



EUROPEAID/129783/C/SER/multi

FWC COM 2011 Lot 1: Studies and Technical Assistance in all Sectors

**EX POST EVALUATION
OF THE ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY
THE EU'S TURKISH PRE-ACCESSION
INSTRUMENT, 2002-2006**

Specific Contract N° 2012/306685

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

15 October 2013

**Implementing Partners: B&S EUROPE, LINPICO and
PROMAN**



This project is funded by
The European Union



A project implemented by
Business and Strategies Europe Consortium

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of B&S EUROPE and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	4
PREFACE	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
MAIN REPORT	18
1. EVALUATION CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES.....	18
1.1. CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND.....	18
1.2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	21
1.3. METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE OF THIS FINAL EVALUATION REPORT	21
2. PERFORMANCE OF THE TURKISH PRE-ACCESSION ASSISTANCE, 2002-2006.....	23
2.1. RELEVANCE	23
2.2. EFFICIENCY	34
2.3. EFFECTIVENESS.....	38
2.4. IMPACT	42
2.5. SUSTAINABILITY	49
3. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED.....	55
4. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	60
ANNEXES.....	64
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	65
Annex 2: Overview of the EU's Assistance Programmes for Turkey, 2002-2006.....	69
Annex 3: Overview of Project Sample Evaluated – Project Components / Funding	76
Annex 4: Overview of Project Sample Evaluated – Project Objectives / Goals	88
Annex 5: List of Stakeholders Interviewed.....	110
Annex 6: List of Documents Collected and Reviewed	114
Annex 7: Interview Guide	116

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CCN	Common Communication Network
CEB	Council of Europe Development Bank
CFCU	Central Finance and Contracts Unit
CoA	Court of Auditors
CSI	Common System Interface
DIS	Decentralised Implementation System
DG ELARG	Directorate General for Enlargement
DG SANCO	Directorate General for Health and Consumers
DG TAXUD	Directorate General for Taxation and Customs Union
EC	European Commission
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EEAS	European External Action Service
EIB	European Investment Bank
EMCDDA	European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction
ESC	Economic and Social Cohesion
EUD	Delegation of the European Union
EU	European Union
FMIS	Financial Management Information System
FWC	Framework Contract
GAC	General Affairs Council
HRB	Human Rights Board
HRD	Human Resources Development
HRP	Human Rights Presidency
IFI	International Financial Institution
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession
IPR	Intellectual Property Right
IT	Information Technology
ITMS	Integrated Tariff Management System
JMC	Joint Monitoring Committee
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
MEUA	Ministry for EU Affairs
MFAL	Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
MIPD	Multi-Annual Indicative Planning Document
MoLSS	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
NAC	National Aid Coordinator
NAO	National Authorising Officer
NCTS	New Customs Transit System
NDP	National Development Plan
NFRL	National Food Reference Laboratory
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIPAC	National IPA Coordinator
NPAA	National Programme for the Adoption of the <i>Acquis</i>
OECD	Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
OP	Operational Programme
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PCM	Project Cycle Management
pNDP	Provisional National Development Plan
POG	Programme Operational Guide
PPA	Public Procurement Authority
ROM	Result-Oriented Monitoring

RTA	Resident Twinning Adviser
RTP	Regional Training Programme
SCF	Strategic Cohesion framework
SEE	State Economic Enterprise
SIGMA	Support for Improvement in Governance and Management
SMART	Indicators = Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound Objectives = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
SPO	Senior Programme Officer State Planning Organisation (now Ministry of Development)
TA	Technical Assistance
TAIEX	Technical Assistance & Information Exchange
TBB	Union of Turkey's Bar Associations
TCA	Turkish Customs Administration (now Ministry for Customs and Trade)
TCDD	Turkish State Railway Administration
TOBB	Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey
ToR	Terms of Reference
TUBIM	Turkish Drugs Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund (former UN Fund for Population Activities)
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VET	Vocational Education and Training
WB	World Bank

PREFACE

The purpose of this *ex post* evaluation specifically relates to the 2002-2006 programmes implemented under the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey*. This evaluation focuses mainly on the outputs produced by these programmes. It primarily assesses the **relevance**, **impact**, and **sustainability** of these outputs. The evaluation also assesses the **efficiency** and **effectiveness** of these programmes towards the actual performance of services in Turkey, taking into account EU standards as benchmarks where relevant.

The main goal of the EU's pre-accession financial assistance has been to support Turkey in undertaking reforms so as to achieve compliance with the EU accession criteria and the requirements of the EU *Acquis*. Programming of EU financial assistance to Turkey is based upon objectives set out in the Accession Partnership document (subsequently in the Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document-MIPD) and also the priorities set out by Turkey, e.g. in its National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis* (NPAA).

This Report was prepared in June/July 2013 and reflects the situation as at 30 June 2013, the cut-off date for this Report. This evaluation is based upon an analysis of documents provided at the start, during and on completion of this assignment, including programming and project documents, and upon interviews with line beneficiaries and other stakeholders (participatory process). It examines the performance of the 2002-2006 programmes implemented under the EU's Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey in addressing the objectives stated in the formal programming documents, provides a general assessment of the programmes and draws conclusions and lessons learnt from them.

Given that a considerable amount of time has elapsed since the last projects contracted in 2002-2006 were completed, the Evaluators would like to thank the EU Delegation, the Central Finance and Contacts Unit (CFCU), the National IPA Coordinator (NIPAC), the Ministry for EU Affairs (MEUA) and the line beneficiary institutions for facilitating access to relevant officials, data and information, which was far from easy, and also for exchanging views and opinions on programme performance.

Authors of the Report:

Jean-Bernard Moreau, Senior Expert 1 - Team Leader
Shawn Webb, Senior Expert 2
Hülya Gunaydin, Junior Expert 1
Ceyda Dayioglu, Junior Expert 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Objective and Scope of this Evaluation

Background

Framework for Relations between the EU and Turkey

Turkey's involvement in European integration dates back to 1959, when Turkey first applied for EU membership. EU-Turkey relations were initiated within the framework of the *Ankara Association Agreement*, which was signed on 12 September 1963 and took effect on 1 December 1964.

The progressive establishment of an EU-Turkey Customs Union, a very important step towards European integration, was planned at the end of the transitional stage of the integration process and the Customs Union eventually entered into force on 1 January 1996. Further to the EU's fifth enlargement in 2004, an *Additional Protocol* extending the Ankara Association Agreement to the new EU Member States that had acceded to the EU was concluded between Turkey, the EU Presidency, and the Commission on 29 July 2005.

In 1987, Turkey once again applied to join what still then was the European Economic Community. Following the entry into force of the EU-Turkey Customs Union a new period began in EU-Turkey relations, which were further deepened after Turkey was granted "candidate country status" at the Helsinki Summit of 10-11 December 1999, destined to join the EU on the basis of the same accession criteria as applied to the other Candidate Countries, i.e. the "Copenhagen criteria". Its population of approx. 75 million inhabitants would make it the EU's second largest Member State after Germany.

Since 1998 the European Commission has published an annual "Progress Report" on Turkey stating its views on the developments over the past year concerning Turkey's fulfilment of the accession criteria, its alignment with the EU *Acquis* and, since 2005, on progress achieved in the accession negotiations with the EU. Along with the Progress Reports on every Candidate and potential Candidate Country, the European Commission also updates and issues an "EU Enlargement Strategy" document comprising assessments on and future direction for the enlargement agenda. The latest Progress Reports and the EU Enlargement Strategy document were published on 10 October 2012. Additionally, the framework for EU relations with every Candidate and potential Candidate Country has been defined via the adoption by the Council of "Accession Partnerships" with each country, establishing the principles, priorities, intermediate objectives, and conditions for cooperation with the EU and the fulfilment of reforms by each country linked to its preparations for EU accession.

The first *Accession Partnership for Turkey* was adopted in 2001, updated in 2003, 2006, and 2008. In response to each Accession Partnership, Turkey developed a plan with the measures foreseen, corresponding to the priorities in the Accession Partnership Document, known as the "National Programme of Turkey for the Adoption of the EU *Acquis* (NPAA)".

EU Accession Negotiations

At the Brussels Summit on 16-17 December 2004, the decisions made at the 1999 Helsinki Summit were confirmed; as the Council took note that Turkey sufficiently fulfilled the Copenhagen political criteria so as to allow for the opening of EU accession negotiations with Turkey. Then the EU decided to launch accession negotiations with Turkey on 3 October 2005.

In preparation for EU accession Turkey must go through a long and challenging process which requires the alignment of its political, legal, institutional, economic, and social structures with those of the EU. The process of accession negotiations is structured on the basis of the 35 EU *Acquis* Chapters that must be negotiated successfully by any Candidate Country as a condition for membership.

Due to Turkey's failure to apply the 2005 Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement to include the Republic of Cyprus, the December 2006 Council Decision has remained in force, which stipulates that negotiations with Turkey will not open on eight EU *Acquis* Chapters relevant to Turkey's

restrictions regarding Cyprus and that no chapter will be provisionally closed until the Commission confirms that Turkey has fully implemented the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement.

Moreover, in 2007 France declared that it will not allow the opening of negotiations on 5 EU *Acquis* Chapters, as they are directly related with membership. Further to the Council meeting of December 2009, the Republic of Cyprus also declared that it would block the opening of 6 EU *Acquis* Chapters.

No chapters have been opened for the past 3 years, i.e. since the end of the Spanish presidency in June 2010, although the recent General Affairs Council, of 25 June 2013, did agree to start the process to open the chapter on regional policy with Turkey, after the confirmation of the common position of the Council, later in 2013, as to the negotiation framework for opening the chapter.

EU Pre-Accession Assistance for Turkey

Turkey has been receiving pre-accession oriented assistance from the EU since 2001, based on the Accession Partnership for Turkey adopted by the Council on 8 March 2001.

Initially this was provided within the already established framework for EU assistance to Turkey under the *MEDA Programme*; established in 1996 as the main component of the EU's financial cooperation with beneficiary countries under the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership of November 1995.

For programme years 2002-2006 the EU's assistance was provided within the specific pre-accession oriented framework of the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* in accordance with Council Regulation 2500/2001 of 17 December 2001. Over the financing period the EC allocated almost € 1,250 million to Turkey in terms of pre-accession financial assistance.

Since 2007, as with all Candidate and potential Candidate countries for EU accession, Turkey has been a beneficiary of the EU's *Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance* (IPA) in accordance with Council Regulation 1085/2006 of 17 July 2006. Over the 2007-2013 financing period the national allocation to Turkey is anticipated to total almost € 4,800 million in terms of pre-accession assistance.

The main goal of the EU's pre-accession financial assistance is to support Turkey undertake reforms so as to achieve compliance with the EU accession criteria and the requirements of the EU *Acquis*. Programming of EU financial assistance to Turkey is based upon objectives set out in the Accession Partnership document (subsequently in the Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document) and also the priorities set out by Turkey, e.g. in its National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis* (NPAA).

While the Commission retains overall responsibility for the management of the pre-accession assistance, the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* and the IPA are managed by Turkish authorities on the basis of the Decentralised Implementation System (DIS). In this context, the Turkish Government therefore bears responsibility for the use of EU funding and for the achievement of the programme/project goals. The Commission approves the annual National Programme (comprising the individual projects selected for EU funding, prepared in cooperation with the Turkish authorities), and the Commission's staff in Ankara give prior (*ex-ante*) approval during implementation for the tendering and contracting processes, plus participates in the monitoring of actions as co-chair of the Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) for Turkey, and also is responsible for the management of *ex post* control and verification of the programmes. The establishment and effective operation of DIS in Turkey – and the subsequent transition to Extended DIS, when the Commission's *ex-ante* approval during implementation is waived – as in the other Candidate Countries, is part of a process in the development of institutional capacity to manage EU-funds, as required for accession to the EU.

Latest Developments

At present, efforts are underway to revive the negotiation process, which has been gaining momentum. For example, Turkey's Prime Minister recently reiterated that Turkey maintained its determination to go ahead with reforms to bring its laws and its institutions into line with EU standards and requirements and the government has taken further steps in this direction accordingly. Moreover, France's new government has given signals that it could reconsider its position with regard to the negotiation chapters that France had blocked in 2007.

As regards EU financial assistance, some € 780 million and € 856 million were earmarked under the IPA for Turkey respectively in 2011 and 2012. Moreover, Turkey is the largest beneficiary of EU financial assistance and by 2013 it will have received a total € 6,900 million as of 1996. In addition, Turkey also benefits from a series of regional and horizontal EU programmes apart from the IPA.

In this context, the EU Commission proposed to develop a “Positive Agenda” between Turkey and the EU in its Enlargement Strategy for 2011-2012 published on 12 October 2011. Endorsed by the Council in December 2011, the Positive Agenda aims to support and complement Turkey’s accession negotiations through enhanced cooperation in a wide range of areas of joint interest. The Positive Agenda was agreed to be a temporary exercise supporting the accession negotiations.

The Positive Agenda kick-off meeting was conducted in Ankara on 17 May 2012 with the participation of the EU Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy. As a result of the Working Groups meetings held so far, a total of four closing benchmarks were confirmed to have been met by Turkey in three EU *Acquis* Chapters, namely Company Law, Consumer and Health Protection and Financial Control.

The Evaluation

The global objective of the *ex post* evaluation is to provide:

- Accountability with respect to the value for money and the use of the funds, by reporting the findings and conclusions of the evaluation to the institutions of the EU and to the relevant interest groups of the public at large (summative evaluation), and
- Lessons learned on the financial assistance where relevant.

The specific objectives of the *ex post* evaluation are to:

- Assess the impact and sustainability of Turkey Pre Accession funded interventions, and
- Provide lessons learned and recommendations for decision-making on improvements of future financial assistance.

Methodology

The ToR established a clear framework for the evaluation based on five distinctive phases: (1) Inception Phase including an initial briefing with the EC in Brussels and in Ankara; (2) Field Phase interviews with the line stakeholders (participatory process) and research in Turkey; (3) Synthesis Phase; (4) Draft Final Evaluation Report commentary and approval Phase; and (5) final debriefing Presentation Phase.

The underpinning evaluation methodology adopted is mainly based on criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC and, more specifically, is derived from EC guidance with respect to standard interim evaluation methodology, e.g. as per the DG ELARG “Evaluation Guide” and the DG Budget guide “Evaluating EU activities – a practical guide for the Commission Services”, and is fully consistent with the EC’s Joint Evaluation Unit’s Methodology and Guidelines.

In accordance with the ToR the basic methodology for the *ex post* evaluation is to undertake an evaluation of the 2002-2006 programmes on the basis of the detailed assessment of a sample of projects reflective of the overall programme/projects. This was reviewed with the EC during the Inception Phase and finalized at the start of the Field Phase, with a final sample of 18 projects reflective of the key programme objectives, delivery modalities, beneficiaries, and year of allocation. Via the sample of 18 projects assessed in detail the total project grant allocation was approx. € 98.5 million; approx. € 88.25 million in EC grant and approx. € 10.25 million in co-financing grant.

The main instrument underpinning the evaluation consists of 5 key evaluation questions that focus on limited number of key issues against the five traditional DAC evaluation criteria. Each EQ may cover one or more evaluation criteria and does not explicitly refer to any of them. The criteria are the very basis for the evaluation and the information and data collected for responding to each of the EQs will contribute to the overall assessment of the criteria in the Final Report. The five generic Evaluation Questions are as follows:

EQ1 – Relevance: To what extent are/have the intervention logic (internal coherence), strategic complementarity with other EU, other multilateral/bilateral donor and national programmes, the overall approach and the objectives of the actions been consistent with, and contributed adequately to, beneficiaries' requirements, Turkey's country needs, global priorities and partners' and EU policies (e.g. NPAA, other relevant bilateral EU-Turkey agreements, commitments etc.)?

EQ2 – Efficiency: To what extent have the project activities been delivered adequately to Turkey's beneficiaries? *Have things been done right?*

EQ3 – Effectiveness: To what extent are/have the project results and specific objectives been achieved? *Have the right things been done?*

EQ4 – Impact: To what extent will/have the objectives of the 2002-2006 projects be/been achieved as intended, in particular their planned overall objectives, in terms of capacity building, legal approximation (e.g. EU *Acquis*), Turkey's economic integration into the EU market, institutional modernisation and overall EU-Turkey cooperation?

EQ5 – Sustainability: To what extent have/are the positive outcomes of the projects and the flow of benefits continued/likely to continue after external funding ends/has ended?

Finally, as indicated above, based upon a sample of 18 projects, this ex post evaluation of the EU-funded 2002-2006 assistance for Turkey focuses first on project level and then extrapolate the evaluation findings to the whole Pre-Accession Instrument's programme for the financing period 2002-2006.

Data Collection Method and Analysis

The information sources used for answering the evaluation questions will include:

- Planning and programming documents, including Multi-Annual Indicative Programming Documents (MIPDs), Annual National Programmes, National Development Plan of 2004, National Indicative Programmes (NIPs), Financing Agreements;
- Commission papers such as the Regular Progress Reports and reports from the Court of Auditors;
- Project management documents, such as Terms of References, Twinning Project Fiches, TAIEX and SIGMA Requests and Reports, Inception Reports, Progress Reports, Monitoring Reports, Evaluation Interim/Final Reports, Phare Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) and Sectoral Monitoring Sub-Committee (SMSC) minutes;
- Project output documents, such as research reports, training materials, recommendations, project websites, newsletters and brochures, impact assessments;
- Beneficiary and stakeholder documentation and websites;
- External relevant analyses and documentation on Turkey's reform process;
- EU guidelines and documents on past evaluations on Turkey.

The basic methodology for conducting the Field Phase research linked to the evaluation consisted of a range of standard evaluation techniques and tools, e.g. documentation review, source data research and literature survey, logical framework analysis, plus semi-structured interviews with programme and project beneficiaries, with project stakeholders, with project implementing partners, and with relevant staff based at the EUD (EEAS-Ankara), plus representatives of other donors active in Turkey etc. This illustrates the participatory process effort of evaluation.

This Report was prepared in June/July 2013 and reflects the situation as of 30 June 2013, the cut-off date for this Report. This evaluation is based upon an analysis of documents provided at the start, during and on completion of this assignment, including programming and project documents, and upon interviews with line beneficiaries and other stakeholders (participatory process). It examines the performance of the 2002-2006 programmes implemented under the EU's Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey in addressing the objectives stated in the formal programming documents, provides a general assessment of the programmes and draws conclusions and lessons learnt from them.

Key Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

The continued Relevance of the assistance is good

The continued relevance of projects under the Objectives "Approximation with the EU *Acquis*" and "Public Administration Reform" is good. The projects have addressed the real immediate needs of their respective line beneficiary institutions in terms of EU *Acquis* harmonisation and institutional modernisation effort. The 2002-2006 projects were targeted to provide *Acquis*-related support to Turkey in a range of fields linked to the EU *Acquis* Chapters, with a good emphasis provided to projects supporting the effective operation of the EU-Turkey Customs Union and the EU's Internal Market. Reflecting the EU's decision to open accession negotiations with Turkey in October 2005 – coinciding with the earlier period in the lifetime of the implementation of the 2002-2006 programmes – the actions were generally very timely and highly relevant in that respect.

The continued relevance of projects under the Objective "Economic and Social Cohesion" is also good. The projects have supported the progressive introduction in Turkey of an EU strategic planning approach to Cohesion Policy, which is now being further developed via the IPA in terms of the management capacity of the Turkish partners as well the delivery of more sizeable investment grant.

Despite a number of design and performance weaknesses, notably in the area of human rights reform, the continued relevance of the basic project goals under the Objectives "Political Criteria" and "Justice and Home Affairs" remains to be strong. When Turkey was recognised by the EU in 1999 as a Candidate Country for accession to the EU it was also recognised that Turkey did not yet, at that time, sufficiently comply with the EU's accession 'political criteria' so as to allow for the opening of EU accession negotiations. As such, the strong focus to strengthening Turkey's compliance with the EU *Acquis* in the area and with European human rights standards has been vital. While the 2002-2006 programmes cannot claim any impact in terms of the decision of the Council in December 2004 that Turkey sufficiently fulfilled the Copenhagen 'political criteria' so as to allow for the opening of EU accession negotiations, the relevance of the actions were very timely in respect to supporting Turkey's further development of systems and awareness so as to consolidate compliance with the accession 'political criteria'. However, the projects suffered from design and ownership weaknesses that have limited the projects' performance and absorption, due to the lack of consensus between beneficiary partners as to the goals to be addressed and/or the benefits of the assistance be ensured by the partners over the longer-term.

At the time the programming of the 2002-2006 assistance also suffered from its over-ambitious scale in terms of programme/project design. The extent that individual projects of two- to three- years delivery can substantially address the full range of sectoral reforms and development issues that face Turkey was sometimes over-looked, in particular in regard to promoting human rights reforms.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that the EU's Accession Partnerships were over-ambitious as it was impossible to achieve all their targets and objectives within the short time period before the Partnership was updated; while the programming of the assistance was conducted utilizing the Partnership(s), the start-up of project implementation under the EU financial support was often up to two years later, and the consequently the delivery of results three or more years after programming.

Reflecting this time-lag, a frequent constraint in terms of assessing the performance of the assistance is the insufficiently 'SMART' specification of the intervention objectives and of the related indicators (OVIs), notably at the levels of the project purpose (Immediate Objective) and the project goal/impact (Wider Objective). While project results are 'in the future' the programming exercise would have benefited from a clearer focus in terms of the quality of the objectives and indicators being 'Specific' and also 'Time-bound'. The indicators could also be improved in terms of being 'Measurable': via the inclusion of quantified targets and baseline data to support progress monitoring and evaluation. The timeline for the chain of development effects/goals – objectives and indicators – should have been more clearly demarcated: i.e. Results/Outputs = achieved by the project during implementation; Immediate Objective(s) = achieved on project completion or the immediate short-term after; Wider Objective(s) = the intermediate (1-year) to longer-term (3-years) outlook post-project completion.

The efficiency of the 2002-2006 programmes was constrained by the beneficiary's capacity

The 2002-2006 programmes were the first EU assistance programmes for which the Turkish authorities were directly involved in and responsible for the management and implementation of the

assistance, on the basis of the DIS, and thus directly responsible for the achievement of the project objectives. As with the other Candidate Countries, e.g. under the Phare Programme, the process of establishing the DIS structures and ensuring their efficient and effective function also faced delays in Turkey. However, the process of addressing the DIS capacity weaknesses in Turkey was lengthy.

All the DIS structures faced constraints in terms of staffing levels; but most notably so at the CFCU with the obvious constraints this created for the efficiency and effectiveness of its functionality as the contracting agent for EU-funded projects. Additionally the DIS structures also suffered from the initial lack of demarcation between DIS programme actors and the slow process in establishing lines for coordination and communication to support the efficient management of the programmes (during the processes of procurement, implementation or monitoring). The development of reporting tools of adequate quality to provide monitoring data for decision-making was especially challenging. The progressive strengthening of the DIS structures was undertaken starting from 2007 through to the restructuring of the NAC in 2009. However, for almost the entire lifetime of the 2002-2006 programmes (i.e. mainly 2002-2010) the inadequacy of the DIS structures in Turkey was a frequent constraint to the efficient and effective implementation of the assistance and achievement of impact.

At only 85% the efficiency of the procurement contracting-rate of the EU-funding made available under the 2002-2006 programmes was only barely satisfactory; a rate of minimally 90% would traditionally be judged as sufficient. The shortfall in contracting represents a sizeable limitation of the 2002-2006 programmes' overall potential for the achievement of results, limiting the overall effectiveness and impact of the programmes. Furthermore, a significant constraint in terms of efficiency was the traditionally delayed process of procurement and contracting, with 77% of the total number of contracts signed in the month prior to the contracting deadline.

In addition to measures enacted by the Turkish authorities to strengthen the DIS structures (staff levels, capacity, and tools), the EC also introduced specific measures to strengthen the efficiency of the deployment of the EC-grant, most notably via the utilization of clearly defined deadlines for the preparation of procurement documentation by the Turkish authorities for submission to the EC for *ex-ante* authorisation under the DIS. This reduced the late contracting of the 2005 programme and, most clearly, the 2006 programme; with only 22% of contracts signed in the month prior to the deadline.

In regard to the efficiency of the processes of implementation and delivery of the contracted project actions, in terms of the provision of appropriate solutions and the delivery of the outputs and hand-over of the intended results, the efficiency of the 2002-2006 programmes was generally satisfactory. The delivery of outputs as the basis for the achievement of the project results linked to the sample of projects assessed as part of this evaluation have largely been efficiently fulfilled, although in a number of cases with the extension of contract implementation periods, and thus the delayed delivery of outputs and results, and/or with problems arising from the synchronisation/sequencing of all the project components and sub-components as a result of the over-ambitious character of projects as there were so many activities and project components and subcomponents to put in place.

Generally, while institutional arrangements for all programmes/projects are set-out in the respective programming documents, at project-level the information on the beneficiary's management structures that shall operate coordination and the development and delivery of the results was often insufficient to support the efficient implementation of actions, e.g. information on project working groups, project actors and milestones at the different stages in the decision-making chain linked to project delivery.

The effectiveness of the 2002-2006 programmes in generating change was satisfactory

The effectiveness of the projects is judged to be strongest in areas where actions were directly related to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis*, notably where the *Acquis* is well defined in terms of a clear legal and administrative framework to be achieved and where local ownership was strong. Projects have provided focused support for the drafting of legislation, the development of systems and structures, staff training etc. Projects on EU *Acquis* transfer have mostly been implemented with full effectiveness in terms of the development of legislation, regulations, structures etc., although the effectiveness of a number of the projects has partially been weakened by the delays in the decision-making processes linked to the institutionalisation of the project results and in the ratification of new laws by Parliament, which often takes too long before project results are adopted and put into force. When delays are experienced fulfilment of the process should be assessed via *ex post* reports. Most notably this has affected the fulfilment of the objectives linked to the Railways sector and to IPR.

The effectiveness of the projects is judged to be good in areas where actions were related to the programme objective of the promotion of Economic and Social Cohesion, including via the promotion of EU-Turkish Civil Society Dialogue actions between Chambers of commerce and industry. The involvement of project beneficiaries and partners in the design and take-up of the benefits was good.

However, the effectiveness of projects is judged to be limited – reflecting the ownership and design weaknesses – in regard to improving cooperation between NGOs and the public sector, plus the promotion of human rights reforms and good practice in Turkey – although in the areas of women's rights and gender equality the effectiveness of the projects is judged to be good / satisfactory.

Given that the greatest threat to the effectiveness of the assistance is the level of ownership and adequacy of the beneficiary's management structures to support the take-up of results and to embed them in the institutional operations of the beneficiary, it is a weakness that the management systems and institutional procedures for the effective absorption of the results were rarely detailed in project documentation or indicators of such processes provided. As the majority of actions aimed to support institutional reforms in the beneficiary and thus a change of specific behavioural patterns in the targeted institutions the limited consideration as to 'how' this will be achieved procedurally within the overall operational/administrative framework of the beneficiary is a design weakness.

Too frequently the focus of programme/project monitoring was purely linked to counting the delivery of project outputs. Too rarely did this also assess the effectiveness of the outputs delivered (e.g. via reporting on trainees' assessments of training), or the effectiveness of the beneficiary's decision-making processes linked to the absorption and institutionalisation of the results (e.g. via the adoption of new/revised operating procedures, implementing regulations, or laws).

A further design weakness in terms of assessing the effectiveness of the assistance was the frequent deficiency of the intervention objectives and indicators of achievement (OVIs). At the level of project purpose (Immediate Objective) the indicators should provide the basis for assessing the achievement of the projects' (SMART) immediate objectives, i.e. the immediate impact and behavioural change generated, by the time that project implementation has been completed or in the immediate short-term period after completion. The lack of sufficiently SMART objectives and indicators poses a risk in terms of the limited provision of direction or vision to fulfil when project implementation is finished.

Mixed evidence of impact and sustainability, but, overall, programmes have been successful

Naturally, the key determinant of the impact and sustainability of the projects has been the ownership of the objectives and results of the direct beneficiary institutions. They are responsible for ensuring the effective institutionalisation and continuation of the project results and the delivery of benefits, plus, as suitable, the further development of the project results to support the wider reform agenda.

This was generally strongest where the beneficiary institutions have clear multi-annual strategic plans for policy orientation and delivery supported by medium-term implementation action plans and budget plans. This was most evident in regard to the successful impact and sustainability of projects in the areas of Customs, Statistics, Food Safety, Drugs Focal Point, and HRD via VET, where achievements have been fully institutionalised and further operated in the delivery of related functions and services.

However, the achievement of the impact of projects linked to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis* was significantly constrained for a number of projects due to the delayed adoption of the project results by the beneficiary and/or due to follow-up enforcement weaknesses. This was most notable in the case of the impact of the Railways sector and the IPR projects, and partially for OHS.

The impact and ownership of the projects is better ensured whenever the projects are part of multi-phased interventions or whenever they are followed up on by one or more projects (e.g. EU projects and/or TAIEX actions and/or SIGMA actions, or via other donors) that build upon the results to further evolve the related policy agenda and/or via peer reviews to assess how effectively previous results have been introduced and suitably operated. In addition to utilizing follow-up projects to strengthen impact, the intermediate impact of the projects has also been strengthened via the increasing participation of Turkish partners and experts in EU networks generated by the projects, e.g. via testing laboratory networks, or Chambers of commerce and industry, or between line ministries/agencies.

However, in the areas of the promotion of human rights and the promotion of public sector dialogue with civil society / NGOs the immediate impact of projects is moderate and the intermediate impact

and sustainability is limited. This reflects the moderate/limited effectiveness of the projects to achieve their objectives, plus the limited evidence of any significant follow-up by the main beneficiary(s).

The achievement of impact in the area of human rights has also been affected by the slow pace in establishing a clear and transparent, functional institutional and operational framework for the human rights agenda. The human rights projects each contained a Training-of-Trainers component as a core deliverable, to promote greater impact over the intermediate and longer-term periods. However, in each case the institutionalisation of the training capacity as a pool of future trainers failed to materialise. This was largely a failure of ownership and the limited capacity of the main beneficiary to follow-up. However, such training actions under the 2002-2006 programme have not always been unsuccessful, with the Customs project notably highly successful in the institutionalisation of the training capacity generated by the assistance, delivering on-going and entry-level training for all new staff at the TCA. However, the impact of projects with a significant Training-of-Trainers component has, overall, frequently been weakened by the limited planning of how the Trainers should be utilised post-project, e.g. the Gender Equality project also faced difficulties to maintain the pool of trainers.

At the programme management level the impact of the projects also includes the process of gradually introducing the Turkish authorities and staff to the requirements of EU-funds management. While the development of the DIS structures and functionality has been a lengthy process, which negatively impacted on the overall impact of the 2002-2006 programmes, staffing levels and expertise available for EU-funds management has gradually been enhanced since 2007 and the legal basis strengthened. These are essential steps for the effective operation of DIS (and the transition to Extended DIS), and, as evident in the area of Economic and Social Cohesion, is ultimately part of a process in the development of institutional capacity to manage EU-funds as an EU Member State.

Overall, the assessment of the impact and sustainability of the programme/projects is also weakened by the lack of post-project follow-up monitoring and reporting. Too often the focus of partners is almost exclusively on the project implementation period and delivery. Rarely was an exit strategy or post-project follow-up action plan specified within the context of the DIS, unless in the context of a multi-annual strategy and medium-term action plan. The consistent application of post-project planning and subsequent follow-up would strengthen the impact of the overall assistance, e.g. in terms of follow-up on the delayed institutionalisation of results, or in the follow-up of the achievement of intermediate impact after further utilization and roll-out of the benefits by the beneficiary(s).

Overall Conclusion

The 2002-2006 programmes for Turkey were the first EU assistance programmes for which there was the exclusive focus on projects supporting Turkey meeting the accession criteria, in particular via the provision of institution building support to Turkey aimed at the implementation of the EU *Acquis*. The programmes were also the first EU assistance programmes for which the Turkish authorities were directly involved in and responsible for the management and implementation of the assistance, on the basis of the Decentralised Implementation System (DIS), and thus also directly responsible for the achievement of the programme/project objectives. The programmes were also the first to extend the Twinning instrument to Turkey as the delivery mechanism of choice for institution building projects linked to the EU *Acquis*, based on the achievement of mandatory results to be fulfilled in partnership between the Twinning providers and the Turkish beneficiary(s).

While the performance of the 2002-2006 programmes has been mixed, reflecting the diverse range of interventions that were addressed and the 'learning curve' for the Turkish authorities in terms of the management of EU-funds, the programmes have, overall, provided valuable support to Turkey in the implementation of its reform and development processes. The assistance also provided valuable support to Turkey linked to addressing issues connected to the opening of some EU *Acquis* Chapters for accession negotiations, and addressing issues arising following the 'screening' process.

The performance of the programmes in terms of the effectiveness, the immediate and intermediate impact, and the prospects for sustainability has been strongest in areas where actions were directly related to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis*, notably where the *Acquis* is well defined in terms of a clear legal and administrative framework to be achieved and where local political and institutional ownership was strong. Reflecting that the main focus of the EU's assistance to Turkey starting with the 2002-2006 programmes has been to ensure a pre-accession oriented framework for the delivery of the EU's assistance to the reform process in Turkey this is a clear success story.

The performance of the programmes was also good in the area of promoting Economic and Social Cohesion. Although it is clear that the development needs in this area are of a medium- to long-term nature, and that the 2002-2006 programmes were therefore initial interventions to promote reforms, the programmes have supported the progressive introduction into Turkey of an EU strategic planning approach to Cohesion Policy, e.g. via the development of sectoral and regional development plans, the development of institutional frameworks and partnership, plus monitoring structures and capacity.

However, the performance of the programmes was weaker in regard to support in the areas of promoting human rights reforms/standards, and the development of consultative dialogue between the public sector and civil society / NGOs. The impact and sustainability of these actions is limited. This primarily reflects the 'soft' nature of the reforms and the difficulties beneficiaries faced in terms of establishing a clear strategic framework for the actions and in building sufficient ownership of the project partners for the establishment of a clear plan for post-project continuation and follow-up.

For all projects the performance of the assistance, notably in terms of the prospects for impact and sustainability of the assistance, has also been affected by the high levels of staff turnover in the public sector in Turkey, due to staff departing/joining as well as staff being transferred to different posts during the process of institutional reorganisation, which has created a risk for the success of the capacity development actions and the successful achievement of wider impact over the long period.

Overall Rating

<p>For these reasons, the Evaluators are of the opinion that EU's Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey, 2002-2006, has performed "Satisfactorily".</p>
--

Key Recommendations

Recommendation 1 (EC Services, EU Delegation and MEUA): Project Programming and Design

- *Budget allocated should be increased for IPA-2.*
- *Pilot projects should be rolled out.*
- *The project intervention logic and its design need to be based on a specific needs assessment.*
- *Continuous delays in the ex ante approvals and also changes to procedures and formats should be avoided.*
- *The right beneficiary institutions should be identified clearly as a failure to do so may affect sustainability and effectiveness.*
- *Realistic rather than overambitious project fiches/TORs should prevail (number of objectives, project scope, number of components, number of planned activities and results (per component), risks, timing, duration of the implementation period, budget allocations, etc.).*
- *A preliminary careful analysis phase should ideally be included systematically in the programming phase in order to make sure that all necessary infrastructure, human resource & project management capacity are built in within the Beneficiary Institution before the design and implementation phases may start. If not, then the project should not be allowed to start as planned and should instead be included in the next programming cycle.*
- *When appropriate, technical specifications for procurement projects should be prepared through FWCs with the active involvement of line beneficiaries.*
- *Design should include dissemination of results at the regional level and coordination between relevant public and social stakeholders, more particularly for enforcement purposes.*
- *The design phase should cover an exit strategy specifying what to do (what actions should be taken) after a project is over and the BAs should be made aware of the fact that they should follow up on their projects with concrete actions.*
- *A mechanism should ensure better project ownership through (ex post monitoring).*

Recommendation 2 (EU Delegation and CFCU): Implementation

- *The number and capacity of CFCU staff should be increased.*

- *Together with this, direct grant agreements should be preferred among the types of contracts.*

Recommendation 3 (Line Beneficiaries, EC Services and EUD): Law Enforcement

- *Effective law enforcement should be the main priority, as several legal reforms have been put in place now that new primary and secondary legislation has been passed into law as a direct result of project activities*

Recommendation 4 (EC Services, EUD, MEUA, Line Beneficiaries): Follow-up and Awareness-Raising

- *In a number of cases, new projects could be developed for further capacity development on new EC Directives and practices and increased awareness-raising amongst the public.*

Recommendation 5 (EC Services, EUD, MEUA, Line Beneficiaries): Logical Frameworks

- *LogFrames should include SMART OVs along with realistic assumptions, conditionality and monitoring, more particularly at the result level, to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.*
- *Technical specifications need to have realistic assumptions.*
- *Result and impact indicators (SMART) should be utilised for measuring the success of a project at higher levels of the LogFrame.*

Recommendation 6 (EUD, MEUA, Line Beneficiaries): Sustainability

- *Relations between Turkish beneficiaries and their EU counterparts should be intensified to ensure continuity of results through such cooperation (e.g. as between DG SANCO and National Food Reference Laboratory).*
- *Adequate political commitment and project ownership should be ensured for sustainability of results and the appropriate institutions should exist, particularly for EU Acquis alignment purposes.*
- *Ex-post monitoring mechanism should be enforced by the EUD and DIS players to better analyse and follow up on real impact and sustainability of project results. Even if it can be argued that the MEUA is the beneficiary of "ALTUN/ROM/TR0702.28-02/SER/026/001-Technical Assistance for Result-Oriented Monitoring (ROM)" project, whose objective is to monitor IPA-period projects, including ex-post monitoring, those ROM interventions are usually carried out too closely to project completion dates (when they are conducted after the project implementation phase). Therefore, in most cases, i.e. when it is obvious that there won't be any immediate impact and sustainability inherent to project results, ROM Monitors, from an ex post perspective, can only speculate about impact and sustainability of project results. In essence, they're not intended to fulfil ex post monitoring requirements per se. The mechanism proposed by the Evaluators is not only to monitor impact and sustainability of project results after project completion, but also to follow up, i.e. to take concrete (corrective) action, in order to ensure as much impact and sustainability as possible (whenever appropriate).*
- *Projects with a significant Training-of-Trainers component should be required to provide an Action Plan for the post-project utilisation of those Trainers.*
- *Capacity in the fields of monitoring and impact assessment of the beneficiary institutions should be strengthened.*
- *Follow-up projects should be required to provide evidence that previous project results and impacts generated have been sustained.*
- *To align with the EU Acquis, primary and secondary legislation drafted as a result of EU-funded projects should be adopted and capacity building on law enforcement should continue in order to ensure the intended impact of projects is achieved.*

Specific Recommendation 7 - Intellectual Property Rights (Line Beneficiaries and EC Services/EUD):

- *The draft Law on IPRs should be ratified and put into force and the decision-making procedures - aligned with EU best practices.*

- *The capacity of the of the IPR Specialised Judges and IPR Specialised Courts as well as other related judges should be further improved.*
- *Effective IPR legal enforcement should be critically considered, particularly with reference to counterfeiting.*
- *Awareness-raising activities on IPR protection against piracy should be intensively conducted (workshops, seminars, EU study tours, etc), until and also after the new Law is put into force.*
- *The level of coordination and exchange of information between law enforcement bodies in Turkey should be further enhanced."*

Final Remark:

Given that a considerable amount of time has elapsed since the last projects contacted in 2002-2006 were completed, the Evaluators would like to thank the EU Delegation, the Central Finance and Contacts Unit (CFCU), the National IPA Coordinator (NIPAC), the Ministry for EU Affairs (MEUA) and the line beneficiary institutions for facilitating access to relevant officials, data and information, which was far from easy, and also for exchanging views and opinions on programme performance.

MAIN REPORT

1. EVALUATION CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

1.1. CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

Framework for Relations between the EU and Turkey

Turkey's involvement in European integration dates back to 1959, when Turkey first applied for EU membership. EU-Turkey relations were initiated within the framework of the association regime based upon the Ankara Association Agreement¹, which was signed with the European Economic Community on 12 September 1963 and took effect on 1 December 1964.

The Ankara Association Agreement envisaged three stages for Turkey's integration into the European Economic Community / EU, namely a preparatory stage, a transitional stage, and a final stage.

With the finalisation of the preparatory stage as planned in the Agreement, provisions governing the transitional stage and the obligations of the Parties were determined in the Additional Protocol² signed on 13 November 1970 and brought into force in 1973. The progressive establishment of an EU-Turkey Customs Union, a very important step towards European integration, was planned at the end of the transitional stage of the integration process and the Customs Union eventually entered into force on 1 January 1996. Further to the EU's fifth enlargement in 2004, an Additional Protocol³ extending the Ankara Association Agreement to the new EU Member States that had acceded to the EU was concluded between Turkey, the EU Presidency, and the Commission on 29 July 2005.

In 1987, Turkey once again applied to join what still then was the European Economic Community. Following the entry into force of the EU-Turkey Customs Union a new period began in EU-Turkey relations, which were further deepened after Turkey was granted "candidate country status" at the Helsinki Summit of 10-11 December 1999, destined to join the EU on the basis of the same accession criteria as applied to the other Candidate Countries, i.e. the "Copenhagen criteria". Its population of approx. 75 million inhabitants would make it the EU's second largest Member State after Germany.

EU Accession Criteria

The Candidate Country has achieved / created:

- stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities;
- the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;
- the ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union;
- the conditions for its integration through the adjustment of its administrative structures, so that EU legislation transposed into national legislation is implemented effectively through appropriate administrative and judicial structures.

EU Enlargement / Pre-Accession Strategy

Since 1998 the European Commission has published an annual "Progress Report" on Turkey stating its views on the developments over the past year concerning Turkey's fulfilment of the accession

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/turkey/association_agreement_1964_en.pdf

² [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21970A1123\(01\):EN:HTML](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21970A1123(01):EN:HTML)

³ <http://ec.europa.eu/world/agreements/prepareCreateTreatiesWorkspace/treatiesGeneralData.do?redirect=true&treatyId=1561>

criteria, its alignment with the EU *Acquis* and, since 2005, on progress achieved in the accession negotiations with the EU. Along with the Progress Reports on every Candidate and potential Candidate Country, the European Commission also updates and issues an “EU Enlargement Strategy” document comprising assessments on and future direction for the enlargement agenda. The latest Progress Reports and the EU Enlargement Strategy document were published on 10 October 2012⁴. Additionally, the framework for EU relations with every Candidate and potential Candidate Country has been defined via the adoption by the Council of “Accession Partnerships” with each country, establishing the principles, priorities, intermediate objectives, and conditions for cooperation with the EU and the fulfilment of reforms by each country linked to its preparations for EU accession.

The first *Accession Partnership for Turkey*⁵ was adopted in 2001, updated in 2003, 2006, and 2008. In response to each Accession Partnership, Turkey developed a plan with the measures foreseen, corresponding to the priorities in the Accession Partnership Document, known as the “National Programme of Turkey for the Adoption of the EU *Acquis* (NPAA)”.

EU Accession Negotiations

At the Brussels Summit on 16-17 December 2004, the decisions made at the 1999 Helsinki Summit were confirmed; as the Council took note that Turkey sufficiently fulfilled the Copenhagen political criteria so as to allow for the opening of EU accession negotiations with Turkey. Then the EU decided to launch accession negotiations with Turkey on 3 October 2005.

In preparation for EU accession Turkey must go through a long and challenging process which requires the alignment of its political, legal, institutional, economic, and social structures with those of the EU. The process of accession negotiations is structured on the basis of the 35 EU *Acquis* Chapters that must be negotiated successfully by any Candidate Country as a condition for membership. As at June 1st, 2013 only 13 Chapters have been opened by Turkey⁶ and, so far, only one EU *Acquis* Chapter, namely on science and research, has been provisionally closed.

Due to Turkey's failure to apply the 2005 Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement to include the Republic of Cyprus, the December 2006 Council Decision has remained in force, which stipulates that negotiations with Turkey will not open on eight EU *Acquis* Chapters⁷ relevant to Turkey's restrictions regarding Cyprus and that no chapter will be provisionally closed until the Commission confirms that Turkey has fully implemented the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement.

Moreover, in 2007 France declared that it will not allow the opening of negotiations on 5 EU *Acquis* Chapters⁸, as they are directly related with membership. Further to the Council meeting of December 2009, the Republic of Cyprus also declared that it would block the opening of 6 EU *Acquis* Chapters⁹.

No chapters have been opened for the past 3 years, i.e. since the end of the Spanish presidency in June 2010, although the recent General Affairs Council, of 25 June 2013, did agree to start the process to open the chapter on regional policy with Turkey, after the confirmation of the common position of the Council, later in 2013, as to the negotiation framework for opening the chapter.

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/tr_rapport_2012_en.pdf

⁵ The purpose of the Accession Partnership is to assist the Turkish authorities in their efforts to meet the Accession Criteria. The Partnership places particular emphasis on political criteria. It covers in detail the priorities for Turkey's accession preparations, with particular reference to implementation of the EU *Acquis*, and provides a reference framework for directing pre-accession assistance. Further information can be found at http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/enlargement/ongoing_enlargement/community_acquis_turkey/e40111_en.htm

⁶ 13 Chapters: “4-Free Movement of Capital”, “6-Company Law”, “7-Intellectual Property Law”, “10-Information Society and Media”, “12-Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Policy”, “16-Taxation”, “18-Statistics”, “20-Enterprise and Industrial Policy”, “21-Trans-European Networks”, “25-Science and Research”, “27-Environment”, “28-Consumer and Health Protection”, “32-Financial Control”

⁷ 8 Chapters: “1-Free Movement of Goods”, “3-Right of Establishment and Freedom to Provide Services”, “9-Financial Services”, “11-Agriculture and Rural Development”, “13-Fisheries”, “14-Transport Policy”, “29-Customs Union” and “30-External Relations”

⁸ 5 Chapters: “11-Agriculture and Rural Development” (one of the 8 chapters blocked due to the Additional Protocol), “17-Economic and Monetary Policy”, “22-Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments”, “33-Financial and Budgetary Provisions”, “34-Institutions”

⁹ 6 Chapters: “2-Freedom of Movement for Workers”, “15-Energy”, “23-Judiciary and Fundamental Rights”, “24-Justice, Freedom and Security”, “26-Education and Culture”, “31-Foreign, Security and Defence Policy”

EU Pre-Accession Assistance for Turkey

Turkey has been receiving pre-accession oriented assistance from the EU since 2001, based on the Accession Partnership for Turkey adopted by the Council on 8 March 2001.

Initially this was provided within the already established framework for EU assistance to Turkey under the *MEDA Programme*; established in 1996 as the main component of the EU's financial cooperation with beneficiary countries under the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership of November 1995.

For programme years 2002-2006 the EU's assistance was provided within the specific pre-accession oriented framework of the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* in accordance with Council Regulation 2500/2001 of 17 December 2001. Over the financing period the EC allocated almost € 1,250 million to Turkey in terms of pre-accession financial assistance.

Since 2007, as with all Candidate and potential Candidate countries for EU accession, Turkey has been a beneficiary of the EU's *Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance* (IPA) in accordance with Council Regulation 1085/2006 of 17 July 2006. Over the 2007-2013 financing period the national allocation to Turkey is anticipated to total almost € 4,800 million in terms of pre-accession assistance.

The main goal of the EU's pre-accession financial assistance is to support Turkey undertake reforms so as to achieve compliance with the EU accession criteria and the requirements of the EU *Acquis*. Programming of EU financial assistance to Turkey is based upon objectives set out in the Accession Partnership document (subsequently in the Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document) and also the priorities set out by Turkey, e.g. in its National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis* (NPAA).

While the Commission retains overall responsibility for the management of the pre-accession assistance, the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* and the IPA are managed by Turkish authorities on the basis of the Decentralised Implementation System (DIS). In this context, the Turkish Government therefore bears responsibility for the use of EU funding and for the achievement of the programme/project goals. The Commission approves the annual National Programme (comprising the individual projects selected for EU funding, prepared in cooperation with the Turkish authorities), and the Commission's staff in Ankara give prior (*ex-ante*) approval during implementation for the tendering and contracting processes, plus participates in the monitoring of actions as co-chair of the Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) for Turkey, and also is responsible for the management of *ex post* control and verification of the programmes. The establishment and effective operation of DIS in Turkey – and the subsequent transition to Extended DIS, when the Commission's *ex-ante* approval during implementation is waived – as in the other Candidate Countries, is part of a process in the development of institutional capacity to manage EU-funds, as required for accession to the EU.

Latest Developments

At present, efforts are underway to revive the negotiation process, which has been gaining momentum. For example, Turkey's Prime Minister recently reiterated that Turkey maintained its determination to go ahead with reforms to bring its laws and its institutions into line with EU standards and requirements and the government has taken further steps in this direction accordingly. Moreover, France's new government has given signals that it could reconsider its position with regard to the negotiation chapters that France had blocked in 2007.

As regards EU financial assistance, some € 780 million and € 856 million were earmarked under the IPA for Turkey respectively in 2011 and 2012. Moreover, Turkey is the largest beneficiary of EU financial assistance and by 2013 it will have received a total € 6,900 million as of 1996. In addition, Turkey also benefits from a series of regional and horizontal EU programmes apart from the IPA.

In this context, the EU Commission proposed to develop a "Positive Agenda" between Turkey and the EU in its Enlargement Strategy for 2011-2012 published on 12 October 2011. Endorsed by the Council in December 2011, the Positive Agenda aims to support and complement Turkey's accession negotiations through enhanced cooperation in a wide range of areas of joint interest: "intensified dialogue and cooperation on political reforms and foreign policy", "visas", "mobility and migration", "energy", "fight against terrorism", "further participation of Turkey in Community Programmes", "town twinning", "trade and Customs Union", "fight against terrorism" and "support to Turkey's efforts to align with the EU *Acquis*, including on those EU *Acquis* Chapters where accession negotiations cannot be opened for the time being". The Positive Agenda was agreed to be a temporary exercise supporting the accession negotiations.

Within the framework of the Positive Agenda, Working Groups have been decided to be established for 8 EU *Acquis* Chapters (“3-Right of Establishment and Freedom to Provide Services”, “6-Company Law”, “10-Information Society, and Media”, “18-Statistics”, “23-Judiciary and Fundamental Rights”, “24-Justice, Freedom and Security”, “28-Consumer and Health Protection” and “32-Financial Control”). However the Working Group for Chapter 24 has not been launched by the European Commission. The Positive Agenda kick-off meeting was conducted in Ankara on 17 May 2012 with the participation of the EU Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy. As a result of the Working Groups meetings held so far, a total of four closing benchmarks were confirmed to have been met by Turkey in three EU *Acquis* Chapters, namely Company Law, Consumer and Health Protection and Financial Control.

1.2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of this *ex post* evaluation specifically relates to the 2002-2006 programmes implemented under the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey*.

A series of interim evaluations of the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* have been conducted over the past decade, including a review of the general utility of the EU's assistance to Turkey for 2003-2006 (issued in 2007). Additionally, in January 2010 the European Court of Auditors (CoA) published a “Special Report on the European Commission's Management of Pre-Accession Assistance to Turkey” (Report N° 16 - 2009). Now that sufficient time has elapsed it was time for an *ex post* evaluation of the performance of the EU's Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey, 2002-2006.

The global objective of the *ex post* evaluation is to provide:

- Accountability with respect to the value for money and the use of the funds, by reporting the findings and conclusions of the evaluation to the institutions of the EU and to the relevant interest groups of the public at large (summative evaluation), and
- Lessons learned on the financial assistance where relevant.

The specific objectives of the *ex post* evaluation are to:

- Assess the impact and sustainability of Turkey Pre Accession funded interventions, and
- Provide lessons learned and recommendations for decision-making on improvements of future financial assistance.

Linked to the specific objectives for this *ex post* evaluation the Terms of Reference (ToR) established a set of specific Evaluation Questions – see Annex 1 for a fuller description of the background to the evaluation, its goals and scope, and the specific Evaluation Questions. During the Inception Phase the Evaluation Questions were discussed with the European Commission and further refined on the basis of the core evaluation criteria underpinning evaluation methodology as adopted by the OECD-DAC.

Following initial project kick-off meetings at DG ELARG and then the EEAS-Ankara in January 2013, the Field Phase research was undertaken from late April 2013 to late June 2013. The Evaluation Report reflects the situation as of 30/06/2013 – the ‘cut-off-date’ for the Report.

1.3. METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE OF THIS FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

The ToR established a clear framework for the evaluation based on five distinctive phases: (1) Inception Phase including an initial briefing with the EC in Brussels and in Ankara; (2) Field Phase interviews with the line stakeholders (participatory process) and research in Turkey; (3) Synthesis Phase; (4) Draft Final Evaluation Report commentary and approval Phase; and (5) final debriefing Presentation Phase.

The underpinning evaluation methodology adopted is mainly based on criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC and, more specifically, is derived from EC guidance with respect to standard interim evaluation methodology, e.g. as per the DG ELARG “Evaluation Guide” and the DG Budget guide

“Evaluating EU activities – a practical guide for the Commission Services”, and is fully consistent with the EC's Joint Evaluation Unit's Methodology and Guidelines.

In accordance with the ToR the basic methodology for the *ex post* evaluation is to undertake an evaluation of the 2002-2006 programmes on the basis of the detailed assessment of a sample of projects reflective of the overall programme/projects. This was reviewed with the EC during the Inception Phase and finalized at the start of the Field Phase, with a final sample of 18 projects reflective of the key programme objectives, delivery modalities, beneficiaries, and year of allocation.

See Annex 2 for an overview of the 2002-2006 programmes and Annexes 3 and 4 for information on the sample of projects, including the project sample table and a short description of each project. Via the sample of 18 projects assessed in detail the total project grant allocation was approx. € 98.5 million; approx. € 88.25 million in EC grant and approx. € 10.25 million in co-financing grant.

The basic methodology for conducting the Field Phase research linked to the evaluation consisted of a range of standard evaluation techniques and tools, e.g. documentation review, source data research and literature survey, logical framework analysis, plus semi-structured interviews with programme and project beneficiaries, with project stakeholders, with project implementing partners, and with relevant staff based at the EUD (EEAS-Ankara), plus representatives of other donors active in Turkey etc. This illustrates the participatory process effort of evaluation.

Reflecting that this is an *ex post* evaluation the process of documentation review, source data research and literature survey has been conducted on the basis of materials directly linked to the 2002-2006 programmes/projects, plus via a range of publically available materials issued in subsequent years by Turkish partners, the EC and other EU institutions, plus other international donors and partners of relevance to the policy goals of the 2002-2006 programmes/projects.

Reflecting that this is an *ex post* evaluation the process of data collection, for subsequent verification and review processes, plus the interview of relevant stakeholders, allowing for the verification of information and the further elaboration of insight into particular programme/project features, have faced some constraints. This was primarily reflective of the time necessary for data collection for documentation and materials directly linked to the detailed design and implementation of the different project components under the sample of projects, plus in the identification of relevant stakeholders for interview presently in-post at institutions that have benefited from the assistance. To minimize the risks the evaluators worked in close cooperation with the EUD and the CFCU in Turkey.

See Annex 5 for an overview of the stakeholders interviewed / consulted and Annex 6 for an overview of documentation utilized in the preparation of this Evaluation Report. The Interview Guide used for this evaluation is in Annex 7.

2. PERFORMANCE OF THE TURKISH PRE-ACCESSION ASSISTANCE, 2002-2006

This Section covers the 5 generic Evaluation Questions on the basis of data analysis and synthesis. In doing so, this Section analyses the data obtained through the review of relevant project documentation and interviews conducted with relevant stakeholders in Turkey. The following table provides an overview of the 5 Evaluation Questions and related criteria:

EQ N°	EVALUATION CRITERIA
EQ 1	Relevance, including Intervention Logic and Project Design
EQ 2	Efficiency (<i>best use of resources</i>)
EQ 3	Effectiveness, Impact, EU Intervention Added Value, Cross-Cutting Issues
EQ 4	Impact, Cross-Cutting Issues, Communication & Visibility (e.g. Awareness-Raising)
EQ 5	Sustainability

2.1. RELEVANCE

To what extent are/have the intervention logic (internal coherence), strategic complementarity with other EU, other multilateral/bilateral donor and national programmes, the overall approach and the objectives of the actions been consistent with, and contributed adequately to, beneficiaries' requirements, Turkey's country needs, global priorities and partners' and EU policies (e.g. NPAA, other relevant bilateral EU-Turkey agreements, commitments etc.)?

This question relates to the *Relevance* criterion and, to some extent, to the *Complementarity/Coherence* criterion and covers *Design*-related issues.

In essence, *Relevance* is the extent to which project activities are suited to the priorities and policies of a target group, recipient, and donor.

However, *Relevance* must be assessed throughout the lifecycle of project activities in case changes occur either in the nature of the issues originally identified or in the context – whether physical, political, economic, social, environmental, institutional or policy-wise – in which the project activities have been planned and implemented, which may require a change to the activity focus.

Consequently, **Relevance** also relates to the appropriateness of project activity *design* to the issues that must be solved at two key PCM stages: during the design phase and during the evaluation phase. **Project Design** covers planned activities, expected results, the overall **intervention logic** (internal coherence) and also strategic *complementarity/coherence*¹⁰ with other past and current EU projects (e.g. Twinning, TAIEX, SIGMA, Grant Schemes, Community Programmes, FWC, classical TA, etc.), other multilateral/bilateral donor and also national programmes.

We therefore propose to merge *Relevance* with project design and intervention logic (internal coherence) under this criterion, as they tend to somewhat overlap. *Complementarity/Coherence* is addressed separately.

¹⁰ This point addresses the *Complementarity/Coherence* criterion used for EU policy evaluation. This criterion may have several dimensions. It is proposed to focus on the next two points:

- Complementarity/Coherence within EU development programmes (Twinning, TAIEX, SIGMA, Classical TA, etc.)
- Complementarity/Coherence with Turkey's policies and with other donor interventions (UNDP, USAID, EIB Group, etc.)

Relevance, Project Design and Intervention Logic

The Evaluators consider the projects funded under the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* as relevant when the overall programme's objectives are in full compliance with the short- and medium-term priorities stated in the *Accession Partnership for Turkey* (See above EU Enlargement / Pre-Accession Strategy). By contrast, projects cannot be considered relevant in situations where their need was unclear or has been so poorly defined as to suggest it is unclear.

Programming of Pre-Accession Financial Assistance started with the 2002 National Programme, whose implementation was launched in 2004, following the accreditation of the Turkish Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) by the European Commission in October 2003.

The projects were selected jointly by the Turkish authorities and the European Commission, and included in a financing agreement signed by both parties after adoption of the corresponding national programme by the Commission.

Although programming of EU financial assistance to Turkey has been based upon objectives set out in the Accession Partnership document (subsequently in the Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document-MIPD) and also the priorities set out by Turkey, e.g. in its National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis* (NPAA), the Evaluators have not been able to identify a clear mechanism for prioritising the relevant interventions on a sectoral basis, since they were programmed rather as individual projects aiming to meet the general needs identified. It is true that Turkey's needs in the various intervention sectors relevant to EU accession are so significant that prioritising can be a very difficult task indeed. However, it could be recommended to carry out an overall needs assessment in all sectors, although it could be argued in this case that this cross-sectoral needs assessment would be outdated once completed, as needs may also change very rapidly. Therefore it could be recommended to carry out an in-depth needs assessment on a sectoral basis, which would be updated with the line stakeholders on a regular basis. Priorities established should be more clearly defined in terms of their relative importance and relevance to the Accession Partnership documents.

Overall, the vast majority of the projects funded under the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument for 2002-2006 were *highly relevant* to the fulfilment of the EC accession criteria, to the EU *Acquis*, standards and best practices, transfer and also to the priorities set out in Turkey's 8th and 9th National Development Plans (NDP) respectively for 2001-2005 and 2007-2013.

Projects evaluated under Objectives 2 "Approximation with the EU *Acquis*" and 3 "Public Administration Reform" (See Annexes 3 and 4 – Overview of the Project Sample Evaluated) also addressed the real immediate needs of their respective line beneficiary institutions in terms of EU *Acquis* harmonisation and institutional capacity building effort. Generally they were very timely in that respect. Project design usually provided for several types of complementary interventions: Twinning or classical Technical Assistance (as suitable); procurement of equipment supply (e.g. IT, software, etc.) and works; framework contracts; grants; etc. to make the interventions as complete and relevant as possible in achieving the project objectives.

The Evaluators have identified a few good practice examples:

1) Project TR-0402-04 on "Support to Turkey's efforts in the full alignment and enforcement in the field of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) with a focus on fight against piracy" of 2004, which was implemented from 2006 to 2007, was very timely as in 2004 Turkey amended Law No. 5846, which was the main legal arrangement in Turkey for copyright and related rights. With this amendment, further alignment with the EU *acquis* on intellectual property rights has been accomplished. However, there was a critical lack of adequate coordination amongst the various Turkish institutions to protect IPRs. Chapter 7 of the 2006 Screening Report for Turkey on Intellectual Property Law (p.10) indicated that "Turkey has now reached a considerable level of legislative alignment with the EU *Acquis* in the field of IPR", as a result of the project. However, further legal amendments are still necessary to achieve full alignment with the EU *Acquis* (Chapter 7 "Intellectual Property Rights"). Project design was quite strong for the following reasons:

- Many other stakeholders were included to participate in, or benefit from, the project directly or indirectly, e.g. the judiciary, national police force for enforcement, civil society, and vocational organisations.
- The project built upon the results and achievements of a previous MEDA project on "Effective Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights" (1999-2004) in order to further develop and

strengthen capacity of judges specialising in IPR legal cases and to develop cooperation amongst relevant Turkish institutions to protect IPRs and fight against piracy and counterfeiting.

- The project consists in 2 main components, including Twinning and IT equipment supply, including software.

This project's Relevance has so far continued, as the draft Law, which was one of the project's major results, has not yet been adopted and the need for progress in EU *Acquis* harmonisation in the field of IPRs has once again been highlighted in the most recent EC 2012 Progress Report on Turkey. Besides, Turkey's NPAA 2008 focused on harmonising Turkish legislation with EU *Acquis*, the MIPD 2011-2013 set IPR protection and enforcement as a priority, and the 9th National Development Plan (2007-2013) stated that "there is still a need to improve the judicial system in the area of intellectual property rights". Follow-up action on enforcement, more specifically to fight against piracy and counterfeiting, is addressed in the Recommendations.

2) Implemented from 2005 to 2006, Project TR0302-07 on "Strengthening the Public Procurement system in Turkey" was very timely and highly relevant to EU *Acquis* harmonisation (Chapter 5 "Public Procurement") in this field in Turkey. The project also served as a gap analysis between the EU *Acquis* and Turkish effective legislation, namely Turkey's Laws N° 4734 on Public Procurement and N°4735 on Public Procurement Contracts adopted in 2002. Turkey's Public Procurement Authority was created in 2003 to respond to EU *Acquis* requirements. It must be pointed out that old EU Member States do not have any Public Procurement Authorities (PPA) organised as separate structures. Project design was very strong for the following reasons:

- Project design provided for Twinning and IT equipment supply, including software.
- Design was improved by the Resident Twinning Adviser (RTA), who was very knowledgeable and experienced.
- The Project Fiche was so good that many other beneficiaries used it as a good practice example and even used the format of the Twinning component as a template.
- The Twinning project's four subcomponents (Regulatory / Legal Advice; Organisation / Management Consulting; Training; and Communication – internal within the PPA and external with procurement entities and suppliers) were very complementary.

3) Project TR0503-16 on "Upgrading Turkey's Statistical System – Phase-II" was implemented from 2007 to 2009. The accession negotiations with Turkey revealed the need to improve and modernise statistics in Turkey, especially data collection and methodology, and adapt it to EU methods, standards, and best practices. The project's Overall Objective was "To upgrade Turkey's Statistical System according to EU standards on methodology and quality of compiling and processing statistical information and to ensure TurkStat's efficient coordination". The main strengths consisted in the following:

- High relevance to the EU *Acquis*, more particularly Chapter 18 "Statistics", as indicated in the Progress Report on Turkey
- Requirement specified in the project fiche (project design level) to include a Final Evaluation Study aiming to provide input into Phase-III.
- Project built upon Phase-I and was initially designed to be multi-phased. EUROSTAT contributed to the programming phase. The 3rd phase of this project is now being implemented under IPA-1¹¹
- A needs assessment was conducted to identify needs and design the 5 components, which are very complementary, namely TA; FWCs (2); Training and Grant; Supply; and IT data collection. However, it must be noted that the supply and data collection components were eventually cancelled due to very long supply tender procedures (this issue will be covered in the design weaknesses hereinafter). As a result, the beneficiary had to procure equipment from its own budget.

¹¹ IPA-I: 2007-2013 and IPA-II: 2014-2020

4) Project TR0503-04 on “Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory (NFRL)” was implemented from 2006 to 2008. A needs assessment revealed that the project was highly relevant to EU *Acquis* harmonisation (Chapter 12 “Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Policy”). There was a strong need to ensure food safety in the country in accordance with EC regulations and standards, mainly through licensing, inspection, and laboratory controls. For this purpose, capacity building of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL)’s inspectors was necessary. There was also a strong need for secondary legislation and for a national reference laboratory to serve food safety purposes. The institutions responsible for food safety to align with EU standards were the MFAL, municipalities, and MFAL provincial directorates.

5) Project TR0203.01 on “Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety” was implemented from 2004 to 2006. The project and its components were highly relevant to align Turkey’s occupational health and safety (OHS) standards with the EU and to contribute to improving an effective and efficient system for implementing OHS rules and regulations at work places, more particularly SMEs, which represent 98% of Turkey’s 2 million private companies. These SMEs usually lack financial and HR capacity to invest in OHS and are not aware of EU OHS standards, rules and regulations. Moreover, ILO requirements are consistent with that of the EC Directives, which supports relevance. Although it was not reported that the project was based on a robust specific needs assessment, the project was directly relevant to the negotiations on Chapter 19 “Social Policy and Employment”. The Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) did not have any adequate capacity to ensure the implementation of OHS requirements in Turkey before the project. Project design was appropriate in including activities related to capacity development, awareness-raising, laboratory development, and stakeholder coordination. Project design included two components: (1) institution building support, and (2) investment in OHS laboratories, mostly equipment and works for installation of the laboratories in Ankara and Kocaeli. In addition, there was also a lack of adequate statistics on occupational diseases and accidents. Therefore no specific baseline data for indicators could be identified. For initial technical specifications of supplies, FWC assistance was requested by the MoLSS. Design was well balanced and included only with two components: equipment supply and works, and TA for capacity/institution building. For the record, SMEs in Turkey’s Marmara Region still have a high need for OHS enforcement. Many diseases have been recorded. Employees were very keen to have EU standards at their work places and requested public institutions to enforce OHS rules and regulations.

6) Project TR0303.07 on “Turkish Rail Sector Restructuring and Strengthening” was implemented from 2005 to 2006. The project and its Twinning and TA components were highly relevant with respect to the Accession Partnership and the NPAA (namely adoption of EU *Acquis* - Chapter 14 “Transport Policy” - in the field of railway transport and related capacity building). The project aimed to establish the legislative and institutional framework for Turkey’s railway sector in order to contribute to its re-organisation in accordance with the EU *Acquis*. A gap analysis and Action Plan were prepared in 2003 and revealed that the Turkish State Railways Administration (TCDD) operated as a State Economic Enterprise (SEE) with poor efficiency and financial performance. As it was the first EU-funded project with TCDD, project design was based on previous projects including that of the World Bank. It appropriately included four complementary components: organisation of the railway sector; Management Information System (MIS); new TCDD organisational chart; and financial relations with the government. The intervention logic included restructuring of the overall railway sector, while restructuring the TCDD with two beneficiaries (TCDD and Ministry of Transport), which is quite complex and ambitious recalling the similar cases in the EU countries in terms of time and substantial structural change.

7) Project TR0603.07 on “Modernising the Turkish Customs Administration (TCA) – Phase-III” was implemented from 2008 to 2009. Increasing administrative capacity in accordance with EU standards was one of the TCA’s top priorities. Project design was therefore developed in consultation with DG TAXUD (EC Directorate General for Taxation and Customs Union). Part of a multi-phased project, this Phase-III project built upon the two phases and focused essentially on IT supply and training aimed to modernise the TCA. It was a critical project for TCA to align with the EU, since there was a strong need for clear connection with the EU IT system. This project was highly relevant to improve trade between EU countries and Turkey and to align with the EU *Acquis* (Chapter 29 “Customs Union”). The project consisted in 3 components (just like Phase-II) using TA, Twinning and supply instruments, which were all complementary and appropriate. Supply was related to a vehicle-tracking system.

Twinning and TA were related respectively to capacity building and IT systems. Project design was very appropriate as the components were very complementary:

- The IT Component aimed to harmonise the TCA's IT systems with EU. In this respect, it aimed to install and operate the Common Communication Network (CCN) and Common System Interface (CSI) infrastructure developed by DG TAXUD. In addition, the project also aimed to develop and integrate the New Customs Transit System for Europe (NCTS) and Integrated Tariff Management System (ITMS) into BILGE, the computerised system for customs transactions, which is the abbreviated form of Computerised Customs Activities in Turkish.
- The Customs Enforcement Component aimed to strengthen customs enforcement patrolling services and surveillance function.
- The Customs Capacity Building Component aimed to enhance the TAC's training capacity in the fields of post-clearance control and customs enforcement.

Phase III included 2 Twinning projects for ITMS and NCTS; TA for ITMS – IT development; TA for NCTS – Software development; Supply for ITMS and NCTS and also a vehicle-tracking system. Before 2011, the beneficiary was the Turkish Customs Administration, which was reorganised into a Ministry of Customs and Trade in 2011. The Customs Blueprints¹² prepared by the EU Commission's DG TAXUD to identify an ideal customs administration has been a benchmark for strategic planning of TCA projects.

Under Objectives 1 "Political Criteria" and 4 "Justice and Home Affairs", Relevance and Project Design may be more questionable, which does not mean that the interventions were irrelevant or eventually unsuccessful and which does not mean that further alignment of Turkey with the EU *Acquis* in these areas cannot be achieved. It is simply less straightforward than in the case of more directly transferrable legislation, standards and best practices. How can respect for human rights, equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming be effectively transferred? How can empowerment of civil society be effectively nurtured in a country with hardly any strong tradition in this area? These issues go beyond the mere transfer of competence and skills through training, as they can also strongly affect personal belief, moral commitment, and ultimately national culture in terms of values, upbringing, and education. In this respect, adequate project design is also key to measuring effective impact in due course.

For example, the Project Fiche for TR0301.03 "Improving Cooperation between NGOs and the Public Sector and Strengthening NGOs Democratic Participation Level ("SKIP")", which pertained to Objective 1 (Political Criteria), failed to stipulate that the extent of civil society involvement in public decision-making should be followed up/monitored by any relevant Turkish public institution, which also makes it impossible to assess any level of Impact in this respect.

The pre-accession strategy has ensured that gender equality is firmly on the political agenda. Project TR0501.06 was gender-specific and had a national and regional policy dimension. It consisted of two components: (i) institutional capacity building with the participation of central and local authorities and NGOs and (ii) combating domestic violence against women in order to better advance their human rights.

Conversely, Project TR0204.03 "Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre (REITOX Focal Point) and Development of National Drugs Strategy" built up its strategy upon the same pillars and cross-cutting themes as the EU Drugs Strategy for 2005-2012: (i) coordination; (ii) supply reduction; (iii) demand reduction; (iv) international cooperation; and (v) information/research/evaluation. Moreover, Turkey's National Policy and Strategy Document on Counteracting Addictive Substance and Substance Addiction 2006–12 has been prepared by TUBİM, with the cooperation of other relevant authorities and replaced the Strategy Document on Preventing, Monitoring and Management on Drug Addiction 1997–2006.

Under Objective 5 "Economic and Social Cohesion", one of the two projects selected in the sample, namely TA Project TR0405.01 "Support to the State Planning Organisation to build its capacity at central, regional and local levels to implement economic and social cohesion measures in line with

¹² http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/info_docs/customs/customs_blueprint_en.pdf

the preliminary National Development Plan (pNDP)" implemented from 2006 to 2008, provided technical assistance to the Turkish Administration – primarily to the State Planning Organisation (now Ministry of Development), its main beneficiary institution – in order to ensure the basic conditions for appropriate programming and implementation of the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA)'s resources in the country, of which 1/3 was dedicated to economic and social cohesion as the main motivation for this project. In other words, this project aimed to increase the SPO's capacity to prepare the NDP for absorption and management of EU funding after Turkey became eligible to EU accession negotiations in 2005 (the SPO was also to play an intermediary role with line ministries on EU funding). This Project was a very complex technical assistance programme¹³, composed of several inter-linked advisory and training components and involving a large number of direct and 2 indirect beneficiaries. However, the Evaluators noted the changes made to the original Terms of Reference, more particularly to the 2nd Specific Objective "To support the preparation of the Operational Programmes (OPs), the ex-ante evaluation of the OPs and the accreditation process". The implementer and the beneficiaries faced the following situation: the Turkish Administration had made significant progress relevant to project implementation, so the Strategic Cohesion Framework (SCF) and the OPs were agreed upon with the European Commission halfway through the project – in September 2007. Therefore the project activities and the results to be achieved by the implementer had to be adjusted to the actual situation throughout the project term. These adjustments were taken into consideration as early as the inception period and relevant activities were undertaken and results achieved. In order to speed up the launch of IPA in Turkey, both the EUD and the Turkish authorities decided to prioritise the IPA accreditation. After consultation with both the EUD and the beneficiary, the implementer agreed to the restructuring of the initial project and in August 2007 became involved in the preparation of a set of standard manuals of procedures. These are the Programme Implementation Manual (PIM) and the Programme Operational Guide (POG) for the management of IPA Component III – Regional Development in the Environment, Transport and Regional Competitiveness Sectors, and Component IV – Human Resources Development, which are essential for the accreditation of IPA operating structures. In fact, the ToR had been ready in 2003 and by the time of project implementation, the institutional environment of the project changed and as a result, focus had shifted. The preliminary National Development Plan (pNDP), which had been prepared for the 2004-2006 period for programming pre-accession assistance to Turkey in the field of social and economic cohesion, lost its relevance as a programming document by the end of 2006. The subsequent programming and planning document was then the 9th Development Plan of Turkey covering all policy areas relevant for the development of the country. It serves as the basis for the Strategic Cohesion Framework (SCF). In particular the document was used to derive the priorities of the SCF. Four addenda were prepared. It's worth noting that on the basis of Addenda 3 and 4, the project now consisted of another two components, bringing the final number of project components to five, namely: (1) Support for the effective implementation of economic and social cohesion (ESC) measures in line with the pNDP/SCF and OPs; (2) Ex-ante evaluation of OPs; (3) Support to the implementation of OPs; (4) Support to the accreditation process; and (5) Preparation for the Structural Funds. Addendum 4 also extended the project by 6 months to give time for the new components. The main observation is that this type of situation may pose a high threat to smooth project implementation and therefore also to the project's planned results and achievements, as the ToR were prepared too early before the project started (too much time had elapsed). Fortunately, the EUD, the implementer and beneficiaries worked together successfully to keep the project on track by introducing the appropriate corrective actions better responding to the real needs of the beneficiaries and country and also ensuring better relevance in terms of intervention logic from an EU policy perspective. However, this was far from obvious and project design should not tolerate anything close to improvisation in respect of major component design.

The Evaluation Team's conclusion on this Section is that it appears very clear that whenever projects related to EU *Acquis* transfer ("twinable" activities) and public administration reform, Relevance was a lot easier to establish in terms of project design and intervention logic. However, whenever projects aimed at less tangible targets (human rights, democracy, civil society, public-private dialogue, gender equality and mainstreaming, etc.), Relevance and ownership was not adequately demonstrated and could also be questioned in terms of

¹³ Classical Technical Assistance was chosen over Twinning, as the TORs were initiated in 2002 and finalised in 2003, and the instrument was not yet really used in Turkey in 2002, when it was launched in Turkey in 2002. The Twinning rules and procedures were perceived as lengthy and burdensome. Moreover, Twinning is not used at the local level.

prioritisation at individual project level. Moreover, timing can also be an issue in terms of programming and project design when too much time has elapsed between project design and implementation, as focus may, in the meantime, have shifted to other priorities that can be more relevant from an EU policy and real needs perspective.

In addition to the above very positive and less positive findings, the Evaluators have also noted the following weaknesses and potential risks related to Relevance, Project Design and Intervention Logic:

- *Overambitious programming:*

The Evaluators confirm Finding N°15 highlighted in Special Report N°16 of the Court of Auditors of 2009: "The Accession Partnership priorities were not consistently stated in specific, measurable terms. It proved to be unrealistic to achieve them all within the time periods specified in the Council Decision". Programming was at times overambitious, as Turkey was put under much pressure with so many required adaptations, secondary legislation, plus fight against terrorism. Turkey was often put before the "fait accompli". In 2002-2006, there was "over-programming" of activities that were then transferred to the next period. Instead, programming should have been more focused on a few specific objectives against better defined priorities. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that Accession Partnerships were overambitious as it was impossible to achieve all their targets and objectives also due to limited EU financial support (the EU was overwhelmed by the size of the country). This led to the design of "pilot projects" that had very limited impacts in a large number of cases, whereas several strong needs can be covered only through additional projects. Several interventions were implemented as part of multi-phased projects only in a few cases (e.g. Customs, Statistics). Systematic gap analyses started only in 2006. Moreover, several sectors, such as food safety – Chapter 12 to the EU *Acquis*) cannot be reformed only with one or two projects, all the more so in a pre-accession context.

- *Overambitious project design in several cases:*

This observation is also linked to *Overambitious Programming* above. Even though both projects TR0503.04 "Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory" and TR0403.03 "Restructuring and Strengthening Turkey's Food Safety and Control System" were initially designed as one, but were eventually split up as TR0503.04 included significant supply and works, project design remained very demanding, overambitious and even too complex with respect to the changing contextual conditions in the country (external conditions such as the long period of time needed to adopt new legislation, long construction periods, increasing costs for construction goods, etc.).

Although project design of TR0303.07 "Turkish Railway Sector Restructuring and strengthening" appropriately included various instruments to address the different project components: (1) Twinning for sectoral restructuring; (2) TA to support the TCDD and the Ministry of Transport; and (3) Supply of hardware and software for establishing TCDD's Management Information System, the intervention logic was too ambitious for the beneficiary institutions, as political commitment was not adequate.

Project TR0204.03 "Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre (REITOX Focal Point) and Development and Implementation of a National Drugs Strategy" had 12 main objectives, including the prevention of trafficking and abuse of addictive substance, and also the protection of the population as whole and risk groups. This project was overambitious. Although a project fiche may have as many overall objectives as desirable, it should however be limited to one or two project purposes.

Project TR0401.01 "Support to the Implementation of Human Rights Reforms in Turkey" had a partial design weakness relating to the overambitious goal of the project, namely "Full compliance of human rights actually enjoyed by Turkish citizens and civil society as a whole with principles, standards and practices in accordance with the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR)" and "To support Turkey in the implementation of human rights reforms and improve and strengthen the national capacity for applying European human rights standards, in particular that of legal professionals, law enforcement officials, the Human Rights Presidency (HRP) and the Human Rights Boards (HRBs), and thereby to facilitate a higher level of human rights protection in Turkey". However, it was not apparent that the HRP should therefore also have the capacity to oversee/monitor follow-up training and awareness-raising actions by the local HRBs or in terms of good practice promotion.

The overambitious character of a project may seriously affect sustainability of project results by undermining absorption capacity, project ownership, and institutional commitment.

- *Synchronisation/sequencing of all the project components and subcomponents made implementation difficult, as a result of the overambitious character of projects as there were so many activities and project components and subcomponents to put in place.*

For example, in the case of both projects TR0503.04 “Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory” and TR0403.03 “Restructuring and Strengthening Turkey’s Food Safety and Control System”, the instruments used for project activity implementation were as follows:

- **FWC:** to prepare design, technical specifications and drawings, and the tender dossier for works.
- **Twinning Light:** to define property, legal and institutional infrastructure needs.
- **Works:** covered construction of the laboratory building, mechanical, and electrical works, including automation systems, as well as landscaping.
- **Service:** Supervision services were provided for the construction of the laboratory.
- **Supply:** procurement of furniture and equipments; the establishment of an MIS was cancelled.
- **Classical TA:** capacity development of the lab staff.

- *Model replication:*

Although it’s been often recommended to feed lessons learnt, recommendations and best practices into the next programming cycle and although this approach could be appropriate on a thematic basis, such as food safety, in which all countries have to adopt the same principles, the replicability of project formats and models developed in the EU accession context for Poland, Hungary, etc. was not adequate for Turkey at all. The overall approach and strategy should have been better tailored for Turkey, which is not a former communist country. However, in the end Turkey managed to adapt quite well.

- *Use of Twinning:*

Although Twinning has been perceived, for good reasons, as the right instrument to understand and transfer EU *Acquis* (laws, regulations, best practices) and also benefit from EU institutional experience, Twinning was sometimes too strongly “encouraged” (almost forced upon beneficiaries, even newly created institutions) by the EC. Some beneficiaries were too young, i.e. not mature enough, institutions to utilize a Twinning project (e.g. Public Procurement Authority was created in 2003 to respond to EU *Acquis* requirements), and this could have negatively affected their absorption capacity and project ownership. Beneficiaries and target groups must be ready or well-prepared to receive a Twinning project. Alternatively, Twinning Light interventions could be used for initial support, although it can also be argued that Twinning Light is difficult to put in place as there is no RTA.

- *Institutional capacity to absorb and utilise first-wave “institution building” projects was mixed, depending on the sector.*

As indicated earlier, several *Acquis*-related activities such as those related to very tangible technical issues are far more straightforwardly transferrable actions compared to less tangible sectors such as human rights, democracy, gender equity/mainstreaming, public-private dialogue, anti-discrimination policies, etc. This has been true in other countries and this holds true also for Turkey.

- *Lack of readiness of beneficiary institutions in a few cases:*

In order to adopt the EU *Acquis* in a specific field, the relevant institution and required infrastructure should be established first. However, because of the rush to catch up with the programming periods, some of the programmed projects either had to be cancelled (e.g. State Aid project) or had created no substantial impact, if any at all.

- *Poor quality of the Objectively Verifiable Indicators of Achievement (OVIs):*

As pointed out in Special Report N°16 of the Court of Auditors of 2009, the Financial Regulation requires SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound) objectives to be established for all policy measures covered by the EU budget. They should be set out in the annual activity statements as part of the activity-based budgeting and management processes. However, the Commission did not include such objectives in the activity statements for pre-accession expenditure in

Turkey. However, this changed after the CoA Report. Activity-level indicators have been mostly referred to by the beneficiaries before the CoA Report. Impact indicators are also key to any accurate evaluation. However, identifying such indicators has been challenging for most of the beneficiaries since they are indeed commitments to future activities and results. The EC intervention on these indicators can, and could at that time, only be limited to making the indicators become SMARTer, since they represent the own commitments of beneficiary stakeholders. This is now being changed with the new format to be introduced with IPA-2. Moreover, since becoming the beneficiary of ROM Reports, the MEUA has also contributed to improving the quality of SMART OVIs.

- *Identification of the right beneficiary institutions may affect sustainability and effectiveness:*

For example, the extent of institutionalisation and follow-up of the results under Project TR0401.01 “Support the Implementation of Human Rights Reform in Turkey” was significantly variable. This partly reflects that the operational framework and tools by which the Human Rights Presidency (HRP)¹⁴, the project beneficiary, coordinates its activities with its partners, notably the local Human Rights Boards (HRBs)¹⁵, was at the initial phase of development. But it also reflects that the HRP has also suffered from significant staff turnover at the senior management level. This limited the focus and capacity of the HRP to provide follow-up monitoring and consolidation of the project results¹⁶. Furthermore, the level of ownership and active follow-up at the level of the HRBs has been variable, and is greatly influenced by the composition of the local HRBs. A follow-up project has been programmed under the IPA (2010) to further develop and consolidate the operational framework of the HRP and the HRBs¹⁷. However, this will now be implemented in the context of a series of partly overlapping national institutions in the area of the protection and the promotion of human rights, e.g. the Ombudsman institution and the National Human Rights Institute were both established in 2012.

- *Law enforcement in the area of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) was left behind in project design, as administrative capacity was still insufficient to ensure an effective enforcement of intellectual property law (See also Impact). Although this process has already started, the next programming cycles should now focus intensively on law enforcement.*

Complementarity/Coherence

This section addresses the Complementarity/Coherence criterion used for EU policy evaluation. This criterion may have several dimensions. It is proposed to focus on the next two points:

- Complementarity/Coherence within EU development programmes (Twinning, TAIEX, SIGMA, Classical TA, etc.)

The main finding here is that there was a very high degree of complementarity/coherence between the various EU-funded instruments used (TAIEX, SIGMA, Twinning, Classical TA, Grants, and FWC) and also, when suitable, between the implemented projects themselves. No serious overlap has been detected, all the more so as Turkey has very strong needs and EU-funds are not adequate to cover all sectors, thus avoiding overlaps. Here are a few examples:

¹⁴ The Human Rights Presidency was established in 2001 within the Office of the Prime Ministry. Its principal functions are to act as a co-ordinating body for state agencies in dealing with human rights, to monitor the implementation of all legislation concerning human rights and make recommendations for improvement, to co-ordinate training for state agencies in this field and to investigate and report on claims of human rights violations.

¹⁵ There are 972 Human Rights Boards in Turkey of which 81 are the Provincial Human Rights Boards and 891 are the Sub-Provincial Human Rights Boards. The composition of the HRBs was restructured in November 2003 so as to provide for majority representation on the HRBs for representatives of civil society, e.g. NGOs, lawyers from local Bar Associations.

¹⁶ The HRP was not able to provide any statistics to the evaluators regarding the follow-up training or awareness-raising activities conducted by the HRBs, or information as to how it assesses the performance of the HRBs, e.g. good practice.

¹⁷ An independent peer-review mission on Human Rights Institutions, commissioned by the EC and undertaken in January 2011, praised the idea of having local-level engagement on human rights (i.e. Human Rights Boards) and having a central structure in Government as a focal point for human rights (i.e. the Human Rights Presidency), and emphasised that an assessment of lessons learned and of good practice would be of assistance in the further development of institutions.

- Project TR0402.04 “Support to Turkey’s efforts in the full alignment and enforcement in the field of Intellectual Property Rights with a focus on Fight against Piracy” involved several stakeholders, including the Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Ministry of Interior, the Turkish Customs Administration and collecting societies. This was a very consistent multi-beneficiary project.
- Both projects TR0503.04 “On Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory” and TR0403.03 on “Restructuring and Strengthening Turkey’s Food Safety and Control System” were initially designed as one, but were eventually split up as TR0503.04 included significant supply and works, as Project TR0503.04 on “Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory (NFRL)” was complementary to Project TR0403.03 on “Restructuring and Strengthening Turkey’s Food Safety and Control System”, as a follow-up action to the latter.
- Both projects TR0501.06 “Promoting Gender Equality” and TR0601.05 “Shelters for Women Subject to Violence” closely intertwined in terms of project activity design, as the shelters project was built upon the research and feasibility studies conducted under the gender equality project, field of intervention and ownership over results.
- The SIGMA Programme. In general, a country’s accession status has a strong impact on the shape and contents of SIGMA support and advice. Turkey’s relationship with SIGMA is very closely linked to its accession status, with strong collaboration following the opening of negotiations (2005) and a significant reduction of activities when Chapters were blocked in the negotiation process. SIGMA finance and audit support was unanimously considered highly relevant to EU requirements by Turkish stakeholders and SIGMA has been pivotal in supporting public procurement according to EU requirements. The Public Procurement project results allowed for OECD Sigma Peer Reviews in 2007 right after the project ended, and also in 2012, to ensure its standards and quality in accordance with the OECD standards. At the moment, the Public Procurement authority takes part in the OECD SIGMA/IPA Peer Review on public procurement for further development.

However, it should be recommended to seek complementarity/coherence between the EU-funded instruments more systematically, more actively and even more pro-actively, i.e. during the project design phase if not during the programming phase. For this purpose, more awareness-raising activities on the various instruments could be implemented to better ensure desirable complementarity/coherence.

- Complementarity/Coherence with Turkey’s policies and with other donor interventions (UNDP, USAID, EIB Group, etc.)

Complementarity/Coherence inevitably also raises the critical issue of Donor Coordination and Aid Effectiveness in Turkey. The best general definition of Donor Coordination could be as follows: “Coordination amongst multilateral and bilateral donor institutions and effective allocation of financial sources to avoid overlaps, increase the effectiveness of donor funds and create synergy from cooperation”. The notion of Donor Coordination is very close to this definition for the EC, whereas it may have a completely different meaning for other IFIs. The EU is overall very committed to Donor Coordination, whereas other IFIs could have a lighter version of Donor Coordination in mind. For example, other IFIs also have their own rules and procedures and cannot always make commitments as they like, especially if those cannot be budgeted ahead with certainty. As a result, they prefer to refrain from any strong declaration and commitment in terms of strategy and mobilisation of resources.

The lack of efficient Donor Coordination may negatively affect Aid Effectiveness (as defined in the principles of the Paris Declaration of 2005), as the various donor strategies, policies, conditions of assistance, rules and procedures in terms of preparation, procurement, disbursement and monitoring/reporting lead, deliberately or not, to competition between donors and their respective activities, which can distract focus from strategic objectives, duplication of effort in research, analytical work and funding, restricted overall absorption capacity by the beneficiaries, inadequate technical and administrative capacity of project implementing agencies.

Turkey’s local funds are not sufficient to meet the investment needs. In this respect, exploring alternative financing sources and modalities is essential. Today, the main funding sources come from local and international sources, such as transfers from the central government budget, loans from the

local banking market, foreign borrowings, multilateral development institutions, bilateral development agencies, commercial banks loans, and EU funds. For example, the IPA is neither adequate, nor sufficient to cover all of Turkey's needs for technical assistance and investment, which strengthens the case for donor coordination and synergies. However, the IPA can be used as leverage. In this respect it must be pointed out that the EU is by far the first international multilateral donor in Turkey.

The two government institutions dealing with Donor Coordination in Turkey at the moment are the Treasury's Directorate General for Foreign Economic Relations and the Directorate for Financial Cooperation of the Ministry for EU Affairs (MEUA), also known as the National IPA Coordinator, or NIPAC. The Treasury coordinates the funding and activities of investment-related IFIs, such as the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB), the European Investment Bank (EIB) or KfW, but not the UNDP, UNIDO, etc. The National Programme for the Adoption of the *Acquis* (NPAA) sets a framework for Donor Coordination at policy level. In the early days of EU-Turkey cooperation of the late 1990s, the Donor Coordination issue was covered in the Linked Activities sections of project fiches, focusing essentially on the avoidance of activity duplication not so much with other IFIs, but rather on a bilateral basis. In 2012, as suggested by the EC, the NIPAC organised for the first time a Donor Coordination Meeting to discuss additional financing opportunities that would complement EU funding to meet Turkey's needs in terms of alignment with the EU. So far, two rounds of discussions on Donor Coordination with IFIs have already taken place. IFIs have been invited to submit their ideas and proposals. Each year, several meetings are organised by the Treasury to ensure Donor Coordination in reviewing the Needs Assessment Document (which is a permanent process). IFIs and line ministries take part in start-of-year, middle-of-year, and end-of-year meetings. At the middle-of-year meetings, a mid-term evaluation of the Needs Assessment Document is conducted. At end-of-year meetings, results of the past year are evaluated and a new strategy is developed or fine-tuned for the next year. However, the question for Turkish authorities is also how to get better EU support.

The EU Delegation conducts Donor Coordination meetings of the EU Member States on a thematic basis every month. For instance, in 2008, the meetings focused on gender equality and women's rights, internal market and customs union, 7th Framework Research Programme, EU Member States bilateral cooperation, environment, UN briefing and regional competitiveness. More and more information sessions are organised as EU Member States have scaled back their bilateral assistance since the IPA was introduced. When and where relevant, IFIs are also invited to participate. On an ad-hoc basis, the EUD conducts donor coordination meetings with other IFIs, such as the EIB, WBG, the UN as the main players and also bilateral assistance programmes (KfW, AFD, etc.), etc. A database of projects funded by EC and EU Member States was established by the EU Delegation in 2005 as a response to difficulty in getting easy access to relevant information on bilateral contributions of EU Member States.

2.2. EFFICIENCY

**To what extent have the project activities been delivered adequately to Turkey's beneficiaries?
Have things been done right?**

The Evaluators have added this question that relates to the *Efficiency* criterion. In measuring the outputs – both qualitative and quantitative – against the inputs, it aims to find out to what extent things have been done right in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness, and thereby also addresses value-for-money aspects. In other words, this question also addresses the best use of resources (e.g. best value for money or “*cost effectiveness*”), the quality of the implementation system, i.e. delivery timeliness and reporting / monitoring and quality assurance systems. This analysis generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs in order to find out whether the most efficient decision as to the choice of the technical cooperation instrument has been made.

Programme Implementation Administration

While the Commission retains overall responsibility for the management of the assistance under the EU's *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey* the implementation of the programmes is managed by Turkish authorities under the Decentralised Implementation System (DIS). This reflects the status of Turkey as a Candidate Country for accession to the EU and thereby that the Turkish Government must institutionalise the capacity to manage EU-funds in accordance with EU requirements and standards and therefore also must bear responsibility for the use of EU funding.

The decision to establish DIS in Turkey was taken in 2001, thereby ensuring that the EU's assistance programme for Turkey was in line with EU assistance programmes for the other Candidate Countries. Programming of the *Pre-Accession Financial Assistance* started with the 2002 National Programme, whose implementation was launched in 2004, following the accreditation of the Turkish authorities to manage the programmes by the European Commission in October 2003. Under DIS the Turkish authorities manage programme/project implementation, while the European Commission, via the EC Representation to Turkey (the EEAS) based in Ankara, remains responsible to give its *ex-ante* approval before any tender is launched or contract awarded, and as co-chair of the Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) for Turkey that monitors the functioning of the DIS and the EU's assistance.

As with the other Candidate Countries, e.g. under the Phare Programme, the process of establishing the DIS structures and ensuring their efficient and effective function also faced delays in Turkey. However, the process of addressing weaknesses in the DIS structures in Turkey has been lengthy.

All the DIS structures, i.e. the National Aid Coordinator (NAC), the National Authorising Officer (NAO), the Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU), and the line ministry Senior Programme Officers (SPOs), faced constraints in terms of staffing levels; most notably so at the CFCU with the obvious constraints this created for the efficiency and effectiveness of its functionality as the contracting agent for EU-funded projects in the earlier years of the 2002-2006 programmes. The inadequacy of DIS staffing was a frequent constraint across almost the lifetime of the 2002-2006 programmes.

At the line ministry level the variable capacity of SPOs for proposing project ideas, then preparing the detailed project requirements (tender documentation/specifications) of sufficient quality was also a frequent cause for the late submission of procurement dossiers for the EC's *ex-ante* control and the contracting of funds. Equally the capacity of SPOs to provide adequate progress monitoring reports has constrained the efficiency and effectiveness of the project monitoring functions. The development of efficient and effective programme monitoring functions also faced constraints as the DIS structures initially struggled to establish a clear demarcation of their powers and clear lines for coordination and communication to support the efficient management of the programmes (during the processes of procurement, implementation or monitoring). The development of common reporting tools of adequate quality to provide timely monitoring data for decision-making purposes proved especially challenging.

The Commission Decision authorising the conferral of DIS management to the Turkish authorities taken in October 2003 set-out a number of conditions to be met by the DIS structures over the following months and years. Follow-up audits to review the compliance of the DIS structures revealed (notably an audit finalized in March 2006) serious weaknesses existed that were sufficiently great that the suspension of the DIS in Turkey was a real risk in 2006 and early 2007.

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

The progressive strengthening of the DIS structures was undertaken starting from 2007 through to the restructuring of the NAC in 2009. However, for almost the entire lifetime of the 2002-2006 programmes (i.e. mainly 2002-2010) the inadequacy of the DIS structures was a frequent constraint to the efficient and the effective implementation of the assistance.

Programme Procurement

At the programme level the efficiency of 2002-2006 assistance for Turkey is initially assessed in terms of the achieved deployment of the available programme funds. The rates for contracting and disbursement of the 2002-2006 EC-grant are summarized in the Table below.

Table 1: Utilization of the 2002-2006 Financial Assistance (EC Grant) as of 31 December 2010

Programme (year)	Allocated (M€)	Contracted (M€)	Contracted (%)	Disbursed (M€)	Disbursed (%)
2002	126.0	112.2	89.05	105	83.33
2003	144.0	122.0	84.72	117	81.25
2004	235.6	194.4	82.51	186	78.95
2005	277.7	232.6	83.76	223	80.30
2006	450.0	388.9	86.42	348	77.33
TOTAL	1233.3	1050.1	85.15	979	79.38

At 85% the overall contracting rate for the 2002-2006 programmes is only barely satisfactory. It falls short of the standard contracting rates achieved by other Candidate Countries under other pre-accession assistance programmes in the pre-IPA period: traditionally minimum 90% contracting. The shortfall in contracting represents a sizeable limitation of the 2002-2006 programmes' overall potential for the achievement of results, limiting the overall effectiveness and impact of the programmes.

Furthermore, a significant constraint in terms of the efficiency of the 2002-2006 programmes was the traditionally delayed process of procurement and contracting, with 77% of the total number of contracts signed in the month prior to the contracting deadline, as summarized in the Table below.

Table 2: Contracting of the 2002-2006 Financial Assistance

Programme (year)	Contracting Deadline	Total Number of Contracts	Last Month Contracting	
			(Number)	(%)
2002	30/11/2004	351	287	82
2003	30/11/2005	501	454	91
2004	30/11/2006	752	688	91
2005	30/11/2007	604	470	78
2006	30/11/2008	378	85	22
TOTAL		2586	1984	77

The principle reason for the delayed and reduced level of deployment of the available programme funds was the initial weakness of the DIS structures in Turkey to efficiently manage the programme; in addition to the management processes supporting the procurement process the weaknesses also affected the efficiency of the implementation of progress monitoring functions. Each year a constant constraint for the DIS structures was the need to clear the contracting backlog so as to minimise the risk of loss of funds. The efficient start-up of the next years' programmes was accordingly affected.

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

In order to support the Turkish authorities develop and strengthen the DIS structures (e.g. via training, via the development of management systems, audits) and also to support implement the programmes (e.g. via support with the preparation of projects and/or technical specifications, needs-assessments), EC-funds were made available to Turkey under Objective 6 of the programme "Project Preparation". Between 2002 and 2006 a total of € 63 million was made available under the programmes for "Support activities to strengthen the European integration process". However, the funds were not fully utilized by the Turkish side. Only 64% of the funds were actually contracted (€ 40.4 million).

In addition to measures enacted by the Turkish authorities to strengthen the DIS structures (staff levels, capacity, and tools), the EC also introduced specific measures to strengthen the efficiency of the deployment of the EC-grant, most notably via the utilization of clearly defined deadlines for the preparation of procurement documentation / technical specifications by the Turkish authorities for submission to the EC for *ex-ante* authorisation, as required under DIS. This was initiated with the 2005 programme and fully effective linked to the 2006 programme, with the clear result that fewer contracts were concluded in the final available period; as shown in Table 2 above. It is also noted that while the implementation (execution of contracts) deadline for the 2006 programme was extended for a series of specific projects for a period of either 6 or 12 months, the 2006 programme was the only programme year (between 2002-2006) for which an extension of the execution of contracts deadline by 12 months was not provided for the whole annual programme.

Programme Implementation

In regard to the efficiency of the processes of implementation and delivery of the contracted project actions, in terms of the provision of appropriate solutions and the delivery of the outputs and hand-over of the intended results, the efficiency of the 2002-2006 programmes was generally satisfactory.

Project actions were implemented by the relevant technical units of the beneficiary(s) in partnership with the different contractors responsible for the delivery of the outputs. In regard to the delivery of services (via Twinning, Technical Assistance, Direct Grant) the actions were managed under the direction of a Project Steering Committee, traditionally held monthly to monitor and guide implementation, supported by the SPO and potentially the other DIS actors, e.g. the NAC and CFCU, plus also the EC, although the attendance of horizontal DIS actors at meetings was often problematic.

The delivery of outputs as the basis for the achievement of the project results linked to the sample of 18 projects assessed as part of this evaluation have largely been efficiently fulfilled, although:

- In a number of cases contract extensions have been required due to delivery delays arising (due to internal project factors and/or due to external factors), e.g. under [TR 02.03.01 \(Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety\)](#), [TR 02.04.03 \(Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre\)](#), [TR 05.03.16 \(Upgrading the Statistical System\)](#), and [TR 06.01.05 \(Shelters for Women Subject to Violence\)](#).
- In a number of cases project components have been cancelled, notably supply of equipment, e.g. under [TR 02.03.01 \(Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety\)](#), [TR 05.01.03 \(Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol\)](#), and [TR 05.03.16 \(Upgrading the Statistical System\)](#); for [TR 02.03.01](#) and [TR 05.03.16](#) the beneficiaries procured the equipment from its own budget.
- In other cases procurement delays for some project components has partially de-coupled the full linkages between components, e.g. under project [TR 03.01.03 \(Improving Cooperation between NGOs and the Public Sector\)](#) the TA component and the grant scheme component.

Project implementation linked to the 2002-2006 programmes was undertaken via the standard range of delivery modalities available for EU pre-accession assistance, as summarized in the Table below.

Table 3: Project Delivery Modalities of the 2002-2006 Financial Assistance

Delivery Modality	Services				Supply	Works	Grants Calls for Proposal
	Twinning	TA	FWC	Direct Grant			
Financial Value (% of 2002-2006 grant)	8%	16%	5%	7%	23%	18%	22%

The predominant type of assistance was via the provision of services. The selection of the relevant service delivery modality for the project components has generally been appropriate. While the majority of contracts were in the form of Technical Assistance (TA) there were also an appropriate number of Twinning projects (70), plus a number of direct grants with specialist agencies and international institutions (e.g. Eurostat, Eurochambres, the Council of Europe, the UNFPA).

Twinning has clear advantages in providing the beneficiary with the most appropriate, hands-on experience with the modalities of *Acquis* transposition and administrative operation, plus in terms of the institutional partnership between the Twinning providers and the beneficiary. Therefore the capacity-level of the beneficiary to actively participate in covenant negotiation and the subsequent management and realization of the planned results is a major element to ensure the efficient delivery of the Twinning actions. For the sample of projects assessed as part of this evaluation there was generally a good level of cooperation achieved between the Twinning providers and the beneficiary.

Investment type actions, whether in supply or works, were judged to be less efficient in terms of the timely delivery of intended outputs. Often this was due to procurement delays, e.g. in the preparation of the technical specifications, or following the unsuccessful procurement of some supply lots, or due to implementation delays linked to the successful fulfilment of conditionalities, e.g. securing and contracting co-financing, or land, or securing permits, or due to implementation delays linked to the contractors, e.g. due to bankruptcy.

The supply and works components, plus linked activities provided under the service contracts, under a number of the sample of 18 projects faced delivery deficiencies due to construction delays, e.g. under TR 04.03.03 (Restructuring and Strengthening Food Safety and Control System), TR 05.03.04 (Establishment of a National Food Reference Laboratory) and TR 06.01.05 (Shelters for Women Subject to Violence).

The efficiency of actions based on the need for inter-agency cooperation was often weaker than for actions where this was not a key requirement. The development of operational mechanisms for such cooperation and/or in securing the commitment and active collaboration of all actors to the process and/or ownership of the results were the key reasons for the reduced efficiency.

A number of projects faced initial efficiency difficulties in terms of the development of cooperation and data-sharing between partners, e.g. TR 02.04.03 (Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre), TR 05.01.03 (Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol), and TR 05.03.16 (Upgrading the Statistical System).

Generally, while institutional arrangements for all programmes/projects are set-out in the respective programming documents, at project-level the information on the beneficiary's management structures that shall operate coordination and the development and delivery of the results was often insufficient to support the efficient implementation of actions, e.g. information on project working groups, project actors and milestones at the different stages in the decision-making chain linked to project delivery.

2.3. EFFECTIVENESS

To what extent are/have the project results and specific objectives been achieved? *Have the right things been done?*

This question covers the *Effectiveness* criterion and also, to some extent, the *Impact* criterion. *Effectiveness* measures the extent to which the project activities implemented have achieved the stated objectives, more particularly the project purpose (Immediate Objective). This criterion also covers overall project management, the appropriateness, and the effectiveness of the projects and the level of political and institutional commitment and absorption capacity. In other words, *Effectiveness* may also be interpreted as "Have the right things been done?"

Programme performance has generally been good, but also faced some delivery constraints

Based on the sample of 18 projects assessed as part of this evaluation the effectiveness of the 2002-2006 programmes is, overall, judged to be satisfactory, although the performance was mixed.

The effectiveness of 11 of the projects is judged to be good, with the specific projects' outputs/results appropriately delivered and most of these utilized further by the direct beneficiaries in the management/delivery of their agenda, i.e. the projects have successfully generated immediate impact and behavioural change. But for 5 projects the effectiveness of the assistance in terms of the achievement of the objectives and purpose, i.e. in generating change, is judged to be moderate.

The effectiveness of the projects is judged to be strongest in areas where actions were directly related to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis*, notably where the *Acquis* is well defined in terms of a clear legal and administrative framework to be achieved and where local ownership was strong.

Reflecting that the main focus of the EU's assistance to Turkey, notably so starting with the 2002-2006 programmes, has been to ensure a pre-accession oriented framework for the delivery of the EU's assistance to the reform process in Turkey the positive effectiveness of the majority of the *Acquis* related institution building projects is a clear success story. Only one of the 10 projects in the sample with a direct *Acquis* related focus is judged to have been of moderate/limited effectiveness:

- TR 03.03.07 (Turkish Rail Sector Restructuring and Strengthening): While the project outputs were generated these were not adopted due to the lack of political commitment for reform. The main contribution of the project was to generate awareness among the project partners of the need for reform, the EU agenda in this regard, and potential options for sector reform.

The effectiveness of the projects is judged to be good in areas where actions were related to the programme objective of the promotion of economic and social cohesion, including via the promotion of EU-Turkish Civil Society Dialogue actions between Chambers of commerce and industry.

However, the effectiveness of projects is judged to be limited in regard to improving cooperation between NGOs and the public sector, plus in regard to the promotion of human rights reforms and good practice in Turkey – although in the areas of women's rights and gender equality the effectiveness of the projects is judged to be good / satisfactory.

Based on the sample of 18 projects assessed, the more notably successful / effective projects were:

- TR 02.04.03 (Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre): Turkey's National Policy and Strategy Document on Counteracting Addictive Substance and Substance Addiction 2006–2012 was adopted, built around the same pillars and cross-cutting themes as the EU Drugs Strategy 2006–2012, complemented by a detailed implementation action plan 2007–2009; national reports on drugs prepared and submitted to EMCDDA since 2006; TUBIM is able, increasingly year by year, to collect data from other institutions via the inter-agency cooperation developed and awareness raised in the area by the project and via a follow-up (IPA 2007) Twinning project that consolidated the achievements; the National Drugs Coordination Board, with participation from all relevant institutions, was established in 2007.
- TR 03.02.07 (Strengthening the Public Procurement System): A functional IT system enabling the Public Procurement Agency to perform its duties has been very well established and the electronic system is still in use very effectively providing the basis for e-procurement (e.g.

guidance manuals, procurement documents, applications to tenders, complaints etc.); a sustainable pool of trained-trainers was established; awareness and knowledge on public procurement procedures and the new system was widely provided amongst potential contracting suppliers and service providers as well as the general public.

- TR 04.03.03 (Restructuring and Strengthening Food Safety and Control System) and TR 05.03.04 (Establishment of a National Food Reference Laboratory): Control processes and IT systems for food control were significantly enhanced, including connectivity between the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL, General Directorate of Food and Control) and the NFRL; the laboratory construction was completed at the end of 2009 and the NFRL has become gradually functional and since 2012 fully functional with all its specialised units for different tests; the NFRL also completed its accreditation procedures and was accredited by TURKAK on 02/10/2012; currently, the NFRL is fully functional serving to the purpose in the country in accordance with EU-compliant national food safety legislation; the MFAL conducts a Control/Inspection Plan and a Risk Based Assessment has started to be implemented; the Rapid Alert System is functioning; awareness and knowledge on food safety was widely provided to the business community, particularly the food industry, as well as the general public.
- TR 05.03.16 (Upgrading the Statistical System): The process of compiling, evaluating, and frequency of publishing statistical data was upgraded in 12 areas (e.g. health statistics), with Turkstat producing statistics in line with the Eurostat standards and definitions and timing; new surveys and methodologies have been introduced and new data and statistics are produced; data providers use the Classification Server to provide data electronically; regional offices gained capacity for collecting data, editing data and transferring data to the headquarters of Turkstat; 2063 participants attended 195 training activities.
- TR 06.03.07 (Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration): IT systems upgraded with customs procedures integrated into the system and virtually all declarations are now processed electronically; vehicles tracking system and vessels tracking system improved through new software; inter-agency interconnectivity and interoperability strengthened and compatibility with the EU IT systems (including CCN/CSL) improved, but not totally achieved; establishment of TCA Training Center and a sustainable pool of trained-trainers; Regulation on Post Clearance Control and Operations with Risk published in the Turkish Official Gazette on 27/10/2008 and in force since then; establishment of Post Control Audit System achieved.
- TR 06.02.04 (Support to Human Resource Development through VET): Labour market analysis completed in 8 pilot provinces to identify priority occupations / needs; for priority areas the occupational standards, training standards, training curricula were developed and adopted (52 curricula in 23 fields of training), plus management and teachers of vocational school trained; training equipment at 16 Secondary vocational schools and at 8 Post-Secondary vocational schools upgraded; strengthened cooperation between business and social partners; extensive awareness raising and information campaign in the pilot provinces.
- TR 06.04.03 (Civil Society Dialogue – EU-Turkish Chambers Forum): Management capacity and systems/tools utilized by Turkish Chambers to generate value-added services to their members strengthened via 22 cooperation partnerships established between Turkish and EU Chambers (e.g. on the promotion of trade and joint-ventures, of women entrepreneurship), 29 Chambers' executives trained at Eurochambres Academies, and quality management systems accredited at 6 Chambers; knowledge of Turkish Chambers on EU legislation and policies enhanced via 6 detailed Manuals on EU topics of particular relevance for the Turkish business community (e.g. Free Movement of Goods; Competition policy; Trade policy; Agriculture/Fisheries and Food Quality; Environmental policy). In total, 80 Chambers from all over Turkey and 24 Chambers from the EU were involved in the various project activities.

While still adequately successful, the effectiveness of some projects was weakened by the non-adoption of project outputs/results or weaknesses in terms of the quality of the deliverables, e.g.:

- TR 04.02.04 (Intellectual Property Rights with a focus on the Fight against Piracy): While the institutional structures and inter-agency cooperation to support the protection of IPR and the fight against piracy has been strengthened and staff of the range of enforcement bodies and

collective societies successfully trained, the draft legislation prepared under the project to ensure the full transposition of the *Acquis* in the area of IPR has still not been adopted.

- TR 05.01.06 (Promoting Gender Equality): The National Action Plan for Gender Equality 2008-2013 and the National Action Plan for Combating Domestic Violence against Women 2007-2010 were adopted, with inter-agency cooperation and monitoring systems linked to the two action plans established and functioning; however the quality of the action plans are weakened by the partially vague statement of objectives, the limited specification of targets, and the lack of specific timelines. Additionally, studies for the development of a model for a gender equality body were completed but have not been put into practice. Similarly the model for an inter-agency database for monitoring violence against women was not put into practice, although it can also be argued that to establish a full-fledged human rights institutional mechanism, efforts are currently underway to enact the Draft Law on Anti-discrimination and Equality.

However, the following projects are highlighted in terms of their moderate/limited effectiveness:

- TR 03.01.03 (Improving Cooperation between NGOs and the Public Sector): While a number of useful training actions for NGOs and the public sector were delivered the development of structured dialogue mechanisms was not achieved. The development of a detailed Code of Conduct establishing the principles for cooperation between NGOs and the public sector was modified in favour of the drafting of a Prime Ministry Circular, although this was not adopted. Via the grant scheme component 11 pilot projects were undertaken, which generated some level of dialogue in specific areas (e.g. the environment, children's rights, health), but, apart from a protocol on introducing a system for autism screening, the main achievement of the projects was to generate initial contacts and basic awareness among the project partners.
- TR 04.01.01 (Support to the Implementation of Human Rights Reforms), TR 05.01.03 (Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol), and TR 05.01.04 (Cascaded Training of Turkish Lawyers on Human Rights): Each of these projects contained significant training components and associated awareness raising actions. Recognising that the target groups of beneficiaries for the training are sizeable (e.g. judges, prosecutors, police, lawyers, physicians, staff of provincial government etc.), a key part of the projects was the Training-of-Trainers to undertake the initial roll-out of the introductory Training-of-Users. The training was successfully delivered, although for projects TR 05.01.03 and TR 05.01.04 the number of users trained was 18% and 10% lower than anticipated¹⁸, and the training was generally rated as good or satisfactory, although a minority of users requested that the introductory training provide more specialist/advanced information. However, the projects did not effectively create the basis for handing-over responsibility for the institutionalisation and continuation and further specialisation of training for users. As such, the main contribution of the projects was to generate general awareness among the trained users, the project partners, plus awareness-raising on human rights targeted at the public. Additionally, under TR 05.01.04, while the development of new guidelines, procedures, services etc. (for conducting medical examination and documentation of torture claims and the subsequent assessment of such documentation by prosecutors and judges) was eventually agreed between the project partners, these were not adopted by the beneficiary. The effectiveness of TR 04.01.01 was affected by the relatively weak institutional and operational position of the Human Rights Presidency (the main beneficiary) and of its relations with the local Human Rights Boards.

The key factors and obstacles influencing the effectiveness of the programme/projects

Naturally, the greatest determinant of the effectiveness of the projects is the level of political and institutional commitment to the project goals and the level of absorption capacity of the beneficiaries' management structures to support the delivery and take-up of results and to embed them in the institutional operations of the beneficiary.

The effectiveness of projects in terms of take-up and utilization by final users was also influenced by the success achieved by beneficiaries in regard to the functionality of inter-agency cooperation and

¹⁸ Under TR 05.01.03 the Training of Users was realised for c. 3600 physicians and c. 900 prosecutors or judges, against the planned 4000 + 1500 ; under TR 05.01.03 the Training of Users was realised for 9464 lawyers against the planned 10500.

the establishment of data-sharing protocols, plus in the functionality of consultations with wider stakeholders. A key determinant of success was the effectiveness of the main project beneficiary to ensure suitable communication of information on the goals linked to the project / reform agenda.

This has notably been stronger in regard to projects related to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis* and related public administration reform, for which the projects have provided focused support for the drafting of legislation, the development of systems and structures, staff training etc. Projects on EU *Acquis* transfer have mostly been implemented with full effectiveness in terms of development of legislation, secondary legislation, and regulations etc.

However, the effectiveness of a number of the projects has partially been weakened by the delays in the decision-making processes linked to the institutionalisation of the project results and in the ratification of new laws by Parliament, which often takes too long before legislation is finally put into force. When delays are experienced fulfilment of the process should be assessed via *ex post* reports.

Where the *Acquis* is defined in a looser framework or there is not a formal *Acquis* chapter the level of political and institutional commitment and ownership is less evident. For this type of interventions the beneficiary needs to establish its own, appropriate strategic/implementation frameworks, often involving inter-agency cooperation. Effectiveness depends largely on the stakeholders' ownership. In this regard the human rights projects suffered from weaknesses of ownership and also the limited provision of direction or vision during or after project implementation by the main project beneficiary.

Given that the greatest threat to the effectiveness of the assistance is the level of ownership and adequacy of the beneficiary's management structures to support the take-up of results and to embed them in the institutional operations of the beneficiary, it is a weakness that the management systems and institutional procedures for the effective absorption of the results were rarely detailed in project documentation or indicators of such processes provided. As the majority of actions aimed to support institutional reforms in the beneficiary and thus a change of specific behavioural patterns in the targeted institutions the limited consideration as to 'how' this will be achieved procedurally within the overall operational/administrative framework of the beneficiary is a design weakness.

For all projects the effectiveness of the assistance was also partially limited by the high levels of staff turnover in the public sector in Turkey, due to staff departing/joining as well as staff being transferred to different posts during the process of institutional reorganisation, which has created a risk for the success of the capacity development actions and effectiveness over the long period.

A further design weakness in terms of assessing the effectiveness of the assistance in contributing to achieving the strategic objectives (Immediate Objective) of the projects is the frequent deficiency of the indicators of achievement (OVIs) provided in the project documentation. The indicators should provide the basis for assessing the achievement of the projects' immediate objectives, i.e. the immediate impact and behavioural change generated, by the time that project implementation has been completed or in the immediate short-term period after completion. The lack of sufficiently SMART indicators poses a risk in terms of the limited provision of direction or vision this provided for the project partners to effectively aim for and achieve when project implementation is finished.

Assessing the effectiveness of the programme/projects during its implementation period in terms of progress being achieved and obstacles encountered was also hampered by the significant problems experienced in terms of the establishment of programme/project monitoring systems and tools. A programme cannot be managed effectively if data on outputs, results, or financial matters is not gathered precisely and appropriately. Additionally, too frequently the focus of monitoring was purely linked to counting the delivery of project outputs. Too rarely did this also assess the effectiveness of the outputs delivered (e.g. via reporting on trainees' assessments of training), or the effectiveness of the beneficiary's decision-making processes linked to the absorption and institutionalisation of the results (e.g. via the adoption of new/revised operating procedures, implementing regulations, or laws).

2.4. IMPACT

To what extent will/have the objectives of the 2002-2006 projects be/been achieved as intended, in particular their planned overall objectives, in terms of capacity building, legal approximation (e.g. EU *Acquis*), Turkey's economic integration into the EU market, institutional modernisation and overall EU-Turkey cooperation?

This question is fundamental as it addresses the *Impact* criterion, which is also referred to as *Outcome*, and also to some extent, to *Cross-Cutting Issues* and *Communication & Visibility* (e.g. *awareness-raising*). The analysis of the *Impact* criterion will be qualitative and quantitative whenever is appropriate. However, it must be noted that any particular activity is just one contribution to the wider outcome. As such, it exposes the relationship between the overall and immediate objectives, i.e. the extent to which the capacity building benefits received by the target beneficiaries have had a wider overall effect on a larger number of persons, institutions, authorities, and/or actors in a sector, region, or even country as a whole. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators.

This criterion will more particularly cover the direct, indirect, and horizontal outputs. The horizontal outputs will include:

- Turkey's progress on commitments and implementation; monitoring of progress made in the priority areas and sectors, as necessary for future policy advice; optimal use of EU assistance mechanisms;
- Defining and introducing best practice with respect to the policy-making process across all policy-making bodies;
- Defining and introducing best practice with respect to public administration reform, economic integration into the EU, approximation with EU legislation and standards (EU *Acquis* transfer).

In addition, the evaluation will provide data on the non-governmental organisations (NGOs) involved and how they benefited from assistance: initiatives aimed at the consolidation and further development of democratic practices, the rule of law, human rights, gender equality / mainstreaming and the protection of minorities.

Emphasis should be also put on investment in economic and social cohesion, taking into account the importance of regional disparities between Turkish regions as well as the gap between Turkey's national income and the EU average.

The achievement, impact, and sustainability of project results must always be measurable and measured in due course so that a sensible, substantiated decision can be made as to the fate of a project: stop or continue? The impact could be measured by applying weighted grades to each of the various stages reached by the project in terms of impact.

Together with *Sustainability*, *Impact* is often considered as the most important criterion from a donor perspective. Therefore, this criterion will be rather comprehensively covered.

Mixed evidence of impact, but overall the 2002-2006 programmes have been successful

In preparation for EU accession, Turkey must go through the challenging process which requires the alignment of its political, legal, institutional, economic, and social structures with those of the EU.

The 2002-2006 programmes for Turkey were the first EU assistance programmes for which there was the exclusive focus on projects supporting Turkey meeting the accession criteria, in particular via the provision of institution building support to Turkey aimed at the implementation of the EU *Acquis*. The programmes were also the first EU assistance programmes for which the Turkish authorities were directly involved in and responsible for the management and implementation of the assistance, on the basis of the DIS, and thus responsible for the achievement of the project objectives. The programmes were also the first to extend the Twinning instrument to Turkey as the delivery mechanism of choice for institution building projects linked to the EU *Acquis*, based on the achievement of mandatory results to be fulfilled in partnership between the Twinning providers and the Turkish beneficiary(s).

In terms of the assessment of the impact of the 2002-2006 programmes it is important to appreciate that the programmes/projects were annual programmes, for which the implementation delivery period of projects was traditionally two years up to three years. Recognising that the processes of reforms that must be achieved by Turkey to meet the requirements of EU membership (including in regard to human rights standards, and the promotion of Economic and Social Cohesion) are of a medium- to long-term nature, it is clear that the projects are therefore the initial interventions to promote reforms.

The extent of impact of a single project of two years delivery is therefore often just as one of a series of contributory factors to the achievement of the wider societal-economic impact of the reforms over the medium- or longer-term. Reflecting this, a frequent constraint in terms of assessing the impact of the assistance is the insufficiently 'SMART' specification of the intervention objectives and related indicators (OVIs) at the impact level for many projects. This is often reflective that the Wider Objective(s) lack a 'Specific' medium-term focus for projects (i.e. the intermediate impact one-year after project completion) within the overall framework of the longer-term goal (i.e. the wider impact three-to-five years after project completion). While this represents a risk in terms of assessing impact it does not necessarily indicate the unsuccessful achievement of programme/project impact over the intermediate or longer-term period. However, it is a programme/project design weakness.

Based on the sample of 18 projects assessed, and reflecting that projects linked to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis* were, generally, effectively delivered, the immediate and intermediate impact of the 2002-2006 programmes is most evident in this regard. The impact of the assistance was notably evident in regard to the Customs, Statistics, Public Procurement, Food Safety, and Drugs Focal Point projects. In regard to projects in the area of Economic and Social Cohesion the achievement of immediate and intermediate impact is also evident, while also recognising that the reform and development processes in the area are of a long-term nature and significant scale. However, the immediate impact of projects linked to the promotion of public sector dialogue with civil society / NGOs and to the promotion of human rights is moderate, and the intermediate impact of the projects is limited; although the impact of the women's rights and gender equality projects is good.

Table 4: Successful Project Impact Generated via the 2002-2006 Financial Assistance

<p>Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration</p>	<p>The assistance has strengthened the capacity of the TCA to ensure more effective operation, protection, and control of its external borders in line with the increased level of approximation with the <i>Acquis</i> and EU standards achieved, including further improvements in the IT systems' compatibility, inter-connectivity and inter-operability with the EU's IT systems. The CCN/CSI, NCTS and ITMS systems are operational within the TCA and further activities on inter-connectivity with the EU systems are underway. The TCA has reached a good level of alignment in the field of transit with a view to starting the process for acceding to the Common Transit Convention. The modernisation of the TCA systems and operations has facilitated trade across the border achieved via the simplification of customs transactions and the increased efficiency and effectiveness of the customs system via electronic processing of import and export declarations. The improved capacity of the border control and patrolling services to undertake surveillance has improved the effectiveness of customs surveillance actions, such as in the fight against tobacco smuggling, fraud etc. The Training Centre and training capacity established via the project ensures the delivery of on-going and entry-level training for staff.</p>
<p>Upgrading the Statistical System</p>	<p>The assistance has improved the quality and transparency of the statistical system in Turkey, based on utilizing EU statistical definitions and standards, via enhancing the capacity of Turkstat, in cooperation with other partners with responsibilities to collect sectoral data in their field, to compile, evaluate, and provide more timely and reliable statistics. In addition to the introduction of new surveys, the frequency of existing surveys has also been improved, e.g. in the</p>

	<p>fields of employment, balance of payments. The trust and confidence of partners and the wider public in the quality and independence of the statistical process has been strengthened. Further development of the system by Turkstat is undertaken on the basis of the 2nd Official Statistics Programme (2012-2016), is guided by the Eurostat Strategy for full alignment of the Candidate Countries in the area of statistics by 2020. Additionally, peer-review studies are undertaken to support Turkstat to identify further necessary actions. The enhanced quality and transparency of the statistical system supports improved analyses, policy and strategy development of the government as well as the private sector and others utilizing statistics in decision-making and public policy development.</p>
<p>Strengthening the Public Procurement System</p>	<p>The operational performance and professionalism of public procurement in Turkey has been strengthened, based on the closer alignment of national legislation to the <i>Acquis</i> and the introduction of new tools, e.g. guidance manuals on legislation and procedures for procurers and for tenderers, good practice guides on tender management. The training capacity established via the project ensures the delivery of on-going and entry-level training for staff. The introduction of e-procurement has also strengthened the public procurement process via improved transparency of procurement and the use of an e-complaints system to efficiently process complaints. While the number of complaints received rose in 2012 by 19% compared to 2011, this is also an indication of the increased number of participants in public procurement tenders under the e-procurement system; reportedly the average number of participants per tender has risen from 3 to at least 5 or more, which should ensure greater cost-efficiency of awards.</p>
<p>Strengthening Food Safety and Control & Establishment of a National Reference Laboratory</p>	<p>Food Safety standards and the credibility of the food control services have been significantly strengthened impacting on the food industry and producers, and overall society based on Turkey's progressive alignment with, application and enforcement of EU standards. The National Food Reference Laboratory is a member of the EU laboratory network, ensuring that it maintains informed with the evolving EU framework for food safety and good practice, utilizing proficiency tests, inter-laboratory cooperative studies, and peer-reviews. The efficiency and effectiveness of food control and inspection conducted by the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock has been strengthened at the national and local level via improved standard operational procedures, IT systems to ensure timeliness and via utilizing Risk Based Assessment to ensure the appropriate frequency and content of control inspections. Awareness of the food industry and producers as to requirements in the area has been further promoted via good practice guides. The increased food safety standards achieved have allowed for the increased export of foodstuffs to the EU after companies have obtained certification of their products in line with EU requirements; for instance 6 companies were certified in the dairy food industry in April 2013, the first dairy product export since 2001.</p>
<p>Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre</p>	<p>The National Drugs Strategy Document (2006-2012) has served as the central reference document to guide the National Focal Point (TUBIM) and its wide range of partners in the area of illicit addictive drugs and substance abuse, prevention and treatment. The strategy is presently being updated under the coordination of TUBIM based on the evaluation of the measures enacted under the 2nd National Drug Action Plan (2010-2012). Providing coordination between institutions and</p>

	<p>agencies is an essential task for TUBIM and further to the EU's assistance the inter-agency collaboration, data-sharing systems, and protocols have been further developed. Inter-agency partnership and ownership is ensured via the National Drugs Coordination Board, composed of representatives of central units of relevant institutions, which meets on a quarterly basis. Provincial coordination is executed through Provincial Drug Coordination Boards (Provincial Focal Point), established in accordance with the 1st National Drug Action Plan, under the provincial governorships, via which Provincial Drug Actions Plans have been prepared. TUBIM has also introduced additional surveys on the prevalence of drug use (e.g. the first general population survey in 2011, and school student attitude and behaviour survey). In addition to the range of prevention actions conducted by partners, since its establishment TUBIM has implemented 12,000 information and awareness raising activities (trainings, seminars, workshops) of which 2+ million people have benefited. It also provides trainings for personnel who are working in the field of counteracting substance addiction in both Turkey and foreign countries in order to improve the effectiveness of prevention.</p>
<p>Combatting Violence against Women</p>	<p>The assistance has significantly supported to move the agenda forward, under the auspices of the Ministry of Family and Social Policy and the Ministry of Interior, greatly contributing to the awareness of service partners and decision-makers at the national and provincial levels. The 2004 Municipalities Law required municipalities with a population of min. 50,000 to open protection houses/shelters for women's and children's welfare; revised in 2012 up to min. 100,000 population. However, in 2007, when the EU assistance projects in the area were at start-up, only 35 such shelters existed across Turkey. Due to the increased visibility for the subject generated by the EU projects supporting the development of the 1st National Action Plan (2007-2010) and the construction of shelters and the development of service guidelines for their operation, a series of further reforms have been enacted. Legislation for the Protection of Family and Prevention of Violence against Women was enacted in 2012 to develop more comprehensive prevention and protection policies and to overcome problems occurring during the implementation of previous legislation, while the number of shelters across Turkey totalled 118 in May 2013. A Department for the Fight Against Domestic Violence was established at the Turkish National Police in 2010. The 2nd National Action Plan was prepared by the Ministry of Family and Social Policy covering 2012-2015. The UNFPA is actively supporting Turkey to continue to roll-out reforms in the area of combatting Violence against Women. However, it is also evident that while good progress has been achieved linked to the development of support services available to women subject to violence, progress has not been as significant in regard the prevention of violence against women, or in greatly changing public attitudes regarding violence against women.</p>
<p>Human Resource Development via VET</p>	<p>The assistance has strengthened the capacity of the Ministry of National Education and the Higher Education Council, plus vocational training providers, to undertake further development of VET standards in Turkey within the context of the European Qualification Framework and the changing needs of the labour market. There are presently approximately 7000 training modules covering 62 job families and 228 branches being utilized for VET teaching in Turkey. The EU</p>

	<p>assistance has also greatly strengthened dialogue with and the involvement of economic and social partners in the development and take-up of VET: at the national level this is undertaken via the Vocational Education Council and at the provincial level via Provincial Employment and Vocational Education Boards (meeting quarterly) to determine and monitor the needs of the local labour market and find local solutions for local problems/opportunities. The Ministry is also continuing to undertake measures to raise awareness and ownership on VET, to promote VET via the extension of its network of VET Information Centres, information seminars, career days, entrepreneurship conferences etc. In 2012 the Ministry also launched an on-line portal "National Career Information System", a career-guidance and counselling service for career planning purposes for VET (for upper secondary education and higher education, plus lifelong learning).</p>
--	---

Factors influencing programme/project impact

Naturally, the key determinant of the impact of the projects has been the ownership of the project objectives and results of the direct beneficiary institutions. They are responsible for ensuring the effective institutionalisation and continuation of the project results and the delivery of benefits, plus, as suitable, the further development of the project results to support the wider reform agenda.

This was generally strongest where the beneficiary institutions have clear corporate plans and multi-annual strategic plans for policy orientation and policy delivery supported by medium-term implementation action plans and budget plans. This was most evident in regard to the successful impact of projects in the areas of Customs, Statistics, and Food Safety, where the projects achievements have been fully institutionalised and operated within the delivery of related functions and services, e.g. (Customs) the facilitation of trade achieved via the simplification of customs transactions and the increased efficiency and effectiveness of the customs system via electronic processing of import and export declarations, plus the more effective protection and control of external borders; (Statistics) the improved transparency of and enhanced capacity in the statistical system, providing timely and reliable statistics to support policy and strategy development of the government as well as the private sector and others utilizing comparative statistics; (Food Safety) standards have been significantly strengthened impacting on the food industry and overall society in line with EU standards, allowing for the increased export of foodstuffs to the EU after companies have obtained certification of their products in line with EU requirements, for instance 6 companies were certified in the dairy food industry in April 2013, the first dairy product export since 2001.

However, the achievement of the immediate impact of projects linked to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis* was significantly constrained for a number of projects due to the delayed adoption of the project results by the beneficiary and/or due to follow-up enforcement weaknesses. This was most notable in the case of the impact of the Railways sector and the IPR projects. For the Railway project the impact of the assistance has been limited; while legislation in the area of liberalisation of the railway sector entered into force on 1 May 2013, for which the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications reports reports that it did consult the project's draft outputs, the new law is not strictly in line with the principles of the legislation proposed under the project. In the area of IPR, the immediate impact is constrained by the long delay and, still, non-adoption of the law to provide for harmonisation of the Turkish legal framework in the area. The intermediate impact of the projects is accordingly substantially weakened / limited.

The immediate and intermediate impact of the projects is also dependent on the extent of continued stakeholder consultation and continuation of suitable awareness-raising and access to information for partners and the wider public linked to the upgraded / new services, processes and quality standards that have been adopted and implemented. While this has been undertaken by all beneficiaries linked to *Acquis* projects, these actions remain notably less effective in the areas of OHS and of IPR.

The intermediate impact and ownership of the projects is also far better ensured whenever the projects are part of multi-phased interventions or whenever they are followed up on by one or more projects (EU projects and/or TAIEX actions and/or SIGMA actions, or via other donors) that have built

upon the results to further evolve the related policy agenda and/or via peer reviews to assess how effectively previous results have been introduced and suitably operated. This has been most evident in regard to the Customs, Statistics, Food Safety, Public Procurement, Drugs Focal Point, HRD via VET, Support to the SPO/pNDP projects, plus in the area of combatting Violence against Women.

In addition to utilizing follow-up projects to strengthen impact, the intermediate impact of the projects is also strengthened via the increasing participation of Turkish partners and experts in EU networks generated by the projects, e.g. via testing laboratory networks, or Chambers of commerce and industry, or between line ministries/agencies. This has been most evident in regard to the Customs, Statistics, Food Safety, OHS, Drugs Focal Point, HRD via VET and EU-Turkish Chambers projects.

The immediate and intermediate impact and ownership of the projects dependent on inter-agency cooperation and data-sharing was strengthened when a key project deliverable was a multi-annual strategy and medium-term implementation action plan to guide the range of partners in their further cooperation. Even if the first action plans are sometimes partially weakened, e.g. for Gender Equality by the lack of clear indicators or detailed budget to support promote further actions over the six-year period covered by the strategy, the action plans have served to establish the framework for regular consultation on the progress achieved by the different partners in terms of on-going actions to achieve the medium-term goals in a range of policy areas. The main beneficiaries supported by multi-annual plans, e.g. Customs, Statistics, Gender Equality, combatting Violence against Women, and Drugs Focal Point projects, now have the capacity to prepare the subsequent multi-annual strategy and medium-term implementation action plans, which are being presently prepared for the post 2012/2013 period. The updated strategies and action plans are being prepared on the basis of detailed assessments of the lessons learned and achievements under the previous phases.

The impact of the projects in the area of Economic and Social Cohesion is evident not only at the level of the achievement of the immediate and intermediate project objectives, e.g. via the further development of additional VET standards and courses and the further transition to a modular approach for VET delivery, but is also evident in regard to the process the projects have collectively supported of progressively introducing into Turkey the basis for it to operate an EU strategic planning approach to Cohesion Policy, e.g. via the development of sectoral and regional development plans.

At the programme management level the impact of the projects also includes the process of gradually introducing the Turkish authorities and staff to the requirements of EU-funds management. While the development of the DIS structures and functionality was a lengthy process, which negatively impacted on the overall impact of the 2002-2006 programmes, e.g. the non-contracting of 15% of the funds available under the programmes, the staffing levels and expertise available for EU-funds management has gradually been enhanced since 2007 and the legal basis also strengthened. This is essential for the effective operation of DIS in Turkey and the subsequent transition to Extended DIS, when the Commission's *ex-ante* approval during implementation is waived. Ultimately it is part of a process in the development of institutional capacity to manage EU-funds as an EU Member State.

For all projects the impact of the assistance has also been affected by the high levels of staff turnover in the public sector in Turkey, due to staff departing/joining as well as staff being transferred to different posts during the process of institutional reorganisation, which has created a risk for the success of the capacity development actions and impact over the long period.

In the areas of the promotion of human rights and the promotion of public sector dialogue with civil society / NGOs the immediate impact of projects is moderate and the intermediate impact is limited. This reflects the moderate/limited effectiveness of the projects to achieve their objectives, plus the limited evidence of any significant follow-up by the main beneficiary(s). The only significant result and impact arising from the public sector dialogue with civil society project was the introduction of an autism screening system developed via one of the grant scheme projects. A follow-up project (under IPA 2011) will attempt to build consensus in the area of structured dialogue.

The direct impact arising from the human rights projects (Human Rights Presidency, Cascaded Training for Lawyers, and Istanbul Protocol), has primarily only been experienced in terms of the training and awareness-raising actions specifically delivered during project implementation. The projects were based on a Training-of-Trainers component as a core project deliverable, as a means to thereby promote greater impact of the projects over the intermediate and longer-term periods. However, in each case the institutionalisation of the training capacity as a pool of future trainers failed to materialise. In the cases of the Human Rights Presidency and of Cascaded Training for Lawyers

the main beneficiaries did not establish a central institutional capacity, leaving this for the local Human Rights Boards and for the local Bar Associations and the interested trained-trainers to promote further training to their peers on the ECHR and the ECtHR. While this was initially actively undertaken by a pool of approximately 30 trainers trained under the Cascaded Training for Lawyers project, this had largely faded out after two or three years, thus the needs of lawyers in the area remained largely unfulfilled. Neither the Human Rights Presidency nor the Union of Bar Associations set-up systems to monitor follow-up and/or to receive reports from their local counterparts on the provision of follow-up actions. In the case of the Istanbul Protocol project the respective authorities did not seek to continue training.

The failure to establish a permanent training capacity under these projects was largely a failure of ownership and the limited capacity of the main beneficiary to follow-up the Training-of-Trainers. However, such training actions under the 2002-2006 programme have not always been unsuccessful, with the Customs project and the Public Procurement project notably highly successful in the institutionalisation of the training capacity generated by the assistance, delivering on-going training and entry-level training for all new staff at the beneficiary institutions. However, the impact of projects with a significant Training-of-Trainers component has, overall, frequently been weakened by the limited planning of how the Trainers should be utilised post-project, e.g. the Gender Equality project also faced difficulties to maintain the pool of trainers, with the pool of trainers now consisting purely of the experts trained under the project that are still working at the Directorate-General Status of Women (now part of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies).

The achievement of impact in the area of human rights has also been affected by the slow pace in establishing a clear and transparent, functional institutional and operational framework for the human rights agenda. The Human Rights Presidency (HRP) was established in 2001 within the Office of the Prime Ministry. Its principal functions are to act as a coordinating body for state agencies in dealing with human rights, to monitor the implementation of all legislation concerning human rights and make recommendations for improvement, to co-ordinate training for state agencies in this field and to investigate and report on claims of human rights violations. However, the operational framework by which the HRP coordinates its activities with its partners, notably the local Human Rights Boards, so as to ensure the consistent application of common, standardized monitoring mechanisms and reporting tools remains to be weak (this will, in part, be addressed via a follow-up IPA (2010) project), while the HRP has also suffered significant staff turn-over at the senior management level. Furthermore a series of partly overlapping national institutions in the area of the protection and the promotion of human rights now exist in Turkey, which may limit the overall effectiveness of mechanisms for investigating and solving allegations over human rights violations: the Ombudsman institution was established in 2012, also partially addressing human rights complaints within its wider remit to address maladministration, while a National Human Rights Institute was also set-up in 2012. However, no decision has yet been made in regard the format or structure of the future National Preventative Mechanism under the Optional Protocol of the UN Convention Against Torture (a mechanism to oversee a system of unannounced and unrestricted visits to places of detention by international and national monitoring bodies).

Overall, the assessment of the impact of the programme/projects is also weakened by the lack of post-project follow-up monitoring and reporting. Too often the focus of partners is almost exclusively on the project implementation period and delivery. Rarely was an exit strategy or post-project follow-up action plan specified within the context of the DIS, unless in the context of a multi-annual strategy and medium-term action plan. The consistent application of post-project planning and subsequent follow-up would strengthen the impact of the overall assistance, e.g. in terms of follow-up on the delayed institutionalisation of results, or in the follow-up of the achievement of intermediate impact after further utilization and roll-out of the benefits by the beneficiary(s).

Good Example of unplanned impacts

Economic and Social Cohesion TA Project TR0405.01 "Support to the State Planning Organisation to build its capacity at central, regional and local levels to implement economic and social cohesion measures in line with the preliminary National Development Plan (pNDP)" implemented from 2006 to 2008 generated unplanned impacts as the SPO in its capacity of beneficiary institution noticed that monitoring was very important for EU funds. Therefore they have installed a monitoring system with impact indicators for future (*ex-ante*) evaluations and programming cycles (see also Strategic Cohesion Framework).

2.5. SUSTAINABILITY

To what extent have/are the positive outcomes of the projects and the flow of benefits continued/likely to continue after external funding ends/has ended?

This question addresses the *Sustainability* criterion, which, together with *Impact*, is usually considered as most important not only from a donor perspective, but also for all stakeholders. To some extent, *Sustainability* of the effects and results is primarily concerned with measuring to what extent the benefits of project activities are likely to continue after EU funding has stopped. This criterion also analyses whether the longer-term impacts of project activities on the wider on-going reform processes in Turkey are sustainable at all at target sector, region, and/or country level. In this respect, the evaluation will carefully review Turkey's efforts to fulfil the Copenhagen Criteria with special attention to political criteria and more particularly to strengthening institutional capacity and investment related to the adoption of the *EU Acquis*.

The analysis aiming to answer this question on *Sustainability* will therefore more particularly cover the following points:

- Financial perspectives;
- Continued political commitment and policy support;
- Ownership over objectives and achievements by the beneficiaries;
- Continued institutional commitment e.g. to capacity building (staff turnover within the beneficiary administration, absorption capacity of beneficiary stakeholders, continued training, etc.); and
- Horizontal issues affecting or likely to affect sustainability.

First of all, the Evaluators would like to point out that overall sustainability of project results has been quite in the majority of cases. However, a few issues will be highlighted hereinafter for further consideration for the next programming cycles, e.g. under IPA-2.

1) Financial perspectives

Financial perspectives are adequate for follow-up purposes and continuity of project results, as follow-up projects have already started or are on the verge of starting to strengthen law enforcement capacity in a number of sectors.

As Turkey's economy is doing rather well, it is reasonable to expect that financial perspectives will be good and the beneficiary country will continue contribute funding to pre-accession projects on its own and/or to complement EU funding.

It must also be noted that financial perspectives can be positive at the beneficiary institution level. For example, after Project TR0302.07 with the Public Procurement Authority was completed, additional infrastructure investments and maintenance and updating costs related to the IT system were funded from the beneficiary's own budget. Another relevant telling example is Project TR0503.04 "Established of a National Food Reference Laboratory" where IT maintenance costs, payments for utility services and consumables, salaries and other expenditure are covered by the MFAL's budget.

New equipment for the National Food Reference Laboratory (NFRL), including the new MIS server, was procured from the MFAL's budget.

The Kocaeli Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) laboratory established under Project TR0203.01 is financially self-sustained. As there is high demand from the industry in the regions, the laboratory now earns adequate income to sustain all its expenditures for consumables, maintenance, etc.

Under Project TR0303.07, the Turkish State Railway Administration has been utilising government budget to fund most of its infrastructure investments and it is still not sustainable. The new Law allows partnerships with the private sector, which could provide leverage for inward private investment. However, so far, no private investor has made any concrete commitment to this sector.

Project TR0603.07 “Modernisation of Turkish Customs Administration (TCA) – Phase III” has maintained its training centre from its own budget. The Trainers have continued to deliver training programmes. Handbooks, guidelines and other working documents must be updated. The maintenance of the TCA-III’s IT system will be funded by the Ministry of Customs and Trade’s budget. The Ministry of Customs and Trade moved to a new building in July 2013. This new building is equipped with a modern Training Centre where training will be continued.

Sustainability of Project TR0604.03 “Civil Society Dialogue – EU-Turkish Chambers Forum (“ETCF”)” in terms of continued support services provided via the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB) in partnership with Eurochambres has been dependent upon continued regular financial allocations. In the present case, sustainability of such cooperation partnerships between Chambers and/or between their members is partly dependent on the relevance of this cooperation, on its success and also on the availability of future co-financing grants.

Shelters established under project TR0601.05 “Shelters For Women Subject to Violence”, have also been sustained financially either by the municipalities or by the Ministry of Family and Social Policies, where limited financial resources of the municipality is the case.

2) Continued political and institutional commitment (staff turnover, absorption capacity, continued training, website(s) still active and regularly updated, etc.)

There cannot be any continued institutional commitment without any significant political commitment. As indicated in the above Introduction to this Final Report, “At present, efforts are underway to revive the negotiation process, which has been gaining momentum. For example, Turkey’s Prime Minister recently reiterated that Turkey maintained its determination to go ahead with reforms to bring its laws and its institutions into line with EU standards and requirements and the government had taken further steps in this direction accordingly”.

Moreover, several projects were part of multi-phased interventions, e.g. customs, statistics, etc. For example, sustainability of Project TR0503.16 “Upgrading the State Statistical System of Turkey – Phase-II” has been ensured by Phase-III, which built upon Phase-II’s results just as Phase-II built upon Phase-I’s results.

However, institutional commitment also depends heavily on staff turnover, availability and commitment, absorption capacity, continued training, website(s) still active and regularly updated, etc. after project completion. Staff turnover has been quite high in a few cases, thus affecting absorption capacity, continued training, and overall institutional commitment.

This is the case of Project TR0402.04 on Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) where sustainability of results within the beneficiary institutions was weak due to high staff turnover and lack of relevant staff availability (thus affecting absorption capacity), as there is a strong need to follow the EC Directives newly published, which is impossible due to the high workload of IPR judges.

In the Turkish State Statistical Institute (TurkStat), although ownership over project results has been significant at the top management and staff levels due to the enlargement framework and related EU *Acquis* requirements, high staff turnover may nonetheless cause serious difficulties in the future. 500 new experts were hired between 2005 and 2010 to sustain the project results. One more issue with this Phase-II of the project “Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey” is the Institute’s regional structure. However, this project is part of an on-going modernisation process, which should solve this operational issue at the regional level within a reasonable period of time, as capacity development continues at regional offices. TurkStat’s independence has been well accepted. The Statistics Council meets twice a year to review the quality of statistical work against the EU *Acquis* and best practices. Cooperation protocols have been signed with several line ministries, including the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL), Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) and the Ministry of National Education (MoNE).

Under Projects TR0403.03 “Restructuring and Strengthening the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey” and TR0503.04 “NFRL”, staff turnover was quite high, which undermines sustainability of results. Due to frequent MFAL restructuring, trainees were transferred to other departments and as a result could not utilise their learning. For example, the old staff of the Control Department cannot conduct inspection missions.

During and after TR203.01 project implementation, the number of Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) inspectors was increased to ensure projects results towards sustainability. Follow-up projects, e.g. this project's Phase II – TR0503.14 and another 2 more OHS projects, namely TR0603.10 and TR0702.20 have contributed to Sustainability.

Without enough political commitment, no substantial reform is sustainable, as was the case for the railway sector under Project TR0303.7 "Turkish Rail Sector Restructuring and Strengthening". However, sustainability is supported by a follow-up project, namely TR0702.27 on capacity building the Turkish State Railway Administration (TCDD) under the 2007 Programme. A new project "Support to the Rail Regulating Authority" is now also in the IPA-I pipeline under the 2010 Programme. Under this project, secondary legislation will be prepared. It has also been reported that the Government intends to liberalise and restructure Turkey's railway sector. However, sustainability of staff capacity building could not be ensured after the TCDD's restructuring. Therefore additional capacity building will be necessary during the transition period (TA is needed for the transition/restructuring process). Currently, there is no framework for secondary legislation, which still needs to be developed. The Financial Management Information System (FMIS) could not be sustained after two years. Finally, it is too early to observe any concrete evidence about real reform ownership by the government, public sector and other stakeholders, including the private sector.

The Ministry for Customs and Trade has experienced high staff turnover over the last few years. However, it has been hiring and training younger staffers who have no intention of leaving the Ministry for Customs and Trade. As a result, turnover has slowed down considerably and the situation is now far more stable.

Notwithstanding, the overall picture is quite positive, as demonstrated by the examples below.

The number of the Public Procurement Authority (PPA) staff increased during and after the project. Currently, there are about 250 staffers working in the PPA. The trainers who gained capacity during the project continue to train the PPA staff. As a result, the difficulties due to high staff turnover are being compensated. The PPA has been cooperating with universities (currently 2 universities) to receive continuous and systematic training for its entire staff. Thus, institutional development has continued. After the project with the Public Procurement Authority was completed, awareness-raising activities intended for the public continued through electronic announcements and information-sharing activities.

The National Food Reference Laboratory established under Project TR0503.04 now operates on the basis of specific legislation ensuring its sustainability. Moreover, an adequate number of highly skilled staffers have been appointed to the laboratory. However, additional staff and training sessions are needed as new functions are being created within the laboratory. A Training Plan is being implemented to train the laboratory staffers as well as other experts in the field of food safety.

After Economic and Social Cohesion TA Project TR0405.01 "Support to the State Planning Organisation to build its capacity at central, regional and local levels to implement economic and social cohesion measures, the SPO, now Turkey's Ministry of Development, now plays a strategic coordination role on EU funds in Turkey. Moreover, it planned to open Chapter 22 of the EU Acquis "Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments" under the Irish EU presidency. The Council declared its approval to open EU *Acquis* Chapter 22 on "Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments" as of June 25, 2013. The Inter-Governmental Conference, which will confirm the Council's common position for the opening of Chapter 22 and determine the date for the accession conference, will take place after the presentation of the Commission's annual Progress Report following a discussion of the General Affairs Council (GAC).

With IPA-2, DG Enlargement's role is expected to increase, although its role is limited to political criteria and EU Acquis alignment. DG Region and DG Employment should be involved more proactively, although they will progressively disappear from the picture. All this gives the impression that the pre-IPA period is back.

3) Continued ownership over project objectives and results by the beneficiaries

Continued ownership over project objectives and results has remained an issue, as few Turkish direct beneficiary institutions seem to care sufficiently for impacts and sustainability once their respective projects have been completed. Project ownership is far better ensured whenever the projects under evaluation in this Final Report are part of multi-phased interventions or whenever they are followed up

on by one or more projects, which have built upon their results. Otherwise a mechanism should ensure better project ownership through systematic monitoring after project completion.

Best illustrating this finding is the follow-up project, which was launched by the EU Delegation after Project TR0301.03 "Improving Cooperation between NGOs and the Public Sector and Strengthening NGOs Democratic Participation ("SKIP)". The beneficiary of both interventions was the MEUA. The Project Fiche of this new project TR2011/0135.07 states that "while "SKIP" did produce valuable reports and thawed government civil society relations to a certain extent by producing several successful projects involving public sector - civil society cooperation, it left the government-civil society relations with an uncertain future. The [SKIP] project failed to galvanise action on the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) side to engage with government beyond the project timelines, while it also could not succeed in generating political commitment on the government side to sign a code of conduct outlining relations between to two sectors".

The Evaluators also point out that Trainers are somewhere out there, but very often there is no training department left or created to this effect or simply there is no commitment to any long-term follow-up. For example, under Project TR0501.04 "Cascaded Training of Turkish Lawyers on Human Rights", follow-up training on the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) and on the rules and procedures of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) after project completion was provided by several trained trainers to local Bar Associations. However, four years after project completion, this type of training is now limited. In this respect, a questionnaire was sent to the 81 local Bar Associations of which 19 of them replied. Only the Sanliurfa Bar Association confirmed that 5 training sessions on ECHR rules and procedures were delivered for 179 lawyers in 2012. The majority of survey respondents acknowledged a gap over latest ECHR developments. Besides, another key issue affecting this project's Impact and Sustainability also lies with the frequency of elections to the management board of the Union of Turkey's Bar Associations (TBB) and of local Bar Associations, which can lead to a positive or negative change of focus in respect of the ECHR.

However, the situation described in the above paragraph could be avoided in a number of cases. For example, the Public Procurement Authority is now planning another EU project to sustain the results of its project and to gain capacity on the new EC Directives, regulations, and practices. This intervention could be either a twinning or a TA project.

To keep awareness alive amongst the beneficiaries on Intellectual Property Rights, follow-up meetings, conferences, workshops are still conducted. The most recent event took place in June 2013 with the participation of all relevant line institutions and stakeholders. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism has taken measures to increase the staff capacity to fight against piracy and to protect the IPR. Thus, new experts have been hired and the number of the staff at the DG for Copyright has increased drastically after the project, reached to 100 currently. The newly hired experts are also being trained to understand the EC Directives.

The first EU-funded project on Food Safety was a MEDA project. Then the Food Safety and NFRL projects under evaluation in this Final Report were implemented. A project for classification of food companies and their control is currently being planned. In the meantime, a few FWC projects supported the MFAL in this respect. In 2013, a sectoral approach to EU interventions was worked out. New components are planned to be as follows: (1) Animal by-products and welfare; (2) Animal food safety; (3) Food-safety training (additional training); and (4) Regional Training Programme (RTP) for Environment and Food Safety.

The first EU-funded project on Food Safety was a MEDA project. Then the Food Safety and NFRL projects under evaluation in this Final Report were implemented. In 2010, as part of the EU harmonisation process, classification of food companies was established. The companies are now obliged to submit their modernisation plan by 2013, in accordance with Turkey's effective national legislation, which is in line with EU legislation. In the meantime, a few FWC projects supported the MFAL in this respect. In parallel with the draft IPA Regulation for 2014-2020, as from the 2013 programming year of EU financial assistance to Turkey, a sectoral approach has been adopted and the food safety-related measures proposed for EU funding by Turkey in the draft 2013 Sector Fiche include: (1) Animal by-products management and animal welfare; (2) Feed safety; (3) Food-safety training for control officials and feed experts (additional training); and (4) Capacity building for the control of foodborne zoonoses, risk communication and risk assessment.

Sustainability of the two Occupational Health and Safety laboratories in Ankara and Kocaeli created by Project TR0203.01 has been ensured by new regulations since project completion. More recently, the amendment to Law N°6331 on Occupational Health and Safety of June 2012 has put in place additional requirements for the private sector to ensure OHS of corporate structures and their employees. Enterprises with over 9 employees are required to have an in-house occupational safety expert.

Projects following up on Project TR0601.05 “Shelters for Women Subject to Violence” (with the Ministry of Interior as beneficiary institution) to establish another 26 new shelters has been designed and programmed under the 2009 IPA-1 programming period and also to prevent domestic violence under the 2010 programming period for which the Ministry for Family and Social Affairs is the beneficiary institution.

All modules developed under Project TR0602.04 “Support to Human Resources through Vocational Education and Training (VET)” as well as other informative / educational materials are published on the website www.ikmep.meb.gov.tr. The website of the project is still in use. The administrators and teachers of the vocational schools continue to benefit from it, which demonstrates project sustainability.

Through its consultancy role in Economic and Social Cohesion TA Project TR0405.01 “Support to the State Planning Organisation to build its capacity at central, regional and local levels to implement economic and social cohesion measures in line with the preliminary National Development Plan (pNDP)” implemented from 2006 to 2008, the project team contributed considerably to the completion of the four OPs, and to the preparation of modular training courses and various types of manuals and guidelines. Moreover, it helped lay the basis for follow-up measures on the use of IPA funds, and for the implementation of the OPs. The project's 2nd phase was being implemented from September 2011 to September 2013, improving the results achieved under Phase 1. Ex ante evaluations were conducted during Phase 1. Today, under Phase 2, the SPO (now the Ministry of Development) carries out mid-term evaluation of OPs and intends to continue conducting ex ante evaluations of OPs under the next programming period. Overall, the two interventions have been providing excellent training and preparation ground for structural funding (Regional Development) management in Turkey (Phase 1 even produced an Action Plan on Structural Funds for Turkey), although that was probably the least developed part of the project. Finally, a webpage on EU structural funding was also developed and is fully operational, which testifies to continued project ownership and commitment.

4) Horizontal issues affecting or likely to affect sustainability (positively or negatively)

Several projects have also generated good multiplier effects. For example, a project on Industrial Property Rights protection has been undertaken by the Patent Institute of Turkey, benefiting and sustaining several results of Project TR0402.04 on Intellectual Property Rights, namely Project TR0702.14 “Supporting Turkey in Enhancing Implementation and Enforcement of Industrial Property Rights” under IPA-I in Turkey. Accreditation of the two OHS laboratories (Ankara and Kocaeli) set up by Project TR0203-01 will ensure their sustainability as reference laboratories for Turkey, which should also generate a multiplier effect across the country (→ private and public laboratories). Moreover, the sustainability of results can be achieved by focusing on replicable training.

Networking continued after project completion. Communication and cooperation with the MS partner institutions and RTAs continued in a large number of cases after project completion, including with EU institutions and agencies, e.g. Public Procurement, Statistics (EUROSTAT), Food Safety (DG SANCO – relations to be enhanced – see Recommendations). In this respect, Eurostat Strategy 2014-2020 is guiding for the accession countries including Turkey, targeting full alignment by 2020.

Good *Complementarity/Coherence* between several projects has been effective, thus ensuring further institutional commitment and sustainability. For example, both projects TR0503.04 “On Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory” and TR0403.03 on “Restructuring and Strengthening Turkey’s Food Safety and Control System” were initially designed as one, but were eventually split up as TR0503.04 included significant supply and works, as Project TR0503.04 on “Establishing a National Food Reference Laboratory (NFRL)” was complementary to Project TR0403.03 on “Restructuring and Strengthening Turkey’s Food Safety and Control System”, as a follow-up action to the latter. Another example is provided by both projects TR0501.06 “Promoting Gender Equality” and TR0601.05 “Shelters for Women Subject to Violence”, which closely intertwined in terms of project activity design, as the shelters project was built upon the research and feasibility studies conducted under the gender

equality project, field of intervention and ownership over results. Considering this high level of commitment and project ownership achieved by Turkish authorities in those fields, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) as beneficiary implementer built upon the “Shelters for Women” project by implementing the “Women Friendly Cities Project” once again in coordination with the Ministry of Interior. The project currently covers 12 municipalities, 4 of which being where the shelters were built under the “Shelters for Women” project, namely Antalya, Izmir, Gaziantep, and Trabzon. The project aims to establish gender equality units at municipalities and adopt localised action plans on gender equality for each city. The project plans to cover 81 cities with additional financing from other donors.

5) Separate issues on Intellectual Property Rights in Turkey

During the interviews conducted in Ankara, several line stakeholders issued critical complaints that there was still too much counterfeiting in Turkey to make accession in the field of IPRs acceptable to EU. Therefore the Evaluators have put forward a few IPR sector-specific Recommendations to this effect in this Final Report.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

EU's Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Turkey, 2002-2006, has performed satisfactorily

The 2002-2006 programmes for Turkey were the first EU assistance programmes for which there was the exclusive focus on projects supporting Turkey meeting the accession criteria, in particular via the provision of institution building support to Turkey aimed at the implementation of the EU *Acquis*. The programmes were also the first EU assistance programmes for which the Turkish authorities were directly involved in and responsible for the management and implementation of the assistance, on the basis of the Decentralised Implementation System (DIS), and thus also directly responsible for the achievement of the programme/project objectives. The programmes were also the first to extend the Twinning instrument to Turkey as the delivery mechanism of choice for institution building projects linked to the EU *Acquis*, based on the achievement of mandatory results to be fulfilled in partnership between the Twinning providers and the Turkish beneficiary(s).

While the performance of the 2002-2006 programmes has been mixed, reflecting the diverse range of interventions that were addressed and the 'learning curve' for the Turkish authorities in terms of the management of EU-funds, the programmes have, overall, provided valuable support to Turkey in the implementation of its reform and development processes. The assistance also provided valuable support to Turkey linked to addressing issues connected to the opening of some EU *Acquis* Chapters for accession negotiations, and addressing issues arising following the 'screening' process.

The performance of the programmes in terms of the effectiveness, the immediate and intermediate impact, and the prospects for sustainability has been strongest in areas where actions were directly related to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis*, notably where the *Acquis* is well defined in terms of a clear legal and administrative framework to be achieved and where local political and institutional ownership was strong. Reflecting that the main focus of the EU's assistance to Turkey starting with the 2002-2006 programmes has been to ensure a pre-accession oriented framework for the delivery of the EU's assistance to the reform process in Turkey this is a clear success story.

The performance of the programmes was also good in the area of promoting Economic and Social Cohesion. Although it is clear that the development needs in this area are of a medium- to long-term nature, and that the 2002-2006 programmes were therefore initial interventions to promote reforms, the programmes have supported the progressive introduction into Turkey of an EU strategic planning approach to Cohesion Policy, e.g. via the development of sectoral and regional development plans, the development of institutional frameworks and partnership, plus monitoring structures and capacity.

However, the performance of the programmes was weaker in regard to support in the areas of promoting human rights reforms/standards, and the development of consultative dialogue between the public sector and civil society / NGOs. The impact and sustainability of these actions is limited. This primarily reflects the 'soft' nature of the reforms and the difficulties beneficiaries faced in terms of establishing a clear strategic framework for the actions and in building sufficient ownership of the project partners for the establishment of a clear plan for post-project continuation and follow-up.

For all projects the performance of the assistance, notably in terms of the prospects for impact and sustainability of the assistance, has also been affected by the high levels of staff turnover in the public sector in Turkey, due to staff departing/joining as well as staff being transferred to different posts during the process of institutional reorganisation, which has created a risk for the success of the capacity development actions and the successful achievement of wider impact over the long period.

The continued Relevance of the assistance is good

The continued relevance of projects under the Objectives "Approximation with the EU *Acquis*" and "Public Administration Reform" is good. The projects have addressed the real immediate needs of their respective line beneficiary institutions in terms of EU *Acquis* harmonisation and institutional modernisation effort. The 2002-2006 projects were targeted to provide *Acquis*-related support to Turkey in a range of fields linked to the EU *Acquis* Chapters, with a good emphasis provided to projects supporting the effective operation of the EU-Turkey Customs Union and the EU's Internal Market. Reflecting the EU's decision to open accession negotiations with Turkey in October 2005 – coinciding with the earlier period in the lifetime of the implementation of the 2002-2006 programmes – the actions were generally very timely and highly relevant in that respect.

The continued relevance of projects under the Objective "Economic and Social Cohesion" is also good. The projects have supported the progressive introduction in Turkey of an EU strategic planning approach to Cohesion Policy, which is now being further developed via the IPA in terms of the management capacity of the Turkish partners as well the delivery of more sizeable investment grant.

Despite a number of design and performance weaknesses, notably in the area of human rights reform, the continued relevance of the basic project goals under the Objectives "Political Criteria" and "Justice and Home Affairs" remains to be strong. When Turkey was recognised by the EU in 1999 as a Candidate Country for accession to the EU it was also recognised that Turkey did not yet, at that time, sufficiently comply with the EU's accession 'political criteria' so as to allow for the opening of EU accession negotiations. As such, the strong focus to strengthening Turkey's compliance with the EU *Acquis* in the area and with European human rights standards has been vital. While the 2002-2006 programmes cannot claim any impact in terms of the decision of the Council in December 2004 that Turkey sufficiently fulfilled the Copenhagen 'political criteria' so as to allow for the opening of EU accession negotiations, the relevance of the actions were very timely in respect to supporting Turkey's further development of systems and awareness so as to consolidate compliance with the accession 'political criteria'. However, the projects suffered from design and ownership weaknesses that have limited the projects' performance and absorption, due to the lack of consensus between beneficiary partners as to the goals to be addressed and/or the benefits of the assistance be ensured by the partners over the longer-term.

At the time the programming of the 2002-2006 assistance also suffered from its over-ambitious scale in terms of programme/project design. The extent that individual projects of two- to three- years delivery can substantially address the full range of sectoral reforms and development issues that face Turkey was sometimes over-looked, in particular in regard to promoting human rights reforms.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that the EU's Accession Partnerships were over-ambitious as it was impossible to achieve all their targets and objectives within the short time period before the Partnership was updated; while the programming of the assistance was conducted utilizing the Partnership(s), the start-up of project implementation under the EU financial support was often up to two years later, and the consequently the delivery of results three or more years after programming.

Reflecting this time-lag, a frequent constraint in terms of assessing the performance of the assistance is the insufficiently 'SMART' specification of the intervention objectives and of the related indicators (OVIs), notably at the levels of the project purpose (Immediate Objective) and the project goal/impact (Wider Objective). While project results are 'in the future' the programming exercise would have benefited from a clearer focus in terms of the quality of the objectives and indicators being 'Specific' and also 'Time-bound'. The indicators could also be improved in terms of being 'Measurable': via the inclusion of quantified targets and baseline data to support progress monitoring and evaluation. The timeline for the chain of development effects/goals – objectives and indicators – should have been more clearly demarcated: i.e. Results/Outputs = achieved by the project during implementation; Immediate Objective(s) = achieved on project completion or the immediate short-term after; Wider Objective(s) = the intermediate (1-year) to longer-term (3-years) outlook post-project completion.

The efficiency of the 2002-2006 programmes was constrained by the beneficiary's capacity

The 2002-2006 programmes were the first EU assistance programmes for which the Turkish authorities were directly involved in and responsible for the management and implementation of the assistance, on the basis of the DIS, and thus directly responsible for the achievement of the project objectives. As with the other Candidate Countries, e.g. under the Phare Programme, the process of establishing the DIS structures and ensuring their efficient and effective function also faced delays in Turkey. However, the process of addressing the DIS capacity weaknesses in Turkey was lengthy.

All the DIS structures faced constraints in terms of staffing levels; but most notably so at the CFCU with the obvious constraints this created for the efficiency and effectiveness of its functionality as the contracting agent for EU-funded projects. Additionally the DIS structures also suffered from the initial lack of demarcation between DIS programme actors and the slow process in establishing lines for coordination and communication to support the efficient management of the programmes (during the processes of procurement, implementation or monitoring). The development of reporting tools of adequate quality to provide monitoring data for decision-making was especially challenging. The progressive strengthening of the DIS structures was undertaken starting from 2007 through to the restructuring of the NAC in 2009. However, for almost the entire lifetime of the 2002-2006

programmes (i.e. mainly 2002-2010) the inadequacy of the DIS structures in Turkey was a frequent constraint to the efficient and effective implementation of the assistance and achievement of impact.

At only 85% the efficiency of the procurement contracting-rate of the EU-funding made available under the 2002-2006 programmes was only barely satisfactory; a rate of minimally 90% would traditionally be judged as sufficient. The shortfall in contracting represents a sizeable limitation of the 2002-2006 programmes' overall potential for the achievement of results, limiting the overall effectiveness and impact of the programmes. Furthermore, a significant constraint in terms of efficiency was the traditionally delayed process of procurement and contracting, with 77% of the total number of contracts signed in the month prior to the contracting deadline.

In addition to measures enacted by the Turkish authorities to strengthen the DIS structures (staff levels, capacity, and tools), the EC also introduced specific measures to strengthen the efficiency of the deployment of the EC-grant, most notably via the utilization of clearly defined deadlines for the preparation of procurement documentation by the Turkish authorities for submission to the EC for *ex-ante* authorisation under the DIS. This reduced the late contracting of the 2005 programme and, most clearly, the 2006 programme; with only 22% of contracts signed in the month prior to the deadline.

In regard to the efficiency of the processes of implementation and delivery of the contracted project actions, in terms of the provision of appropriate solutions and the delivery of the outputs and hand-over of the intended results, the efficiency of the 2002-2006 programmes was generally satisfactory. The delivery of outputs as the basis for the achievement of the project results linked to the sample of projects assessed as part of this evaluation have largely been efficiently fulfilled, although in a number of cases with the extension of contract implementation periods, and thus the delayed delivery of outputs and results, and/or with problems arising from the synchronisation/sequencing of all the project components and sub-components as a result of the over-ambitious character of projects as there were so many activities and project components and subcomponents to put in place.

Generally, while institutional arrangements for all programmes/projects are set-out in the respective programming documents, at project-level the information on the beneficiary's management structures that shall operate coordination and the development and delivery of the results was often insufficient to support the efficient implementation of actions, e.g. information on project working groups, project actors and milestones at the different stages in the decision-making chain linked to project delivery.

The effectiveness of the 2002-2006 programmes in generating change was satisfactory

The effectiveness of the projects is judged to be strongest in areas where actions were directly related to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis*, notably where the *Acquis* is well defined in terms of a clear legal and administrative framework to be achieved and where local ownership was strong. Projects have provided focused support for the drafting of legislation, the development of systems and structures, staff training etc. Projects on EU *Acquis* transfer have mostly been implemented with full effectiveness in terms of the development of legislation, regulations, structures etc., although the effectiveness of a number of the projects has partially been weakened by the delays in the decision-making processes linked to the institutionalisation of the project results and in the ratification of new laws by Parliament, which often takes too long before project results are adopted and put into force. When delays are experienced fulfilment of the process should be assessed via *ex post* reports. Most notably this has affected the fulfilment of the objectives linked to the Railways sector and to IPR.

The effectiveness of the projects is judged to be good in areas where actions were related to the programme objective of the promotion of Economic and Social Cohesion, including via the promotion of EU-Turkish Civil Society Dialogue actions between Chambers of commerce and industry. The involvement of project beneficiaries and partners in the design and take-up of the benefits was good.

However, the effectiveness of projects is judged to be limited – reflecting the ownership and design weaknesses – in regard to improving cooperation between NGOs and the public sector, plus the promotion of human rights reforms and good practice in Turkey – although in the areas of women's rights and gender equality the effectiveness of the projects is judged to be good / satisfactory.

Given that the greatest threat to the effectiveness of the assistance is the level of ownership and adequacy of the beneficiary's management structures to support the take-up of results and to embed them in the institutional operations of the beneficiary, it is a weakness that the management systems and institutional procedures for the effective absorption of the results were rarely detailed in project documentation or indicators of such processes provided. As the majority of actions aimed to support

institutional reforms in the beneficiary and thus a change of specific behavioural patterns in the targeted institutions the limited consideration as to 'how' this will be achieved procedurally within the overall operational/administrative framework of the beneficiary is a design weakness.

Too frequently the focus of programme/project monitoring was purely linked to counting the delivery of project outputs. Too rarely did this also assess the effectiveness of the outputs delivered (e.g. via reporting on trainees' assessments of training), or the effectiveness of the beneficiary's decision-making processes linked to the absorption and institutionalisation of the results (e.g. via the adoption of new/revised operating procedures, implementing regulations, or laws).

A further design weakness in terms of assessing the effectiveness of the assistance was the frequent deficiency of the intervention objectives and indicators of achievement (OVIs). At the level of project purpose (Immediate Objective) the indicators should provide the basis for assessing the achievement of the projects' (SMART) immediate objectives, i.e. the immediate impact and behavioural change generated, by the time that project implementation has been completed or in the immediate short-term period after completion. The lack of sufficiently SMART objectives and indicators poses a risk in terms of the limited provision of direction or vision to fulfil when project implementation is finished.

Mixed evidence of impact and sustainability, but, overall, programmes have been successful

Naturally, the key determinant of the impact and sustainability of the projects has been the ownership of the objectives and results of the direct beneficiary institutions. They are responsible for ensuring the effective institutionalisation and continuation of the project results and the delivery of benefits, plus, as suitable, the further development of the project results to support the wider reform agenda.

This was generally strongest where the beneficiary institutions have clear multi-annual strategic plans for policy orientation and delivery supported by medium-term implementation action plans and budget plans. This was most evident in regard to the successful impact and sustainability of projects in the areas of Customs, Statistics, Food Safety, Drugs Focal Point, and HRD via VET, where achievements have been fully institutionalised and further operated in the delivery of related functions and services.

However, the achievement of the impact of projects linked to the alignment with / adoption of the *Acquis* was significantly constrained for a number of projects due to the delayed adoption of the project results by the beneficiary and/or due to follow-up enforcement weaknesses. This was most notable in the case of the impact of the Railways sector and the IPR projects, and partially for OHS.

The impact and ownership of the projects is better ensured whenever the projects are part of multi-phased interventions or whenever they are followed up on by one or more projects (e.g. EU projects and/or TAIEX actions and/or SIGMA actions, or via other donors) that build upon the results to further evolve the related policy agenda and/or via peer reviews to assess how effectively previous results have been introduced and suitably operated. In addition to utilizing follow-up projects to strengthen impact, the intermediate impact of the projects has also been strengthened via the increasing participation of Turkish partners and experts in EU networks generated by the projects, e.g. via testing laboratory networks, or Chambers of commerce and industry, or between line ministries/agencies.

However, in the areas of the promotion of human rights and the promotion of public sector dialogue with civil society / NGOs the immediate impact of projects is moderate and the intermediate impact and sustainability is limited. This reflects the moderate/limited effectiveness of the projects to achieve their objectives, plus the limited evidence of any significant follow-up by the main beneficiary(s).

The achievement of impact in the area of human rights has also been affected by the slow pace in establishing a clear and transparent, functional institutional and operational framework for the human rights agenda. The human rights projects each contained a Training-of-Trainers component as a core deliverable, to promote greater impact over the intermediate and longer-term periods. However, in each case the institutionalisation of the training capacity as a pool of future trainers failed to materialise. This was largely a failure of ownership and the limited capacity of the main beneficiary to follow-up. However, such training actions under the 2002-2006 programme have not always been unsuccessful, with the Customs project notably highly successful in the institutionalisation of the training capacity generated by the assistance, delivering on-going and entry-level training for all new staff at the TCA. However, the impact of projects with a significant Training-of-Trainers component has, overall, frequently been weakened by the limited planning of how the Trainers should be utilised post-project, e.g. the Gender Equality project also faced difficulties to maintain the pool of trainers.

At the programme management level the impact of the projects also includes the process of gradually introducing the Turkish authorities and staff to the requirements of EU-funds management. While the development of the DIS structures and functionality has been a lengthy process, which negatively impacted on the overall impact of the 2002-2006 programmes, staffing levels and expertise available for EU-funds management has gradually been enhanced since 2007 and the legal basis strengthened. These are essential steps for the effective operation of DIS (and the transition to Extended DIS), and, as evident in the area of Economic and Social Cohesion, is ultimately part of a process in the development of institutional capacity to manage EU-funds as an EU Member State.

Overall, the assessment of the impact and sustainability of the programme/projects is also weakened by the lack of post-project follow-up monitoring and reporting. Too often the focus of partners is almost exclusively on the project implementation period and delivery. Rarely was an exit strategy or post-project follow-up action plan specified within the context of the DIS, unless in the context of a multi-annual strategy and medium-term action plan. The consistent application of post-project planning and subsequent follow-up would strengthen the impact of the overall assistance, e.g. in terms of follow-up on the delayed institutionalisation of results, or in the follow-up of the achievement of intermediate impact after further utilization and roll-out of the benefits by the beneficiary(s).

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of our analysis of the project sample under the 5 evaluation criteria, we put forward a series of recommendations addressed to the various line stakeholders as indicated.

General and Horizontal Recommendations for IPA-2

Recommendation 1 (EC Services, EU Delegation and MEUA): Project Programming and Design

- *Budget allocated should be increased for IPA-2.* There is a need to increase the allocated budget against the rather ambitious IPA objectives. For example, IPA-I had the same financial constraints with PAA with regard to the achievement of objectives. As a solution to this issue, Turkey started to utilise DGA tool, which satisfied the EC as well. Another solution to this issue could also be to consider IPA-2 as leverage to benefit from other donors such as WB, USAID etc. IFIs have also been contacted to this end in order to provide larger co-financing to the IPA projects.
- *Pilot projects should be rolled out.* IPA funding cannot cover all the needs as Turkey is a very big country. This has led to the design of “pilot projects” and very limited impacts in a large number of cases, whereas several strong needs can be covered only through additional project. For example, multi-phased projects can offer a good solution to this issue as they're implemented over a few years and can be interrupted or resumed (after refocusing) just as funding is provided and as new needs arise.
- *The project intervention logic and its design need to be based on a specific needs assessment.*
- *Continuous delays in the ex ante approvals and also changes to procedures and formats should be avoided.* Especially since 2006, beneficiaries have been suffering from delays, while awaiting directions (such as manuals, templates, etc.) from the EC whenever they wanted and needed to proceed further with implementation. There is a high risk of “Euro-fatigue” within several institutions. For example, there were delays in the ex-ante approvals and accreditation process under IPA-1. Turkish line beneficiaries suffered a lot from these delays and encounter severe difficulty if similar delays occur under IPA-2. Moreover, during the programming phase, ex ante approvals are mostly used for decreasing the budget allocations. Ex-ante approvals during programming should be abolished.
- *The right beneficiary institutions should be identified clearly as a failure to do so may affect sustainability and effectiveness.* Project programmers and designers must ascertain that the right beneficiary institution is identified in order to avoid any overlap between competences. Otherwise, the intended project should not be allowed to be designed until the right beneficiary is identified for the whole implementation period and beyond or until the situation is clarified as to who does what.
- *Realistic rather than overambitious project fiches/TORs should prevail (number of objectives, project scope, number of components, number of planned activities and results (per component), risks, timing, duration of the implementation period, budget allocations, etc.).*
- *A preliminary careful analysis phase should ideally be included systematically in the programming phase in order to make sure that all necessary infrastructure, human resource & project management capacity are built in within the Beneficiary Institution before the design and implementation phases may start.* If not, then the project should not be allowed to start as planned and should instead be included in the next programming cycle.

- *When appropriate, technical specifications for procurement projects should be prepared through FWCs with the active involvement of line beneficiaries.*
- *Design should include dissemination of results at the regional level and coordination between relevant public and social stakeholders, more particularly for enforcement purposes.*
- *The design phase should cover an exit strategy specifying what to do (what actions should be taken) after a project is over and the BAs should be made aware of the fact that they should follow up on their projects with concrete actions.*
- *A mechanism should ensure better project ownership through (ex post monitoring).*

Recommendation 2 (EU Delegation and CFCU): Implementation

- *The number and capacity of CFCU staff¹⁹ should be increased. High turnover at CFCU should ideally be decreased. This would help catch up with the deadlines effectively. For example, the “Shelters for Women” project suffered from cancellations and delays with regard to works contracts.*
- *Together with this, direct grant agreements should be preferred among the types of contracts.*

Recommendation 3 (Line Beneficiaries, EC Services and EUD): Law Enforcement

- *Effective law enforcement should be the main priority, as several legal reforms have been put in place now that new primary and secondary legislation has been passed into law as a direct result of project activities*

Recommendation 4 (EC Services, EUD, MEUA, Line Beneficiaries): Follow-up and Awareness-Raising

- *In a number of cases, new projects could be developed for further capacity development on new EC Directives and practices and increased awareness-raising amongst the public.*

Recommendation 5 (EC Services, EUD, MEUA, Line Beneficiaries): Logical Frameworks

- *LogFrames should include SMART OVIs along with realistic assumptions, conditionality and monitoring, more particularly at the result level, to ensure smooth implementation of project activities. In the absence of SMART indicators and baselines, monitoring the success of the project becomes difficult, if not inaccurate, distorted or impossible.*
- *Technical specifications need to have realistic assumptions.*
- *Result and impact indicators (SMART) should be utilised for measuring the success of a project at higher levels of the LogFrame.*

Recommendation 6 (EUD, MEUA, Line Beneficiaries): Sustainability

¹⁹ The CFCU updates its Workload Analysis (WLA) annually at the beginning of each year. The latest WLA of June 2013 revealed that the CFCU needed to hire 16 staff. A new vacancy announcement was published to this effect on 26 July 2013. Interviews should take place on 16-27 September 2013 and the recruitment process is expected to be completed by end-October. On the other hand, in order to ensure better management of the workload, in line with DG ELARG's recommendation of 19 March 2012, three team leaders were assigned under the Coordinator of the Procurement Section with the PAO's approval on 19 December 2012. This will also facilitate effective supervision of the work done by the staff.

- *Relations between Turkish beneficiaries and their EU counterparts should be intensified to ensure continuity of results through such cooperation (e.g. as between DG SANCO and National Food Reference Laboratory). Relations between DG SANCO and the NFRL should be enhanced more particularly in meeting DG SANCO's target: "Better training for safer food" → continue with awareness-raising and training activities*
- *Adequate political commitment and project ownership should be ensured for sustainability of results and the appropriate institutions should exist, particularly for EU Acquis alignment purposes.*
- *Ex-post monitoring mechanism should be enforced by the EUD and DIS players to better analyse and follow up on real impact and sustainability of project results. Even if it can be argued that the MEUA is the beneficiary of "ALTUN/ROM/TR0702.28-02/SER/026/001-Technical Assistance for Result-Oriented Monitoring (ROM)" project, whose objective is to monitor IPA-period projects, including ex-post monitoring, those ROM interventions are usually carried out too closely to project completion dates (when they are conducted after the project implementation phase). Therefore, in most cases, i.e. when it is obvious that there won't be any immediate impact and sustainability inherent to project results, ROM Monitors, from an ex post perspective, can only speculate about impact and sustainability of project results. In essence, they're not intended to fulfil ex post monitoring requirements per se. The mechanism proposed by the Evaluators is not only to monitor impact and sustainability of project results after project completion, but also to follow up, i.e. to take concrete (corrective) action, in order to ensure as much impact and sustainability as possible (whenever appropriate).*
- *Projects with a significant Training-of-Trainers component should be required to provide an Action Plan for the post-project utilisation of those Trainers.*
- *Capacity in the fields of monitoring and impact assessment of the beneficiary institutions should be strengthened.*
- *Follow-up projects should be required to provide evidence that previous project results and impacts generated have been sustained.*
- *To align with the EU Acquis, primary and secondary legislation drafted as a result of EU-funded projects should be adopted and capacity building on law enforcement should continue in order to ensure the intended impact of projects is achieved.*

Specific Recommendation 7 - Intellectual Property Rights (Line Beneficiaries and EC Services/EUD):

- *The draft Law on IPRs should be ratified and put into force and the decision-making procedures - aligned with EU best practices.*
- *The capacity of the of the IPR Specialised Judges and IPR Specialised Courts as well as other related judges should be further improved.*
- *Effective IPR legal enforcement should be critically considered, particularly with reference to counterfeiting.*
- *Awareness-raising activities on IPR protection against piracy should be intensively conducted (workshops, seminars, EU study tours, etc), until and also after the new Law is put into force.*
- *The level of coordination and exchange of information between law enforcement bodies in Turkey should be further enhanced."*

A FEW EXAMPLES OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES COVERED BY THE PROJECTS IDENTIFIED DURING THIS EVALUATION:

- Project TR0302.07 with the Public Procurement Authority aimed to contribute to improving public governance.
- Project TR0302.07 on Public Procurement targeted equal opportunity for Turkish citizens and institutions to have access to documentation and take part in public tenders.
- Project TR-0402-04 on Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) was directly related to protection of human right issues, as it aimed to protect private property.
- Project TR0203.01 on Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) contributed to human rights protection in promoting and enforcing better working conditions in the manufacturing sector.
- The OHS laboratories under Project TR0203.01 have directly contributed to environment-friendly business conditions.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference	65
Annex 2: Overview of the EU's Assistance Programmes for Turkey, 2002-2006	69
Annex 3: Overview of Project Sample Evaluated – Project Components / Funding	76
Annex 4: Overview of Project Sample Evaluated – Project Objectives / Goals	88
Annex 5: List of Stakeholders Interviewed	110
Annex 6: List of Key Documents Collected and Reviewed	114
Annex 7: Interview Guide	116

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

DEVCO FWC Commission 2011 - LOT N°1

**EVALUATION OF THE ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE EU'S TURKISH PRE-
ACCESSION INSTRUMENT, 2002 - 2006.**

REQUEST FOR OFFER N° 2012/306685

1. CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

Following the Helsinki European Council in 1999, a pre-accession orientation was introduced to European Commission's financial assistance programmes with Turkey. The first Turkey Accession Partnership and the first National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis were adopted in 2001, as was Council Regulation No. 2500/2001, which established the basis for pre-accession assistance to Turkey. Programming of the pre-accession assistance commenced with the 2002 National Pre-Accession Programme, and implementation commenced in 2004, following accreditation of the Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) by the Commission Services in late 2003.

A series of evaluations of the Turkey Pre-accession Instrument were conducted, culminating in a 'Turkey Pre-Accession Assistance Evaluation Review' in 2007 which provided an overview of the general utility of EU assistance to Turkey from 2003 to 2006. It highlighted the main areas of success and provided a general analysis of the key issues which influenced the overall impact and sustainability of EU assistance to Turkey. That review was based on the findings of 26 sectoral interim evaluation reports carried out by the GmbH Consortium from 2003 to 2006. In January 2010 the European Court of Auditors published a Special Report on the European Commission's Management of pre-accession assistance to Turkey. Now that sufficient time has elapsed we would like to contract an ex-post evaluation of the Turkish pre-accession instrument.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The primary beneficiary of this evaluation is the EU. It is expected that findings and recommendations of this evaluation will provide lessons learned relevant to the implementation of ongoing EU assistance in Turkey.

2.1 Global objective

The purpose of the *ex post* evaluation is to provide: (a) accountability with respect to the value for money and the use of funds; by reporting the findings and conclusions of the evaluation to the institutions of the European Union and to the relevant interest groups of the public at large in all member states (summative evaluation), and (b) lessons learned on financial assistance where relevant.

2.2 Specific objective(s)

The specific objectives of this evaluation are to:

1. Assess the impact and sustainability of Turkey Pre Accession funded interventions.
2. Provide lessons learned and recommendations for decision-making on improvements of future financial assistance.

2.2.1 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will include a focus on the following questions:

Impact and sustainability of Turkey Pre Accession funded interventions:

- How effectively had the priorities/needs of Turkey been translated into programming of assistance?
- To what extent was the financial assistance effective in achieving the desired results, and what possibly hampered its achievement?
- Did the immediate and intermediate results delivered by the evaluated assistance translate into the desired/expected impacts?
- Were the results achieved sustainable, and if not why not?
- To what extent were the EC's chosen implementation modalities relevant and efficient?
- To what extent was the support provided by the EC coherent?

Lessons learnt and recommendations to an extent relevant and applicable:

- What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the assistance?
- What were the weaknesses and strengths of assistance?
- Could financial assistance have been better coordinated/aligned with reforms to improve effectiveness, impact and sustainability?
- What type of assistance and reforms achieved the most sustainable results, and what were the reasons for that?
- What are the main lessons to be drawn in terms of implementation modalities and institutional setting that could be taken into account in the implementation of IPA?

The final version of the Evaluation questions will be agreed with the reference group at the end of the inception phase.

For each evaluation question at least one appropriate judgement criterion should be proposed, and for each such criterion the appropriate quantitative and qualitative indicators should be identified and specified. This, in turn, will determine the appropriate scope and methods of data collection.

2.3 Requested services

With regard to specific objective 1, the evaluation will cover EU financial assistance provided to Turkey from 2002 to 2006. The evaluators will focus particularly on effectiveness, impact and sustainability of financial assistance.

With regard to specific objective 2, the experts will focus on support provided by the EU in order to gain a full understanding of EU interventions, and particularly where and why they have worked well, and where and why they have worked less well. On that basis, the evaluation will provide relevant recommendations to improve the design, programming and implementation of EU interventions, with the view to improving their relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

The detailed content and focus of the report will be agreed upon with the Reference Group in the inception phase.

The contract will be GLOBAL PRICE.

Note: a methodology (not longer than 5 pages) should be submitted with the offer. DG ELARG's Evaluation guide (attached) and DG Budget's guide "Evaluating EU activities - a practical guide for the Commission Services," provide guidance on good practices concerning conducting an evaluation (attached).

2.3.1 Suggested Methodology

In general, the evaluation should follow the steps described below:

1) Desk Phase

- Identification of a sample of relevant projects to look at;
- Collection and analysis of relevant documentation;
- Completion of the evaluation approach and methodology;
- Establish a list of contacts and sources of data for the field phase;
- Conduct preliminary interviews with the Delegations in countries concerned;
- Prepare and submit a draft inception report, which:
 - summarises the objectives, scope and outputs of the evaluation;
 - provides the final draft of the evaluation questions;
 - describes the methodological approach, including the judgement criteria;
 - presents a work plan for the field and reporting phases.

2) Field Phase

In this phase, the team will work in the region, and (non-exhaustive list of actions):

- Conduct interviews with selected stakeholders (Delegations, governmental and non-governmental institutions) according to the workplan.
- Collect and/or generate data, as agreed in the assessment methodology.
- At the end of the field work, a de-briefing meeting will be organized in Brussels and in Turkey to present preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations stemming from the field and desk phase and getting relevant feedback.

3) Synthesis Phase

This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the evaluation report based on the work done during the desk and field phases, and the outcomes of the briefing meetings held at the end of the field work.

The experts will make sure that their assessment is objective and balanced. The findings should be verifiable and substantiated, and should be presented with the recommendations following a logical cause-effect linkage. When formulating

conclusions, the experts should describe the facts assessed, the judgement criteria applied, and how this led to the findings and recommendations.

Recommendations should address the weaknesses and strengths identified and reported. Recommendations should be operational and realistic, in the sense of providing clear, feasible and relevant input for decision making. They should not be general but should address the specific weaknesses identified, clearly indicating the measures to be undertaken. Recommendations for action will be addressed to the Commission. However, where appropriate, the experts should specify the role of any actor other than the Commission, including beneficiary institutions, in implementing the recommendations.

2.3.2 Reference Group

The experts will work in close cooperation with the members of an advisory Reference Group. The Reference Group will have the following main responsibilities:

- Guiding the experts during the planning and implementation of the evaluation;
 - Assisting the evaluation manager (DG ELARG A3, Inter-institutional relations, Planning, Reporting and Evaluation UnH) on the evaluation activities;
- Providing an assessment of the quality of the work of the consultant, including endorsement of the Inception Report, and the final evaluation report.

The Reference Group will include representatives from DIR A and DIR B of DG Enlargement, and from the EU Delegation to Turkey.

2.4 Required outputs

The outputs of the evaluation will be:

(1) An Inception Report.

(2) An Evaluation report. The evaluation report should specifically answer each of the evaluation questions agreed in the Inception phase, and meet all the specific objectives and requested services. The report will include: an executive summary, main section, conclusions and recommendations and annexes. The final outline of the report will be agreed during the inception phase. The draft and final report will be presented and discussed in both Brussels and in Turkey.

(3) An Activity Report.

The outputs of this evaluation will be presented in the English language.

The experts should ensure an internal quality control during the implementing and reporting phase of the evaluation. The quality control should ensure that the Final evaluation report complies with the requirements in the methodology section above before its submission to the Reference Group.

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Annex 2: Overview of the EU's Assistance Programmes for Turkey, 2002-2006

Projects and Annual Budgets under the EU's Assistance Programmes for Turkey, 2002-2006

National Programme	Number of Projects	Budget Allocation (€ million)
2002	18	126
2003	28	144
2004	38	237
2005	36	278
2006	46	463

Projects Programmed under the EU's Assistance Programmes for Turkey, 2002-2006

Programme Objectives	Projects (per year)	Projects (Total)	2002 National Programme for the Republic of Turkey
Objective 1: Addressing the Copenhagen political criteria	1	1	TR 02 01 01 Improvement of Statement Taking Methods and Staking Taking Rooms
Objective 2: The Economic Criteria, Economic Reform and Support for new Regulatory Bodies	2	2	TR 02 02 01 Institutional Strengthening of the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA)
	3	3	TR 02 02 02 Institution Building for the Telecommunications Authority
	4	4	TR 02 02 03 Reinforcement of the Institutional Capacity of the Turkish State Aid Monitoring and Supervisory Authority (SAMSA)
Objective 3: Strengthening Public Administration	5	5	TR 02 03 01 Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)
	6	6	TR 02 03 02 Support for the Enhancement of the Safety of Maritime Transport
	7	7	TR 02 03 03 Capacity Building in the Field of Environment
	8	8	TR 02 03 04 Conformity Assessment and Market Surveillance Infrastructure
	9	9	TR 02 03 05 Support for Turkey's Alignment to the EU Veterinary <i>Acquis</i>
	10	10	TR 02 03 06 Support for Turkey's Alignment to the EU <i>Acquis</i> in the Phytosanitary Field
Objective 4: Justice and Home Affairs	11	11	TR 02 04 01 Support for the Development of an Action Plan to Implement Turkey's Integrated Border Management Strategy
	12	12	TR 02 04 02 Support for the Development of an Action Plan to Implement Turkey's Asylum and Migration Strategy
	13	13	TR 02 04 03 Sustaining the National Drugs Focal Point
	14	14	TR 02 04 04 Strengthening the Fight Against Money Laundering
	15	15	TR 02 04 05 Strengthening the Fight Against Organised Crime

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Objective 5: Economic and Social Cohesion	16	16	TR 02 05 01 Active Labour Market Strategy Programme
Objective 6: Project Preparation and Community Programmes	17	17	TR 02 06 01 Support Activities to Strengthen the European Integration Process
	18	18	TR 02 06 02 Participation in Community programmes and Agencies
Programme Objectives	Projects (per year)	Projects (Total)	2003 National Programme for the Republic of Turkey
Objective 1: Addressing the Copenhagen Political Criteria	1	19	TR 03 01 01 Strengthening the Accountability, Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Turkish National Police
	2	20	TR 03 01 02 Development of Human Rights, Democracy and Citizenship Education
	3	21	TR 03 01 03 Improving Cooperation Between NGOs and the Public Sector / Strengthening the NGOs Democratic Participation Level
Objective 2: Approximation to the <i>acquis communautaire</i>	4	22	TR 03 02 01 Support to Turkish Conformity Assessment Bodies and the Ministry of Industry and Trade (New Approach directives)
	5	23	TR 03 02 02 Upgrading the Physical Infrastructure in the Telecommunications Sector re. Market Surveillance Equipment
	6	24	TR 03 02 03 Support to Turkey in the Field of Air Quality, Chemicals and Waste Management
	7	25	TR 03 02 04 Alignment of Public Internal Financial Control System with International Standards and EU Practices
	8	26	TR 03 02 05 Strengthening the Audit Capacity of Turkish Court of Accounts
	9	27	TR 03 02 06 Reinforcing Capacity for Insurance Regulation
	10	28	TR 03 02 07 Strengthening the Public Procurement System
Objective 3: Strengthening Public Administration	11	29	TR 03 03 01 Customs Modernisation
	12	30	TR 03 03 02 Legal and Institutional Alignment to the <i>Acquis</i> in the Fisheries Sector
	13	31	TR 03 03 03 Complementary Technical Studies for the Synchronisation of the Turkish Power System with the UCTE
	14	32	TR 03 03 04 Development of the Regulatory Information System for the EMRA
	15	33	TR 03 03 05 Assistance to the Petroleum Pipeline Corporation (BOTAS) on Gas Transmission and Transit
	16	34	TR 03 03 06 Improvement of Energy Efficiency
	17	35	TR 03 03 07 Turkish Rail Sector Restructuring and Strengthening
	18	36	TR 03 03 08 Strengthening the Investment Promotion Agency
Objective 4: Justice and Home Affairs	19	37	TR 03 04 01 Strengthening the Police Forensic Capacity
	20	38	TR 03 04 02 Strengthening Institutions in the Fight Against Trafficking in Human Beings
	21	39	TR 03 04 03 Strengthening the Fight Against Money Laundering, Financial Sources of Crime and the Financing of Terrorism

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	22	40	TR 03 04 04 Visa Policy and Practice
Objective 5: Economic and Social Cohesion	23	41	TR 03 05 01 Strengthening Capacity of the State Planning Organisation
	24	42	TR 03 05 02 Regional Development in Samsun, Kastamonu and Erzurum NUTSII Regions
	25	43	TR 03 05 03 CBC with Bulgaria
	26	44	TR 03 05 04 Fashion and Textile Cluster
Objective 6: Project Preparation and Community Programmes	27	45	TR 03 06 01 Support Activities to Strengthen the European Integration Process
	28	46	TR 03 06 02 Participation in Community Programmes and Agencies
Programme Objectives	Projects (per year)	Projects (Total)	2004 National Programme for the Republic of Turkey
Objective 1: Addressing the Copenhagen Political Criteria	1	47	TR 04 01 01 Implementation of Human Rights Reforms
	2	48	TR 04 01 02 Support to the Establishment of the Courts of Appeal
	3	49	TR 04 01 03 Improvement of Public Service and Quality Standards towards Civil Society Organisations
	4	50	TR 04 01 04 Strengthening Freedom of Association for Further Development of Civil Society
	5	51	TR 04 01 05 Support to the Ombudsman
	6	52	TR 04 01 06 Promotion of Cultural Rights
Objective 2: Approximation to the <i>acquis communautaire</i>	7	53	TR 04 02 01 Support to the Market Surveillance Laboratories in the Implementation of EC Directives
	8	54	TR 04 02 02 Strengthening the Capacity of Turkish Ministries for Market Surveillance
	9	55	TR 04 02 03 Strengthening the Capacity to Harmonise and Implement Legislation in the Field of Good Laboratory Practice
	10	56	TR 04 02 04 Support to Efforts in the Full Alignment and Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights and the Fight Against Piracy
	11	57	TR 04 02 05 Strengthening Capacity in the Full Alignment, Enforcement and Implementation of Consumer Protection
	12	58	TR 04 02 06 Assisting the Capital Markets Board to Comply Fully with EU Capital Markets Standards
	13	59	TR 04 02 07 Alignment of Organic Agriculture Legislation to the EU <i>Acquis</i> and the Development of Organic Agriculture
	14	60	TR 04 02 08 Strengthening Capacity and Preparation for Implementation of the CAP
	15	61	TR 04 02 09 Strengthening Capacity in the Field of Special Waste Management and Noise Management
	16	62	TR 04 02 10 Strengthening Capacity to Harmonise and Implement Legislation in the Field of Biocides and Water
	17	63	TR 04 02 11 Integration of Sustainable Development into Sectoral Policies

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Objective 3: Strengthening Public Administration	18	64	TR 04 03 01 Modernisation of Customs Administration
	19	65	TR 04 03 02 Tax Administration Capacity Building
	20	66	TR 04 03 03 Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System
	21	67	TR 04 03 04 Eradicating the Worst Forms of Child Labour
	22	68	TR 04 03 05 Strengthening Social Dialogue for Innovation and Change
	23	69	TR 04 03 06 Strengthening of the Epidemiological Surveillance and Control of Communicable Diseases System
	24	70	TR 04 03 07 Cancer-Free Life
	25	71	TR 04 03 08 Road Transport Sector
	26	72	TR 04 03 09 Ensuring the Compliance of the Frequency Performance of the Turkish Power System with UCTE Criteria
	27	73	TR 04 03 10 Strengthening Audit Capacity of the Board of Treasury Controllers with respect to Pre-Accession Funds
Objective 4: Justice and Home Affairs	28	74	TR 04 04 01 Towards Good Governance, Protection and Justice for Children
	29	75	TR 04 04 02 Development of a National Probation Service
	30	76	TR 04 04 03 Enhancement of the Professionalism of the Turkish Gendarmerie in its Law Enforcement Activities
	31	77	TR 04 04 04 Development of a Training System for Border Police
Objective 5: Economic and Social Cohesion	32	78	TR 04 05 01 Support to the SPO to Build Capacity at Central, Regional and Local Level to Implement Measures in line with the pNDP
	33	79	TR 04 05 02 Regional Development in Konya, Kayseri, Malatya, and Agri NUTSII Regions
	34	80	TR 04 05 03 CBC Bulgaria - Restoration of the Ekmekcizade Caravanserai in Edirne
	35	81	TR 04 05 04 CBC Bulgaria - JSPF
	36	82	TR 04 05 05 Interreg IIIA Greece-Turkey Programme
Objective 6: Project Preparation and Community Programmes	37	83	TR 04 06 01 Support Activities to Strengthen the European Integration Process
	38	84	TR 04 06 02 Participation in Community Programmes and Agencies
Programme Objectives	Projects (per year)	Projects (Total)	2005 National Programme for the Republic of Turkey
Objectives 1: Addressing the Copenhagen Political Criteria and Justice, Liberty and Security issues	1	85	TR 05 01 01 Better Access to Justice in Turkey
	2	86	TR 05 01 02 Strengthening Civil Society
	3	87	TR 05 01 03 Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol
	4	88	TR 05 01 04 Cascaded Training of Turkish Lawyers on Human Rights
	5	89	

TR 05 01 05 Independent Police Complaints Commission and the Complaints System for the Turkish National Police and

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

			Gendarmerie
	6	90	TR 05 01 06 Promoting Gender Equality
	7	91	TR 05 01 07 Support to the Establishment of the Courts of Appeal
Objectives 2: Economic and Social Cohesion	8	92	TR 05 02 01 Establishment and Functioning of Regional Development Agencies
	9	93	TR 05 02 02 Regional Development in TR90 NUTS II Region
	10	94	TR 05 02 03 Support to the Solution of Economic and Social Problems in Urban Areas
	11	95	TR 05 02 04 CBC Bulgaria
	12	96	TR 05 02 05 Interreg IIIA Greece-Turkey Programme
	13	97	TR 05 02 06 Fashion Textile Cluster
	14	98	TR 05 02 07 Development of Clustering Policy
	15	99	TR 05 02 08 Small Enterprise Loan Programme, 2nd Phase
	16	100	TR 05 02 09 Supporting Women Entrepreneurship
	17	101	TR 05 02 10 Contribution to the FEMIP Support Fund
Objective 3: Approximation to the <i>acquis communautaire</i>	18	102	TR 05 03 01 Reinforcement of Institutional Capacity for Establishing a Product Safety System
	19	103	TR 05 03 02 Support to Market Surveillance Laboratories
	20	104	TR 05 03 03 Reinforcement of Institutional Capacity of the Directorate General for State Aids
	21	105	TR 05 03 04 Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory
	22	106	TR 05 03 05 Establishment of a Rural Development Paying Agency
	23	107	TR 05 03 06 Supervision of Control of Rabies Disease
	24	108	TR 05 03 07 Establishing New Border Inspection Posts (BIPs)
	25	109	TR 05 03 08 Increasing Public Awareness on Energy Efficiency at Buildings
	26	110	TR 05 03 09 Enhancement of Traffic Management and Environmental Safety in Turkish Ports and Coastal Areas
	27	111	TR 05 03 10 Improvement of Access Regime in the Turkish Telecommunications Market
	28	112	TR 05 03 11 Canakkale Regional Solid Waste Management project
	29	113	TR 05 03 12 Kusadasi Regional Solid Waste Management project
	30	114	TR 05 03 13 Strengthening of the Epidemiological Surveillance and Control of Communicable Diseases System (ESCCDS), Phase II
	31	115	TR 05 03 14 Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety (OHS), Phase II
	32	116	TR 05 03 15 Capacity Building for the Compilation of Accounting Data in the Context of e-Government
	33	117	TR 05 03 16 Upgrading the Statistical System, Phase II
Objectives 4: Civil Society Dialogue & Support for European	34	118	TR 05 04 01 Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme
	35	119	TR 05 04 02 Participation in Community Programmes and

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Integration			Agencies
	36	120	TR 05 04 03 Support Activities to Strengthen the European Integration Process
Programme Objectives	Projects (per year)	Projects (Total)	2006 National Programme for the Republic of Turkey
Objectives 1: Addressing the Copenhagen Political Criteria and Justice, Liberty and Security issues	1	121	TR 06 01 01 Support to Set up an Asylum and Country of Origin Information (COI) System
	2	122	TR 06 01 02 Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector
	3	123	TR 06 01 03 Training of Gendarmerie Officers on European Human Rights Standards
	4	124	TR 06 01 04 Support to the Court Management System
	5	125	TR 06 01 05 Shelters for Women Subject to Violence
	6	126	TR 06 01 06 Strengthening the Capacity of Turkey in the Struggle Against Drug Trafficking
	7	127	TR 06 01 07 Combatting Human Trafficking
	8	128	TR 06 01 08 Ethics for the Prevention of Corruption in Turkey
	9	129	TR 06 01 09 "Children First" - Coordinated Mechanisms for the Protection of Vulnerable Children
Objectives 2: Economic and Social Cohesion	10	130	TR 06 02 01 Nevsehir Wastewater Treatment Plant Project
	11	131	TR 06 02 02 Tokat Wastewater Treatment Plant Project
	12	132	TR 06 02 03 Active Employment Measures and Support to the Turkish Employment Organisation at the Local Level
	13	133	TR 06 02 04 Support to Human Resources Development through Vocational Education and Training (VET)
	14	134	TR 06 02 05 Support to the Solution of Economic and Social Integration Problems
	15	135	TR 06 02 06 Expansion of the European Turkish Business Centres Network
	16	136	TR 06 02 07 Access of Trademen and Craftsmen to Finance
	17	137	TR 06 02 08 Industrial Restructuring of Sanliurfa
	18	138	TR 06 02 09 Improvement of Road Safety
	19	139	TR 06 02 10 Amasya Solid Waste Management Project
	20	140	TR 06 02 11 Kutahya Solid Waste Management Project
	21	141	TR 06 02 12 Bitlis Solid Waste Management Project
	22	142	TR 06 02 13 CBC Bulgaria - TA for the Management of the Ekmekcizade Caravanserai in Edirne
	23	143	TR 06 02 14 CBC Bulgaria - Ugrading of Kırklareli-Dereköy-Aziziye Border State Road Project
	24	144	TR 06 02 15 CBC Bulgaria - Capacity Improvement for Flood Forecasting and Flood Control
	25	145	TR 06 02 16 CBC Bulgaria - Protection and Sustainable Development in the Yıldız Mountains

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	26	146	TR 06 02 17 CBC Bulgaria - Joint Small Project Fund
	27	147	TR 06 02 18 Mitigating Flood Risk in Flooded Areas in the GAP Region
Objective 3: Approximation to the <i>acquis communautaire</i>	28	148	TR 06 03 01 Establishment of a Pilot Turkish Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN)
	29	149	TR 06 03 02 Control of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in Turkey
	30	150	TR 06 03 03 Improvement of the Conditions for Cross-Border Electricity Trade in Turkey in Compliance with the Best Practice in EU
	31	151	TR 06 03 04 Capacity Building Support for the Water Sector in Turkey
	32	152	TR 06 03 05 Strengthening the capacity of the Turkish Grand National Assembly
	33	153	TR 06 03 06 Introducing Regulatory Impact Analysis into the Turkish Legal Framework
	34	154	TR 06 03 07 Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration, Phase III
	35	155	TR 06 03 08 Support to the Turkish Police in Enforcement of Intellectual and Industrial Property Rights
	36	156	TR 06 03 09 Development of the Seed Sector in Turkey and Alignment to the EU
	37	157	TR 06 03 10 Improving the Labour Inspection System
	38	158	TR 06 03 11 Capacity Building Support for the Ministry of National Education
	39	159	TR 06 03 12 Establishment of an Environmental Information Exchange Network (TEIEN)
	40	160	TR 06 03 13 Support Activities to Strengthen the European Integration Process
Objectives 4: Civil Society Dialogue & Support for European Integration	41	161	TR 06 04 01 Promotion of the Civil Society Dialogue between EU and Turkey
	42	162	TR 06 04 02 Continuation of the "Jean Monnet" Scholarship Programme for Post-Graduates
	43	163	TR 06 04 03 Civil Society Dialogue - EU-Turkish Chambers Forum
	44	164	TR 06 04 04 Civil Society Dialogue - Bringing Together Workers from Turkey and the EU
	45	165	TR 06 04 05 Supporting Civil Society Development and Dialogue
	46	166	TR 06 04 06 Participation in Community Programmes and Agencies
Special Avian Influenza Action	1	167	TR 06 AI Avian Influenza Preparedness and Response Project

Annex 3: Overview of Project Sample Evaluated – Project Components / Funding

Overall sample: 18 sectorally representative projects

Project Typology:

- Twinning Projects
- Services
- Works
- Framework Contracts
- Grant Schemes

5 Objectives:

- Objective 1: Political Criteria (Copenhagen) – 4 projects
- Objective 2: Approximation with the EU *Acquis* – 4 projects
- Objective 3: Public Administration Reform – 4 projects
- Objective 4: Justice & Home Affairs – 4 projects
- Objective 5: Economic & Social Cohesion – 2 projects

Annual Distribution:

- 2002: 2 projects
- 2003: 3 projects
- 2004: 4 projects
- 2005: 5 projects
- 2006: 4 projects

Objective 1: Political Criteria (Copenhagen) – 4 projects

- Improve Cooperation between the NGOs & the Public Sector (2003)
- Implementation of Human Rights Reforms (2004)
- Promoting Gender Equality (2005)
- Civil Society Dialogue - EU - Turkish Chambers Forum (2006)

Objective 2: Approximation with the EU *Acquis* – 4 projects

- Strengthening the Public Procurement System (2003)
- Intellectual Property Rights with Focus on Piracy (2004)
- Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (2005)
- Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III (2006)

Objective 3: Public Administration Reform – 4 projects

- Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety-OHS (2002)
- Rail Sector Re-Structuring and Strengthening (2003)
- Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System (2004)
- Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory (2005)

Objective 4: Justice & Home Affairs – 4 projects

- Sustaining the National Drugs Focal Point (2002)
- Enhancing Non-Forensic Expert Physicians, Judges and Prosecutors (2005)
- Training Of Turkish Lawyers in Human Rights (2005)
- Shelters for Women Subject to Violence (2006)

Objective 5: Economic & Social Cohesion – 2 projects (initially 5 projects)

- Support to SPO to Capacity Building at Central, Regional & Local Levels in line with the pNPD (2004)
- Support to HR Development through VET (2006)

2002-2006 PROJECT SAMPLE

EVALUATION OF THE ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDED BY THE EU'S TURKISH PRE-ACCESSION INSTRUMENT 2002-2006

FINAL LIST OF SAMPLE PROJECTS - AS AT 30-06-2013

Projects		€	€	€	€	€	€	
4	Objective 1	Political Criteria	17.688.929,00	0,00	17.688.929,00	17.274.735,83	0,00	17.274.735,83
4	Objective 2	Approximation with the EU Acquis	14.344.500,00	1.967.500,00	16.312.000,00	12.320.349,23	1.519.768,11	13.840.117,34
4	Objective 3	Public Administration	26.555.100,00	3.243.700,00	29.798.800,00	21.268.937,48	1.579.568,87	22.848.506,35
4	Objective 4	Justice and Home Affairs	13.685.000,00	2.375.000,00	16.060.000,00	13.018.270,90	2.231.908,95	15.250.179,85
2	Objective 5	Economic and Social Cohesion	15.975.920,00	2.665.000,00	18.640.920,00	15.874.000,69	2.662.290,22	18.536.290,91

NO	PROJECT NUMBER	TITLE	TYPE OF TENDER	FINAL BUDGET			STATUS	DATE OF CONTRACT SIGNATURE	CONTRACT VALUE		
				EU	TR	TOTAL			EU	TR	TOTAL

2002

1	TR0203.01-01	Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)	Service	3.500.000,00	0,00	3.500.000,00	SIGNED	8/01/2004	3.494.800,00	0,00	3.494.800,00
	TR0203.01-02	Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)	Works	375.000,00	125.000,00	500.000,00	SIGNED	20/09/2004	361.416,38	120.472,12	481.888,50
	TR0203.01-03	Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)	Supply	3.125.000,00	1.035.000,00	4.160.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2004	1.494.000,00	498.000,00	1.992.000,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

2	TR0204.03-01	Sustaining the National Drugs Focal Point	Twinning	1.200.000,00	0,00	1.200.000,00	SIGNED	11/08/2004	1.009.289,92	0,00	1.009.289,92
	TR0204.03-02	Sustaining the National Drugs Focal Point	Supply	150.000,00	50.000,00	200.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2004	138.292,50	46.097,50	184.390,00

2003

3	TR0301.03-01	TA to improve the cooperation between the NGOs & the public sector & strengthen the NGOs' democratic participation level	Service	1.500.000,00	0,00	1.500.000,00	SIGNED	27/09/2005	1.499.750,00	0,00	1.499.750,00
	TR0301.03-02	Improving Co-operation Between the NGOs and the Public Sector and Strengthening the NGOs' Democratic Participation Level	Grant	500.000,00	0,00	500.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2005	483.719,16	0,00	483.719,16
4	TR0302.07-01	Strengthening the Public Procurement System in Turkey	Twinning	1.300.000,00	0,00	1.300.000,00	SIGNED	4/01/2005	1.297.509,25	0,00	1.297.509,25
	TR0302.07-02	Strengthening the Public Procurement	Supply	52.500,00	17.500,00	70.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2005	39.862,50	13.287,50	53.150,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

		System in Turkey									
	TR0302.07-03	Strengthening the Public Procurement System in Turkey	Service	337.500,00	112.500,00	450.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2005	266.175,00	88.725,00	354.900,00
5	TR0303.07-01	Turkish Rail Sector Re-Structuring and Strengthening	Twinning	836.000,00	0,00	836.000,00	SIGNED	12/01/2005	836.000,00	0,00	836.000,00
	TR0303.07-02	TA in the Turkish Rail Sector Re-Structuring and Strengthening	Service	3.428.000,00	110.000,00	3.538.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2005	2.943.000,00	10.000,00	2.953.000,00

2004

6	TR0401.01-01	Implementation of Human Rights Reforms in Turkey	Supply	0,00	0,00	0,00	CANCELLED			0,00	
	TR0401.01-02	Implementation of Human Rights Reforms in Turkey	Direct Grant	4.000.749,00	0,00	4.000.749,00	SIGNED	30/11/2006	4.000.749,00	0,00	4.000.749,00
7	TR0402.04-01	Support to Turkey's efforts in the full alignment, and	Twinning	1.600.000,00	0,00	1.600.000,00	SIGNED	4/05/2006	1.240.973,65	0,00	1.240.973,65

		enforcement in the field of intellectual property rights with a focus on fight against piracy									
	TR0402.04-02	Support to Turkey's efforts in the full alignment, and enforcement in the field of intellectual property rights with a focus on fight against piracy	Supply	855.500,00	287.500,00	1.143.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2006	54.187,50	18.062,50	72.250,00
8	TR0403.03-01	Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey	Twinning	1.500.000,00	0,00	1.500.000,00	SIGNED	27/03/2006	1.500.000,00	0,00	1.500.000,00
	TR0403.03-02	Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey	Twinning	250.000,00	0,00	250.000,00	SIGNED	8/06/2006	250.000,00	0,00	250.000,00
	TR0403.03-03	Restructuring and	Supply	393.750,00	131.250,00	525.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2006	172.782,75	57.594,25	230.377,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

		Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey									
	TR0403.03-04	Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey	Supply	1.068.750,00	356.250,00	1.425.000,00	SIGNED	24/11/2006	417.401,25	139.133,75	556.535,00
	TR0403.03-05	Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey	Service	500.000,00	0,00	500.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2006	494.357,00	0,00	494.357,00
9	TR0405.01-01	Support to SPO to build capacity at central, regional and local level to implement economic and social cohesion measures in line with the pNDP	Service	2.500.000,00	0,00	2.500.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2006	2.449.230,00	0,00	2.449.230,00

2005

10	TR0501.06-01	Promoting Gender Equality	Service	2.500.000,00	0,00	2.500.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2007	2.495.000,00	0,00	2.495.000,00
-----------	--------------	---------------------------	---------	--------------	------	--------------	--------	------------	--------------	------	--------------

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	TR0501.06-02	Promoting Gender Equality	Twinning	1.720.000,00	0,00	1.720.000,00	SIGNED	12/03/2007	1.559.042,28	0,00	1.559.042,28
	TR0501.06-03	Promoting Gender Equality	Direct Grant	2.968.180,00	0,00	2.968.180,00	SIGNED	26/11/2006	2.968.180,00	0,00	2.968.180,00
11	TR0503.04-01	Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory	Service	149.000,00	50.000,00	199.000,00	SIGNED	29/03/2007	128.415,00	126.465,00	254.880,00
	TR0503.04-02	Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory	Supply	2.437.500,00	812.500,00	3.250.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2007	1.924.284,33	641.428,11	2.565.712,44
	TR0503.04-03	Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory	Works	2.062.500,00	687.500,00	2.750.000,00	SIGNED	30/03/2007	1.895.400,00	631.800,00	2.527.200,00
	TR0503.04-04	Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory	FWC	200.000,00	0,00	200.000,00	SIGNED	26/10/2007	169.811,00	0,00	169.811,00
12	TR0503.16-01	Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (Service for Technical Assistance)	Service	3.250.000,00	0,00	3.250.000,00	SIGNED	21/09/2007	3.249.425,00	0,00	3.249.425,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

TR0503.16-02	Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (Supply of Hardware, software and office equipment)	Supply	0,00	0,00	0,00	CANCELLED	1/01/2000			0,00
TR0503.16-03	Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (Service for Data Collection)	Service	0,00	0,00	0,00	CANCELLED	1/01/2000			0,00
TR0503.16-04	Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (Direct Grant Agreement for Training)	Direct Grant	1.750.000,00	0,00	1.750.000,00	SIGNED	28/12/2006	1.750.000,00	0,00	1.750.000,00
TR0503.16-05	Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (Direct Contract for Multi Beneficiary Program)	FWC	195.000,00	0,00	195.000,00	SIGNED	21/09/2007	169.945,00	0,00	169.945,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	TR0503.16-06	Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II (Direct Contract for Multi Beneficiary Program	FWC	155.000,00	0,00	155.000,00	SIGNED	24/09/2007	134.361,00	0,00	134.361,00
13	TR0501.03-01	Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol: Enhancing the Knowledge Level of Non-Forensic Expert Physicians, Judges and Prosecutors	Supply	225.000,00	75.000,00	300.000,00	CANCELLED	1/01/2000			0,00
	TR0501.03-02	Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol: Enhancing the Knowledge Level of Non-Forensic Expert Physicians, Judges and Prosecutors	Service	2.700.000,00	0,00	2.700.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2007	2.700.000,00	0,00	2.700.000,00
14	TR0501.04-01	Cascaded	Direct	1.300.000,00	0,00	1.300.000,00	SIGNED	19/12/2006	1.300.000,00	0,00	1.300.000,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

		Training Of Turkish Lawyers On Human Rights	Grant								
2006											
15	TR0604.03-01	Civil Society Dialogue - EU - Turkish Chambers Forum	Direct Grant	2.250.000,00	0,00	2.250.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2007	2.019.507,00	0,00	2.019.507,00
	TR0604.03-02	Civil Society Dialogue - EU - Turkish Chambers Forum	Grant	2.250.000,00	0,00	2.250.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2008	2.248.788,39	0,00	2.248.788,39
16	TR0603.07-01	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Service	0,00	0,00	0,00	CANCELLED	17/11/2008			0,00
	TR0603.07-02	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Service	1.550.000,00	0,00	1.550.000,00	SIGNED	28/11/2008	1.550.000,00	0,00	1.550.000,00
	TR0603.07-03	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Service	1.570.000,00	0,00	1.570.000,00	SIGNED	30/11/2008	1.570.000,00	0	1.570.000,00
	TR0603.07-04	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration	Supply	4.458.600,00	1.486.200,00	5.944.800,00	SIGNED	28/11/2008	2.263.106,25	754.368,75	3.017.475,00

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

		on III									
	TR0603.07-05	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Twinning	1.000.000,00	0,00	1.000.000,00	SIGNED	7/08/2008	1.000.000	0	1.000.000,00
	TR0603.07-06	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Twinning	1.000.000,00	0,00	1.000.000,00	SIGNED	18/08/2008	1.000.000,00	0	1.000.000,00
	TR0603.07-07	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Twinning	2.000.000,00	0,00	2.000.000,00	SIGNED	24/04/2008	1.922.073,85	0	1.922.073,85
	TR0603.07-08	Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III	Supply	0,00	0,00	0,00	CANCELLED	N/A			0,00
17	TR0601.05-01	Shelters for Women Subject to Violence	Works	5.495.426,00	1.831.809,00	7.327.235,00	SIGNED	30/11/2008	5.256.960,75	1.752.320,25	7.009.281,00
	TR0601.05-02	Shelters for Women Subject to Violence	Service	528.750,00	176.250,00	705.000,00	SIGNED	14/11/2008	528.750,00	191.550,00	720.300,00
	TR0601.05-03	Shelters for Women Subject to Violence	Supply	725.824,00	241.941,00	967.765,00	SIGNED	25/08/2008	725.823,60	241.941,20	967.764,80
	TR0601.05-04	Shelters for Women	Direct Grant	1.360.000,00	0,00	1.360.000,00	SIGNED	13/03/2008	1.359.154,13	0,00	1.359.154,13

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

		Subject to Violence									
18	TR0602.04-01	Support to Human Resources Development Through Vocational Education and Training	Supply	7.995.000,00	2.665.000,00	10.660.000,00	SIGNED	29/11/2008	7.986.870,69	2.662.290,22	10.649.160,91
	TR0602.04-02	Support to Human Resources Development Through Vocational Education and Training	Service	5.480.920,00	0,00	5.480.920,00	SIGNED	6/06/2008	5.438.720,00	0,00	5.438.720,00

NO	PROJECT NUMBER	TITLE	TYPE OF TENDER	FINAL BUDGET			STATUS	DATE OF CONTRACT SIGNATURE	CONTRACT VALUE		
				EU	TR	TOTAL			EU	TR	TOTAL
				88.249.449,00	10.251.200,00	98.500.649,00			79.756.294,13	7.993.536,15	87.749.830,28
	Projects			€	€	€			€	€	€
4	Objective 1	Political Criteria		17.688.929,00	0,00	17.688.929,00			17.274.735,83	0,00	17.274.735,83
4	Objective 2	Approximation with the <i>Acquis</i>		14.344.500,00	1.967.500,00	16.312.000,00			12.320.349,23	1.519.768,11	13.840.117,34
4	Objective 3	Public Administration		26.555.100,00	3.243.700,00	29.798.800,00			21.268.937,48	1.579.568,87	22.848.506,35
4	Objective 4	Justice and Home Affairs		13.685.000,00	2.375.000,00	16.060.000,00			13.018.270,90	2.231.908,95	15.250.179,85
2	Objective 5	Economic and Social Cohesion		15.975.920,00	2.665.000,00	18.640.920,00			15.874.000,69	2.662.290,22	18.536.290,91

Annex 4: Overview of Project Sample Evaluated – Project Objectives / Goals

OBJECTIVE 1

Improving Cooperation Between NGOs AND the Public Sector and Strengthening NGOs' Democratic Participation Level ("SKIP") TR0301.03	Ministry for EU Affairs Mr Ege Erkoçak
	Civil Society Development Centre Ms Ayça Haykır
	EUD Ms Aycan Akdeniz
Overall Objective	Indicators
Strengthening the NGOs democratic participation level and the ties between the public sector and the civil society within the framework of EU alignment process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall number of joint projects/actions between NGOs and the public sector increases by 10 % (situation end 2006 compared with 2003) Participation of NGOs in decision-making processes increases by 10% (end 2006 compared with 2003)
Project Purpose	Indicators
To prepare and implement an Action Plan on the "Public Sector – Civil Society Cooperation" with an emphasis on the promotion of such relations within a structured dialogue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Action Plan prepared in the first 9 months Viable dialogues established in 5 to 10 pilot areas 5-10 successful demonstration projects implemented in 'viable dialogues' established in 5 to 10 pilot areas
Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study on potential matches between NGOs and public institutions realized in order to determine the priority areas and activities. An Action Plan consisting of exhaustive description of actions to be taken (Regulatory changes, identification of good practices, Code of Conduct establishing the cooperation between the NGOs and the public sector, capacity building for all stakeholders, including confidence building measures etc.). Dissemination of the strategy, increased overall awareness of the necessity for cooperation between the NGO and the public sector and improved consciousness amongst the NGO's. This includes establishment of a permanent web site for this purpose. Implementation of a grant facility supporting pilot projects selected through a call for proposals in order to sector-NGO cooperation in the context of jointly prepared and proposed pilot projects. 	

Support to the Implementation of Human Rights Reforms in Turkey TR0401.01	Human Rights Presidency Dr. Hikmet Tülen (president), Ms Asena Topçubaşı
	Council of Europe Mr Adrian Butler Mr Mehmet Cüneyd Tiryaki

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	Ministry of Justice, DG of EU Mr Ali Bilen
	EUD Task Manager Ms Banur Özyaydin
Overall Objective	Indicators
Full compliance of human rights actually enjoyed by Turkish citizens and the civil society as a whole with principles, standards and practices in accordance with the ECHR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More favourable opinions of ECtHR and international HR organisations re. HR situation in Turkey • Less complaints filed by Turkish citizens with ECtHR or international HR organisations
Project Purpose	Indicators
To support Turkey in the implementation of human rights reforms and improve and strengthen the national capacity for applying European human rights standards, in particular that of legal professionals, law enforcement officials, the Human Rights Presidency (HRP) and the Human Rights Boards (HRBs), and thereby to facilitate a higher level of human rights protection in Turkey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More favourable opinions of ECtHR and international HR organisations re. HR situation in Turkey • Less complaints filed by Turkish citizens with ECtHR or international HR organisations
Results and key indicators	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the knowledge of 450 judges and prosecutors as regards the ECHR and the case-law of the ECtHR, as well as their skills in using these in their daily work • Strengthening the level of professionalism of 180 inspectors of the Inspection Board of the MoJ and ensuring the inclusion of human rights considerations in the formulation of their recommendations to judges and prosecutors • Improving the knowledge of 2250 Governors, Deputy Governors, Sub-Governors, police and Jandarma officers on the ECHR and the case-law of the ECtHR, by training 500 as trainers • Strengthening the HRP and HRBs, improving the knowledge, in particular of the ECHR and the case-law of the ECtHR, by training 420 members of the HRBs as ECHR trainers • Strengthening dialogue and cooperation between the HRP/HRBs and civil society in order to consolidate domestic mechanisms for preventing and remedying human rights violations 	

Promoting Gender Equality TR0501.06	Ministry of Family and Social Policies * Mr. Mehmet Erdoğan, Director Ms Özgün Baltacı, Expert Ms Ekin Bozkurt Şener, Expert
	UNFPA Ms Meltem Alduk, Gender Programme Coordinator
	EUD Task Manager Ms Figen Tunçkanat
Project Purpose	Impact indicators
Component 1: Institutional Capacity Building To strengthen the institutional capacity of the <i>National Mechanism's</i> (NM/KSGM) to	Component 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of national legislation that supports and enhances gender equality in all aspects of social life is advanced and all gaps identified by the end of the project

<p>mainstream gender issues into all public policies and promote the implementation of gender equality legislation with the participation of central and local authorities and NGOs, and to contribute to the establishment of a Gender Equality Body in line with the EC practices and acquis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender focal points exist in all government institutions by the end of the project • Increase by 25% programs that address gender initiated by ministries other than KSGM • Implementation of EC Equality of Treatment between Men and Women Programmes by KSGM by the end of the project
<p>Component 2: Combating Domestic Violence Against Women</p> <p>To strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to protect women from domestic violence in order to better advance their human rights.</p>	<p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Action Plan for violence against women and Implementation Programme developed by the first quarter of 2007 • Existence of surveillance system and Database on Violence against Women by the second half of 2007. • Increase number of shelters, counselling centres and hotlines by 25%
<p>Indicators with regard to expected results</p>	
<p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stable expert group composed of minimum four persons in KSGM exists at the end of the project • KSGM will have prepared at least 10 policy documents, strategies or papers by the end of the project • KSGM is able to submit a project proposal for future programming periods • 2 KSGM staff trained to run the KSGM documentation centre by the end of the project • KSGM's documentation centre has a website with a search engine receiving minimum 200 hits per month. • Gender Equality Body model is ready to be endorsed by the end of the project • A report on implementation of gender equality policies and gender mainstreaming in the EU is available by the third quarter of 2007 • Draft National Action Plan for Implementation of Gender Equality Policies developed by the third quarter of 2007 • The Communication Strategy is utilised by at least 20 media organisations by the end of the project • Minimum 100 trainers are ready to conduct implementation of gender equality policies training programs • Minimum 50 top-level decision makers, 150 experts and 500 policy implementers trained 	
<p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 7000 persons interviewed to establish the national database on violence • National Action Plan and on violence against women exists by first quarter of 2007 • The Communication Strategy is utilised by at least 20 media organisations by the end of the project • Domestic Violence Against Women Database model exists by second half of 2007 • Service models available for implementation by all service administrators by the end of the project Minimum 100 trainers trained by third quarter of 2007. • Minimum 760 civil servants trained to provide more comprehensive, sensitive services to women victims of violence • Minimum 25 municipalities are contacted to define the final list of municipalities willing to establish shelters 	

Civil Society Dialogue – EU-Turkish Chambers Forum (“ETCF”) TR0604.03	Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB) European Union Department Mr Mustafa Bayburtlu Mr Werner Gruber
	Antalya Chamber of Commerce and Industry Ms Burcu Topkaya Head of Projects Department
	Trabzon Chamber of Commerce and Industry Ms Elif Duman Project Expert
Overall Objective	Indicators
Strengthened dialogue between EU and Turkish Chambers, thus promoting the integration of the Turkish business community as member in European civil society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competitiveness of Turkish industry within EU increases by the year 2010 Targets of NPAA and “Industrial Policy Paper” of Turkey have been reached by 2012
Project Purpose	Indicators
The service capacity of Turkish Chambers is enhanced through benchmarking with their European counterparts, thus helping to contribute to increasing the role of Turkish business in EU market integration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% increase of new EU-Turkish joint ventures and cooperation supported by Turkish chambers by 2009
Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The establishment and further deepening of a strong and sustainable dialogue between Turkish and European Chambers both at global EU-Turkey level and at a regional level (region-to-region) Increased mutual knowledge and understanding between EU and Turkish Chambers, and their respective business communities, facilitating long-term collaboration Enhanced abilities of Turkish Chambers to design and generate value-added services to their members Enhanced abilities of Turkish Chambers to take an active part in the accession negotiations Better understanding by the European Chambers and their business communities of the potential impact of Turkish accession in the EU Integration of the Turkish Chambers into the European Chamber network through dialogue, partnerships, traineeships Accreditation capacity of TOBB enhanced and participating chambers accredited 	

OBJECTIVE 2

<p>Strengthening the Public Procurement System in Turkey</p> <p>TR0302.07</p>	<p>Public Procurement Authority Mr. Dursun Ali DEMİRBOGA, Department Head, International Relations Mr. Çağatay TAŞYÜREK, Public Procurement Expert Ms. Nilhan OZKAN, Group Head</p> <p>EUD Ms. Umut OZDEMIR TSAROUHAS TSAROUHAS, Sector Manager for Public Finance and Public Administration Reform</p>
<p>Overall Objective</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>To contribute towards upgrading the operational performance and professionalism of public procurement systems in South-East Europe by putting in place sustainable training systems in public procurement that are in compliance with EU public procurement legislation and practices and with related national legislation.</p>	<p>Public procurement rules implemented in more professional way by a greater number of public institutions.</p>
<p>Project Purpose</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>To develop a sustainable procurement training strategy at regional and national levels.</p>	<p>Training of trainers programme implemented 150-180 national trainers accredited. National training strategies adopted and process of implementation started</p>
<p>Results</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>Infrastructure for regional cooperation within the public procurement community in all participating beneficiaries (common tools and training materials, network of experts certified according to regionally recognized rules)</p>	<p>All national training materials compatible with each other (based on the same generic training materials) Network of certified trainers in each beneficiary</p>
<p>National training strategy in each beneficiary in place</p>	<p>National training strategies adopted in each beneficiary by relevant authorities</p>
<p>Public procurement training materials (modules) which transmit knowledge of the legal and business processes and corresponding professional skills;</p>	<p>National training modules translated, customised and published in hard copy and available on-line in each Beneficiary</p>
<p>A core team of national procurement trainers capable of customising these modules to fit national, legal and administrative contexts;</p>	<p>150-180 national trainers trained and certified</p>
<p>Sustained delivery of face-to-face and online modalities of procurement training, in close collaboration with a recognised network of anchor training institutions.</p>	<p>At least 10 training courses implemented with the assistance of the project in each beneficiary by certified national trainers in the first year after accreditation On-line course established in each beneficiary</p>

<p>Support to Turkey's efforts in the full alignment, and enforcement in the field of intellectual property rights with a focus on fight against piracy</p> <p>TR0402.04</p>	EUD Ms. Umut KAVLAK
	Ministry of Justice (MoJ) Ms. Hülya ÇETİN / Judge, EU Department
	Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MoTC) Mr. Özgür SEMİZ, Deputy Director General , DG for Copyrights Ms. Bilge KILIÇ, Head of Collecting Societies Department Ms. Fatoş ALTUNTAŞ, DG Copyrights, Senior Expert
	MÜYAP – Turkish Phonographic Industry Society Mr. Ahmet ASENA /General Secretariat
Overall Objective	Indicators
To support the Turkish government in its efforts towards strengthening the capacity in legal, institutional, technical and investment matters related to intellectual rights protection(copyright, related rights, <i>sui generis</i> data base rights, etc.) in Turkey in line with relevant EU <i>Acquis</i> , with specific focus on fight against piracy.	<p>3 % decrease in level of piracy every year over 5 years.</p> <p>Increase of copyright cases and more efficient handling by Courts.</p> <p>Increase in the number of seizures and seized pirate goods by Police, Customs and Provincial Supervisory Committees</p>
Project Purpose	Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To improve the existing legal environment by assessing and contributing to its further alignment with the EU legislation. - To strengthen the legal, administrative and institutional capacity of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) /Directorate General Copyright and Cinema (DGCC) and its services to comply with the rules and practices of EU intellectual property rights system To improve the technical capacity of the Ministry and its services and ensure their effective operation and monitoring intellectual property related activities by upgrading the technical infrastructure. - To improve the coordination between the bodies engaged in administrative protection and enforcement of IPR legislation. - To promote protection of intellectual property through developing a well structured strategy for awareness raising activities together with collecting societies, national police, the customs and users. - To develop and implement an Information Network System through establishment of a web-site for making the data available to the specialised IPR courts and relevant sections of the Customs , the National Police, National Security bodies, Provincial Directorates and Collective Societies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -EU IPR protection legislation transposed into Turkish legislation at the end of the project. - The central implementation (Directorate General for Copyright and Cinema) is reorganised in order to ensure effective enforcement. - Related staff of the DG and other enforcement bodies and collective societies is trained within their area of specialisation. - A common web-based database is established integrating the main beneficiary and other enforcement bodies and collective societies - Efforts of various actors on IPR protection are integrated.

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Results	Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National and EU legislation concerning intellectual property rights is analysed, Turkish legislation revised and necessary amendments (including drafting a single Copyright Code) drafted. - Institutional structure reorganised and administrative capacity of the Directorate General for Copyright and Cinema strengthened for effective implementation and absorbing new developments in the field of IPR and a policy paper drafted. - The related staff of the MoCT are competent in their respective areas of specialisations. - Enforcement capacity of the National Police, Municipalities, the Customs, the Judiciary are promoted. - An enhanced cooperation among the related institutions is structured. - Awareness raising activities performed for the public (right holders, pirate traders and users...etc). Efforts of various actors including collective societies on the IPR are integrated. - A database is developed to contribute in effective collective rights management (gathering the related data from the rightholders and collective societies, receiving applications electronically, keeping and making available the collected data provided that the previously agreed rules obeyed and security interests ensured). - Training in use of equipment is provided. - Accurate statistics are produced by the Directorate General to support national IPR policy. - Continuous exchange of information is secured between the MoCT and other enforcement bodies. - Website is developed to support the legal predictability and general awareness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The developed new IP legislation and regulations are well known by the enforcement authorities after receiving training - 90 % of surveyed staff able to successfully answer a questionnaire on legal, administrative and technical aspects of IPR protection. - Clear division of responsibilities exists within the Directorate General for Copyright and Cinema for different areas. - Job descriptions are available for all staff and the assigned staff members meet the job requirements of the job descriptions. - Effective coordination among the DG, enforcement bodies and collective societies is ensured. - Increased number of joint events and initiatives among IPR related institutions. -The relative level of copyright payments increase 5 % during the lifetime of the project (ratio copyright payments/GNP). - Increase of copyright infringement complaints, seizures and cases and more efficient handling by courts. - Increasing awareness of the general public on IPR. - Demand for pirate goods is decreased. - Fully operational website.

<p>Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II</p> <p>TR0503.16</p>	<p>EUD Mr. Güray VURAL / Sector Manager</p>
	<p>Turkstat (Former State Institute of Statistics-SIS). Ms. Sennur ONUR, Head of Department Mr. Alper GUCUMENGIL, Head of International Project Management Group Ms. Ebru COMEZ, expert</p>
	<p>Eurostat Ms.</p>

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Overall Objective	Indicators
<p>To upgrade the Statistical System of Turkey in order to provide adequate data and analysis for the purposes of facilitating policy decisions towards implementation of the pre-accession strategy and the adoption of the <i>Acquis</i>.</p>	
Project Purpose	Indicators
<p>To upgrade the Statistical System of Turkey, according to EU standards on the methodology and quality of compiling and processing statistical information and to ensure the efficient coordination by the State Institute of Statistics (SIS).</p>	<p>The BR system fulfils basic requirements of the system.</p> <p>The New Social and Demographic System has been defined and has been implemented to a great extend.</p> <p>Raw data of LFS is transmitted to Eurostat Labour Cost Index has been developed. Modular survey results has been received. Questionnaire for the new census system is available.</p> <p>Compliant data are available on Inbound and Outbound Tourism Statistics. Compliant data on structure of Tourism are available for the satellite accounts. Data collection procedures on accommodation statistics are compliant with EU.</p> <p>Comparability and regularity has been achieved on business statistics. The methodology for using administrative sources in producing business statistics for units under the defined threshold is developed according to EU requirements.</p> <p>Methodology for energy statistics is adapted and pilot survey results have been received and published.</p> <p>Updated and translated classifications in the server are available.</p> <p>The Agricultural Statistical System has been evaluated and has been implemented to a great extend for the future needs.</p> <p>The methodology in land use / cover statistics is adapted and compliant data are available in a selected region of Turkey.</p> <p>Data is available pre-accession process.</p> <p>The regional GDP data are estimated. The methodology and data sources for GG accounts are improved. The framework of SAM is set up according to EU requirements and standards.</p> <p>ICT Usage databases are developed. R&D and Innovation data is produced at NUTS II level. Regional Quality Report is prepared. Rural Development Statistics are developed. Consumer confidence index, Leading indicators index, Core inflation for Turkey have been calculated Seasonal adjustment analysis have been done. Indicators of competitiveness of manufacturing industry in EU market have been defined.</p> <p>Environmental Statistics System is improved. Compliant data are available.</p> <p>A centralised data entry system has been established. An archiving and disaster recovery centre has been arranged. An integrated data infrastructure and institutional data management has been ensured. Effective, fast, dynamic and user-friendly web service has been established.</p>

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	<p>Compliant data on selected areas of health statistics are available.</p> <p>Strengthened institutional capacity and higher efficiency within the institutional frames, an increased know-how level and knowledge of SIS staff on statistical standard methods, on indicators and on information of the EU.</p>
Results	Indicators
<p>1) The process of compiling, evaluating and publishing statistical data has been upgraded according to EU standards, procedures and regulations for selected sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Register System • Social and demographic statistics • Tourism statistics • Business statistics • Agricultural statistics system • Environmental statistics capacity • Health Statistics 	<p>The pilot survey in compliance with EU requirements</p> <p>Supply balance sheets for crops, milk and meat</p> <p>Reliable yield quantities for certain crops used for checking production data</p> <p>Pilot survey of Economic Accounts for Agriculture</p> <p>A centralised statistical system in the ministry connected with its regional directorates</p> <p>SGM coefficients</p> <p>Classified holdings by their typology</p> <p>The Agri-Environmental indicators</p> <p>The results of pilot survey for farm structure results are in compliance with EU requirements</p> <p>An action plan for environmental data collection</p> <p>Sample survey designed to collect representative data for each environmental sector</p> <p>Environmental expenditure accounting according to SERIEE framework</p> <p>Reports of available information by considering geographical dimension</p> <p>Meta data catalogue</p> <p>The data for users on environmental statistics</p> <p>Availability of health statistics ratio is increased</p> <p>Occupational Accidents Statistics</p> <p>Occupational Diseases Statistics</p>
<p>2) The quality and management of the Statistical System has been improved and harmonised according to EU standards by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision of the Classification System and Classification Server of SIS • Development of Multi-Domain Statistical System and Statistical Analysis • Improvement of National Accounts according to the recommendation of ESA95 • Improvement of information and communication technology • Multi Beneficiary Programme 	<p>Classifications in Turkish</p> <p>Additional National codes</p> <p>ICT Usage database</p> <p>R&D data</p> <p>Regional Quality Report</p> <p>Consumer confidence index</p> <p>Leading indicators index</p> <p>Measurement of core inflation for Turkey</p> <p>Seasonal adjustment analysis</p> <p>Indicators of competitiveness of manufacturing industry in EU market</p> <p>GDP</p> <p>Standard data architecture</p>

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	<p>A metadata system</p> <p>An enterprise data warehouse</p> <p>Data mining applications on enterprise level.</p> <p>Improved the processes for data collection and data entry</p> <p>Data standardisation and accuracy</p> <p>A centralised data entry application</p> <p>Implemented the security policy of SIS</p> <p>Online opportunities for regional offices to increase the training quality</p> <p>Dynamic database over one server instead of distributed servers</p> <p>Reliable and expandable cluster server</p> <p>Minimisation of maintenance and administrative costs for server and thin client.</p> <p>HRM and Survey management system for central and regional organisations.</p> <p>Very effective, fast, dynamic and user-friendly web service Increased knowledge on selected areas</p> <p>Gained experiences in practical problems</p>
<p>3) The capacity to manage upgrading the Statistical System and to efficiently implement the project will be guaranteed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Improvement of Administrative Structure of SIS • Project Implementation Team 	<p>Well-organised program completely in accordance with Commissions rules</p>

<p>Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III</p> <p>TR0603.07</p>	<p>Ministry of Customs and Trade (former Turkish Customs Administration-TCA)</p> <p>Ms. Sevil Karaca, Department Head</p> <p>Ms. Aybike Yalcin, EU Expert</p> <p>Mr. Muzaffer Küçük, EU J. Expert</p> <p>Ms. Beste Öztürk Bakacak, EU J. Expert</p>
	<p>EUD</p> <p>Ms. Deniz ATASOY / Sector Manager</p>
<p>Overall Objective</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>Proper protection of the future external borders of the EU through a modernised Turkish Customs Administration (TCA) to ensure that it is in a position to fulfil the tasks and obligations of an EU compatible Customs Administration.</p>	<p>1. Full integration with the EU IT systems by the end of 2009.</p> <p>2. At least 30 % reduction in the level of trans-border crime by the end of 2008.</p> <p>2. Effective controls established at customs border locations by end 2009, according to customs legislation and strategy, to support the overall aim.</p> <p>3. Fully functional Customs Training Services;</p> <p>3. 80% integration with the EU customs operations and practices by end 2010.</p> <p>3. At least 30 % reduction in the level complaints of customer and traders.</p> <p>3. 50% increase per year in the level of trained personnel by the end of 2010.</p>

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	<p>3. It is expected that false declarations on tariff, valuation, origin etc. considerably decrease in the medium- term period.</p>
Project Purpose	Indicators
<p>The purposes of this project are, <u>Component 1:</u> EU compatible Customs IT systems (including CCN/CSI, ITMS and NCTS applications) installed and fully operational at the end of the project and in line with the EU requirements in terms of interconnectivity and interoperability; <u>Component 2:</u> While achieving the objectives of the EU's IT interconnectivity requirements; Customs enforcement operations reinforced and improved in a synergetic manner to meet the responsibilities for the protection and control of external borders of the enlarged EU; <u>Component 3:</u> The human resources management system, enforcement, operational and administrative capacity mainly in the training domain strengthened in order to have sufficient capacity to implement and to enforce the acquis.</p>	<p>1. Systems (CCN/CSI, NCTS, ITMS) are operational and functional by the end of 2009. 2. At least 30 % increase in the number of prevented perpetrations of the Customs border gates by the end of 2009. 2. 20 technical staff trained by the end of 2009. 3. Customs Training Services facilities ready including locations, buildings, classes and equipment by the end of 2009. 3. 50% increase per year in the level of trained personnel by the end of 2010. 3. First (pilot) phase of e- and b-learning training is finalised by the end of 2010. 3. 50% increase in the level of implementation of the rules of integrity by the end of 2010. 3. The accessibility to the training databases of EU (autodata, e-learning data base) is provided by the end of 2010 3. The starting to benefit from the training technical assistance of EU Programmes (TAIEX, Customs 2007.) by 2010. 3. Post Clearance Control Mechanism is operational and functional by the end of 2009. 3. A risk based post control is functional by the end of 2009. 3. Regional post control offices are in place by the end 2010</p>
Results	Indicators
<p>Sub-Component 1: Customs IT Systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCN/CSI gateways have been installed and configured • NCTS has been developed and integrated into BILGE • ITMS has been developed and integrated into BILGE • Legislation, working procedures and related business alignment have been developed and conducted 	<p>CCN/CSI gateways have been installed and configured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCN/CSI gateways and other communication and Support equipments installed at TCA headquarters in 2008 • A coherent method of access used by the Commission and member states under CCN/CSI ensured in 2008 • Accession to all other EU IT sub-systems (such as TARIC, EBTI, Quotas, Ceilings etc.) ensured in 2009 • Sufficient number of TCA staff trained to operate CCN/CSI gateways in 2008 <p>NCTS has been developed and integrated into BILGE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements identified to integrate NCTS to BILGE to ensure compatible transit module in 2008 • Development & production platforms procured and installed in 2008 • Adhesion to the Common Transit Convention and NCTS ready for conformance test in 2009 • Conformance tests for NCTS compatible transit module successfully

	<p>performed in 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trader module to traders will be available (1st quarter) • Source-code and know how was transferred to TCA and necessary information was given in 2009 • Manuals produced for the TCA staff in 2009 • Organisation of seminars, training and information sessions with the relevant countries (in the Countries and/or in Turkey) as required by TCA held in 2009 <p>ITMS has been developed and integrated into BILGE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User requirements identified to integrate TARIC to BILGE to be compatible with EU TARIC system in 2008 • ITMS software written in cooperation between the contracted experts and Turkish experts in 2008 in accordance with the system and design analysis completed under 2004 project. • Turkish IT officials trained on TARIC software system in 2008 • ITMS developed and disseminated to customs operational staff and Turkish integrated Customs tariff (TICT) fully compatible with TARIC completed in 2008 • TICT integrated into BILGE • Relevant regulations amended to support the implementation of interoperability with the EU systems in 2008 • Rules, working procedures, methodologies, information flows, staff responsibilities and job description, documented in 2008. • Manuals produced for the TCA staff in 2008. • Turkish Customs staff (customs and IT) selected, trained and evaluated in 2009 • Train-the-trainers programme designed and delivered in 2009 <p>High-level awareness meetings organised for the participants to the customs operations in 2009</p>
<p>Sub-Component 2; Customs Enforcement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary equipments have been strengthened within the area of Customs posts • Customs surveillance function has been strengthened (extension of GÜMSİS Project -See Annex 5 	<p>Sub-Component 2; Customs Enforcement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of smuggling attempts detected increased by 55% in 2009 • Intervened smuggling attempts increased by 45% in mid-2009 • 40% increase in the mobility capacity needed during the smuggling cases ensured by mid-2009 • The objectives and key conditions and indicators contained within the Customs pre-accession Blueprints for Border and Inland Control, and Infrastructure and Equipment achieved by the end of 2010. • Effective controls at Customs border posts established by the end of 2009;
<p>Sub-component 3; Capacity Building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The training services in the fields of post clearance control, customs enforcement and global 	<p>Sub-component 3; Capacity Building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of trained sniffer dogs and dog handlers increased in 2008 • The training modules prepared under the TR03/FI/05-Twining Project further developed in 2008

<p>administrative capacity of TCA have been improved and extended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The physical conditions of the training services of TCA has been strengthened and improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application of legal regulations in a way which is uniform and consistent with the practice of EU member states improved by the preparation, printing and dissemination of updated handbooks and instructions concerning Customs regulations in 2008 • The training strategy conformant with EU developed under the TR03/FI/05-Twinning project better put into practice in 2008 • The administrative capacity and personnel management system strengthened by further development of training and technical support as continuation and extension of components with the framework of the Twinning TR03/F/05. TCAs technical and organisational compatibility with EU communication and technological adjustments further developed in 2008 • The Business Change Management Plan and the National Action Plan developed under Component 2 of the Twinning TR03/FI705 further developed and necessary adjustments made in 2009 • The Action Plan on Strengthening Border Controls and the resulting organisational, administrative changes are brought in line with the overall strategy in 2008 • The number of well trained and highly skilled Customs officers and brokers increased in 2009 • Sustainability of having well trained personnel achieved in 2009 (2nd quarter) • IT training support system developed and the staff management system improved in 2009 • The trainers trained under above component are able to bring the knowledge to the regional Customs offices where facilities and rooms are in place to conduct training in 2008 • An overall strategy drafted including initiation of a pilot practice for dog training and tactical training in 2008 • IT strategies concerning E- and B-learning possibilities put in place 2008 • Physical training infrastructures for sniffer dogs and dog handlers located (2008) • Office equipments; (DVDs, electronic boards, projections, photocopy machines, audio system, etc) installed, • Training equipments installed (2009) • Computer systems, hardware and software (i.e. Servers, PCs, printers, auto data system, LMS system, data and power lines etc.) procured and installed. Other equipment (trucks to handle the documents, phone switches etc.) (2009) • Strategy for the TCA on Post Clearance Control prepared in 2008 (1st quarter) responsibilities with other departments within TCA and/or other administrations ascertained in 2008 • Necessary human resources / job profiles for Customs Audits defined in 2008 • Turkish legislation reviewed to define the deficiencies in 2008 • EU compatible Post Control Legislation prepared in 2008 • A risk assessment approach for post clearance control purposes developed in 2008
--	---

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An administrative and related legislative structure of the post clearance control and customs audit function put in place within the framework of the existing system of TCA in 2009 • Customs audit training programme (including training and trainers) prepared and fulfilled in 2009 • Instructions and manuals for auditors prepared in 2009
--	---

OBJECTIVE 3

Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)	Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) Mr. İbrahim GERİM, Deputy DG for OHS Mr. Vedat Reha MERT (former General Director and SPO of the project) Mr. Erhan BATUR, ISGUM, Ankara Laboratory Head
TR0203.01	EUD Ms. Zeynep AYDEMİR / Sector Manager
	ISGUM Kocaeli OHS Laboratory Mr. Hüseyin SEZEK/Head of the Kocaeli Lab Mr. Erkan SAYGI /Chemical Engineer
Overall Objective	Indicators
To improve the health and safety conditions of workers at work and improve implementation of related EU directives in Turkey.	Decreased frequency and severity of occupational diseases and accidents (long term). 20% increase of employers and workers participating in the implementing of EU directives at the end of the project compared with 2003 level.
Project Purpose	Indicators
To assist the Turkish Government in transposing and implementing the EU Acquis in the field of occupational health and safety at work through the enhancement of the institutional capacity of the Directorate General for Occupational Health and Safety (DGOHS) of the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MOLSS) and its Occupational Health and Safety Centre (ISGUM) and regional outstations in its ability to promote Occupational Health and Safety at national and regional level.	Adoptions of already selected regulations by the end of 2002. Functional OHS units implemented end 2003. Financial sustainability assured end 2005 (Auditing).
To improve the health and safety situation of the workers in large, small and mediumsized enterprises through upgraded risk assessment and improved awareness and participation of stakeholders involved in OHS promotion and operational OHS-services.	20 new enterprises are accepting OHS regulations in each project year. 10% increase of enterprises with OHS services by 2005 compared with 2002 level of 8000 10% increase of the number of workers covered by OHS services by 2005 compared with 2003 level.

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Results	Indicators
1. OHS Promotion 1.1 Management	Selected laws and regulations adapted to EU Acquis and ILO standards by 2005 Number of documents prepared directly or under-coordination of DGOHS/ISGUM. Target group analysis realised. Counselling programme elaborated and implemented. The 4 Units for research, training, consultancy and social marketing are established and operational.
1.2. Raising awareness of target groups	Countrywide mapping and inventory of existing OHS services and OHS councils completed in 2004. Evaluation studies to define level IEC (Information, Education, Communication) designed beginning 2004. Impact surveys in 3 sectors (agriculture, industry, service) realised approving increased awareness.
1.3. Participation of social Partners	Number of actively participating social partners in 2003 identified. 80% of stakeholders are participating in 2005 compared with 2003 level. 20% of OHS related NGOs are selected and participate in project activities in each of the 7 cultural regions in 2004 10 project proposals of NGOs selected and sponsored in each project year
1.4. Personal Protective Equipment	Feasibility study realised in 2003 Personal protective equipment centre plan elaborated. Financing resources identified.
2. Laboratories 2.1 Technical Assistance	Management concept elaborated and implemented. 10% increase of revenue in 2005 compared with 2003 level. 30% increase of testing areas in 2005 related to branches compared with 2003 level. 10 % increase in the quantity of samples in each project year compared with 2003 level.
2.2 Works	Infrastructure for laboratory services renovated. Facilities for complimentary units (training, research, social marketing) functional. Renovation of complete ISKUM building planned in 2003
2.3 Supplies	In 2003 laboratory operational, collaboration between equipment and furniture suppliers and architects assured, mobile units operational. 3 month after arrival of TAT Team all workplaces Operational Kocaeli outstation infrastructure upgraded, equipment in stored and functionality assured

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

<p>Turkish Rail Sector Re-Structuring and Strengthening</p> <p>TR0303.07</p>	<p>EUD</p> <p>Dr. Göktuğ KARA / Sector Manager for Transportation Policy and Infrastructure Investments</p>
	<p>TCDD - Turkish State Railways Directorate General</p> <p>Mr. İbrahim ÇEVİK, Head of Foreign Relations Department</p> <p>Mr. Safi ÇATAL, Department Head, Member of the Restructuring Committee</p>
	<p>MoT – Ministry of Transport and Maritime Affairs</p> <p>Dr. Şeref TABAK; DG Foreign Relations and EU Affairs, Head of Department</p> <p>Mr. Umut DEMİRCİ, DG Foreign Relations and EU Affairs, EU Expert</p> <p>Mr. Serkan ÇELİK, DG Foreign Relations and EU Affairs, EU Expert</p>
<p>Overall Objective</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>To re-organize the Turkish rail sector in compliance with the EU acquis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparent and nondiscriminatory rail sector structure in place and functioning by first quarter of 2006
<p>Project Purpose</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>To improve the compliance of the Turkish rail sector legislation and organisation with the EU acquis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New rail sector framework law and law governing TCDD published and in force by mid-2006 • Necessary secondary legislation issued by third quarter of 2006 • New TCDD business unit based organisation in place by mid-2006
<p>Results</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>1.The legal framework defining and governing the rail sector in Turkey as well as the role of TCDD is in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft framework laws defining and governing the rail sector in Turkey as well as the role of TCDD is in place are drafted and sent to the Parliament for approval by end-2005 • The draft laws defining role and powers of the independent and regulatory bodies required by the Acquis and the role, objectives and responsibilities of TCDD are drafted and sent to the Parliament by end-2005 • Draft secondary legislation is drafted and ready for issuance by first quarter of 2006
<p>2.Financial performance (profit and loss) of TCDD is measured and actual performance against budget at business unit and subsector level is being monitored.</p>	<p>MIS is installed and operational by end-2005</p>
<p>3 .A business unit and subsector organisation structure at TCDD is in place.</p>	<p>Organigram for the new structure is approved by TCDD by end-2004.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business unit managers appointed and in place with financial objectives and targets set. Resources allocated to business units and budgets agreed mid- 2005.

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

4. Skills and knowledge of TCDD managers to manage in a commercial environment are improved.	All business unit and subsector managers trained in financial management, business planning and people management by end of the project
5. Contracts are established with Government defining and governing Public Sector Obligations (PSO) according to EU regulations.	<p>Rail services that are uneconomic to operate are identified by first quarter of 2005.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of the above services, those the Government wishes to support as socially necessary are identified by mid-2005. • The costs of providing those services are calculated by mid-2005. • Draft contracts defining the services (including performance standards to be met), their costs and other terms and conditions are drafted and ready for signature by end-2005.
Separate accounting systems are operational for infrastructure and operations (passenger and freight) and, where appropriate, for PSO contracts.	Separate accounts are published for infrastructure and operations (passenger and freight) and for PSO supported services by end of the project

<p>Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey</p> <p>TR0403.03</p>	<p>EUD</p> <p>Ms. Nermin KAHRAMAN, Sector Manager for Agriculture and Fisheries</p> <p>Ms. Leyla ALMA, Sector Manager</p>
	<p>Ministry of Food Agriculture and Livestock</p> <p>Ms. Emine Güher ÇELTEK, Deputy Director General, DG EU and Foreign Relations</p> <p>Ms. Tuğba ADIGÜZEL, EU Expert, DG EU and Foreign Relations</p>
Overall Objective	Indicators
Strengthening legal and organizational structures of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) at central and decentralized levels and improving co-operation with the private sector to ensure food safety and increase effective implementation and enforcement of food control system in Turkey	Food freely moved between Turkey and EU Food exports increased by 100%
Project Purpose	Indicators
<p>To strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) to transpose and comply the current Turkish food law with the Council Regulation no 178/2002 of 28 January 2002 and to design and implement an efficient and effective food control system by providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A high quality service with the improvement of food inspection and control services through strengthening administrative, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully operational food safety and control system in 2006 - Information exchanged between EU and Turkey through RASFF system - NFRL ready to accept samples and carry out supervision activities in 2007 and accredited internationally

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

<p>technical capacities and personal skills of food inspectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishing an information technology system for Rapid Alert System and implementation with the participation of all units related to food safety at national level - Laboratory equipment to fully equip a new purpose built Laboratory in Ankara to function as National Food Reference Laboratory and Provincial Control Laboratory 	
Results	Indicators
<p>1. Food Safety and Control System Component</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing food safety and control strengthened through the establishment of new system, the transposition and fully implementation of the relevant legislation, well trained food inspectors and inspection manuals and voluntary guides. - Inspection programs and a computerized food control database developed - Risk management system including database developed - National Rapid Alert System (RAS) fully functional - Information technology system developed and implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment with EU food legislation completed - Number of food inspectors responsible for food control and safety trained increased and equipped with necessary facilities - Inspection manuals and programs accepted by MARA - User friendly and easy understandable guides are published - Properly functioning information technology system in place - Common network between food control and safety authorities (RAS) established
<p>2. National Food Reference Laboratory Component</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The National Food Reference Laboratory established, fully equipped and ready for functioning. - LIMS system installed. - The NFRL applies for accreditation to ISO 17025 with Turkish Accreditation Body (TURKAK) by December 2006 . (The NFRL will also apply for accreditation to ISO 17025 with Member State Accreditation Body, If TÜRKAK hasn't been member of EU Accreditation Body by the end of 2006). - The laboratory to assume responsibility for the analytical quality of all measurements made within the Provincial Food Control Laboratories - The NFRL organises Proficiency Testing for all Provincial Food Control Laboratories - Implementation of LIMS system in NFR laboratory and expansion of it to other 5 regional laboratories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction will be completed, and the building will be fully equipped by October 2006. - Application to CSL Norwich ,UK for membership lodged by 2007. - Detailed scheme published and made available to all Provincial Food Control Laboratories in 2006

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory TR0503.04	EUD Ms. Nermin KAHRAMAN, Sector Manager for Agriculture and Fisheries Ms. Leyla ALMA, Sector Manager
	National Food Reference Laboratory (NFRL) of the Ministry of Food Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL) Dr. Berrin ŞENÖZ, Director of the NFRL Dr. Gülsen SÖYLEMEZ, Deputy Director Dr. Yusuf YİĞİT, Deputy Director
	MFAL Ms. Emine Güher ÇELTEK, Deputy Director General, DG EU and Foreign Relations Ms. Tuğba ADIGÜZEL, EU Expert, DG EU and Foreign Relations
Overall Objective	
Strengthening legal and organisational structures of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) at central and decentralized levels and improving co-operation with the private sector to ensure food safety and increase effective implementation and enforcement of food control system in Turkey.	Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food freely moved between Turkey and EU • Food exports increased by 100%
Project Purpose	
Meeting EU accession requirements for official food control and developing sustainable laboratory strategy for effective implementation and enforcement of food control system through establishing National Food Reference Laboratory and strengthening the institutional capacity.	Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credibility of Turkish food control services confirmed by the EU • NFRL ready to accept samples and carry out supervision activities in 2008
Results	
R1: Adequate physical and technical infrastructure for the National Food Reference Laboratory established.	• Construction will be completed, and the building will be fully equipped by December 2007
R2: Management and implementation structures and procedures (including information management) adapted.	NFRL is fully functional by the end of 2007
R3: Newly formed National Food Reference Laboratory ready for accreditation.	NFRL applied for accreditation
R4: Quality of analysis, measurement and control improved according to international standards	Analytical methods are harmonized and detection limits brought into line with EU requirements
R5: Proficiency tests performed/ organised for all Provincial Food Control Laboratories by NFRL	Detailed scheme published and made available to all Provincial Food Control Laboratories in 2008
R6: All regional food control laboratories implement the LIMS system.	LIMS installed in NFRL and in all regional laboratories by the end of 2007

OBJECTIVE 4

<p>Establishment of a National Drugs Monitoring Centre (REITOX Focal Point) and Development and Implementation of a National Drugs Strategy</p> <p>TR0204.03</p>	<p>Turkish National Police Unit of Turkish National Focal Point to the EMCDDA (TUBİM) Mr Bülent Demirci Mr Bünyamin Öztaş Mr Oğulcan Kayhan Mr Nadir Koçak</p>
<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>To strengthen the capacity of the law enforcement bodies in the fight against drug trafficking by developing an efficient institutional and technical framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the level of personnel education and specialization by 30%. • Increase the number of the trainer trainers by 50% • Increase in the number of rural operations leading to drug seizures
<p>Indicators with regard to expected results</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Rural Action Plan adopted by the Gendarmerie on Drug Trafficking in compliance with the National Drugs Strategy, the National Organised Crime Strategy and the EU Drugs Strategy • Equipment and training provided to five priority Gendarmerie regions. • A functioning system of drugs intelligence collection, analysis and dissemination established to support proactive operations in rural areas, is in place. • Increase in number of covert/ intelligence led operations • Training programmes and curriculum for law enforcement staff dealing with fight against drug trafficking in rural areas developed, printed and disseminated. 	

<p>Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol: Enhancing the Knowledge Level of Non-Forensic Expert Physicians, Judges and Prosecutors</p> <p>TR0501.03</p>	<p>Human Rights Foundation of Turkey (Former Head of Turkish Medical Association) Dr. Metin Bakkalci Ministry of Justice, DG of EU Mr Ali Bilen</p>
<p>Overall Objective</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>Promoting further alignment with the EU acquis on human rights</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement of compatibility with the EU acquis • Number of complaints about human rights abuses by the law enforcement authorities reduced by %20 between 2007 and 2008 as documented by international and national human rights NGOs
<p>Project Purpose</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>Enhancement of effectiveness of the evaluation process in medical examination and judicial procedures of torture claims by: -training of physicians who are not expert on forensic medicine re. the Istanbul Protocol -training of prosecutors and judges re. the Protocol</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% decrease in internally in-concluded torture claims by the end of 2007 • 30% decrease in torture claims against Turkey referred to the European Court of Human Rights based on the motive of improper investigation of the case by the end of 2007

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Results / Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements of the Istanbul Protocol adopted as national standards by the end of 2007 • Medical examination reports brought in line with the Istanbul Protocol reports by end 2007 • 4000 Physicians and 1500 prosecutors and judges trained on the Istanbul Protocol by project end • Prosecutions based on medical examination reports increased by 20% by project end as compared to the year before • New training strategy officially adopted by the relevant institutions by project end • Medical facilities equipped with cameras • Use of cameras in medical examinations increased by 100% by project end

Cascaded Training of Turkish Lawyers On Human Rights TR0501.04	Union of Bars - EU Unit Mr Murat Yalkın
	Council of Europe, Ankara Programme Office Mr Adrian Butler Mr. Yücel Erduran
	Antalya Bar Mr Sedat Alp, General Secretary Mr Erdal Taş, President of HRB of Antalya
	EUD task Manager Ms Banur Özaydin
	Survey Study for all Bars (13 replies) and active trained trainers (6 replies)
Overall Objective	Indicators
To increase knowledge and skills as regards European human rights standards among lawyers through training activities leading to effective application of these standards at national level.	NOT SPECIFIED
Project Purpose	Indicators
Knowledge of and practical skills as regards European human rights standards, in particular the ECHR, among lawyers are improved in Turkey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyers attend study sessions • Arguments making reference to the ECHR in pleadings and domestic court judgments increase • In the long run, cases brought to the ECtHR decrease
Results / Indicators	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a pool of lawyers experts on human rights, via Training of Trainers (x100), who will then train a significant number of lawyers (x10500) on human rights across Turkey • Creation of an annotated version of the new Turkish Code on Criminal Procedures (x20000) for judges and lawyers, local bar associations, and the libraries of law schools • Access to relevant case law and relevant human rights training materials 	

Shelters for Women Subject to Violence TR0601.05	UNFPA Ms Zeynep Başarankut Project Coordinator
	EUD Task Manager Ms Figen Tunçkanat

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Objectives	Indicators
Overall objective: The overall objective is protection of women's human rights in Turkey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of a National Action Plan on combating VAW • Existence of a communication strategy for combating VAW • Existence of a Gender Equality Law • Increased number of Consultation Centres directly related to VAW • Existence of a model for a database for monitoring VAW
Project purpose: To ensure that women subjected to violence are provided with sufficient protection through establishing and managing shelters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 totally furnished shelters established in İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Samsun, Gaziantep, Antalya, Eskişehir, and Bursa • Existence of a protection mechanism for women victims of violence running in all 8 cities
Indicators with regard to expected results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 75% utilisation rate of each of the shelters per year 2. Shelters Executive board composed of local authorities and NGO members in place and convened and took relevant decisions every two months • Minimum 10 shelter staff trained to provide comprehensive, sensitive services to women victims of violence at each city by the end of the project • Minimum 60 service providers (lawyers, health care providers, public prosecutors, judges, governors, sub-governors etc.) trained to be more sensitive during their encounter with women victims of violence at each city • 5. National violence victim's database adopted to local needs and functioning in all 8 cities and will be updated every two months by the end of the project 	

OBJECTIVE 5

Support to Human Resources Development Through Vocational Education and Training	Ministry of National Education Mr Osman Yalçın
TR0602.04	EUD Task Manager Prof Dr Mustafa Balci
Overall Objective	Indicators
To promote the development and competitiveness of SMEs in Eastern and South-Eastern regions of Turkey through the participation of a qualified and skilled labour force.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural dialogue between SMEs' associations and local education institutions established as platforms to ensure that VET schools graduates meet the demand of the labour market
Project Purpose	Indicators
To promote human resources development through the up-grading and modernisation of initial and continuing vocational education and training (VET) in the selected provinces within a lifelong learning perspective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reform undertaken with the EU SVET programme is disseminated and consolidated and extended to higher vocational schools and public education centres (PEC).
Key Results / Indicators	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural dialogue between SMEs' associations and local education institutions established in order to analyse labour market demands in the 8 provinces. • 30 VET schools become centres of excellence in the regions and pilot flexibility to local needs • 5 PEC become examples of best practice in Turkey and their graduates better meet the requirements of the labour market • Entrepreneurship is introduced on a regular basis in the provision of VET • Social partners contribute in making VET more attractive in the selected regions 	

Annex 5: List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Date	Name	Position	Institution
29 April 2013, 3 May 2013, 10 May 2013, 22 May 2013	Ms Arzu Şener	Coordinator – Financial Cooperation	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
10 May 2013	Ms Teresa Reeves	Coordinator – Financial Cooperation	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
15 May 2013	Mr Andrea Baggioli	Task Manager – DG Enlargement	European Commission
17 May 2013	Ms Banur Özaydin	Sector Manager – Justice, Freedom and Security	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
17 May 2013	Dr Figen Tunçkanat	Sector Manager – Health	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
17 May 2013	Ms Aycan Akdeniz	Political Officer – Domestic Politics	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
28 May 2013	Mr Güray Vural	Sector Manager - Statistics	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
29 May 2013	Ms Sennur Onur Mr Alper Gucumengil Ms Ebru Comez	International Relations Department	Turkstat
29 May 2013	Mr Göktuğ Kara	Sector Manager – Transport Policy	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
30 May 2013	Mr Ege Erkoçak	Director	Directorate for Political Affairs, Ministry for EU Affairs
30 May 2013	Ms Ayça Haykır	General Coordinator	Association of Civil Society Development Centre
31 May 2013	Ms Sevil Karaca Ms Aybike Yalcin Mr Muzaffer Küçük Ms. Beste Öztürk Bakacak		Ministry of Customs and Trade (former Turkish Customs Administration)
31 May 2013	Mr Bülent Demirci Mr Bünyamin Öztaş Mr Oğulcan Kayhan Mr Nadir Koçak		Turkish Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction [the Turkish NFP to the EMCDDA]

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Date	Name	Position	Institution
31 May 2013	Dr Hikmet Tülen Ms Asena Topçubaşı	President	Human Rights Presidency
3 June 2013	Dr Berrin Şenöz Dr Gulsen Soylemez Dr Yusuf Yigit	Director Deputy Director Deputy Director	National Food Reference Laboratory
4 June 2013	Ms Zeynep Aydemir	Sector Manager – OHS	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
4 June 2013	Ms Emine Güher Çeltak Ms Tugba Adiguzel	Deputy Director General EU Expert	DG for EU and Foreign Relations, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
5 June 2013	Mr Mustafa Bayburtlu Mr Werner Gruber	Head – European Union Department EU Project Development and Monitoring Division	The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey
5 June 2013	Mr Süreyya Süner Ms Cemre Güzel Ms Beyza Turan	Director Coordinator Coordinator	Directorate for Financial Cooperation, Ministry for EU Affairs
6 June 2013	Ms Umut Ozdemir	Sector Manager – Public Procurement	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
7 June 2013	Ms Deniz Atasoy	Sector Manager – Customs	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
7 June 2013	Mr İbrahim Gerim Mr Vedat Reha Mert Mr Erhan Batur	Deputy DG for OHS Former SPO for project Head, Ankara Laboratory (ISGUM)	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
7 June 2013	Mr Murat Yalkın	Specialist – International Relations and EU Centre	Union of Turkish Bar Associations
7 June 2013	Mr Mehmet Erdoğan Ms Özgün Baltacı Ms Ekin Bozkurt Şener	Director Expert Expert	Directorate General for the Status of Women, Ministry of Family & Social Policies
10 June 2013	Ms Zeynep Başarnkut	Assistant Representative	United Nations Population Fund (Ankara)
11 June 2013	Mr Adrian Butler Mr Yücel Erduran	Head of Office Project Officer	Council of Europe (Programme Office in Ankara)
11 June 2013	Mr Osman Yalçın	VET Directorate	Ministry of National Education

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Date	Name	Position	Institution
14 June 2013	Ms Umut Kavlak	Sector Manager – IPR	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
14 June 2013	Mr Şeref Tabak Mr Umut Demirci Mr Serkan Çelik	Directorate General for Foreign Relations and EU Affairs	Ministry of Transport and Maritime Affairs
14 June 2013	Mr İbrahim Çevik Mr Safi Çatal	Foreign Relations Department	Turkish State Railway Administration
14 June 2013	Prof Dr Mustafa Balci	Sector Manager – Education and Training	Delegation of the European Union to Turkey
14 June 2013	Mr Sedat Alp	General Secretary	Turkish Bar Association (Local Branch, Antalya)
14 June 2013	Mr Erdal Taş	President	Human Rights Board (Antalya)
14 June 2013	Ms Burcu Topkaya	Head of Projects Department	Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Antalya)
17 June 2013	Mr. Özgür Semiz Ms. Bilge Kılıç Ms. Fatoş Altuntaş	Directorate General for Copyright	Ministry of Tourism and Culture
17 June 2013	Mr. Dursun Ali Demirboğa Mr. Çağatay Taşyürek Ms Nilhan Ozkan	International Relations Department	Public Procurement Authority
17 June 2013	Mr Mehmet Cüneyd Tiryaki	Project Officer	Council of Europe (Programme Office in Ankara)
18 June 2013	Mr Mesut Kamiloglu Mr. Abdullah Basar Mr Alperen Köseoglu	DG Foreign Economic Relations	Ministry of Development
18 June 2013	Ms Meltem Alduk	Gender Programme Coordinator	United Nations Population Fund (Ankara)
18 June 2013	Mr Ali Bilen	Director General	Directorate General for EU Affairs, Ministry of Justice
18 June 2013 (Tel. & e-mail)	Ms Elif Duman	Project Expert	Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Trabzon)
19 June 2013	Ms. Hülya ÇETİN	Judge, EU Department	Ministry of Justice
20 June 2013	Dr Metin Bakkalcı	Secretary General (former head of Turkish Medical Association)	Human Rights Foundation of Turkey

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Date	Name	Position	Institution
20 June 2013 (Telephone)	Ms Claudia Junker Mr Frenc Galik		Eurostat
21 June 2013	Mr Hüseyin Sezek Mr Erkan Saygi	Head of the Laboratory Chemical Engineer	Kocaeli Laboratory (OHS)
25 June 2013	Mr Ahmet Asena	General Secretariat	MUYAP – Turkish Phonographic Industry Society
e-mail	19 responses (from 81 local Bar Associations)	Questionnaire responses	Local Bar Associations linked to project “Cascaded Training of Turkish Lawyers On Human Rights”

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Annex 6: List of Key Documents Collected and Reviewed

Author / Issuer	Title	Date / Year
Horizontal Documentation		
Council of the European Union	Council Regulation (EC) N° 2500/2001 concerning pre-accession financial assistance for Turkey	17/12/2001
	Council Decision on the principles, priorities, intermediate objectives and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with the Republic of Turkey	08/03/2001 19/05/2003 23/01/2006 18/02/2008
	EU Negotiating Framework regarding Turkey	03/10/2005
European Commission	EU Enlargement Strategy Papers (annual reports)	2001-2012
	Regular/Progress Report on Turkey's progress towards accession (annual reports)	2000-2012
	Recommendation of the European Commission on Turkey's progress towards accession, COM(2004) 656 final	06/10/2004
	Report on Pre-Accession Financial Assistance for Enlargement, plus Commission Staff Working Documents (annual reports)	2003-2012
	Screening Reports for individual EU <i>Acquis</i> Chapters opened for accession negotiations with the Republic of Turkey	2006-2007
European Court of Auditors	The European Commission's Management of Pre-Accession Assistance to Turkey (Special Report N° 16//2009)	13/01/2010
Council of Ministers (Republic of Turkey)	Turkey National Programme for the Adoption of the European Union <i>Acquis</i>	24/03/2001 23/06/2003 2008
Turkish Grand National Assembly	Decision on approval of the Eighth Development Plan (2001-2005)	27/06/2000
	Decision on approval of the Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013)	28/06/2006
State Planning Organization (now the Ministry of Development)	Preliminary National Development Plan (2004-2006)	12/2003
Programme / Project Documentation		
European Commission & the Government of the Republic of Turkey	Financing Agreements on the 2002-2006 National Programme for Turkey (as amended) & individual Project Fiches (see <i>Annex 2 for the full list of 2002-2006 projects</i>)	2002-2006 (and amendments)
	Project Fiches (as amended) for the project sample: TR 02.03.01 Upgrading Occupational Health and Safety	2002-2006 (and

Ex post Evaluation of the Assistance Provided by the EU's Turkish Pre-Accession Instrument, 2002-2006

Author / Issuer	Title	Date / Year
	TR 02.04.03 Sustaining the National Drugs Focal Point TR 03.01.03 Improving Cooperation between the NGOs and the Public Sector TR 03.02.07 Strengthening the Public Procurement System TR 03.03.07 Turkish Rail Sector Re-Structuring and Strengthening TR 04.01.01 Implementation of Human Rights Reforms TR 04.02.04 Support in the full alignment and enforcement in the field of Intellectual Property Rights with a focus on the Fight against Piracy TR 04.03.03 Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System TR 04.05.01 Support to SPO to Build Capacity at Central, Regional & Local Levels in line with the pNPD TR 05.01.03 Training Programme on the Istanbul Protocol: Enhancing the Knowledge Level of Non-Forensic Expert Physicians, Judges and Prosecutors TR 05.01.04 Cascaded Training Of Turkish Lawyers in Human Rights TR 05.01.06 Promoting Gender Equality TR 05.03.04 Establishment of National Food Reference Laboratory TR 05.03.16 Upgrading the Statistical System of Turkey – Phase II TR 06.01.05 Shelters for Women Subject to Violence TR 06.02.04 Support to Human Resources Development through VET TR 06.03.07 Modernisation of the Turkish Customs Administration III TR 06.04.03 Civil Society Dialogue: EU - Turkish Chambers Forum	amendments)
European Commission	Financial Data for the 2002-2006 National Programmes for Turkey	Issued 02/2013
CFCU	Technical Description of Actions (Twinning; Services; Direct Grants; Supplies; Works; Grant Schemes) for the project sample	Varied
Project Contractors / Service-Providers	Inception Reports, Progress Reports, Final Reports etc. for the project sample (see Annex 3 for the full list of project sub-components linked to the sample projects)	Varied

Annex 7: Interview Guide

The Interview Guide consists of 5 Evaluation Questions (EQ) overarching this Evaluation's methodological approach. They reflect the 11 questions indicated in the assignment's TORs as follows:

Impact and Sustainability:

- How effectively have Turkey's priorities/needs been translated in programming of assistance?
- To what extent was the financial assistance effective in achieving the desired results and what possibly hampered the achievement?
- Did the immediate and intermediate results delivered by the evaluated assistance translate into the desired/expected impacts?
- Were the results achieved sustainable and if not why not?
- To what extent were the EC's chosen implementation modalities relevant and efficient?
- To what extent was the support provided by the EC coherent?

Relevant and applicable Lessons Learnt and Recommendations:

- What lessons can be learnt from the implementation of the assistance to Turkey?
- What were the weaknesses and strengths of assistance?
- Could financial assistance have been better coordinated/aligned with reforms to improve effectiveness, impact and sustainability?
- What type of assistance and reforms achieved the most sustainable results and why?
- What are the main lessons to be learnt in terms of implementation modalities and institutional setting, which could be taken into account in the implementation of Turkey's IPA?

Each of the Evaluation Questions below covers one or more evaluation criteria, but does not explicitly refer to any of them. The criteria are the very basis for the evaluation and the information and data collected for responding to each of the EQs will contribute to the overall assessment of the criteria in the Final Evaluation Report. The 5 criteria underpinning this Evaluation are *Relevance (incl. Project Design and Complementarity/Coherence)*, *Effectiveness*, *Efficiency*, *Impact* and *Sustainability*.

Sub-questions are indicative and serve as Judgement Criteria, which are the factors for judging whether an EQ can be answered positively, drawing on objective findings, subjective assessments made by the Evaluation Team and the experience of project/sector managers, implementers and beneficiaries. Although not necessarily exhaustive, the indicators prove to be very useful and relevant inputs into responses to evaluation questionnaires.

Finally, the Evaluators will not answer each and every question separately, as this questionnaire will be used first and foremost as an Interview Guide.

EQ1 – Relevance (incl. Project Design and Complementarity/Coherence): To what extent are/have the intervention logic (internal coherence), strategic complementarity with other EU, other multilateral/bilateral donor and national programmes, the overall approach and the objectives of the actions been consistent with, and contributed adequately to, beneficiaries' requirements, Turkey's country needs, global priorities and partners' and EU policies (e.g. NPAA, other relevant bilateral EU-Turkey agreements, commitments etc.)?

Judgement criteria:

1. **Institutional framework: what is the role of the EUD, the NAC/NIPAC, NCU, CFCU and the line beneficiaries?**
2. **For each of the projects under evaluation, why, how, through what process has the project been selected and implemented (gap analysis, needs assessment, ex ante evaluation, feasibility study, demand-driven process)? Did it make any sense to carry out any sectoral approach (with several beneficiary institutions involved directly or indirectly in the same project)? Please add the corresponding key indicators, if appropriate.**

3. **Has the possibility to choose one instrument over another (TA, Grant Schemes, Twinning, TAIEX, SIGMA, FWC, Community Programmes, etc.) been carefully considered** (adequacy of the instrument to the needs and absorption capacity of the beneficiary institutions)? Please add the corresponding key indicators, if appropriate.
4. **Have Turkey's direct beneficiaries and NAC/NIPAC/NCU/CFCU, been directly / indirectly involved in the preparation of project activities (Programming, Project Fiche, TORs, Work Plan and Contract)?** If yes, to what extent / how active was the cooperation? Have they been prepared or have they received any training/advice prior to the project activities? If yes, what specific training activities have been conducted? Please add the corresponding key indicators, if appropriate.
5. **Have the objectives of project activities remained unchanged or have they been improved against the reference documents, including the planned results initially specified in the Project Fiche/TORs/Work Plans, through the entire duration of the activities?** Please elaborate and add the corresponding key indicators, if appropriate.
6. **Have there been any complementary actions/activities planned or implemented between the project and Twinning/TAIEX/SIGMA, classical TA, FWC, Grant Schemes, Community Programmes and/or other multi- and bi-lateral donors?** Please indicate if any at all.
7. **Was there any mechanism operational or envisaged for optimising the additional and coordinated implementation of the various tools made available to the project (Twinning, TAIEX, SIGMA, Grant Schemes, Community Programmes, short-term and long-term Technical Assistance and Procurement)?**
8. **Did the NAC/NIPAC/NCU/CFCU have one of their Project Management Specialists specifically responsible for the project under evaluation?** Did he/she have a direct relationship with his/her colleagues at the EUD to discuss the various issues?
9. **In your opinion, has there been any overlap between the project and other activities implemented in Turkey (Twinning, TAIEX and SIGMA, classical TA, Grant Schemes, Community Programmes, FWCs, procurement, etc.)?** Is it fair to say that complementarity between these instruments could be improved? If yes, please indicate in what areas.
10. **What is your opinion about activities, such as traineeships, staff exchanges, study tours to EU Member States, line stakeholder participation in regional events, etc.?** Would you be in a position to confirm that these activities are necessary, complementary and coherent with the other project activities? Do these activities generate any benefit to the direct beneficiaries? Do they bring any additional benefit to the project? May they be regarded as too costly? How could we measure the result of these activities? What indicator(s) could be appropriate?
11. **What is your opinion on the following points?**
 - Have there been / are there major deviations from the initially planned project activities and results against the project approach, or not? If yes, please elaborate.
 - Should any project systematically be linked to one or more EU *Acquis* chapters?
 - If yes, for this project, what EU *Acquis* chapter is referred to concretely?
 - For this project, do you think that part of the activities could have been carried out through by means of another instrument (classical TA, Twinning, TAIEX, SIGMA, Grant Schemes, Community Programmes, FWC, procurement, etc)? If yes, what are they?
 - Have Cross-Cutting Issues²⁰ been taken into consideration sufficiently in the project preparation phase?

²⁰ Cross-Cutting Issues are Democracy and Human Rights, Environmental Sustainability, Gender Equality/Mainstreaming and HIV/AIDS Anti-Discrimination Policies and Measures, to which the Evaluators have added good Public Governance.

EQ2 – Efficiency: To what extent have the project activities been delivered adequately to Turkey's beneficiaries? *Have things been done right?*

Judgement criteria:

1. **Have all the outputs/results been achieved as planned?** Please indicate the quantitative indicators and their success rates (%) against the planned results.
2. **Do you think that the best quality of the outputs/results achieved was obtained against the expected results and mobilised resources?** Please indicate the qualitative indicators and their success rates (%) against the planned results.
3. **Have local institutions, target beneficiaries and other stakeholders contributed to project activity preparation and implementation in a timely and result-oriented manner?** Please elaborate on this contribution.
4. **In your opinion, can project activity costs be justified against project benefits, which they have generated (best value for money)?** Please compare with similar projects and/or alternative approaches, taking into account contextual differences.
5. **Was this project's total budget proportionate to the planned activities and expected results?** Was the project's total budget entirely consumed? If not, why and for which specific items?
6. **In your opinion, was the total budget for this project under- or over-estimated? If yes, to what extent? Please comment.**
7. **Was there any amendment made to reallocate funds from one or more activities to other existing or new activities? Did this affect the quality of delivery of these and other activities?**
8. **Did Commission HQ/EU Delegation/NAC/NIPAC/NCU/CFCU inputs (procurement, training, contracting either directly or via consulting firms) contribute to project activity preparation and implementation in a timely and result-oriented manner?** Please elaborate on the level of support provided by these line stakeholders.
9. **Did the quality of the expertise made available respond to the level expected and the requirements to achieve the activities? Was a Quality Assurance system in place?** How was the quality of the expertise appreciated/perceived? Were the experts all civil servants, private consultants, local experts, employees of mandated bodies in their EU countries? Are these experts prepared to deliver quality expertise responding to Turkey's needs and expectations? To what extent have the beneficiaries been satisfied in relation to actions conducted in Turkey and in the EU (study tours, traineeships, staff exchanges, etc.)?

EQ3 – Effectiveness: To what extent are/have the project results and specific objectives been achieved? *Have the right things been done?*

Judgement criteria:

1. **Please list the planned results and indicate to what extent they have been reached.** Please add the corresponding key indicators of achievement.
2. **Have the right activities been conducted to obtain the planned results?** Please add the corresponding key indicators of achievement.
3. **To what extent have the implemented activities transferred any institutional capacity to Turkey's beneficiary institution?** Please elaborate and add the corresponding key indicators of achievement.

4. **Were the project indicators adequate in measuring the achievement of immediate objectives?** Did any significant changes occur after the initial design phase was completed? If yes, did project management react promptly and effectively to these changes in order to revise the indicators that were no longer appropriate? Please elaborate and add the corresponding key indicators of achievement.
5. **What were the major implementation constraints that affected the achievement / non-achievement of the stated objectives?** Please mention these objectives and add their corresponding indicators of achievement.
6. **Have unplanned results positively / negatively affected the benefits received?** Please indicate what results?
7. **Have cross-cutting issues been taken into account well enough during the project implementation phase?** Had they been mentioned initially in the Project Fiche and Work Plan? If not, why? If yes, please specify what cross-cutting issues?

EQ4 – Impact: To what extent will/have the objectives of the 2002-2006 projects be/been achieved as intended, in particular their planned overall objectives, in terms of capacity building, legal approximation (e.g. transfer of *EU Acquis* and EU best practices), Turkey's economic integration into the EU market, institutional modernisation and overall EU-Turkey cooperation?

Judgement criteria:

1. **What are the main results of the project and how did they impact on the beneficiary institution's functioning?** Have these results brought about any organisational changes in terms of restructuring and training? Have any additional civil service units been created? Have there been any major changes to the existing working procedures? Please elaborate and provide relevant indicators.
2. **Have the planned results been achieved together with significant and sustainable changes in the functioning of the beneficiary institution?** Would you be in a position to confirm that the project results have generated any substantial progress to the beneficiary institution, e.g. in terms of capacity building, *EU Acquis* transfer, legal approximation, structural reforms and political, economic, trade, finance and justice & home affairs? Please elaborate and provide the project's corresponding key indicators of achievement and their respective success rates (%).
3. **Have economic, trade, justice and social effects resulting from the project activities been spread against the achievement of Overall Objectives?** If yes, what changes have been brought about? Have unplanned impacts affected the overall impact? If yes, what are they? And with what implications?
4. **Have civil servants been trained to the introduction of these changes?** Did they change their working methods accordingly? Is the trained staff still in the positions for which they have been trained? Provide indicators (staff trained, staff still working...)
5. **Have cross-cutting issues been taken into consideration in this project, whenever was appropriate?** Was there any substantial progress made? Please elaborate and provide the relevant indicators. See also the non-governmental organisations (NGOs) involved and how they benefited from assistance: initiatives aimed at the consolidation and further development of democratic practices, the rule of law, human rights, gender equality/mainstreaming and the protection of minorities.

EQ5 – Sustainability: To what extent have/are the positive outcomes of the projects and the flow of benefits continued/likely to continue after external funding ends/has ended?

Judgement criteria:

1. **Have positive results/outcomes/impacts of this project continued, or are they likely to continue, after external funding ended or ends?** Please elaborate and provide the key indicators, if appropriate.
2. **Have the direct beneficiaries demonstrated ownership over the project outcomes?** Have the outcomes/results/changes been integrated for good and in a stable manner into the beneficiary institution's functioning? Is there any follow-up system in place or has this been envisaged? Please elaborate.
3. **As regards institutional capacity building, are the beneficiary institution's trained staff still in place and ensure ownership? Are they working on subjects related to the changes introduced by the project?** Have you noticed any turnover among this staff? Please provide relevant indicators. Have HR management procedures been, are they being or will they be, put in place for staff recruitment, replacement, turnover, career development and further training (e.g. "Training the Trainers" facility or "Manual of Internal Procedures" for dissemination and governance)?
4. **As regards *Acquis* transfer, legal approximation and/or and the law-making process supported by this project, would you be in a position to confirm that this project has had any real, sustainable impact on the modifications introduced to the beneficiary institution's functioning?** Please indicate when the bill, if any at all, was drafted, voted into law by Parliament, enforced and also when it started to deliver its first intended results (during project implementation or after one, two or three years. Or never). See also Turkey's efforts to fulfil the Copenhagen Political Criteria.
5. **What was the level of political commitment and absorption capacity demonstrated by government, public, business and civil society organisations?** Please elaborate.
6. **In the long term, what have the effects of institutional, legal and policy changes (reform process) been like on a particular sector or region in your country as a result of the project activities?** Please elaborate and indicate what sector(s)/region(s)/activity(-ies).
7. **Is any domestic funding strategy in place or under way to continue the project achievements (existing or envisaged)?** If yes, at affordable costs (e.g. maintenance, replacement, insurance, disposables, further training, etc)?
8. **Has the transition (from operational, administrative and financial point of view) from one project to another been envisaged by the beneficiary and have new fields of intervention been identified?**