upcoming İstanbul Forum. This market is also very lucrative. Although distorted by

the Iraq Oil For Food Programme - their procurement in Turkey increased from USD 1.2 million in 1997 to USD 17.5 million in 2000 - Turkey is among the top 10 suppliers of UNICEF's Supply Division globally, which will soon be expanded beyond the region.

- There is considerable scope for development in the area of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). Although Turkey has the largest economy in Eastern Europe, foreign direct investment is one-quarter of that in Poland. At the same time there are success stories of outward FDI. Reducing the barriers to FDI is also an area of policy dialogue with multilateral banks.
- The challenge remains to systematically link the private sector to overall social development at the national level. Recent work by the Country Office on the Global Compact may provide insight.

Action Points

- Continue partnership dialogue with the private sector
- Devise strategies to include the private sector in the social development agenda
- Link efforts in discussions with the private sector to on-going regulatory reforms

ANNEXE 9: LIST OF ALL MAJOR REPORTS PRODUCED, CONFERENCES ORGANISED AND NEW INSTITUTIONS SET UP ON/IN TURKEY BY UNDP SINCE 1998

Institutional Capacity

- 1997 Local Agenda 21 Citizen Houses in a number of cities
- 1997 Entrepreneur Support Centres in Diyarbakır, Adıyaman, Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Gaziantep (the last one is now closed)
- 2000 Middle East Technical University Disaster Management Research and Implementation Centre (Ankara)
- 2001 Sustainable Development Association in Erzurum, East Anatolia
- 2001 Youth Centres in Southeast Anatolia
- 2002 CISCO Networking Academy in Diyarbakır
- 2002 Human Development Centre (İstanbul)
- 2002 Entrepreneur Support Centre in Erzurum, East Anatolia
- 2002 CISCO Networking Academy in Erzurum

Major Conferences/Congresses in which UNDP was the Lead Actor/Organiser

- 2001 Ankara: MATRA (Dutch) Good Governance and Transparency Conference
- 2001-2003 Poverty Roundtables (December 2001, October 2002, September 2003, December 2003), Micro Finance Southeast Anatolia, WSSD (Johannesburg) National Preparation and Follow-up Conferences
- Bursa: LA 21 Women's Congress
- Ankara and Kuşadası: LA 21 Youth Parliament Congresses
- 2001 December, İstanbul: FDI Conference, in partnership with YASED (Foreign Investors Association)
- 2001 December, Ankara: National Human Development Report Launch
- 2002 February, Erzurum: Local Stakeholders meeting for Linking Eastern Anatolia to Development Project
- 2002 February, Ankara: FDI Conference, in partnership with YASED & TOBB
- 2002 March, İstanbul: Forum İstanbul, Vision for 2023. UNDP contributed with a session on

- HDR and parallel session for official introduction of Global Compact in Turkey
- 2002 March, Ankara: UNDP Conference on International Development Organisations, Middle East Technical University
- 2002 April, Ankara: Learning Forum for SMEs, on Global Compact
- 2002 April, İzmir: Regional Development Conference, EGEV
- 2002 May, Kars-Ardahan-Erzurum: Site visit with donors (SDC) for Linking Eastern Anatolia to Development Project.
- 2002 May, Ankara: Seminar to promote business opportunities with UN System
- 2002 June, Ankara: NEX-DEX regional training workshop
- 2002 July, Ankara: Launch of Human Development Report, 2002
- 2002 August-September: İzmir International Fair
- 2002 September, İzmir: Seminar to promote business opportunities with UN System
- 2002 September, İstanbul: Seminar to promote business opportunities with UN System
- 2002 October, İstanbul: Launch of Human Development Centre at Boğazçi University
- 2002 October, İstanbul: Official Launch of Global Compact in Turkey
- 2002 December, Ankara: UN Conference for AIDS, Middle East Technical University
- 2002 December, Diyarbakır: Launch of UNDP-CISCO CNAP at Dicle University
- 2003 March, Ankara: GMMG Declaration on Gender, International Women's Day on Gender
- 2003 March and December, Ankara: KADER Roundtable to support Female Candidates preparing for Nation-wide local elections
- 2003 April, Bursa: Seminar for business sector to promote UN Global Compact
- 2003 May, İstanbul: OECD Regional Roundtable: FDI for Countries in Transition
- 2003 May, İstanbul: Forum İstanbul, UNDP participated with Ben Slay, RBEC
- 2003 May, Gaziantep: Seminar to promote business opportunities with UN System
- 2003 May, İstanbul: Seminar to promote business opportunities with UN System
- 2003 June, İstanbul, HDC: Roundtable for Cultural Values: Preparatory for HDR 2004

- 2003 June, Ankara: Press Conference to promote Vote for a Female Mayor Campaign
- 2003 July, Ankara: Launch of Human Development Report, 2003
- 2003 July, İstanbul: RBEC; Regional Resource Mobilisation Workshop
- 2003 August, Ankara: Mission of SRSG on Iraq, Alvaro Sergio de Mello
- 2003 September, Konya: Seminar for business sector to promote UN Global Compact
- 2003 October, Kayseri: Seminar for SMEs to promote UN Global Compact
- 2003 October, Bucharest: UNDP-IHT Regional FDI Summit
- 2003 November, Erzurum: Launch of UNDP-CISCO CNAP at Atatürk University
- 2003 November, İstanbul: HDC: Regional Consultation Meeting on HDR
- 2004 January, İstanbul: Congress, Role of Business Sector in Sustainable Development

Major Reports

POVERTY SERIES:

- Poverty Roundtable 1, *“Emergence of New Poverty and Changing Welfare Regimes”* (2003), *“Micro Finance Sector Assessment”* (2003)
- 1998 National Human Development Report
- 2001 National Human Development Report
- 2001 Social Impact Assessment *“Cultural Heritage Promotion in Mardin”*
- WSSD Report, Action Plans
- The Role of City Districts (Mahalle) in the Democratisation of Local Administrations
- LA 21 Best Practices Report
- National Report on Sustainable Development and Highlights of Best Practices of Turkey

ANNEXE 10: MEDIA AND PUBLIC APPEARANCES IN 2003

Programme-Projects

- 1- AKŞAM, 6 January 2003: "Local Agenda 21 practices: Good example for local governance". Detailed coverage on the LA 21 concept and interview with project coordinator.
- 2- HÜRRİYET, 15 January 2003: "Platform of Environment for Sustainable Development". Report and picture featuring UNDP DRR attending the meeting.
- 3- AKŞAM, 30 January 2003: "E-governance attack in Cankaya". Application of Cankaya (Turkey's largest county) Municipality to join UNDP supported/managed LA 21 network.
- 4- HABERTÜRK, 27 February 2003: "UN Environment Fund awaits new projects". Report on UNDP managed GEF-SGP, projects and contacts at UNDP Country Office.
- 5- AKŞAM, 18 May 2003: "Young leaders meet in Ankara". Coverage of the LA 21 Youth Assembly, mentioning UNDP, RR, and the LA 21 concept.

Roma Human Development Report

- 6- ANATOLIA News Agency, 16 January 2003: "UN Report; Eastern Europe to work on harmonisation of Roma people". Report on the press release of UNDP Country Office on the Roma HDR.
- 7- RADİKAL, 17 January 2003: "Roma warning". UNDP's Regional HDR on Roma people
- 8- FİNANSAL FORUM, 22 January 2003: "Roma people, the Africans of Europe". Coverage of UNDP's Regional HDR on Roma people.
- 9- PARA (weekly magazine), 16-22 February 2003: "Can you enter EU with gypsies?" Coverage of UNDP's regional HDR on Roma people.

Human Development Report Launch

- 10- TRT, ATV, STAR, CNBC-e, NTV, SKY-Türk, TGRT, Kanal-D, Kanal-A, etc, TV coverage of the HDR Launch and press conference held at UN house by RR, 8 July 2000.
- 11- CNBC-e TV live interview (Levent Oğuz) with RR, on HDR-2003, and its implications on Turkey, 8 July 2003.
- 12- NTV live interview (Işın Eliçin) with PIO, on HDR-2003, and its implications on Turkey, 8 July 2003.
- 13- BBC World Service live interview (Kürsat Akyol) with PIO, on HDR-2003, and implications on Turkey, 8 July 2003

- 14- CUMHURİYET, 9 July 2003: "Even Albania is ahead (of Turkey)". Coverage of HDR Launch at UN House by RR.
- 15- MİLLİYET, 9 July 2003: "Cow is more valuable than humans". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 16- VATAN, 9 July 2003: "Call for guerrilla fight against IMF&WB policies". Coverage of global HDR Launch and UNDP Administrator's messages.
- 17- VATAN, 9 July 2003: "Only at 96th place". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 18- HÜRRİYET, 9 July 2003: "11 step decline in Human Development League". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages .
- 19- RADİKAL, 9 July 2003: "11 step decline in Human Development". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 20- SABAH, 9 July 2003: "The bitter bill". Front page coverage of HDR Launch.
- 21- YENİ ŞAFAK, 9 July 2003: "Quality of life worsens". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 22- SABAH, 9 July 2003: "7 million people live on 2 dollars a day, in Turkey". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages on its implications on Turkey.
- 23- AKŞAM, 9 July 2003: "Snap-shot of the crisis". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 24- ZAMAN, 9 July 2003: "11 step decline in Human Development League". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 25- YARIN, 9 July 2003: "Turkey declines to 96th step". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 26- Turkish Daily News, 9 July 2003: "IMF/World Bank policies failing". Coverage of global HDR Launch and Administrator's messages.
- 27- DÜNYA, 9 July 2003: "Report reflects effects of deep economic crisis". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages.
- 28- GÜNEŞ, 9 July 2003: "Turkey ranks at 96th place in Human Development". Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages .
- 29- FİNANSAL FORUM, 9 July 2003: Coverage of HDR Launch and RR messages on its relevance for Turkey.
- 30- SABAH, 10 July 2003: "Di Pietro Lesson". Article of columnist Erdal Safak (chief editor), on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.

- 31- VATAN, 10 July 2003: “Can’t go like this, we are falling”. Article of columnist Haşmet Babaoğlu (life-style), on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 32- RADİKAL, 10 July 2003: Cartoon of Emre Ulas, on Turkey’s decline at Human Development League and HDR.
- 33- CUMHURİYET, 10 July 2003: “Alligator’s tears”. Article of columnist Sükran Somer (labour issues), on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 34- AKŞAM, 10 July 2003: Disobedience campaign from U2 soloist”. Remarks of U2 soloist Bono, attending global launch of HDR in Dublin.
- 35- MİLLİYET, 10 July 2003: “Fumes for quality of life”. Article of columnist Çetin Altan, on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 36- HÜRRİYET, 10 July 2003: “Turkey’s Human Development Level”. Article of columnist İlter Türkmen (diplomacy), on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 37- MİLLİYET, 10 July 2003: “Development Criteria: Income, health and education”. Article of columnist Cüüngör Uras, on the HDR launch, indicators and relevance for Turkey.
- 38- YENİ ŞAFAK, 10 July 2003: “U2 soloist Bono to attend civil disobedience campaigns”. Remarks of Bono, attending global launch of HDR in Dublin.
- 39- YENİ ŞAFAK, 10 July 2003: “Civil disobedience for poor”. Front page coverage of U2 soloist Bono, attending global launch of HDR in Dublin.
- 40- Voice of America recorded interview (Mehmet İlhan) with PIO, on HDR-2003, and implications on Turkey, 10 July 2003.
- 41- AKŞAM, 12 July 2003: “Critical Status”. Article of columnist Oya Berberoğlu (economist), on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 42- CNN-Türk TV live interview (Esat Pala) with PIO, on HDR-2003, and implications on Turkey, 15 July 2003.
- 43- CUMHURİYET, 15 July 2003: “Global Inequality”. Article of columnist Mehmet Sucu (IT Life), on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 44- MİLLİYET, 17 July 2003: “Flames, flames, flames”. Article of columnist Çetin Altan, on HDR Launch and its implications on Turkey.
- 45- SABAH, 20 October 2003: “Miracle lives”. Special front-page coverage on Turkey’s poverty status based on HDR findings.

Activities in Support of Increased FDI Flow into Turkey

- 46- CUMHURİYET, 19 February 2003: “Competition for FDI”. Report on UNDP messages at press release announcing UNDP and IHT FDI Summit in Bucharest.
- 47- SABAH, 17 April 2003: “Re-construction of Iraq creates opportunities for Turkey”. UNDP RBEC Director Kalman Mizsei’s messages on FDI summit, UNDP and Business sector partnership.
- 48- CNBC-e TV live interview (Acil Sezen) with RR, on OECD roundtable on FDI for countries in transition.
- 49- PARA (weekly magazine), 30 March 2003: Special interviews with RR, RBEC Director on FDI for development and UNDP activities in Turkey.
- 50- CNBC-e TV, live interview with RBEC Director Kalman Mizsei, on UNDP RBEC activities and UNDP and IHT FDI conference.
- 51- Reuters TV, interview with RBEC Director Kalman Mizsei, on UNDP RBEC activities and UNDP and IHT FDI conference.
- 52- CNBC-e TV interview (Acil Sezen) with RBEC Director Kalman Mizsei, at FDI Summit in Bucharest, 14 October 2003.
- 53- CNBC-e TV interview (Acil Sezen) with Kalman Kalotay, UNCTAD, at FDI Summit in Bucharest, 14 October 2003.
- 54- CNBC-e TV interview (Acil Sezen) with UNDP Administrator Mark Malloch Brown, at FDI Summit in Bucharest, 15 October 2003.
- 55- CNBC-e TV interview (Acil Sezen) with Ben Slay, RBEC Bratislava Director, at FDI Summit in Bucharest, 15 October 2003.
- 56- CNBC-e TV, 16 October 2003, special live wrap-up programme on the UNDP-IHT FDI conference.

Seminars to Promote Business Opportunities with UN System

- 57- PARA (weekly magazine), 9-15 March 2003: “How to enter the refugee market”. Business opportunities for private sector with the UN system.
- 58- ZAFER, Gaziantep, 24 May 2003: “UN Procurement Seminar on 26 May”. UNDP’s seminars to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 59- TRT, OLAY TV, TGRT, various local TV coverage of the UNDP led seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System and messages of RR at the opening session, 25 May 2003.

- 60- TRT, Olay TV, TGRT, local TVs: Coverage of opening speech of RR at UNDP lead seminar: "Doing Business with UN System". Gaziantep, 26 May.
- 61- ZAFER, Gaziantep, 26 May 2003: "UN's First Seminar in Gaziantep". UNDP's seminars to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 62- AKŞAM, 26 May 2003: "UN invitation to a market of 5 billion USD". UNDP press release announcing the seminars to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 63- METROPOL, Gaziantep, 26 May 2003: "UN will procure from Turkey for Iraq". UNDP's seminars to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 64- SABAH, Gaziantep, 27 May 2003: "Turkish private sector should increase its share". RR messages during UNDP's seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 65- OLAY, Gaziantep, 27 May 2003: "UN Procurement Seminar". RR messages during UNDP's seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 66- DÜNYA, 27 May 2003: "UN: Iraq's needs to be procured from Turkey". RR messages during UNDP's seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 67- EKSPRES, Gaziantep, 27 May 2003: "We're working to increase your share in the UN tenders". RR messages during UNDP's seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 68- ZAFER, Gaziantep, 27 May 2003: "UN Procurement Seminar". RR messages during UNDP's seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 69- GÜNAYDIN, Gaziantep, 28 May 2003: "You don't get enough share from UN pie". RR's messages during UNDP's seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 70- AKŞAM, 26 June 2003: "Turkey is the leading food provider of Iraq". Special interview with PIO on WFP procurement from Turkey and UNDP's seminars to promote business opportunities with the UN System.
- 71- TRT, CNBC-e, EXPO-Channel coverage of the UNDP lead seminar to promote business opportunities with the UN System and messages of RR at the opening session, 28 May 2003.
- 72- CNBC-e TV, 28 May 2003, interview (Mr. Serdar Cebe) with RR, on UN/UNDP role to introduce private sector to business opportunities with the UN System, İstanbul seminar.
- 73- CNN-Turk TV, 28 May 2003, live interview (Mr. Serdar Cebe) with PIO on UN/UNDP role to introduce private sector to business opportunities with the UN System, İstanbul seminar.
- 74- AKŞAM, 29 May 2003: "10 million USD pipes and contracts a week". Article of columnist Zülfikar Doğan, on UN procurement for Iraq.
- 75- DÜNYA, 30 June 2003, report by Gulsen Cebeci, on interview with PIO on UNDP efforts to assist private sector in Turkey.

Corporate Social Responsibility- Global Compact

- 76- KENT, Bursa, 28 March 2003: "Global Compact will be promoted at Bursa Chambers". Report reflecting UNDP press release to announce UNDP-led Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 77- BURSA, Bursa, 28 March 2003: "UN Global Compact: Don't miss this seminar". Report reflecting UNDP press release to announce UNDP-led Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 78- TİCARET, Bursa, 31 March 2003: "UN's Global Compact principles to be promoted in Bursa". Report reflecting UNDP press release to announce UNDP-led Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 79- OLAY, Bursa, 1 April 2003: "Global Compact". Report reflecting UNDP press release to announce UNDP-led Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 80- HABER, Bursa, 1 April 2003: "Global Compact to be promoted at Bursa Chambers". Report reflecting UNDP press release to announce UNDP-led Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 81- BURSA, Bursa, 1 April 2003: "Good production, good lives: Global Compact to be promoted today". Report reflecting UNDP press release to announce UNDP-led Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 82- TRT, OLAY TV, TGRT, various local TV channels coverage of the UNDP-led Global Compact outreach seminar and messages of DRR at the opening session, 1 April 2003.
- 83- OLAY, Bursa, 2 April 2003: "We want unbiased president". Remarks of Employer's Unions Confederation, co-hosting the Global Compact outreach Seminar.
- 84- KENT, Bursa, 2 April 2003: "Global Compact seminar". DRR messages at Global Compact Outreach seminar.
- 85- TRT, TGRT, KonTV, various local TV channels coverage of the UNDP-led Global Compact outreach seminar, 1 November 2003.

- 86- KONYA COVERAGE (6 Items) to be transferred by TİSK PIO

Poverty-Disparities-HDC Centre Activities

- 87- CNBC-e TV interview with RR, on cultural diversities workshop organised by the UNDP Human Development Centre.
- 88- TRT TV interview with RR, on anniversary of Human Development Centre, and preparations for NHDR-2003.
- 89- Kanal-7, TRT, CNBC-e, wrap-up coverage including words of HDRO Director, RR, etc, on the anniversary and works of Human Development Centre.
- 90- MİLLİYET, 18 February 2003: “No one benefits from US Support”. Article of columnist Meral Tamer, discussing the lack of economic support of richer countries to poor nations, with reference to UNDP reports and policies.
- 91- The New Europe, July issue, monthly magazine, special interview with RBEC Bratislava Director Ben Slay.
- 92- SABAH, 22-23-24 July: “Poverty changes as capitalism changes”. Series of articles by Mehmet Altan on the new poverty aspect, based on UNDP supported scientific research on “New Poverty and changing welfare regime in Turkey”.
- 93- AKŞAM; 29 September 2003: “79 million population in 2015”. Report on urban-rural population projections based on data provided by HDR-2003.
- 94- SABAH, 20 October 2003: “Miracle with less than 1 dollar a day”. Special coverage on Turkey indicators at UNDP HDR, provided by Country Office.
- 95- SABAH, 30 October 2003: “Questions to disturb your mind”. Analysis by columnist Erdal Şafak (chief editor), on HDR-2003 data related to Turkey’s status with expenditure structures and comparisons with other countries.
- 96- AKŞAM, 3 November 2003: “Solution for development: Local Development Institutions”. Coverage on the analysis of ARI-think tank referring to UNDP’s HDR and development policies.
- 97- CUMHURİYET, 4 November 2003: “UNDP RR: Disparities, Big Problem in Turkey”. Report covering the 1st anniversary of the Human Development Centre and preparations for UNDP NHDR-2003.
- 98- CUMHURİYET, 5 November 2003: “UN Coordinator Simonsen: Turkey, Country of Disparities”. Special interview with UNDP RR.
- 99- TURKISH DAILY NEWS, 6 November 2003: “UNDP Report revealing major disparities”. Report covering the 1st anniversary of the Human Development Centre and preparations for UNDP NHDR-2003.
- 100- MİLLİYET, 7 November 2003: “Cheaters and cheated”. Article by columnist Çetin Altan referring to HDR 2003 and its implications for Turkey.
- 101- SABAH, 10 November, 2003: “On 10 November”. Article by columnist Erdal Şafak, referring to weak performance of Turkey at HDR 2003.
- 102- HÜRRİYET, 7 December 2003: Special interview with PIO, on UNDP activities.
- 103- AKŞAM, 17 December 2003: “Stars for Good”. Coverage on the match for poverty, UNDP sponsored football match featuring Ronaldo, Zigane, Beckham, etc.

Significant Meetings/Platforms for Policy Impact (OECD roundtables, Forum İstanbul, Sustainable Development Summit, etc)

- 104- HÜRRİYET, 3 May 2003: “Two Americans fight in İstanbul”. Article by columnist Gila Benmayor, on the discussion between Richard Perle and former UNDP RR Edmund Cain, on the relationship between poverty and security.
- 105- HABER-TÜRK TV: Live interview (Atilla Yeçilada) with Ben Slay, RBEC Bratislava Director, on the UNDP’s contribution to Turkey’s vision studies, 3 May 2003.
- 106- CNBC-e TV: Live interview (Artunç Kılınc) with Ben Slay, RBEC Bratislava Director, on the UNDP’s contribution to Turkey’s vision studies, 3 May 2003.
- 107- CNBC-e TV: Live interview (Artunç Kılınc) with Edmund Cain, former UNDP RR, on the UNDP’s contribution to Turkey’s vision studies, 3 May 2003.
- 108- CUMHURİYET, 27 December 2003: “Search for Sustainable Development”. Report to announce Sustainable Development Summit and the UNDP’s Role.
- 109- ZAMAN, 29 December 2003: “Development Congress to remind companies of their social responsibilities”. Report to announce Sustainable Development Summit and the UNDP’s Role.

UNDP & CISCO Partnership

- 110- HÜRRİYET, 1 June 2003: “Everyone to join the network”. Coverage on Cisco Networking Academy


Program (CNAP) and UNDP-Cisco partnership to expand this to provinces where UNDP manages human development projects.

- 111- HÜRRİYET, 9 November 2003: "Erzurum joins the network". Detailed coverage on the launch of CNAP in Erzurum, UNDP-Cisco partnership to expand this to provinces where UNDP manages human development projects. Special emphasis on MDGs.
- 112- BT Haber, weekly magazine, 10 November 2003: Coverage on the UNDP projects in Erzurum and UNDP-Cisco partnership to expand CNAP to Erzurum.
- 113- TEMPO, weekly magazine, 13 November 2003: "Dollars for future". Coverage on the launch of CNAP in Erzurum, UNDP-Cisco partnership to expand this to provinces where UNDP manages human development projects.
- 114- BT Haber, weekly magazine, 17 November 2003: "CNAP and Development Programme". Coverage on the launch of CNAP in Erzurum, UNDP-Cisco partnership to expand this to provinces where UNDP manages human development projects.
- 115- CAPITAL, monthly magazine, 1 December 2003: "Cisco Systems in Erzurum". Coverage on the UNDP-Cisco partnership.

Common UN System

- 116- TRT-TV (Live coverage and repeats at news bulletins) RR address to International Children Festival, 23 April 2003.
- 117- TRT-TV, TGRT, Kanal 7, various TV channels. President Ahmet Necdet Sezer's special message on the observation of UN Day, 24 October 2003.
- 118- TRT-TV, TGRT, Kanal 7, various TV channels. Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan's special message on the observation of UN Day, 24 October 2003.
- 119- STAR-24 TV (Miss Ceyda), live interview with PIO, on Iraqi crisis.
- 120- TRT-2 TV, live interview (Burcu Duru) with PIO, on Iraqi crisis.
- 121- NTV live interview (Işın Eliçin) with PIO, on Iraqi crisis.
- 122- CNBC-e TV, live interview (Levent Oğuz) with PIO, on Iraqi crisis.
- 123- TRT-TV, TGRT, Kanal 7, various TV channels: INCB annual drug control report launch.
- 124- AKŞAM, 27 February 2003: "AIDS message on coat, peace message on jacket". Report on the UN Secretary General's pins worn on his outfit during his mission to Turkey.
- 125- CUMHURİYET, 8 March 2003: "Low representation in parliament". Report on International Women's Day based on press release and declaration of the UN Gender Mainstreaming Group.
- 126- AKŞAM, 8 March 2003: "Women's movement". Article by columnist Ahmet Tan, referring to the UNDP HDR gender empowerment index.
- 127- MİLLİYET, 5 August 2003: "We cannot be an occupation force in Iraq". Coverage of the meeting of SRSG Sergio de Mello with MoFA Abdullah Gül during his special mission in Turkey.
- 128- CUMHURİYET, 5 August 2003: "Practical Path for UN". Coverage of the meeting of SRSG Sergio de Mello with MoFA Abdullah Gül during his special mission in Turkey.
- 129- HÜRRİYET, 5 August 2003: "Important role in Iraq". Coverage of the meeting of SRSG Sergio de Mello with MoFA Abdullah Gül during his special mission in Turkey.
- 130- VATAN, 5 August 2003: Coverage of the meeting of SRSG Sergio de Mello with MoFA Abdullah Gül during his special mission in Turkey.
- 131- SABAH, 5 August 2003: "Question about the occupation in Iraq". Coverage of the meeting of SRSG Sergio de Mello with MoFA Abdullah Gül during his special mission in Turkey.
- 132- AKŞAM, 6 August 2003: Special interview with SRSG Sergio de Mello on his special mission in Turkey.
- 133- NTV: Special live interview with SRSG Sergio de Mello on his special mission in Turkey.
- 134- AKŞAM, 27 September 2003: "UN: No excuse for discrimination". Coverage on the UN press release on the discrimination against an HIV+ child in primary school.
- 135- MİLLİYET, 27 September 2003: "UN supports Stance of Education Ministry". Coverage on the UN press release on the discrimination against an HIV+ child in primary school.
- 136- SABAH, 27 September 2003: "Could happen to anyone". Article by columnist Erdal Şafak, on the discrimination against HIV/AIDS carriers and UN press release on the discrimination against an HIV+ child in primary school.
- 137- AKŞAM, 27 September 2003: "UN Support to junior Y.O.". Front-page coverage on the UN press release on the discrimination against an HIV+ child in primary school.

ANNEXE 11: UNDP TURKEY COUNTRY OFFICE ORGANIGRAM, JANUARY 2004



ANNEXE 12: TURKEY COUNTRY MAP



Disclaimer: The above map is provided for reference only. The designations employed and the presentation of material on the map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNDP or the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The accuracy of data, boundaries, or geographic names is not warranted to be error free.



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Evaluation Office

One United Nations Plaza

New York, NY 10017, USA

Tel. (212) 906 5095, Fax (212) 906 6008

Internet: <http://intra.undp.org/eo>

or <http://www.undp.org/eo>

© 2004 United Nations Development Programme