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# PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS FOR TURKEY

## SECTOR JUSTICE and HUMAN RIGHTS

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector?**

The most relevant document for this sector is the recently expired Judicial Reform Strategy (JRS) which covered the period 2009-2013. The JRS has been recently updated for the upcoming period but has not been circulated yet for approval. In order to have a comparative view below are the objectives of the 2009-2013 JRS and the new draft JRS:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **JRS 2009-2013** | **JRS 2014-** |
| **Objectives** | A. Strengthening Independence Of The Judiciary  B. Promoting Impartiality Of The Judiciary  C. Enhancing Efficiency And Effectiveness In The Judiciary  D. Enhancing Professionalism In The Judiciary  E. Improving Management System Of The Judicial Organization  F. Enhancing Confidence In The Judiciary  G. Facilitating Access To Justice  H. Ensuring Effective Implementation Of Measures To Prevent Disputes And Improving Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms  I. Improving Penitentiary System  J. Needs Of Our Country And Continuation Of Legislative Works For Eu Harmonization | 1. To Strengthen The Independence, Impartiality And Transparency Of The Judiciary 2. To Improve The Quality, Effectiveness And Efficiency Of The Judiciary 3. To Introduce Effective Measures For Preventing Disputes And Develop Alternative Dispute Resolution Methods 4. To Improve International Relations In Justice 5. To Improve Public Relations Of The Judiciary 6. To Improve The Justice Organisation 7. To Strengthen Law Education And Pre And In Service Training 8. To Improve Practices For Women, Children, And The Disabled 9. To Facilitate Access To Justice 10. To Prevent Human Rights Violations Arising From Judicial Practices And Legislation And Strengthen Human Rights Standards 11. To Improve The Penitentiary System |

The draft Judicial Reform Strategy to replace the previous one is in draft form and is expected to be approved in the coming year. As can be seen there are considerable overlaps between the objectives of the previous and new JRS. On the level of expected results of the new JRS, there are, with the exception of new objectives related to women, children and disabled (Objective 8) as well as improving international relation (Objective 4) and to prevent human rights violations arising from judicial practices and legislation and strengthen human rights standards (Objective 10), overlaps with the JRS that has just expired.

The degree to which the new JRS builds on a fully-fledged assessment of the scope and degree of achievements in the previous JRS implementation period is not clear. During the field mission, the relevant department of the MoJ confirmed that no formal assessment of achievements was made for the expired JRS.

There are several other sub-sector strategies that are relevant to this sector:

* High Council of Judges and Prosecutors Strategic Plan (2012-2016)
* Ministry of Justice Strategic Plan (2010-2014)
* Transparency and Strengthening the Fight Against Corruption Strategy and Action Plan (2010-2014)
* Human Rights Action Plan (HR AP) – draft
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*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub-strategies in the Justice and Human Rights sector*

While highly relevant to the sector the Human Rights Action Plan is currently in draft form and was not available for analysis.



*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity of the Justice and Human Rights sector strategy*

In general, the main specific objectives defined in the JRS are complementary and coherent with the objectives of sub-sector strategies. Both complementarities and coherences are scored as High: 4 as there are strong links between objectives of the JRS and sub-sector strategies. The Transparency and Strengthening the Fight Against Corruption Strategy and Action Plan is the only strategy which relates to only one of the JRS Objectives (namely promotion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms andpriorities concerning the strengthening of the Ombudsman institution). In the calculation of scores the HR AP has not been factored in as the text hasn’t been made available for analysis.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

The preparation of the JRS bases itself on several assessments that have been conducted including those that have been conducted through EU funded projects. Several peer reviews conducted have informed the JRS about Advisory Visit Reports on Functioning of the Turkish Judiciary, CoE recommendations and a number of peer reviews.[[1]](#footnote-1)

A Commission was established in 2008 for the preparation of the JRS with participation from several MoJ departments. An online consultation was launched also in 2008 on the draft JRS. The draft was further discussed with stakeholders. A workshop was organized in Kızılcahamam Judges Guest House between 8-10th June 2009 and the Draft Judicial Reform Strategy was negotiated with the participation of representatives of the Constitutional Court, the Court of Cassation, the Council of State, Military Court of Cassation, High Administrative Military Court, the Ministry of the National Defense, the Union of Turkish Bar Associations, the Union of Turkish Notaries, Bars and Law Faculties and a consensus was reached.

In total more than four consultation meetings were organized. Between 100-500 participants attended in total.

Nevertheless, a narrative presentation of the specific results of consultations have not been included in the text of the strategy itself. A presentation of a SWOT analysis is not present in the strategy. SWOT analyses have been conducted (in compliance with related guidelines and legislation) and duly presented in the Ministry of Justice Strategic Plan and the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors Strategic Plan.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

As outlined in EU’s Progress Reports for Turkey. Justice and Judicial reform stands at high priority for the Government as for the EU accession process.

The 60th government programme makes reference to an independent, impartial and efficient functioning of judicial system. It identifies the impartiality and independence of the judiciary as prerequisites for ensuring the justice and committed itself to continue the justice reforms with determination; adopt new legislation on alternative dispute resolutions in order to ensure speedy, simple, cheap and efficient resolution of disputes and diminish the current workload of the courts.

The Accession Partnership Document of 2008 defines “improving judicial system and ensuring the impartiality of the judiciary, promoting rule of law and human rights, proceeding with the modernization of public administration reform, anti-corruption and protection of minority rights, and of socially vulnerable and disadvantaged groups” as priorities.

The National Program of Turkey for the Adoption of the Acquis (NPAA) (2008) sets forth priorities related to the sector of judiciary and fundamental rights, such as ‘increasing the efficiency, efficacy and functionality of the judiciary’, ‘fight against corruption’.

The 9th NDP[[2]](#footnote-2) also prioritises justice under sub-chapter 5.6.5 “Improving the Judicial System.

The approval status of the strategies for the sector are as follows:

* JRS 2009-2013 has been approved at the highest level, namely the Council of Ministers.
* Strategic Plans of the MoJ and the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors are approved at the Ministry level.
* Transparency and Fight Against Corruption Strategy and Action Plan was approved at the Council of Ministers level on 2010 through decision no. 2010/56
* The Human Rights Action Plan is currently in draft form.

A number of reforms were launched for this sector which also confirms the level of priority attributed to the sector by national policies. In the period which concerns the main strategy several reform efforts were made.[[3]](#footnote-3) These were primarily the 3rd and 4th Reform packages and amendments to the Criminal Procedures Code between 2012 and 2013. As noted by the EU Progress Reports of 2012 and 2013, with regard to *impartiality,* the individual application procedure introduced by the 2010 constitutional amendments and the Law on the Constitutional Court of 2011 entered into force in September 2012. *Âs per efficiency* of the judiciary, amendments to the Laws on the Court of Cassation and the Council of State aiming at tackling their backlog of cases were assessed as an important step. The 3rd Judicial Reform Package, provided some remedies regarding detention and its length. The 4th Judicial Reform Package aimed to address and provide judicial remedies for a number of issues on which Turkey had been condemned by the European Court of Human Rights. Hence, in what concerns human rights and its judicial aspects, several reforms were undertaken. On the contrary, on fight against corruption progress reports note limited progress as well as a limited number and nature of reforms despite the implementation of the strategy and action plan.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified? Are the identified objectives coherent? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact?**

The JRS 2009-2013 does not adequately distinguish between an overall objective and specific objectives. In fact, what have been identified as objectives of the JRS (the new JRS follows a very similar model and structure although it does not constitute part of this analysis) are specific objectives and the main goals are expected results.

In the absence of an overall objective, for the purposes of assisting the analysis, what is closest to an overall objective within the text has been chosen which is “promoting fundamental rights and freedoms to ensure the independence, impartiality”
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*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives of the justice sector strategy*

As can be seen from the table, there is a good level of coherence between the global objective and the specific objectives. However, the JRS could’ve benefited from the identification of more specific and measurable specific objectives. As the same model and structure has been followed for the new draft JRS, a similar comment can be relevant to the updated strategy as well. The lack of specificity exacerbates weaknesses in identifying proper indicators for these objectives and their results. Although there are several needs assessments and situation analyses available, the strategy does not adequately refer to these and connect objectives to specific problems and needs.

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table clearly shows that justice sector is being considered as part of the JHA strategic framework.



*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency of the justice sector with EU accession strategies*

The justice sector is a clear priority in the NPAA and is also identified as one of the main focus sectors in the draft Country Strategy Paper (CSP).

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies?**

Currently there is no regional development strategy as per which this EQ can be assessed. However, it should be noted that the NDPs emphasise regional aspects, and in particular the 10th NDP has provided guidance for the preparation of a National Strategy for Regional Development (NSRD) as the main strategic document in this area, to help ensure coordination for regional development and regional competitiveness, to strengthen harmony between spatial development and socio-economic development policies, and establish a general framework for regional and sub-scale plans and strategies.

Regional dimensions are partially and insufficiently addressed by the sector strategy, mostly confined to those priorities dealing with regional and local courts.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

The JRS also has an Action Plan (JRS AP) which was adopted in 2009 and has not been updated until the end of the strategy implementation period.

The AP contains allocation of responsibilities per stakeholders. Nevertheless, the stakeholders are inadequately reflected per measure/priority as most of the priorities are identified as MoJ. Secondary stakeholders, including non-state actors- have not been adequately identified. Furthermore, there are no specific timelines, critical path or similar planning tool used in the AP in order to establish sequentially and specific timeframes. The timing is distinguished only as short/medium/long-term and continuous. Most importantly it does not include a proper budget allocation per measure. The budget allocations are primarily identified as the MoJ budget and actions are not budgeted at all.

Three out of five of the strategies have APs, although the HR AP is still draft.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –* Are there monitoring mechanisms in place?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

The objectives and results of the JRS AP correspond to the overall and specific objectives of the JRS. As mentioned earlier, the specific objectives could’ve benefited strongly from improvement in their specificity and measurability. The JRS AP fails to identify outcome indicators. It does nevertheless identify certain outputs although these are not specific (e.g. it mentions studies but doesn’t specify number of studies). The AP emphasizes tracking inputs and outputs rather than impact and outcomes. Benchmarks are not identified sufficiently which can allow measuring the accomplishment of various stages in the execution of the strategy.

The JRS doesn’t include a chapter on monitoring and evaluation (M&E). It is not clear who, when and through which means M&E will be conducted to measure achievements and outcomes. The AP doesn’t include specific M&E measures either. The monitoring mechanism is not structured and specific to the strategy, the main body responsible for monitoring being the Strategic Planning Department of MoJ. The DG for EU Affairs of MoJ is designated as the responsible unit within the MoJ under IPA II. Given the large number of EU funded projects implemented in the past and an established project based monitoring system followed by the MEUA and CFCU, the DG has a good level of experience in project-based monitoring. However, know-how and skills on strategy based monitoring is limited. There are furthermore, no written procedures and/or manuals for monitoring, available. It should also be noted that a formal evaluation (mid-term or final) for the JRS 2009-2013 hasn’t been conducted.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately cost estimated and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

The JRS and the AP don’t contain any financial figures or costs of actions. The AP identified the sources of financing per measure/priority. In this respect, Criteria 1.9.2 is assessed as limited (Score 1).

On the other hand, budget allocations for this sector has been continuous both from the annual budget of the MoJ and through EU funds, hence allocations are assessed as good (Score 3).

The sector has received continuous EC support through the IPA Component 1 TAIB. IPA financial assistance in 2012 continued to support the political priorities of the accession process with a focus on the rule of law and tackling key reforms linked to the judiciary and fundamental rights, under Component I, for a total value of EUR 225.74million in 2012.

The allocations for Component I has been as follows:



National co-financing has been maintained between 10-20% of the total budget amount for the period 2011-2013. The commitments for the period 2011-2013 under IPA funds for Justice and Human Rights are as follows (IPA contribution and national co-financing):



*Source: NIPAC Turkey*

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* The document that has been taken as a basis for analysis has been the JRS 2009-2013- approved at Council of Ministers level- although it has expired and has been updated by a new JRS which is currently draft and not public.
* The JRS 2009-2013 bases itself on several situation, problem and needs analyses (e.g. peer reviews, CoE recommendations etc.) although these have not been systematically included in the strategy and links between the objectives, priorities and measures and these analyses have not been properly presented in the strategy.
* Stakeholder involvement in the preparation of the JRS is assessed as good.
* There is a good level of complementarity and coherence between objectives of the JRS and sub-sectorial strategies. In this analysis, given the absence of the document the HR AP could not be included. The Transparency and Fight Against Corruption Strategy is the only sub-sector strategy which relates only to the specific objective of “Ensuring effective implementation of measures to prevent disputes and improving alternative dispute resolution mechanisms” as it includes measures dealing with the Ombudsman institution.
* The coherence of JRS objectives is assessed as good. Nevertheless, the JRS does not identify a specific overall objective. It furthermore confuses specific objectives with expected results. Some of the specific objectives (there are 10 in total) would need to be made specific, time bound and measurable.
* The JRS has strong relations to several national policy documents (60th Government programme, 9th and 10th NDPs, Accession Partnership, NPAA and is also included as a priority sector in the MIPD).
* Regional development priorities are not systematically considered in the JRS, with the exception of some regional consideration for local courts and small penitentiary institutions.
* 60% of strategies in the sector have Action Plans.
* The JRS AP identifies a list of planned activities per specific objective and expected results. However, it lacks measurable indicators and benchmarks. References are mostly made to outputs/outcomes and are insufficiently formulated. There are no impact indicators.
* Allocation of institutional responsibilities is made in the AP. Timeframes are very generally identified. Costing for actions has not been made and budget allocations are generally identified.
* M&E is not foreseen in the JRS and AP. Monitoring procedures, manuals are not formally established.

**Recommendations CRITERIA 1:**

* The MoJ has been preparing the new JRS and within this framework has created a commission to revise the previous strategy. An international workshop was also conducted in Izmir for this purpose. An International Judicial Reform Symposium was held on April 2012 to inform the revision process.
* As the document is still in draft form, there is clear opportunity to improve and correct some of the shortcomings that the previous JRS demonstrated. Primarily, a more in-depth needs analysis should be presented in the new JRS. It should include clear references per objective and priority to problems, needs and a SWOT analysis. Such background analysis, including the recommendations ensuing from the consultations, should be included in the final document.
* The JRS should consider seeking further complementarity with other sub-sectoral issues such as fight against corruption (at least judicial aspects) as well as identifying complementarities with the HRAP.
* The new JRS should distinguish between a single overall objective and SMART specific objectives. One should consider provision of technical support to those departments of the MoJ in charge of drafting and implementing the new JRS for the development of output, result and impact indicators; drafting of an AP which includes proper indicators, costed actions etc.; formalising processes and mechanisms for strategy based M&E.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

The MoJ has a clear leading role in the sector. The MoJ participates as a key institution responsible for Chapter 23 in the Reform Monitoring Group (alongside Ministers of Foreign Affairs, EU, Interior).

The DG for EU Affairs of the MoJ is the lead department in charge for coordinating and implementing IPA funds to date and will also continue to be the main responsible unit for the implementation of IPA II funds.

In Turkey, each ministry is obliged to establish Strategic Planning Departments as per the In Turkey the Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, of 2003 foresees each public institution to prepare strategic plans under the coordination of the Ministry for Development (Article 9. Strategic Planning and performance Based Budgeting). In this respect the Strategic Planning Department of the MoJ has been in charge of developing all strategies with input from other related departments and general directorates.

For the IPA II period, which will cover 2014 – 2020, MoJ, has created (for the design, development, implementation and M&E of sector-based programmes) a separate unit under the name “EU Project Implementation Division” that has been established with the approval of Minister dated 07/11/2013 under the roof of DG for EU Affairs, in terms of all projects in which judicial institutions are involved.

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

Based on the field interviews, it can be said that the overall institutional capacity for strategic planning of MoJ is assessed with a score of 2.5, between average and good. It should be noted however that this assessment is done in a very limited time and cannot constitute a final and reliable assessment of institutional capacities. For this purpose, as also included below in the recommendations, an in-depth analysis of institutional capacities and their assessment would be highly beneficial.

Preparatory activities prior to strategy development have benefited from external consultants inputs, primarily for the implementation of EU funded programmes. In general, there is a good level of capacity in terms of knowledge of EC procedures, project implementation etc. within the MoJ and in particular the DG EU Affairs.

Sector based programming is new to the institution, therefore there is limited capacity in terms of sector-based programming although the General Directorate for EU Affairs has considerable experience in EU funded programming and programme implementation, including necessary and qualified staff. It should be noted that the MoJ General Directorate for EU Affairs is currently planning additional recruitment of staff.

In terms of strategic planning capacity, the Department of Strategic Planning of the MoJ has participated in a training on strategic management delivered by TODAIE. Some further basic trainings related to strategic planning has been conducted with contributions from TUSSIDE to the Strategic Planning Department and members of the Steering Committee[[4]](#footnote-4), followed by more specific trainings delivered by TODAIE and the MoF on “Strategic Planning Techniques” and “Situation Analysis Method in Strategic Planning”.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

M&E and reporting on a sectorial strategy basis is not considered systematically. Only in some sub-strategies monitoring is foreseen to be systematized (e.g. the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors Strategic Plan foresees to establish procedures, principles and methodologies though a circular for the reporting and monitoring of the strategic plan.)

Certain monitoring mechanisms are in place on the country level, primarily coordinated by NIPAC and CFCU where relevant on the project, sectorial, component and DIS levels. These mechanisms are as follows:

1. Progress and Monitoring Reports (PMR) submitted by the beneficiary institutions to the NIPAC and CFCU. The reports are prepared by the beneficiary on quarterly basis through an internal based system and submitted to both the Ministry for EU Affairs and the CFCU by the system for assessment. PMRs include information concerning the activities carried out during the monitoring period, impacts of the activities on the achievement of the PF objectives with respect to indicators in the project fiches, planned activities for the next reporting period, problems encountered during the implementation process of the project, risks which are encountered and anticipated as well as information concerning the progress for addressing the conditions set for the realisation of the projects.
2. SMSCs: Provides an overview on the sectoral level bringing together line ministries per sector and reviewing project implementation in the sector, lessons learned, upcoming needs etc. with the participation of the MEU- NIPAC, CFCU, NAO, NF, line ministries and NGOs. This sector is monitored under SMSC 1.1 - Judiciary and Fundamental Rights
3. TAIB: This consists of monitoring and overview on the component level and involves the NIPAC, EUD, CFCU, line ministries, NGOs and other stakeholders etc.
4. IPA Committee: The committee monitors the effective and efficient use of IPA funds with the participation of MoFA, SPO, NAO, NF, CFCU, MEU- NIPAC, NGOs)

The SPO and related officers in the Sector for EU in the MoJ have been in charge of coordinating the monitoring mechanisms related to individual EU funded projects. They have established communication systems with the institutions within the structure of IPA Component I TAIB (line ministries, CFCD and NIPAC) and with EUD.

Hence it can be concluded that reporting is well established primarily on EU projects and on a project level. Due to this, reporting and activities have been addressed at micro level, without any macro level perspective.

A TA for Results-Oriented Monitoring which monitored all projects was mobilised (including JHA sector) between 2011-2013. The Thematic Report for JHA of the TA notes that the beneficiaries of IPA projects in the mentioned period consider the instrument very formal and strict, with burdening procedures.

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* The MoJ has not been formally appointed as lead institution for this sector (it should be noted that none of the institutions under Component I have been appointed. Formal appointments through a government circular has been done only for those Operational Structures for the implementation of Operational Programmes). Nevertheless, the sector is well consolidated and the MoJ has clear leadership.
* A Strategic Planning Department equipped with skilled staff exists in the MoJ. However, coordination between this Department and the DG for EU Affairs is not systematic.
* Reporting is largely project based. Mid-term, final or ex-post evaluation or assessment of the main sector strategy hasn’t been done. Monitoring system on a sector basis isn’t in place.
* Based on the experience from IPA Component I so far, the monitoring of the implementation of the strategies is still very much focused on the number of projects/ activities implemented rather than on the impact for the sector and direct benefits derived. This problem also ensues from the fact that inadequate monitoring indicators and related baseline data is available.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* For strategic planning, there is definitely a need for stronger coordination between the EU Project Implementation Division of the DG for EU Affairs and the Strategic Planning Department.
* The capacity of the DG for EU Affairs of the MoJ would need to strengthen skills on M&E as well as the capacities of other judicial institutions implicated in the sector. M&E capacities among secondary institutions that will be strongly involved in the sectorial approach (such as High Council of Judges and Prosecutors and in the area of fight against corruption the Prime Ministry Inspection Board) would certainly need to strengthen their capacities in terms of M&E.
* Similarly, coordination mechanisms with implicated institutions need systematization for the overall sector as well as sub-sectoral areas such as improving coordination in the field of fight against corruption with key institutions is necessary.
* Consider an external evaluation of the expired JRS.
* Establish a sector-based monitoring system, with related procedures, manuals and allocation of responsibilities among stakeholder institutions.
* An in-depth analysis of institutional capacities, in particular a training needs assessment would be highly beneficial.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach?**

There are some coordination mechanisms which are primarily dedicated to programme level monitoring (in addition to the SMSCs coordinated by NIPAC) such as Steering Committees that are attended at high level within projects in the field of the Judiciary. Some of these SCs also involve CSOs.

The preparation of the JRS 2009-2013 and also the new draft was done through a Commission established in the MoJ level.

In the field of fight against corruption, a Commission on Increasing Transparency and Efficient Management in the Public Sector in Turkey was established in 2002, whose name and participants to the Commission were changed in 2009 to Commission for Increasing Transparency and combating Corruption in Turkey. In addition to that, a Steering Committee in charge of preparing, monitoring and implementing strategic plans, coordinate among public institutions and CSOs, which will report to the Commission was established in the same year. Under the chairmanship of the Deputy Undersecretary of the PM’s Office this Committee includes the MoJ, MoI, MoF, MoLSS Deputy Undersecretaries as well as the labour unions with the largest constituency partners and TOBB.

While a formal sector coordination mechanism under the leadership of the MoJ does not exist, the MoJ has shown some capacity in terms of organizing sector based consultations and coordination of a wide range of stakeholders, in particular for the preparation of the Judicial Reform Strategy.

On the ministerial level there are several coordination mechanisms in place :

• Unit Strategic Planning Teams tasked with conducting strategic planning activities in all units of the Ministry of Justice and carrying out other tasks assigned by the Strategic Planning Team

• The Ministerial Strategic Planning Team composed of representatives of all units in order to carry out preparatory activities

• The Steering Committee chaired by the Head of Department of Strategic Development and composed of independent heads of department and unit deputy general directors in order to provide overall guidance to activities and discuss and conclude matters brought by the Strategic Planning Team

• The Ministerial Strategic Development Board chaired by the Undersecretary and composed of all unit chiefs in order to set Ministry policies.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach?** |

When it comes to donor coordination, the European Commission has taken several initiatives in Brussels and Ankara in order to coordinate with IFIs, notably EIB, EBRD as well as the World Bank. A second EU-WB Turkey Country Day was organised in Brussels on 2 May 2012 in order to explore further areas where synergy and value added can be found through a joint approach.

In addition, the MEUA has also organised on May 23rd a meeting with the participation of several IFIs (EBRD, AFD, KFW, WB) and other donors (UNDP, UNICEF, UNIDO, ILO, IMO, CoE, WHO) in order to facilitate donor coordination activities within the scope of the accession agenda.

The Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs.

It should be noted however that for Component I, the major donor in Turkey is the EU. International Organisations are also active in Turkey but it should be noted that some of their major activities are carried out through EU direct grants.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* Clear leadership role of MoJ DG for EU Affairs and in particular clear role attributed to the Division of EU Project Implementation for IPA II
* Sectoral coordination mechanisms are partially satisfied with the coordination of MEUA
* Some coordination exists on the level of MoJ through Commissions for the preparation of strategies.
* Donor coordination mechanisms or central databases haven’t been established, although there are some mechanisms coordinated by the EC.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* Coordination mechanisms with and among key stakeholders- including means of involving non-state actors- should be consolidated and consideration should be given to develop manuals and procedures developed that lay out the principles, methods of coordination, cooperation and implementation will take place in a sector-based programme for the justice sector.
* As best practice, it could be considered to develop a database of donors per sector, even though the major donor for justice remains the EU.
* Given that donor coordination in this sector is largely ad hoc, it would be advisable to establish donor coordination mechanisms specific to the sector.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach? Is the sector approach suitable?**

The JRS 2009-2013 has expired and a new JRS has been drafted in 2012 although it hasn’t been made public yet.

In terms of scoring for Criteria 1, the Justice and Human Rights sector reaches **25.92 out of 36**. If we are to take 27 as a minimum score for being in line with a Sector Approach, the following improvements may assist bolstering the level of maturity for this criteria:

* The new JRS should increase complementarity with the sub-sector fight against corruption, in particular its judicial aspects.
* The new strategy should improve its quality, include a performance assessment per indicator of the JRS 2009-2013, base itself more explicitly on an in-depth analysis of needs per subsectors/priorities with a presentation of a SWOT analysis, stakeholder analysis, and similar analytical tools. It should also to the degree possible include baseline data.
* In this respect and also with a view to develop an AP, the MoJ may require technical support to define SMART objectives and result and impact indicators for monitoring and evaluation of the new strategy.
* The AP should include all necessary information related to actions/measures, responsible bodies, timeframe, budget and performance indicators.

The assessment for Criteria 2 shows a score of **8.50 out of 12**. If 9 points are to be considered to reach the minimum quality standards, then the related beneficiaries within the sector need to strengthen their capacities by:

* The MoJ DG for EU Affairs should define its role in strategic planning, programming and especially implementation and M&E of the strategies. M&E capacities among secondary institutions that will be strongly involved in the sectoral approach (such as High Council of Judges and Prosecutors and in the area of fight against corruption the Prime Ministry Inspection Board) would certainly need to strengthen their capacities in terms of M&E.
* An in-depth analysis of institutional capacities and their assessment would be highly beneficial.
* Monitoring mechanisms should include following of the progress of achievement of well-defined output/result and impact indicators in order to be able to make management decisions which are more result oriented.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms is **5 out of 8**.

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, we obtain an overall rate of **38,92 out of 56**. This score is included within the range of 28 and 42 showing that the Sector is in progress towards a Sector Approach.

## SECTOR HOME AFFAIRS

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –* To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector?**

Currently there is no overall strategy for the Security and Home Affairs sector. However the National Development Plans provide a range of specific objectives that are relevant to the sector and have therefore been taken as a basis to analyse the sector. There are nevertheless a large number of sub-sector strategies. These are:



*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub-strategies in the Security and Home Affairs sector*

As it can be seen, with few exceptions, most subsector/priorities are well covered by a set of sub-sector strategies and most of them complemented by Action Plans. A large majority of these strategies are currently relevant (expiring in 2014 or later) with the exception of Turkey’s Strategy and Action Plan against Drugs and Drug Addiction.

There is good coverage of the sector by sub-strategies. Those sub-areas which do not have strategies are addressed- albeit partially- under strategies developed for other sub-sectors. The main challenge however remains to ensure complementarity and coordination among these different strategies.



*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity for the Security and Home Affairs sector strategy*

The main strategic goals defined in the Strategy for the Home Affairs sector are coherent with the identified subsectors/priorities. Synergies can be found in the most of the topics as they are largely interrelated.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

The guiding document taken into consideration in this analysis is the 10th National Development Plan priorities related to security and home affairs (the 9th NDP is much less elaborated in terms of priorities related to this sector). These objectives and priorities are the following:

**a. Overall objective:[[5]](#footnote-5)** Protecting social order and increasing the efficiency of security services for the usage of rights and freedoms enshrined in legislation by our citizens and to create a more secure work and living environment for all sectors of society.

**b. Priorities/policies:**

1. Strengthening cooperation mechanisms between institutions providing security services with a view for them to jointly use their skills and infrastructure;
2. Improvement of legislation and alleviate problems related to organization; better coordination among institutions in the provision of services;
3. Improve the quantity and quality of security personnel, increase professionalism and improve the physical and technological equipment of security personnel;
4. Strengthen the community policing approach through measures that will increase the awareness of citizens of social order and security;
5. In accordance with national and international security strategies, combat cyber crime which threatens individuals, institutions and the state;
6. Emphasise preventive and protective security services and within this framework move on to risk management in the provision of services.

There is a high number of sub-sector strategies covering just below 80% of all sub-sectoral issues and an analysis of the objectives are as follows:

1. **Strategy and National Action Plan on Irregular Migration** currently under preparation with support from the EU funded project “Supporting Turkey’s Efforts to Develop a Strategy and National Action Plan on Irregular Migration” through a direct grant to IOM and expected to be finalised in 2014. It is currently at a very draft stage and it is not clear to what extent the project has conducted a needs assessment.
2. **Turkey’s Action Plan for Asylum and Migration (2005)[[6]](#footnote-6)**: important institutional changes are taking place following the adoption of the *Law on Foreigners and International Protection* which entered into force as of 11 April 2013. The Law redefines main policies and aims to strengthen the current system in the areas of asylum and migration and foresees the establishment of a special professional unit which has been established as the General Directorate of Migration Management (GDMM) affiliated to the Ministry of Interior and will be responsible for all legal and operational issues with regard to asylum and migration. According to the Law GDMM shall be operational in one year’s time from the date of the entry into force with its 3000 personnel. The Migration Board established under the coordination of the GDMM will be responsible for developing policies in the area. An Action Plan is expected for the implementation of the Law. An EU funded Twinning Light project under the IPA 2011 Programme entitled “Supporting the Effective Functioning of the General Directorate of Migration Management by Performing a Comprehensive Needs Assessment” foresees the assessment of comprehensive needs and priorities of the General Directorate in view of the effective functioning and implementation of its core asylum and migration management related mandate with outputs of a needs assessment report and gap assessment.[[7]](#footnote-7)
3. **Turkey's Integration Border Management Strategy & Action Plan:** Turkey set up a Task Force for Asylum Migration and Protection of External Borders in 2002 bringing together a number of key stakeholder institutions under the chairmanship of the MoI.The working group on external borders produced the ‘Strategy Paper on External Borders\ in 2003. This was followed by a Twinning project entitled « Support for the Development of an Action Plan to Implement Turkey’s Integrated Border Management Strategy Project ». As a result an Action Plan was developed. This includes a detailed legislative assessment and necessities in terms of legislative alignment, an administrative review, definition and presentation of training needs, infrastructural needs and equipment needs, identification and prioritisation of infrastructural needs in relation to the necessities for implementing the strategy, identification of possible co-financing. The Action Plan has not been updated since.
4. **National Strategy on Fight Against Organised Crime and AP (2010-2012)** The implementation period of Action Plan (2010-2012) has ended as of December 2012. A Second Action Plan for the period 2013-2015 was prepared and sent to the Prime Ministry for approval.
5. **The Turkish National Cyber Security Strategy and Action Plan** which will end in 2015 outlines certain shortcomings and needs but no reference to a fully fledged needs assessment has been made.
6. **Turkey's Strategy and Action Plan against Drugs and Drug Addiction *:*** A First Action Plan on Fight Against Drugs in Rural Areas (2010-2012)was implemented and successfully completed and an Action Plan for 2013-2015 was prepared and sent to the Ministry of Interior for approval.
7. **Maritime Surveillance Strategy Paper**  is currently under preparation and approval following an IPA 2009 Twinning Project (TR09/IB/FI/02) which
8. **Strategic Plan of Ministry of Customs and Trade** primarily foresees the realisation of customs controls based on risk analyses and to take managerial and structural measures to efficiently fight against smuggling.
9. **Strategic Plan of Ministry of Interior** foresees the establishment of relevant entities responsible for migration management and border security under objective 1 and improvement of internal security services under objective 2. It contains a detailed situation analysis.

EU funded projects for the Security and Home Affairs sector has provided extremely valuable input in terms of preparatory studies, needs analyses as well as technical assistance for the preparation of assessments, studies, strategies and action plans. One can state that the sector is covered well by needs assessments, although their presentation is not always systematic across all sub-sector strategies Good needs and background analyses are included in strategies as numbered above: 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, hence 66% of the strategies and/or action plans duly include needs assessments and situation analyses that are assessed as satisfactory to good.

Consultations are carried out although there is no specific mechanism and/or procedures in place to guide consultations with external stakeholders. On average consultations have been carried out for the preparation of sub-strategies with the participation of 10-50 stakeholders.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

The 2008 AP establishes as a priority to continue efforts “to implement the National Action Plan on Asylum and Migration and accelerate efforts to set up an integrated border management system in line with the acquis, strengthening all law enforcement institutions and align their status and functioning with European standards including through developing inter-agency cooperation, implementing the national strategy on organised crime and strengthening the fight against organised crime, drugs, trafficking of persons and money laundering”. Furthermore, the NPAA (2008) sets legislative and other priorities related to the issues outlined in the AP.

The 61st Government programme which was adopted on July 2011 is a precursor of the priorities set out in the 10th NDP which show high priority for the security and home affairs sector.

Several reforms were undertaken for the sector which were received positively by the EC as reported in its Progress Reports. These reforms constitute the passage of the Law on Foreigners in April 2013 primarily and the establishment of a civilian unit in charge of migration issues. Work on a *Draft Road Map on Integrated Border Management* and a *Draft Law on Border Security* Draft Law has been sent to the relevant ministries for their comments by the Ministry of Interior.[[8]](#footnote-8) The Law on the Prevention of the Financing of Terrorism brings amendments to the Turkish anti-terrorim legislation and introduces a mechanism of asset freezing as foreseen by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). The By-law on the Procedures and Principles Regarding the Implementation of the Law on Prevention of the Financing of Terrorism was published in the OG on 31 May 2013.

Sector strategies, with the exception of those that are currently under preparation, have been endorsed at the Ministerial level (for institutional strategies) or by the government.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified? Are the identified objectives coherent? How well formulated are they? Are they still relevant in order to achieve impact?**

As mentioned earlier, in the absence of an overall strategy for the sector, the overall and specific objectives of the 10th NDP are taken as a point of analysis. The overall objective of the NDP is “Increasing competitiveness, make macro-economic stability permanent, increasing employment, attaining equitable human and social development, effective provision of high-quality public services; reduction of regional differences with an emphasis on EU accession as a major cross-cutting issue”. This obviously is an overall strategy for Turkey’s development priorities and is not specific to the security and home affairs sector. Nevertheless, the specific objectives are relevant to the sector and three out of 6 of the specific objectives relate to the overall objective concerning effective provision of high quality public services and provision of emphasis on EU accession as a major cross-cutting issue.



*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives in the Security & Home Affairs sector strategy*

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The MoI is responsible for Chapter 24. The following table shows how far the Security and Home Affairs Sector is consistent with EU accession strategies:



*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency of the Home Affairs sector with the EU accession strategies*

The Security and Home Affairs sector is clearly identified as a priority in national stratergies for EU accession as well as in the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) as part of the JHA and has been defined as one of the main reference sectors within the IPA II indicative Policy areas.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies ?**

Currently there is no regional development strategy as per which this EQ can be assessed. However, it should be noted that the NDPs emphasise regional aspects, and in particular the 10th NDP has provided guidance for the preparation of a National Strategy for Regional Development (NSRD) as the main strategic document in this area, to help ensure coordination for regional development and regional competitiveness, to strengthen harmony between spatial development and socio-economic development policies, and establish a general framework for regional and sub-scale plans and strategies.

Regional development aspects are partially addressed by the strategies for the security and home affairs sector, especially in what concerns those strategies related to borders, trafficking, customs, smuggling as well as asylum and migration where establishment of local/regional units are foreseen.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extent are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

Seven out of ten of the sub-sector strategies have an Action Plan. The Action Plan against Drugs and Drug Addiction is considered as well prepared as it includes a good background analysis and deals also with coordination aspects. It is also important that it includes a specific chapter on evaluation. There are some measurable result-based indicators although this is not the case for all priorities/measures. The AP identifies sources of verification and most importantly foresees an evaluation of the strategy and action plan. The specific roles and responsibilities of a range of stakeholders have been duly included. One weakness is that proper costing and financial allocations have not been identified (at least estimated costs) and only sources of finance have been indicated. Proper timelines and sequence are also not identified.

The Action Plan on Asylum and Migration, although not regularly updated, contains a good background analysis, draws on an Asylum-Migration Twinning Project (TR02JH-03) which analysed loopholes in legislation. The AP lacks indicators and doesn’t include information on M&E. The timeframes are also generally provided. Similar comments are relevant to the Cyber Security AP.

The National Action Plan towards the Implementation of Turkey’s Integrated Border Management Strategy is a very comprehensive Action Plan with concrete measures, means and clear timeframe. There is also a very clear costing per year, distinguishing between the different inputs (supplies, works, services). Nevertheless, this AP doesn’t adequately bring forward measurable indicators. Interviews have also revealed that, while a well-prepared document, the costing and time frame has not proved to be realistic.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

Certain monitoring mechanisms are in place on the country level, primarily coordinated by NIPAC and CFCU where relevant on the project, sectoral, component and DIS levels. These mechanisms are as follows:

1. Progress and Monitoring Reports (PMR) submitted by the beneficiary institutions to the NIPAC and CFCU. The reports are prepared by the beneficiary on quarterly basis through an interned based system and submitted to both the Ministry for EU Affairs and the CFCU by the system for assessment. PMRs include information concerning the activities carried out during the monitoring period, impact of the activities on the achievement of the PF objectives with respect to indicators in the project fiches, planned activities for the next reporting period, problems encountered during the implementation process of the project, risks which are encountered and anticipated as well as information concerning the progress for addressing the conditions set for the realisation of the projects.
2. SMSCs: Provides an overview on the sectoral level bringing together line ministries per sector and reviewing project implementation in the sector, lessons learned, upcoming needs etc. with the participation of the MEU- NIPAC, CFCU, NAO, NF, line ministries and NGOs. This sector is monitored under SMSC 1.1 - Judiciary and Fundamental Rights
3. TAIB: This constitutes of monitoring and overview on the component level and involves the NIPAC, EUD, CFCU, line ministries, NGOs and other stakeholders etc.
4. IPA Committee: The committee monitors the effective and efficient use of IPA funds with the participation of MoFA, SPO, NAO, NF, CFCU, MEU- NIPAC, NGOs)

In general, monitoring responsibilities on the strategy level are done by the Strategic Planning Departments of the respective ministries. A specific monitoring unit for strategic monitoring is not in place in the institutions. Nevertheless, monitoring within institutions is done largely on an activity basis on a project level. The monitoring of the EU funded projects is performed by Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) and MEUA via Progress and Monitoring Reports (PMRs). These reports are prepared quarterly.

There are several means by which monitoring on the strategy level takes place within the sub-sector areas. In the field of fight against organised crime, in order to monitor the achievements of strategic objectives and evaluate results achieved within the framework of the Action Plan a Council for the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Action Plan (EPIDEK) under the chairmanship of the Deputy Undersecretary of the MoI is established. The Secretariat function of the Council is carried out by EPIDEB (Bureau for Monitoring and Evaluating the Action Plan).

In the field of drugs and drug addiction, there is a clear M&E role by the Turkish Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction (TUBIM) which is also charged with monitoring and evaluating relevant action plans. TUBIM is also the national focal point for fight against drugs in Turkey of the European Monitoring Centre for Drug and Drug Addiction EMCCDA. A “National Drug Coordination Board” founded under TUBİM includes 40 agencies/institutions working in the field of fight against drugs (fight against supply, law enforcement, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation). The board convenes 3 times a year under the presidency of TUBİM.

With a circular 2010/15 of the Prime Ministry of Turkey, “Coordination Board for Integrated Border Management" is established, under the chairmanship of the Undersecretary of Ministry of Interior or the Deputy Undersecretary appointed by the Undersecretary, with the participation of authorised high-level representatives from the Turkish General Staff, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Transport and Communication, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Gendarmerie General Command, Undersecretariat of Customs, Undersecretariat of Maritime Affairs, Secretariat General for EU Affairs, Directorate General of Security, Turkish Coast Guard Command and Directorate General of Provincial Administration. This Board is responsible for developing strategies and policies for the attainment of the objectives listed in relevant national and international documents, such as the NPAA, Strategy Paper for the Protection of the External Borders in Turkey, National Action Plan to Implement Turkey's Integrated Border Management Strategy, Decisions of the Reform Monitoring Group, Accession Partnership Documents and Progress Reports; monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the measures to be taken by public institutions and organizations, and ensuring high-level coordination and cooperation.

The objectives of the strategies are generally well defined but would strongly benefit from being rendered more SMART. The absence of impact indicators is generally a problem across all strategies.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

The following are budget allocation figures for security and home affairs under IPA, also showing co-financing per project between 2011-2013:



*Table 1.4 Budget commitments for IPA Component I Security, Home Affairs, IBM Customs, Source: NIPAC*

Hence, this sector has allocations of 20% of the total IPA allocation for TAIB Component one for the years 2011-2013 which shows a high rate of allocation.

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* Comprehensive overall strategy in the area of Home Affairs does not exist at the moment. In order to be able to cover all sub-sector areas and not to distort the analysis (especially in what concerns coherence and complementarity among sector strategies) the 10th NDP priorities were selected as an overall strategic document.
* Visa policy and fight against terrorism do not have strategies, although fight against terrorism is partially addressed through the Strategy on Fight Against Organised Crime and visa policy is addressed partially through Strategy for Migration.
* Nevertheless, one can state that the sector is covered well by sub-strategies.
* Seven out of the 9 sub-strategies are still in place or will be in place as of 2014.
* There is a good level of complementarity and coherence between the overall objectives of the main strategy and those of the sub-strategies.
* Participatory approaches are not systematically used and there are no consultation mechanisms established. Consultations are conducted on average with 10 to 50 at most.
* The sector is a clear priority for the government (61st Government programme, NDP etc.).
* APs in general include all the necessary information, especially in what concerns the background information. Information on actions/measures, stakeholders and their responsibilities, general timeframe and output indicators. The APs – with the exception of the IBM action plan- lack proper costing and specific and realistic sources of finance. They also do not adequately identify result and impact indicators.
* It seems that the monitoring of the strategies is done based on the number of activities implemented and is not really done vis-à-vis baseline data and impact indicators. It is good practice to have Chapter on the Monitoring and Evaluation in the strategy like the one in Turkey’s Strategy and Action Plan Against Drugs and Drug Addiction.
* The Home Affairs sector has received regular funding budget allocation with 22% of the total budget allocated to TAIB Component I being absorbed by the Security and Home Affairs Sector.

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* It would be beneficial to develop an overall guidingframework for the sector, with more specific and clear expected results and indicators to feed into a multi-annial Sector Planning Document in the IPA context and building on priorities and areas of action identified in national strategies and APs which have been adopted or are under preparation This is deemed necessary so as to provide coherence to all sub-strategies which are numerous for the sector and would benefit from improved complementarity.
* There are a number of strategies which have been prepared several years ago and it is recommended to update and review these strategies.
* The preparation of the APs (some of which will be updated and/or prepared as of 2014) should include some basic information, namely strategic objective; Action; specific target date; Activities and specific dates for those; Indicators of Achievement; sources of verification; Responsible institutions; Resources; Costs per measure and per activity/output. The APs should also include M&E as well as identify sequentiality. When designing strategies and action plans one has to be realistic and match it to the available resources.
* In order to improve coherence among the sub-strategies, any updates should ensure that strategies include minimum information such as: situation analysis, presentation of baseline data, needs assessment, stakeholder analysis, SWOT, overall objectives, specific objectives, priorities, measures, indicators for measuring achievements and specific measures for M&E.
* Monitoring of the implementation of the strategies should be improved towards Result Oriented Monitoring. Result and impact indicators should be introduced and all indicators should be formulated as SMART.
* It is recommended to conduct evaluations of the strategies at various stages (ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post). It should be done by external experts and should follow the OECD - DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impacts).
* Consultations should be organised in a structural manner and also systematised, ensuring that they are conducted in a transparent and inclusive manner.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

There is clear leadership of the MoI in this sector, with its departments and affiliated bodies. The MoI Department for EU Affairs and Foreign Relations is the de facto coordinating department for the sector. Formal appointment has not taken place yet (which is the case for all institutions under Component I).

As required by legislation (PFM Law), the MoI has also established a Strategic Planning Department which is in charge of preparing strategies.

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

Based on the field interviews and questionnaires submitted, it can be said that the overall institutional capacity for strategic planning of MoI is assessed with a score of 2.33, average. It should be noted however that this assessment is done in a very limited time and cannot constitute a final and reliable assessment of institutional capacities. For this purpose, as also included below in the recommendations, an in-depth analysis of institutional capacities and their assessment would be highly beneficial.

There is limited capacity in terms of sector-based programming at the MoI Department for EU Affairs and Foreign Relations, exacerbated by the fact that IPA II Regulations and Rules have not been announced. Nevertheless, most of the institutions involved have a good degree of capacity in terms project implementation and activity based monitoring.

As per the questionnaires and interviews in the field, some of the Strategic Planning Units (e.g. Bureau of Border Management) has not received any training on strategic planning for the past two years. While the managers and senior staff are skilled in strategic planning newly recruited staff require training on strategic planning.

Other capacity needs identified are trainings and technical support on ROM, sector-based programming, budgeting. Such training in particular is necessary for newly established structures such as the DG of Migration Management which has been recruiting a large amount of central and regional staff.

It can be concluded that in elaboration of strategic documents for the sector there has been considerable dependence on external sources such as consultants or twinning experts.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

There are several monitoring instruments on different levels. The overall framework for monitoring implementation of sector policies and strategies is a responsibility at the level of ministry and/or coordinative bodies with ensured representation from the relevant stakeholders.

The SPOs have been in charge of coordinating the monitoring mechanisms related to individual EU funded projects. They have established communication systems with the institutions within the structure of IPA Component I TAIB (line ministries, CFCU and NIPAC) and with EUD. However, this kind of reporting is not focused on output/results/impact indicators related to priority axis or measures. Reporting has been addressed at micro level without addressing a real overview of the sector.

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* MoI has clear leadership of the sector.
* Clear department dedicated to strategic planning at the MoI, but capacity of staff in charge of sector-based programming is average and there’s average level of leadership in strategic planning.
* Overall, there is still lack of capacities related to strategic planning in the MoI. In addition, there is no clear separation of functions between programming, implementation and monitoring & evaluation tasks.
* There are monitoring structures in place, especially project-based and activity-based monitoring. Some of the sub-sector strategies foresee in Strategies specific measures and bodies to conduct M&E but this is not the case for all strategies.
* In general there is a lack of knowledge and skills for efficient Result Oriented Monitoring system. Written manuals of procedures on strategy and results based monitoring and reporting isn’t in place.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* Consideration should be given to formalising coordination structures for the sector. This could also provide a platform for monitoring and reporting on the strategy level for the sector overall. For this purpose, technical support may be necessary to formalise procedures and processes for the WG.
* Monitoring mechanisms should include follow up of the progress of achievement of well-defined output/result and impact indicators in order to be able to make management decisions which are more result oriented.
* Experience and knowledge gained by some institutions in implementing projects under IPA, including monitoring procedures, templates etc. could be shared with other institutions that have less experience.
* It would benefit both the lead institution and secondary institutions for the sector to organise in-service trainings on strategic planning and implementation, including a focus on strategy and result based M&E.
* Given that the strategic planning process formalized with the PFMC Law which establishes strategic planning departments in each ministry, it is recommended – as with other sectors- to particularly strengthen coordination between those strategic planning departments at ministry level and the Department of EU Affairs, and formalize such procedures of coordination to the extent possible.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach?**

In general coordination mechanisms exist in the sector Home Affairs, and usually activities are coordinated through working groups and the national committees. The SMSC (Sectoral Monitoring Sub-Committee 1.2- Home Affairs/Crime, IBM/Migration and Customs) which are established per sector, acquis and harmonisation related coordination mechanisms such as the Internal Coordination and Harmonization Committee (IKUK) established through Circular No 28352 in 2012 provide an institutional framework assisting coordination on a sectorial basis.

On the lead institution level, the MoI EU Affairs and Foreign Relations Department has been chairing Sector Coordination Meetings and Working Groups since March 2013 for the Security and Home Affairs Sector to identify priorities and measures for the whole sector. It should be noted that some secondary institutions participating in the meetings feel that their efficiency and effectiveness could be improved. The Meetings and WGs could benefit from support (preparation of guidelines, manuals, procedures) to improve their functioning.

In addition on a sub-thematic basis, an *Integrated Border Management Coordination Board* was established in 2010 under the Chairmanship of the Undersecretariat of the Ministry of Interior. In the meeting of the Coordination Board which was held on 10 August 2011, “Working Procedures and Principles of Coordination Board” and “The Protocol on Procedures and Principles of Inter-agency Cooperation on Integrated Border Management” have been adopted.

Also a Task Force for Asylum Migration and Protection of External Borders was established in 2002 brining together a number of key stakeholder institutions under the chairmanship of the MoI.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach ?** |

When it comes to donor coordination, the European Commission has taken several initatives in Brussels and Ankara in order to coordinate with IFIs, notably EIB, EBRD as well as the World Bank. A second EU-WB Turkey Country Day was organised in Brussels on 2 May 2012 in order to explore further areas where synergy and value added can be found through a joint approach.

In addition, the MEUA has also organised on May 23rd a meeting with the participation of several IFIs (EBRD, AFD, KFW, WB) and other donors (UNDP, UNICEF, UNIDO, ILO, IMO, CoE, WHO) in order to facilitate donor coordination activities within the scope of the accession agenda.

The Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs.

It should be noted however that for Component I, the major donor in Turkey is the EU. International Organisations are also active in Turkey but it should be noted that some of their major activities are carried out through EU direct grants for this sector.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* Coordination mechanisms exist in the sector Home Affairs, and usually activities are coordinated through working groups and the national committees.
* MoI EU Affairs and Foreign Relations Department has been chairing Sector Coordination Meetings and Working Groups since March 2013 for the Security and Home Affairs Sector to identify priorities and measures for the whole sector is the main coordination mechanism for the sector.
* The SMSC meetings chaired by the MEUA are also another means for coordinating both projects/programmes and strategies within the sector.
* The EU remains one of the most significant donors in this sector.
* There are no central donor related databases.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* The overall coordination mechanism should be consolidated to take into account all lower level coordination platforms, hence ensuring that micro/sub level coordination mechanisms relate well to overall sectorial coordination mechanisms.
* Donor coordination- although the main donor remains the EU in the field- would need to be provided attention through moving towards a more systematized mechanism of coordinating donors on the sectoral level.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach? Is the sector approach suitable ?**

An overall strategy for the sector is not in place, although the 10th NDP provides sufficient higher level guidance on priorities for the sector. The sector is well covered by sub-strategies and a large number of these have Action Plans that are either still in place or being updated. The complementarity and coherence between these sub-strategies would benefit if there were an overall strategic framework available which also includes an assessment of the sector as a whole as well as indicators for monitoring progress in the sector overall.

In terms of Criteria 1, the assessment provides a score of **25,65 out of 36.** This shows that the sector is in progress for a sector based approach and the following improvements may assist bolstering the level of maturity for these criteria:

* Prepare an overall strategic framework for the sector as a whole. Given the plethora of studies and assessments available for sub-sector areas, the new strategy can build on these resources and provide a coherent framework to all sub-thematic areas of the sector.
* In order to improve coherence among the sub-strategies, any updates should ensure that strategies include minimum information such as: situation analysis, presentation of baseline data, needs assessment, stakeholder analysis, SWOT, overall objectives, specific objectives, priorities, measures, indicators for measuring achievements and specific measures for M&E. Due consideration should also be given to timeframes, indicating clear sequencing of actions.
* Monitoring of the implementation of the strategies should be improved towards Result Oriented Monitoring. Result and impact indicators should be introduced and all indicators should be formulated as SMART.
* External evaluation of strategies should be considered.
* Consultation processes and procedures should be more structured, transparent and include clear guidelines, including an emphasis on involving a higher number of external stakeholders.

The assessment of the capacity for sector planning (Criteria 2) renders a score of **7,87 out of 12** which means in progress towards a sector approach:

* Overall, the capacities related to strategic planning in the sector should be improved for all institutions involved.
* Coordination between Strategic Planning Departments in each ministry implicated and thematic departments and/or those departments in charge of implementing IPA funds should be strengthened and systematized, putting emphasis on strengthening the national system set up in line with obligations under the PFMC Law.
* The coordination of the sector between all implicated national institutions should be bolstered by increased capacity for coordination, and assistance to have a more structured and outcome based coordination mechanism (this may involve the preparation of procedures, code of conduct, memoranda etc.). Such a mechanism would greatly benefit from formalization.
* The central coordination mechanism would need to ensure sustaining links with sub-level coordination committees (issue based or sub-strategy based).
* An external assessment of institutional capacities (institutional needs assessment in terms of strategic planning and implementation) would be necessary.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms is **4,75 out of 8**, which means in progress towards sector approach.

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, we obtain an overall rate of **38,26 out of 56**. This score is included within the range of 28 and 42 showing that the Sector is in progress towards a Sector Approach through EU IPA financing.

## CIVIL SOCIETY AND FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS SECTOR

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector?**

Civil society is a highly horizontal and cross-cutting issue although there is no question of the value of handling civil society together with fundamental rights as a separate sector.[[9]](#footnote-9) Interviews with MoJ have confirmed that its mandate is limited to judicial aspects of human rights as well as those that fall under obligations related to the ECHR. Hence, there is clear added value in handling civil society and fundamental rights together (as also foreseen by the CSP under two separate sub-fields).

There is currently no overall strategic framework for civil society. In the absence of a strategy for the sector, for the purposes of analysis the 10th NDP objectives for the sector are taken which are as follows:

Overall objective:[[10]](#footnote-10) Development of a societal base which accepts as a principle respect for all belief and life choices, where individuals and different sections of society express themselves freely in all aspects within the understanding of a pluralist and liberal democracy. Securing the fundamental rights and freedoms of all citizens regardless of gender, age, race, language, colour, philosophical beliefs, religion, sect, health status, income, nationality, ethnic background, migratory status, political choices as enshrined in the Constitution is fundamental.

Specific Objectives/Policies:

* Fundamental rights and freedoms will continue to be enhanced in light of universal criteria and practice;
* The sphere of freedoms will be enhanced, allowing for a more prosperous and content life for individuals and society; a Constitution which is inclusive, pluralist and integrationist will be prepared with the widest consensus;
* Within the framework of a pluralist and participatory democratic political process, mechanisms for receipt of opinions and recommendations from CSOs and relevant societal groups; harmonization legislation for the Economic and Social Council will be passed and its effective functioning ensured;
* A strong, diverse, plural, sustainable civil society environment will be created to ensure all sectors of society to participate more effectively in social and economic development;
* Comprehensive legal and institutional changes will be done so as to develop institutional capacities, sustainability and accountability of CSOs;
* CSOs which function in line with national priorities and the public good will be priorities in the provision of support;
* Tax incentives will be reviewed and developed for financial support provided by real and legal persons to CSOs in order for the latter to contribute more to the development process;
* Revisiting the definition and criteria for tax exemption and public good status in light of international standards and practice;
* Standards for internal and external audit of CSOs will be identified and importance will be attached to effective and objective auditing.

The following table shows the number of strategies within the sector:



*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub strategies in the Civil Society and Fundamental Rights sector*

As it can be seen the main subsector/priorities are only partially covered by sub-sector strategies. All of those existing sub-strategies have an Action Plan. With the exception of the Gender Equality Action Plan (currently being updated), all APs continue to be in force. There are no strategies on Civil Society Development, Civil Society Dialogue, Minority Rights/cultural rights and combating discrimination, racism and xenophobia.



*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity*

Subsectors, especially in what concerns some of the sub-sectors related to fundamental rights show good coherence and complementarity. However, coherence and complementarity degrees and scoring is undermined due to the absence of strategies for some of the major sub-sector issues/priorities.

It should be noted that civil society actors have raised concerns regarding the absence of a strategic framework and the degree to which this undermines the impact prospects for civil society as a whole. In this regard, for the IPA II 2014 programming exercise CSOs which have been involved previously in IPA implementation are planning to propose a specific project for the development of a strategy and action plan for the civil society and fundamental rights sector.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

There are no strategies which relate to the field of civil society however there are a plethora of needs assessments and reports which cover extremely well the needs in the sector. These documents, while not being strategies, provide principles, priorities for support to civil society in Turkey including but not limited to:

* Guiding Principles for EU Support to Civil Society in Turkey prepared by the EUD.[[11]](#footnote-11)
* Commission Communication on Civil Society Dialogueof 2005 mostly used by the MEUA
* Outputs of the project commissioned by the MEUA “TA to further identifying Turkey-EU Civil Society Dialogue Priorities”[[12]](#footnote-12)
* Impact assessment of the Civil Society Development Association (CSDCA).[[13]](#footnote-13)
* Technical Assistance to Civil Society Organisations (TACSO) needs assessment reports 2009[[14]](#footnote-14) and 2011[[15]](#footnote-15) which analyses the capacities of civil society in Turkey.[[16]](#footnote-16)
* Sivil Düşün Needs Assessment (not public)[[17]](#footnote-17)
* Civic Culture among Voluntary Organisations in Turkey, YADA, 2010[[18]](#footnote-18)
* TUSEV-STEP Civil Society Monitoring reports published yearly.[[19]](#footnote-19)
* TUSEV Report on “Active Participation in Civil Society: International Standards, Challenges in national legislation and Recommendations”, November 2013.

In fact, one can consider that these provide altogether a very comprehensive analysis of the situation on the ground that can easily feed into developing objectives based on needs and specific problems.

The objectives of the 10th NDP in what concerns civil society are obviously developed from a public sector perspective, taking into consideration the mandate of public institutions regarding civil society (hence objectives related to tax incentives, internal and external audit of CSOs). However, these objectives reflect insufficiently the whole range of needs identified in the sector by the aforementioned studies.

Generally for the civil society sector, there are important steps taken towards establishing a properly functioning consultation mechanism with civil society by the lead institution, MEUA. The MEUA has also taken steps to establish a consultation mechanism although these “Civil Society Dialogue Meetings” were held only 4 times in 2009 and 2010 (which included also working groups on specific issues). In order to inform the strategies and goals of upcoming CSD programmes, the MEUA has commissioned a TA which has conducted a wide consultation with almost 700 informants.[[20]](#footnote-20)

On fundamental rights, while consultation mechanisms are not formalised, the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (MoFSP) has conducted for the Gender Equality Strategy and National Action Plan on Combating Violence Against Women (NAPVAW) three consultations with participation of 10 to 50 stakeholders was conducted. On Transparency and Participation no consultations have been reported.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

Civil society and fundamental rights are of importance on the national level – see NDP priorities- but especially of high priority in the accession process and in what concerns compliance with political criteria. Hence, the NPAA 2008 notes the following priorities: *“The development of civil society and its involvement in the shaping of public policies will be more facilitated. The dialogue, communication and cooperation between Turkish civil society and EU member states’ civil society will be further encouraged… Efforts on revising curriculum including removal of the expressions that may contain discrimination from the textbooks will continue…The activities to determine the reasons and results of violence against women will be conducted….reforms realized in the field of cultural rights will continue at its best….Measures on the prevention of violence against women will intensively be monitored and trainings and raising awareness activities will be supported…Comprehensive and broad campaigns will be organized in order to raise awareness of the public about combating violence against women and the participation of all sections of the society will be ensured.”*

The endorsement level of sub-sector strategies is good (2 of them are currently draft, the Gender Equality Strategy was adopted at government level but is currently being revised). Those strategies in place are clearly in line and contributing to national priorities and policies.

There were however limited reforms concerning the sector as a whole. Some steps were taken on cultural rights the introduction, notably, of the right of the accused to use a language of their preference other than Turkish at certain stages of judicial proceedings, even if they can express themselves adequately in Turkish. The Law on the Protection of Family and Prevention of Violence against Women was passed on March 2012. Efforts were stepped up on VAW such as establishment of a database on VAW and high political prioritization of the issue on the Ministerial level. There have also been several reforms concerning children’s rights namely constitutional amendments in 2010 which included child’s rights in the constitution for the first time (Article 41). The institutional structures have been upgrades as the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (MoFSP) was established in 2011. The Ombudsman institution that was established also foresees ombudspersons both for children’s and women’s rights. There were however limited reforms in what concerns minority rights, religious freedom, combating discrimination, racism and xenophobia, as well as freedom of association as noted by the 2013 EC Progress Report.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified? Are the identified objectives coherent? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact?**

The Overall objective of the NDP “Increasing competitiveness, make macro-economic stability permanent, increasing employment, attaining equitable human and social development, effective provision of high-quality public services; reduction of regional differences with an emphasis on EU accession as a major cross-cutting issue”. Those specific objectives related to fundamental rights show relations to attainment of equitable human and social development and some of those related to civil society cohere with the overall objective of providing high-quality public services and emphasising the EU-accession process as a major cross-cutting issue.



*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives*

There is an average coherence of objectives as only 56% of the specific objectives relate to the overall objective.

The specific objectives, moreover, do not sufficiently focus on outcomes and achievements. They are more a collection of results. Those specific objectives for fundamental rights issues clearly lack specificity and none of them are time bound. It should be noted that the lack of coherence is due to the fact that there is no strategic framework which provides specific priorities, objectives and a vision for the sector as a whole.

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table shows the degree to which the Civil society and fundamental rights sector is considered in the main EU accession strategies.



*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency of the Civil Society & Fundamental Rights Sector with EU accession strategies*

Civil society and Fundamental rights are clear priorities identified under the NPAA and also selected as one of the main priorities. In terms of IPA II Policy Areas and Indicative Policy Area /Sector Combinations, Civil Society and Fundamental rights relates to three sub-areas, namely PAR, human rights and social policies.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies?**

Currently there is no regional development strategy as per which this EQ can be assessed. However, it should be noted that the NDPs emphasise regional aspects, and in particular the 10th NDP has provided guidance for the preparation of a National Strategy for Regional Development (NSRD) as the main strategic document in this area, to help ensure coordination for regional development and regional competitiveness, to strengthen harmony between spatial development and socio-economic development policies, and establish a general framework for regional and sub-scale plans and strategies.

Some of the sub-strategies address regional development aspects. There is partial consideration (although not mainstreamed throughout the strategies and APs), in gender related APs in measures such as provision of accessible protective services, rehabilitation services among others.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

Those APs currently in place are NAPVAW (2012-2015) as well as Open Government Partnership Action Plan – OGP AP (2013-2015). The Fundamental Rights Action Plan which was prepared by the MEUA is currently defunct. As the latter is defunct, it has not been provided to the mission and thus cannot be analysed.

The Gender Equality Strategy and Action Plan was prepared within the framework of a “Promoting Gender Equality Project-Strengthening Institutional Capacity Twinning Project”. The Action Plan (currently being updated) has a good background analysis and clearly presents the strategic objectives. It includes a specific chapter on monitoring and evaluation which provides adequate information on the way in which M&E will be carried out. However, the AP – while identifying clearly responsible institutions- doesn’t provide performance indicators, sources for verifying these and clear activities related to each measure. Furthermore, there has been no costing made. The NAPVAW has similar problems and in addition to those also doesn’t include clear measures for M&E and the measures are very briefly presented. It does however include a sub-chapter on coordination and collaboration with other public institutions. The NAPVAW is updated regularly (the current AP in force is the third AP).

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) AP is a brief document and while containing brief background information, objectives, goals and general activities, it doesn’t contain at all proper indicators and sources of verification. There is no information on M&E and coordination with key stakeholder institutions.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

For the lead institution, MEUA there is a specific unit dedicated to monitoring, although this is still project based. Nevertheless, the unit is equipped with skilled staff and are trained on results-oriented monitoring. It has good potential of adaptation to sector-based monitoring.

There are some project based monitoring mechanisms for civil society such as Steering Committees but monitoring is done on the level of activities and project progress as these structures are created as part of programmes. The project currently in place “Strengthening Civil Society Development and Civil Society-Public Sector Dialogue in Turkey” has a Steering Committee which is established to follow project progress. The SC is composed of representatives from the MEU, the EUD and the CFCU. Component coordinators and vice-coordinators from the project partners (Third Sector Foundation (TUSEV), Civil Society Development Center (STGM), YADA Foundation (YADA), Istanbul Bilgi University CSO Training and Research Unit and Istanbul Bilgi University Youth Studies Unit, Capacity Development Association (KAGED), Helsinki Citizens Assembly (hCa)) are foreseen to be present at the SC meetings to provide information and get feedback. The SC hasn’t met with the frequency foreseen (planned to meet every 3 months). To date, only 2 meetings have taken place.

Under the same project the establishment of a Consultation and Dialogue Committee was foreseen and established. It has met only once to date. It would be highly beneficial to upgrade and structure the CDC so as to monitor the progress made towards sector objectives identified in the CSP via identified and improved indicators, to discuss and propose solutions, measures, activities and/or amendments on initial programming. It is of crucial importance that such a coordination body should have equal participation of CSOs and relevant public institutions to be identified according to transparent criteria, should have permanent members that are directly responsible for the implementation of the sector programme, but should also be flexible to integrate ad-hoc participation of other CSOs and/or public institutions when and if necessary.

The MoFSP also has a good level of skills in terms of monitoring on the strategy level. There are some procedures and checklists as well as templates established for this purpose. Both the NAPVAW and the Gender Equality Strategy and Action Plan were monitored based on these templates.[[21]](#footnote-21) The templates are separately prepared for the different sub-issues (education, poverty etc.) and foresee monitoring by stakeholder institutions. However, the monitoring template – although a very good step – falls short of creating a mechanism which monitors on an indicator and performance basis.

In what concerns child’s rights, the MoFSP has established a Board for Assessing and Monitoring Child’s Rights composed of 11 Senior managers from the Ministry, 7 institutions, 20 NGOs and 2 child coordinators/representatives. It is foreseen for this Board to monitor and evaluate the relevant strategies and action plans. As these strategies and APs are currently draft it is not possible to comment on the extent and quality of indicators.

The Prime Ministry Inspection Board which is in charge of implementing the National Action Plan on Open Government Partnership (OGP AP) doesn’t have any structures which are dedicated to monitoring, especially in what concerns the civil society aspects of the OGP AP. As the AP is a result of an international initiative on OGP, the party countries are required to report annually. However, interviewees from civil society have noted that the capacity for reporting and implementing the AP is very limited. There is currently some dialogue established between the Board and CSOs in order to compose a WG to upgrade and revise the AP.

The lack of an overall strategy for the civil society and fundamental rights sector hampers the development of proper indicators and hence monitoring is undermined. The indicators foreseen in the NDP are very general and not always realistic to measure the specific objectives. For instance, there is no institution that gathers monitoring data on a systematic basis and no statistical information on civil society is collected by TUIK (Turkish Statistical Institute). The main baseline data is gathered through some quantitative and mostly qualitative research conducted by non-governmental organisations (such as those studies mentioned under EQ 1.2).

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

The budget allocations for the implementation of the strategies in the sector are assessed as average (largely drawing from questionnaires). Under IPA for the years 2011-2013 the financial allocations are as follows[[22]](#footnote-22):



*Table 1.6 Budget commitments for IPA Component I Civil Society and Fundamental Rights, Source: NIPAC*

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* The scoring for Criteria 1 in the civil society and fundamental rights sector should be relativized. The quantitative and qualitative results may provide weak scoring (given the absence of an overall strategy, lack of Action Plans etc.) which is reflected as such due to the methodology adopted in analyzing more coherent sectors. This is largely due to the horizontal nature of the sector and should not be considered to mean that the sector overall lacks maturity and reduce the added value support to civil society and fundamental rights would have.
* There is no overall strategy for the sector and only some sub-sector areas are covered by sub-strategies, mostly related to fundamental rights.
* The overall strategic framework is the 10th NDP. However, the objectives included in the NDP does not adequately relate to the plethora of needs assessments carried out for the civil society sector and hence is not an adequate strategic document for the sector as a whole.
* Project-based monitoring mechanisms are in place at the level of the MEUA, namely through a specific monitoring unit manned by skilled staff on ROM.
* Monitoring manuals, templates and mechanisms are foreseen for APs and strategies in the sub-fields of women’s rights and children’s rights.
* In the sub-field of transparency and participation, capacity for monitoring is weak.

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* Having a civil society strategy which includes fundamental rights is of primary importance in order to have a comprehensive, coherent and monitorable framework for the sector. Such a strategy would have to be prepared in a highly participatory approach and take into consideration the gamut of assessments and analyses already conducted. As the sector is highly horizontal and there are a number of initiatives by a range of public institutions (local and central level) the strategy would require high-level political commitment, namely approval on the TGNA or Council of Ministers level.
* Based on the above, consider provision of support under IPA II alongside other actions, to allocate resources for the development of such a strategy in an inclusive and participatory manner.
* Provide support to the MoFSP for the improvement of monitoring indicators and templates for the Gender Equality Action Plan and the NAPVAW.
* Provide technical assistance and support to the Board on Assessing and Monitoring Child’s Rights to develop monitoring mechanisms and reporting on a sector basıs. Training on ROM and sector-based planning and M&E would be highly useful.
* Explore possibilities of enhancing monitoring related data, including baseline data such as statistics (e.g. consider coordination with TUIK- Turkish Statistical Institute for the collection of related data).

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

The lead institution is the MEUA both for civil society and fundamental rights. Aspects of fundamental rights which fall under the mandate of the MoJ are dealt with under the sector Justice and Human Rights.

The MEUA leadership in the sector is more de facto than de jure, as it has been the primary institution which has implemented the majority of IPA funded projects related to civil society (civil society development, civil society dialogue, strengthening civil society-public sector cooperation, strengthening freedom of association) as beneficiary institution. It should be noted however that part of these project were implemented through civil society organisations, primarily the CSDA. The Civil Society Dialogue project (now in its third phase) is implemented through a TA but with clear ownership of the MEUA. Hence, one can say that, while not being formally appointed as a lead institution, the MEUA has a high level of ownership of the sector. It should be noted that civil society representatives interviewed in the field also perceived the MEUA as an institution with which they can enter into dialogue and collaborate without compromising on their own priorities.

On fundamental rights, the CSP also identifies the MEUA as the lead institution in close coordination with the MoJ. As the field of fundamental rights covers a large range of thematic issues which fall under the responsibility of a number of institutions, the MEUA’s coordinating role seems to be considered of added value in order to be able to approach the field from a macro level and ensuring its inclusiveness of all major sub-issues. Nevertheless, given that fundamental rights is not within the mandate of the MEUA, the level of ownership is lower than civil society as a whole. Nevertheless, the MEUA, through its CSD III Political Criteria project has been strongly involved in issues related to fundamental rights.

Handling civil society and fundamental rights may be of particular added value (e.g. in any future developments regarding a strategic framework) as they have been and continue to be strongly interlinked in the Turkish context.

Strategic planning is done on the Ministry level by the Strategic Planning Department which is dedicated to developing and monitoring strategic plans.

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

The MEUA as lead institution and the secondary institutions (primarily the MoFPS but not the PM Inspection Board) have considerable experience with IPA funds and DIS mechanisms.

The institutional capacity is assessed as average. While the MEUA and MoFSP displays a good level of skills in strategic planning due to the existence of specific units for Strategic Planning, the level of know-how and skills of staff and units that are in charge of programme development and implementation is considered as insufficient by the respondents to questionnaires. The PM Inspection Board in charge of implementing the OGP AP has insufficient skills for strategic planning, especially in what concerns civil society and participation in the AP. There is a clear need for training on sector based strategic programming.

Although the capacities for strategic planning has been increased over years, the elaboration of strategic documents have partially depended on external consultants and projects.

An in-depth analysis of institutional capacities and needs on sector-based strategic planning would be advisable, as this project can only provide a very preliminary analysis of capacities. Nevertheless, given that the sector requires strong coordination among a high range of institutions (not only those implicated through sub-sector strategies but also other public institutions and local authorities which increasingly foresee- albeit with differing results- civil society participation in decision-making and policy formulation) staff specifically dedicated to coordinating strategic planning and oversight may be advisable.[[23]](#footnote-23)

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

Monitoring and evaluation on a sector level is not systematised. For sub-fields such as Gender equality, VAW and Children’s rights there are some mechanisms for monitoring of strategies.

The SPOs have been in charge of coordinating the monitoring mechanisms related to individual EU funded projects. They have established communication systems with the institutions within the structure of IPA Component I TAIB (line ministries, CFCU and NIPAC) and with EUD. However, this kind of reporting is not focused on output/results/impact indicators related to priority axis or measures. Reporting has been addressed at micro level without addressing a real overview of the sector.

Certain monitoring mechanisms are in place on the country level, primarily coordinated by NIPAC and CFCU where relevant on the project, sectoral, component and DIS levels. These mechanisms are as follows:

1. Progress and Monitoring Reports (PMR) submitted by the beneficiary institutions to the NIPAC and CFCU. The reports are prepared by the beneficiary on quarterly basis through an interned based system and submitted to both the Ministry for EU Affairs and the CFCU by the system for assessment. PMRs include information concerning the activities carried out during the monitoring period, impacts of the activities on the achievement of the PF objectives with respect to indicators in the project fiches, planned activities for the next reporting period, problems encountered during the implementation process of the project, risks which are encountered and anticipated as well as information concerning the progress for addressing the conditions set for the realisation of the projects.
2. SMSCs: Provides an overview on the sectoral level bringing together line ministries per sector and reviewing project implementation in the sector, lessons learned, upcoming needs etc. with the participation of the MEU- NIPAC, CFCU, NAO, NF, line ministries and NGOs. This sector is monitored under SMSC 1.4.
3. TAIB: This constitutes of monitoring and overview on the component level and involves the NIPAC, EUD, CFCU, line ministries, NGOs and other stakeholders etc.
4. IPA Committee: The committee monitors the effective and efficient use of IPA funds with the participation of MoFA, SPO, NAO, NF, CFCU, MEU- NIPAC, NGOs)

The Gender Equality strategy and AP foresees the establishment of monitoring and assessment working groups for each area within the AP, chaired by the General Director or the Deputy General Director of MoFSP (KSGM) and coordinated by KSGM, foreseeing the inclusion of line ministries. Representatives of the Ministries and other governmental agencies that bear a responsibility for the implementation will participate in these working groups. The WGs are foreseen to convene twice a year at six-month-intervals following the submission of reports by relevant parties. Similarly, for the upcoming strategy and action plan related to children’s rights, the Child Rights Monitoring and Assessment Board is responsible for overseeing the planning, development and implementation of relevant strategies.

The PM Inspection Board has very limited capacities in terms of ensuring quality drafting, reporting and implementation of strategies and action plans.

As there is no overall strategy for the civil society and fundamental rights framework it is wonted that there is no specific structures and tools for this purpose. However, there are certain mechanisms established through EU funded projects that are promising in terms of bolstering mechanisms for strategic planning, reporting etc. The project implemented by the MEUA “Strengthening Civil Society Development and Civil Society-Public Sector Dialogue in Turkey” established, in addition to a SC, a *Consultation and Dialogue Committee* **(CDC)** composed of representatives of the government institutions working in relation to the project activities and the civil society in Turkey (for e.g. Ministry of Interior, Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Family and Social Policies, etc.). In contrast to the SC the CDC is considered as an opportunity to create dialogue and consultation on a policy basis. This structure is currently functioning on the basis of the project, but could prove exceedingly useful – if formalized- in constituting a structure and mechanism for overseeing the development and implementation of strategic plans. However meetings have not been as frequent as foreseen in the project description (the first meeting has taken place on the 27th of December 2013) and participation from line ministries has been on the junior level. The project under which the CDC is functioning ends in May 2014 and it would be advisable to try and ensure the continuation and formalisation of the CDC and/or a specific WG for structured coordination, with the participation of main stakeholders.

Hence it can be concluded that reporting is well established primarily on EU projects and on a project level. Due to this, reporting has been addressed at micro and activity without any macro level perspective. There are some mechanisms for reporting and following strategies especially within the MoFSP and some potential to develop such mechanisms if the CDC would be formalised (and procedures and principles for its functioning structured).

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* Good level of ownership of institutions involved. Clear de facto leadership of the MEUA for civil society. MEUA’s involvement in fundamental rights as a coordinating institution that can allow to encompass all aspects of fundamental rights in coordination with institutions that have a mandate in sub-areas (e.g. MoJ in judicial aspects of fundamental rights, MoFSP on women and children’s rights among others).
* Although the capacities for strategic planning has been increased over years, especially with the existence of Strategic Planning Departments in each ministry, the elaboration of strategic documents has been still dependent on external sources such as consultants.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* There is a clear need for increasing skills in strategic planning within institutions, especially for those mechanisms and structures that oversee the implementation of strategies.
* The good reporting mechanisms established on the project level should be enhanced and transformed so as to be able to adopt a macro level perspective for the sector rather than overview on a project level.
* In this respect, it is strongly recommended to develop capacities of the CDC (including structuring mechanisms of consultation, establishing a work plan and formalising the structure) for it to assume a more policy development and strategic guidance role which would be relevant to any development of a strategic framework for the civil society and fundamental rights sector.
* Given the high number of key stakeholders and secondary stakeholders in this sector, recruitment or allocation of staff specifically dedicated to coordinating strategic planning and oversight may be advisable.
* Better coordination at the lead ministry level as well as within implicated ministries between Strategic Planning Departments and thematic departments.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach?**

The SMSC 1.4 Civil Society and Cultural Heritage and SCSC 1.1 Judiciary and Fundamental Rights provides the main coordination mechanism on a sectoral level. They bring together ministries and reviews project implementation in the sector with the participation of the MEU- NIPAC, CFCU, NAO, NF, line ministries and NGOs.

Coordination for the sector is not carried out through other formalised structures which allow for coordination on a sectorial basis. A specific mechanism dedicated to coordination would be necessary given the high number and range of actors for this sector. Staff dedicated to ensuring that coordination is structured, efficient and effective would be advisable.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach?** |

On civil society and fundamental rights, the EU remains the main donor institution. The EUD meets regularly with other donors (e.g. Member State Embassies) who also provide support in the area of fundamental rights and civil society, albeit with much more limited resources.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* Coordination for the sector is not carried out through other formalised structures which allow for coordination on a sectoral basis.
* The SMSC 1.1 and 1.4 provide a platform for coordination although it doesn’t involve all major stakeholders (especially stakeholders beyond public institutions).
* The EU remains the major donor in the field.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* A specific mechanism dedicated to coordination would be necessary given the high number and range of actors for this sector. This mechanism should be endorsed also on the ministerial level and develop manuals and procedures for effective coordination.
* Staff dedicated to ensuring that coordination is structured, efficient and effective would be advisable.
* Donor coordination should be given more consideration at the sectoral level.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach ? Is the sector approach suitable ?**

There is no overall strategy for the sector and it is highly advisable that a comprehensive strategy covering the whole sector be developed. Although the sector is prioritised in the 10th NDP, these priorities do not extensively reflect the sector needs and address main problems.

In terms of Criteria 1, the sector can be classified in the range of progress towards the sector approach. The score obtained is of **23,33 out of 36**.The following improvements would be necessary in order to enhance maturity under Criteria 1:

* Development of an overall strategic framework which encompasses civil society and fundamental rights, especially covering also fundamental rights issues which are ‘orphan’ and are not tackled under other sectors (e.g. minorities, LGBTI etc.)
* This overall strategy should be developed in a participatory manner and in particular IPA II 2014 programming could provide opportunities for support to such an initiative.
* Support to monitoring structures within the MoFSP for improving monitoring indicators and templates (for Gender Equality and VAW) and support to the Board on Assessing and Monitoring Child’s Rights to improve and structure monitoring mechanisms.
* Explore possibilities of enhancing monitoring related data, including baseline data such as statistics (e.g. consider coordination with TUIK- Turkish Statistical Institute for the collection of related data).

The assessment of the capacity for sector based planning within the sector (Criteria 2) renders a score of **8 out of 12** which would benefit from the following improvements:

* Improvement of skills and provision of training on strategic planning and sector based programming to staff in charge of implementing and monitoring all strategies.
* The good reporting mechanisms established on the project level should be enhanced and transformed so as to be able to adopt a macro level perspective for the sector rather than overview on a project level.
* Upgrade and structure the CDC so as to monitor the progress made towards sector objectives identified in the CSP via identified and improved indicators, to discuss and propose solutions, measures, activities and/or amendments on initial programming. It is of crucial importance that such a coordination body should have equal participation of CSOs and relevant public institutions to be identified according to transparent criteria, should have permanent members that are directly responsible for the implementation of the sector programme.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms reaches **6 out of 8**.

* Improvement would be necessary to have a more inclusive coordination mechanism on a sectorial basis. The mechanism is highly advisable to be developed, in consultation with CSOs.
* Consider the recruitment of staff specifically dedicated to the management of the above tasks (in particular overseeing coordination for the sector).

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, we obtain an overall rate of **37,33 out of 56**. This score is included in the upper range of 28 and 42 showing that the sector is in good progress towards qualifying for sector based programming.

## Employment, HRD, Education and Social Policies SECTOR

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector?**

The main strategy for this sector is the draft National Employment Strategy (NES) 2012-2020 and Action Plan prepared by the MoLSS. The NES however has not been officially adopted and is still in draft form.

This document is highly comprehensive and also extensively detailed in terms of background information and situation analysis. In particular, there is an extensive analysis of the macro-economic background. The quality of the document is assessed as good as it constitutes a comprehensive document covering most of the sub-fields of the sector and it is sustained through baseline data. It includes a SWOT analysis per specific objective.

Currently, the Human Resources Development Operational Programme (HRDOP 2007-2013) is in place which is highly complementary and related to priorities of the draft NES. The 2014-2020 programme (HRD Sectoral Programme) is wider than the 1st Operational Programme and its preparation will be officially initiated on January 2014.

The main sub-strategies for this sector are:

* MoLSS Strategic Plan 2014-2018
* National Youth Employment Action Plan 2011-2015
* Life Long Learning Strategy and Action Plan 2010-2013
* Strategic Plan of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) 2010-2014
* Vocational and Technical Education Strategy and Action Plan 2013-2017
* Strengthening the Link between Vocational Training and Employment Action Plan 2010
* Transformation ,Change and Support for Artisans, Artists and Craftsman Strategy and Action Plan (2010-2011)
* Chapter 19 Action Plan 2010
* Disability Strategic Plan (draft)
* Accessibility Strategy and Action Plan 2010-2011
* Combating Poverty Strategic Plan (early draft)
* Strategy for the Situation of the Elderly and Ageing
* National Strategy and Action Plan on Social Policies for Roma (early draft)
* Care Services Strategy and Action Plan 2011-2013



*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub strategies in the Employment, HRD, Education, Social Policies sector*

As it can be seen from the above table, the main subsector/priorities are well covered by individual sub-sector strategies and the most of them are complemented by Action Plans. Five of the sub-sector strategies are covering the period after 2013. Five of the strategies, including the NES, are currently under preparation, two of them being in an early draft form.

In general, there is a good level of connection between subsector/priorities with the specific objectives of the NES. As it can be seen, several priorities contribute to meet more than one objective bolstering the synergy within the sector.



*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity for the Employment, HRD, Education, Social Policies Sector*

The main NES strategic objectives have an average level of coherence as there are several sub sectors (3 out of 10) that do not relate to any of these objectives. To be noted that the subsectors National Action Plan on Roma and on Accessibility that do not show relation with the NES objectives because those documents are at an early draft stage and their objectives have not been developed to maturity yet. On the other hand, strong coherence and complementarity is visible for the specific objective of the NES “Strengthening the link between training and employment (including LLL, VET, access to education, active labour market).

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

The NES takes into account the Europe 2020 targets and identifies the following priorities:

* Strengthening the relationship between education and employment,
* Providing security and flexibility in labour market,
* Increasing the employment of disadvantaged groups,
* Strengthening the relationship between employment and social protection.

The overall objective of the NES is not clearly articulated and is not explicit in the document. Also, the NES identifies at the beginning of the document four “central goals/targets” which are not entirely complementary to the specific objectives that are detailed in the NES. These “goals” – which are measurable- relate primarily to increasing employment, reducing unemployment, employment growth and registered employment levels.

There is a good situation analysis presented in the NES which identifies main problem areas. The quality of the SWOT analysis in NES is assessed as good. On the other hand, a closely related document, the HRDOP contains an extensive needs assessment as well as an ex-ante evaluation as required by the IPA regulation.[[24]](#footnote-24) An interim evaluation was conducted in 2011 of the HRD OP.

The identification of new needs via additional studies is also assessed as mediocre to good. There have been a number of studies and analyses conducted- at times within the framework of EU funded programmes. A background study for the priority of social inclusion was completed in 2013. A background study for Employment is planned to be completed in January 2014. Some of the information available for the sector includes external assistance in the development of indicators and preparation of SWOT for sub-sector areas as well as needs assessments.[[25]](#footnote-25)

The preparation of the NES has been done primarily through workshops and conferences. For this purpose, two workshops were organized, one as a ‘search conference’ to assist the preparation of a framework for the strategic plan with the participation of 180 persons. The second workshop was dedicated to the definition of main goals, priorities and measures which took place with the participation of 220 persons.

The sub-sectorial strategic documents such as the LLL, VET, Youth Unemployment strategies among others have been prepared in consultation with relevant public institutions, non-governmental organizations, social partners, and universities. Consultations that took place for the preparation of the HRD OP are highly relevant to assess this EQ as it demonstrates the capacity of the MoLSS to effectively carry out consultations and whether there are mechanisms in place to carry out consultations in a structured manner. The preparatory works aimed to include social partners and NGOs (although the mid-term evaluation concluded that there was insufficient and limited participation of NGOs). For the process of updating the HRDOP, the MoLSS is going to officially initiate the preparation of the HRD 2014-2020 Sectoral Programme in January 2014, and plans a series of conferences, workshops and meetings in 2014 at the local level.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

The sector is widely addressed in Turkey's 9th and 10th NDPs. Increasing employment is one of the main development axis of the NDPs. The NES was prepared when the 9th NDP was in place and shows strong links and references to the priorities in the plan of developing the labour market, developing the relations between education and the labour market, developing active labour market policies. The NPAA also foresees to target as main reform areas the labour market, social security and social assistance, as well as education.

Some reforms have taken place in the past three years for the sector as a whole with some legislative changes on labour law, trade unions and significant amendments were introduced to Vocational Qualifications Authority (VQA) Law No. 5564 by Decree Law No. 665 of 11 October 2011. The 2012 and 2013 EC Progress Reports also noted that state contribution to social security premiums delivered positive results for female employment, as well as for reducing undeclared work and noted that the coverage and variety of social services continued to increase. However the legal alignment is assessed as limited in the 2013 Progress Report.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified? Are the identified objectives coherent? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact?**

There is no identification of an overall objective in the NES. It only provides the following overall targets:

* Reduction of unemployment to 5% and increase employment to %50
* Increase employment outside of agriculture to 0.62
* Reduce unregistered employment to %15 by 2023
* Increase the labor force participation rate of women to 35 percent

The specific objectives do not sufficiently relate to these overall goals. In fact, the NES would need to develop a single measurable objective in order to establish coherence. See the table below for a demonstration of the lack of coherence:



*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives in the NES*

Given that the NES is a draft and has not been updated, the background information and situation analyses would need to be updated in order to increase their relevance to achieve impact. This would need to be done in close complementarity and coordination with the current efforts to update the HRDOP and take into consideration the relevant studies. The objectives should also be developed in a more measurable manner which would require as a pre-condition that there is adequate and up to date data available, including independent evaluations of labour market policies (the latter as suggested by the 2013 Progress Report). Furthermore, a comprehensive stakeholder analysis is also missing from the NES.

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table clearly shows that the sector is considered in the main EU accession strategies:



*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency of the with EU accession strategies*

The sector is identified as a priority in the draft CSP and the NPAA. The sector priorities and objectives (both NES and HRDOP) are very much in line with Europe 2020 priorities, namely:

* 75% of the 20-64 year-olds to be employed
* Reducing school drop-out rates below 10%
* at least 40% of 30-34–year-olds completing third level education
* and to an extent at least 20 million fewer people in or at risk of poverty and social exclusion

In terms of sub-sector strategy priorities there is also a good consistence with the EU accession strategy and EU policies in the field. For instance the Youth Employment Action Plan corresponds to EU policy priorities of enhancing institutional capacity in promoting youth employment and strengthening the relationship between education and training and employment.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies?**

The sector and the NES and HRDOP have close links to priorities in the 9th and the following 10th NDPs. The 10th NDP has also provided guidance for the preparation of a National Strategy for Regional Development (NSRD) 2014-2023 as the main strategic document in this area, to help ensure coordination for regional development and regional competitiveness, to strengthen harmony between spatial development and socio-economic development policies, and establish a general framework for regional and sub-scale plans and strategies. There is a good level of relations between the priorities and issues identified in the NSRD and the NES. Sections 5.3.3 and 5.4.3 “Developing Human and Social Capital” show strong relations to those priorities in NES. Furthermore, the HRD OP in particular takes into consideration regional aspects.

Nevertheless, the interim evaluation of the HRDOP has identified certain shortcomings in the regionalisation especially in terms of a lack of consistent structure at regional level, increased need for involvement of RDAs in programming and development of objectives, targets and measures on regional level.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

73% of the sector is covered by Action Plans that are in place, being updated or under preparation. Four out of the ten APs are currently in implementation.

The main sector strategy NES does not have an action plan. The HRDOP operationalizes much of the measures also foreseen in the NES.

The Action Plans[[26]](#footnote-26) for LLL includes the following information: Priorities, measures, immediately responsible institution, stakeholder institutions, timing identified on a yearly basis. The timeframe lacks specificity.

The AP of the MoLSS contains clear references to priorities of the strategy and measures which are mostly formulated on the immediate activity level. Time frames are generally provided. The action plan includes performance indicators.

The VET Strategy and Action Plan identified priorities, measures, timing, institution primarily responsible for the measure and secondary institutions as well as performance indicators. Despite its comparative quality, the action does not provide specific timeframes identifying more than necessary ‘continuous’ for most activities without providing a breakdown of actions which can be limited to specific time frames.

Strengthening the link between Vocational Training and Employment Action Plan also provides a general framework for implementation and, like in many of the APs, lacks reference to indicators and specific timelines.

The AP for the Situation of the Elderly and Ageing follows more a strategic plan format and, while providing priorities, targets and expected outputs, does not establish firm time frames and responsible institutions per measure and action.

The Accessibility Strategy and Action Plan uses an AP format, includes priorities and measures. It also identifies responsible institutions. However the time frames are usually referred to as ‘continuous’ even though they constitute of actions that can very well be identified in terms of timing.

Sequencing in the APs is not adequately identified and for most APs (with partial exception of the MoLSS AP) activities for the collection of M&E data are not included. In the majority of APs (except VET and MoLSS APs), performance indicators have not been included.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

The main responsibility for Monitoring of the implementation would be the European Union Coordination Department of the MoLSS. The MoLSS has several monitoring mechanisms in place, primarily set up for monitoring the HRDOP.

The Monitoring Unit of the EU Coordination Department of the MoLSS is specifically dedicated to programme based monitoring and has developed manuals and procedures for effective monitoring.

On the OP level the Sectoral Monitoring Committee chaired by the MoLSS and including a range of stakeholders is a permanently acting body [[27]](#footnote-27) set up to ensure the sound and effective implementation and management of the OP.

Other stakeholder institutions such as the MoNE also have specific units for Monitoring within departments of VET and LLL. These monitoring units not only monitor on a programme basis, but they also have a mandate and scope to monitor progress related to strategies and conduct policy monitoring.

The desk research reveals that the indicators and their quality in the NES are assessed as average to low. As the NES is not in force, the main document through which progress is monitored is the HRDOP, within which the MoLSS manages to collect the information on the indicators for reporting process. Collection of data for monitoring is foreseen mainly through the MIS. Hence, there seems to be insufficient diversification of data and systematic collection and processing of statistics, data, and qualitative information. The interim evaluation of the OP conducted in 2011 also noted an urgent need to reform the set of indicators in the programme and to aim for higher quality and doable targets.

The HRDOP indicators are developed although these are not adequately SMART. For instance, it provides very general indicators making reference only to numbers and not specifying as per which baseline data this will be measured and what level of increase (e.g. “Number of educational staff having participated in vocational guidance services trainings”, “Number of parents who are given trainings”).

In the other strategies, such as the VET strategy, there are performance indicators included. These are however, mostly output indicators and there are an insufficient number of measurable outcome and performance indicators (e.g. indicators focus on for instance number of programmes, number of disabled persons who have participated in VET programmes). The indicators inadequately refer to change vis-à-vis baseline data (e.g. X percentage of expected disabled persons having completed VET programmes based on realistic forecasts).

The LLL Strategy also remains quite weak in terms of establishing indicators per measure. Indicators are not SMART and are not specific to measures, outcomes and expected performance. Similarly, the Accessibility Strategy and Action Plan as well as the Strategy and Action Plan on Care Services would extensively benefit from developing outcome and performance indicators as they are almost lacking completely. Sources of verification and diversification are also another area which requires improvement.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

Budget allocations for the NES have not been made as the document has not been approved and is still at draft level. Nevertheless, the NES does not include any detailed costing per priority or measure.

As can be seen below, the HRD Component IV has had an increasing commitment of EU funds with a national co-financing rate of 10-20%:



*Table 1.6 Budget commitments from IPA for the HRD sector*

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* The National Employment Strategy which covers well all sub-sectors (with the exception of issues such as disability, accessibility and to an extent poverty) is still at draft level.
* The HRD OP 2014-2020 covers a large amount of the concerns and priorities of the NES. In the absence of NES it can provide the necessary strategic guidance and institutional framework.
* Complementarity and coherence of sub-strategies to the overall sector strategy is assessed as good overall. The sub-sector strategies such as LLL, VET etc. are in line with objectives of the NES and are largely coherent with it.
* Almost all aspects of the sector are covered by sub-strategies (more than 70%) although some of them are currently draft or have expired in 2010 or 2011.
* The relevance and formulation of objectives in the NES are assessed as good in general although the more measurable indicators are primarily focused on employment and inadequately consider other sub-strategy aspects (such as poverty, education, social inclusion)
* Regional considerations are taken into account in the NES and in particular the HRD OP although region-based indicators are inadequately developed, as per the interim evaluation.
* More than 60% of sub-strategies that have Action Plans;
* The assessment of indicators is average to low;
* Satisfactory situation analyses are conducted for most strategies (especially the NES). There is less indication on the quality and scope of needs assessments for all sub-sector fields.
* The NES has a good SWOT analysis although it is not conducted systematically and included in the sub-strategies.
* Monitoring is currently conducted on a project basis and Operational Programme level. On the level of sub-strategies, the Strategic Planning Departments of respective Ministries are in charge with some structures established for M&E. For the HRD OP, there were monitoring groups in Governorates but this was not sufficiently well organized. From now on the MoLSS will be in charge of monitoring. Project and programme based internal and external monitoring has been going on. However sector based monitoring is a new concept (there is a Sectoral Monitoring Committee in place within the framework of the HRD OP).

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* Swiftly adopt the NES and revise it in accordance with priorities under HRD OP 2014-2023 to provide a strategic framework endorsed at the highest level. In revising the document, ensure better formulation of objectives and linked indicators as well as enhance coherence with sub-sectors in order to cover some sub-fields which have not been included.
* There is room for improvement in increasing the complementarity of the strategies with the NES.
* The outcomes and related outcome and impact indicators of the related activities/measures in the APs of the strategy/sub-strategies have to be considerably improved.
* MoLSS has a good monitoring system in place and this can be updated in line with developments in terms of sectoral implementation of programmes and strategies.
* Analyze and provide an assessment for M&E capacity needs within stakeholder institutions (MoNE, ISKUR, MoFSP etc.)
* Update NES through wide consultations with a more inclusive participation of non-governmental actors. The NES should take on board evaluations and studies conducted under the HRD OP and if possible an external policy evaluation.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

The EU Coordination Department in the Ministry of Labour and Social Security has been accredited as the Human Resources Development Operating Structure (HRD OS) responsible for tendering, contracting and financial management of EU funded operations under IPA Component IV. The accreditation decision has been given by the European Commission on 31 January 2012. Hence, there is high ownership of the sector and administrative and organizational structures which can, with support to upgrade them in terms of strategic planning, acquire capacities for sector based strategic planning.

The MoLSS has a specific Strategic Planning Unit, like all ministries, required by the PFM Law.

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

With regards to IPA I 2007 - 2013, the Turkish Government has established accredited structures for Decentralised Implementation System (DIS) of IPA funds and specifically the MoLSS EU Coordination Department for Component IV.

Overall institutional capacity for strategic planning of the MoLSS is assessed as good. The capacity is a combination of skilled internal resources and external consultants. The workplan of the MoLSS for in-service training includes a number of trainings for strategic planning. To date, more than four trainings have been organized on strategic planning. The MoLSS’ capacity in strategic planning is also demonstrated by the fact that the new LLL is under preparation and the MoLSS provided technical support for updating that strategy.

It can be concluded that the MoLSS has good internal capacity in strategic planning, not very high turnover and an average dependence on consultants.

Other stakeholders within the sector, such as the MoNE, the MoFSP have a good degree of experience on management of EU funds (especially MoNE) but lack skills on strategic planning.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

There are several monitoring instruments on different levels. The overall framework for monitoring implementation of sector policies and strategies is a responsibility at the level of Ministry and/or coordinative bodies with ensured representation from the relevant stakeholders.

To be noted that in early 2012 some functions such as tendering, contracting and financial management systems have been transferred from the CFCU to the MLSS based on the conferral approval for DIS.

The MIS system ensures monitoring on the HRD OP level. The Sector Monitoring Committee established and chaired by the MoLSS ensures revising, monitoring and assessing reports for the HRD OP.

As mentioned earlier, the MoNE departments related to VET and LLL have specific monitoring units and mechanisms (that may need improvement however) on the policy and programme levels.

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* There is clear leadership of the MoLSS, especially taken into consideration that it has received accreditation since 2012.
* MoLSS has a strategic planning department.
* EU Coordination Department of the MoLSS has a good capacity on strategic planning with a range of trainings having been conducted.
* Although the capacities for strategic planning are relevant, there is some reliance on external sources such as consultants.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* Further enhance strategic planning capacities among units in charge of programming and implementation.
* Enhance capacities among stakeholder participating institutions for strategic planning and M&E on the basis of strategies.
* Increase capacities for data collection and processing as per indicators to be developed as part of the NES.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach?**

During the drafting process of the HRD OP, several mechanisms for consultation and coordination were established.

A WG has been established under the EU-funded “*Strengthening Social Dialogue for Innovation and Change in Turkey*” project. The project was used as a tool for cooperation with social partners.

Informal coordination mechanisms are also in place, such as with the Ministry of Industry and Trade to ensure complementarity between the RC OP and HRD OP.

Coordination on the basis of HRD OP continued with key stakeholders such as Ministry of National Education (MoNE), ISKUR, MoFSP among others, although these take place rather on a programming level and not on strategic level. Interviewees from stakeholder institutions noted that the coordination was more on an activity and progress level rather than allowing for a coordination of strategies and their implementation.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach?** |

Donor coordination undertaken by the MoLSS is basically conducted with the main donor the EU on the basis of the HRD OP.

At national level, the MEUA is stepping up efforts to establish a donor coordination mechanism. The MEUA has organized on May 23rd a meeting with the participation of several IFIs (EBRD, AFD, KFW, WB) and other donors (UNDP, UNICEF, UNIDO, ILO, IMO, CoE, WHO) in order to facilitate donor coordination activities within the scope of the accession agenda.

The Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* Some coordination mechanisms on the basis of the HRD OP but not the NES.
* Main coordination mechanisms are at the operational level and do not have established manuals, work procedures, in contrast to monitoring mechanisms which have checklists, templates and manuals developed on the operational level etc.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* Different coordination platforms should be consolidated and better integrated to benefit from synergies.
* Bolster coordination mechanisms and upgrade them to a sectoral basis and improve the performance of these mechanisms, through inter alia developing ground rules, procedures, manuals etc. and ensuring high level participation as well as establishing working groups.
* Coordination mechanisms and Working Groups should be formalized and endorsed at higher political levels.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach? Is the sector approach suitable?**

The primary strategic document for the sector is the NES which is still draft.

In terms of Criteria 1, the sector can be classified Ready/mature for a sector approach with some improvements. The score obtained **28,71 out of 36**.

* Swiftly update, upgrade, revise and adopt the NES as the chief strategic document.
* Develop an AP for the NES.
* Ensure better complementarity and coherence between the strategies.
* Strategies should follow a more or less standard format and include also a chapter on M&E.
* The APs for the sub-sectors should contain all the necessary information including results, precise costing and budget as well as outcome and impact indicators.
* Ex-post evaluation of outdated strategies should be conducted. Mid-term evaluations of those ongoing should also be considered.

The assessment of the capacity for sector planning within the sector (Criteria 2) brings a score of **8,58 out of 12.** Some improvements in the following areas would be necessary:

* Further enhance strategic planning capacities among units in charge of programming and implementation.
* Enhance capacities among stakeholder participating institutions for strategic planning and M&E on the basis of strategies.
* MoLSS EU Coordination Department can share valuable information gained (as well as manuals, guidelines etc. developed) through the HRD OP with stakeholder institutions.
* Increase capacities for data collection and processing as per indicators to be developed as part of the NES.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms is **4.50 out of 8.** Improvements can be expected in the following areas:

* Different coordination platforms should be consolidated and better integrated to benefit from synergies.
* Formalise coordination platform and WGs at a high political level.

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, an overall rate of **41,78 out of 56** is attained. This score is very close to the upper range of 42 and 56 showing that the sector Employment, HRD, Education and Social Policies is ready for sector approach with some improvements and has sufficient maturity – not withstanding improvements necessary and further assessment of this maturity once the structure and operation of IPA II is also clearer- to enable support through a sector approach. This conclusion is given despite the fact that the NES is still draft. It would nevertheless need to be prepared and adopted. However, there is a strategic framework provided by the HRD OP with sufficient coherence among sub-sector fields that can allow initiating sector based support in the absence of the NES.

## ENERGY SECTOR

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector ?**

There is no main strategy for the Energy Sector, however, the individual sub strategies are outlined in six different strategies/plans.

Although there is no certain main strategy for this sector, there is the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan 2010-2014 is enough general in scope to cover the following five strategic themes:

1. Energy Supply Security
2. The regional and global influence of our country in the area of energy
3. Environment
4. Natural Resources
5. Corporate

This Strategic Plan includes a SWOT which summarizes the reasoning behind the situation and sector/ sub sector background. Regarding the individual strategies within the Energy sector the following one can be mentioned:

1. 10th National Development Plan 2013-2018,
2. Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan,
3. Electricity Market and Security of Supply Strategy Paper,
4. Energy Efficiency Strategy,
5. National Climate Change Strategy 2010–2020, and
6. National Climate Change Action Plan.

The former Ministry of Industry and Trade has enacted several pieces of legislation to harmonize with the corresponding EU legislation on energy labeling of electrical household appliances. Currently the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology is responsible for implementing and following developments in EU legislation in this area.

The former Ministry of Public Works and Settlement has published in December 2008 Regulation on Energy Performance of Buildings, which has subsequently been amended several times. Now the Ministry of Environment and Urban Affairs is responsible for implementation and follow up.

*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub strategies in the Energy sector*

Two of the individual sub strategies have a planned implementation period going beyond 2020.

Except for the power supply, all priorities are coherently in line with the specific objectives of the main Energy strategy. In addition, the defined subsectors cover well the main goal achievements set up for the Energy sector. Only the specific objective for “*Turning out the country into an energy hub and terminal by using the geostrategic position effectively*” is not well addressed by the subsector priorities.

*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity Energy sector strategy*

No major overlaps between sub sectors have been detected. The individual strategies are per se complementary among each other.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

The main reference framework strategy “Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan 2010-2014” for the Energy Sector has been prepared through extensive consultation process as required by the national law[[28]](#footnote-28).

The Plan is not sufficiently mature for analyzing in detailed the problems and needs of the beneficiaries. Nevertheless, in terms of scenario projections for energy consumption and energy balance based on different supply sources, the analysis presented in the main reference strategy is substantially justified targeting the needs of the different subsectors and identifying alternative sources of energy. In addition, the problem tree is correctly use when identifying the cause-root effect in the energy efficiency strategy.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

The Energy sector is considered as one of the priorities in 10th National Development Plan within a detailed and mature context. The sector strategic goal; “*evaluating the energy and mining resources effectively, efficiently, securely, timely and environmentally friendly and therefore reducing the import dependence and bringing the highest contribution into the national prosperity*”, highly contribute to the achievement of the National priority goals and objectives stated at the 10th National Development Plan.

Important progress has been accomplished in the liberalization and restructuring of electricity and natural gas markets in conformity with the EU acquis. “Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA)” has been established in 2001. EMRA is responsible for secondary legislation regarding electricity and natural gas markets. In 2009, the High Planning Council approved the “Electricity Market and Security of Supply Strategy Paper”. Furthermore, in 2012 as a result of the Working Group meetings, the “Turkey-EU Positive Agenda Enhanced EU-Turkey Energy Cooperation” document was prepareded and adopted.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified ? Are the identified objectives coherent ? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact ?**

Under the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan’s five strategic themes, the following specific objectives could be mentioned:

1. Providing Diversity in Resources by Giving Priority to the Domestic Resources
2. Increasing the share of the renewable energy resources within the energy supply
3. Increasing Energy Efficiency
4. Making the free market conditions operate fully and providing for the improvement of the investment environment
5. Providing the diversity of resources in the area of oil and natural gas and taking the measures for reducing the risks due to importation
6. Turning our country into an energy hub and terminal by using our geo-strategic position effectively within the framework of the regional cooperation processes
7. Minimizing the negative environmental impacts of the activities in the energy and natural resources area
8. Increasing the contribution of our natural resources into the national economy
9. Increasing the production of our industrial raw material, metal and non-metal mineral reserves and providing for their utilization on a national scale
10. Increasing the effectiveness in the management of energy and natural resources
11. Being the pioneer and supporter of innovation in the area of energy and natural resources

The majority of the specific objectives are perfectly synchronized with the overall objective of the main relevant strategic document for the Energy sector. However, some of them are outside its vision scope.



*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives Energy sector strategy*

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table clearly shows that Energy sector is considered within the main EU accession strategies.

*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency Energy sector with EU accession strategies*

The Energy sector is clearly identified in the NPAA as a priority as defined in Chapter 15, is considered as one of the main sector of concentration within the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) and has been defined as one of the main reference sectors within the IPA II indicative Policy areas within Component II Regional Development.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies ?**

The priorities/objectives from the main Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan 2010-2014 development strategy contributes to the 9th and 10th National Development Plans, as well as the draft Regional development national Strategy. However, neither of these two documents handles the Energy sector at a regional basis but reflects it more as a framework covering all regions with no difference.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

No AP has been prepared for the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan 2010-2014. Neither there is for any subsectors. Only the National Climate Change Action Plan, involves some objectives and measures related with the Energy sector.

The other subsector documents are;

1. Electricity Market and Security of Supply Strategy Paper,
2. Energy Efficiency Strategy,
3. National Climate Change Strategy 2010–2020.

No specific target indicators, activities and logical steps required for each projects could be found. The Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan presents a good methodological approach for defining, distinguishing, structuring and establishing the logic connections between priorities, programmes and projects.

However, it does not sufficiently identify the structure, role and interest of individual stakeholders for the Energy sector and sub sectors. Furthermore, there is no timeline of implementation including deadlines, financial allocation and expected results, and it fails to provide clear indicators of achievement not to say impact indicators.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place ?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

As no APs are available for the different priority subsectors, no indicators have been also designed at project level. In that sense, projects can be monitored based on their degree of implementation but no monitoring is defined for analyzing the advancement of the majority of the different energy infrastructure.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

For the goals and activities within both the main energy strategy and the institutional strategic plans, deadlines are missing, indicators are not adequately defined and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support. Budget allocation is left to annual budget programmes of the Government and implementation plans.

The financial cooperation with EU in Energy sector has been defined under Component III Regional Development which are represented as follows:



*Table 1.6 Budget commitments from IPA for Component III Regional Development including the Energy Sector*



*Table 1.7 Budget commitments from IPA for Energy Sector between 2007-2011 (MIPD 2011-2013)*

The total IPA contribution for the period 2011-2013 for the Energy sector reached 129,35 M representing almost 5% of the total IPA envelope.

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* Although there is no main strategy for the Energy sector, the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan 2010-2014 can be consider as a global strategic document where the sector based strategies are well defined. The plan is linked to the 9th NDP and is mostly in harmony with the 10th NDP, which entered into force at the mid of 2013. Within the strategy plan, priorities are well identified and the performance indicators are clearly given.
* The situation analyses and SWOTs are not conducted for any strategies. Furthermore, there are no needs assessments made and main problems are not well logically identified. While the plan is based on institutional strategy document, analyses are not based on sector but mostly on institutional capabilities.
* The implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the strategic plans are weakly defined. Except for the legal definition, which mandates strategy monitoring to the Strategic planning department, no specific mechanism is given for monitoring. Further on, there is no clear indication on how to fix specific shift within the plan.
* Within the plan, during the planning process, training and consultancy services were received in strategic planning and performance program subjects for supporting the studies. However, the content of the consultancy and participation are not clear.
* Only three areas count on individual sub strategies which are; 1) Electricity Market and Security of Supply Strategy Paper; 2) Energy Efficiency Strategy; and 3) National Climate Change Strategy 2010–2020. Therefore, most aspects of the sector are not covered by sub-strategies. Furthermore, within these sub strategies, only the National Climate Change Strategy has an AP that was prepared by previously Ministry of Environment and Forestry.
* There is also no specific body for the Monitoring of IPA except the EU department within the MENR which is weak as capacity body in terms of number of staff and qualifications.

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* Coherence between the sub-strategies would benefit from improvement;
* In the absence of an overall Energy strategy, development of indicators, jointly by relevant institutions and organizations heavily involved to date in programme implementation in the sector, would be necessary.
* APs should be prepared including a prioritization of selected projects gathered within the measures/priorities identified. The prioritization could be based on a multi criteria analysis having as a key requirement the source of financing approved.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

Although there is no clearly appointed leading institution in the sector, mainly the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources (MENR) is currently taking the lead within the sector. In addition to the MENR, the main stakeholders are: the Ministry of Environment and Urban Affairs (MoEUA), the Turkish Atomic Energy Authority (TAEK), the Turkish Electricity Transmission Co. (TEIAS), the Petroleum Pipeline Corporation (BOTAS), and the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA) are the main key institutions of the past, on-going and forthcoming programmes. In addition, the Ministry for EU Affairs (MEU), Ministry of Development, Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA), Undersecretariat of Treasury, Development Agencies, Ministry of Science, Technology and Industry and Small and Medium Enterprises Development Administration.

The former Ministry of Industry and Trade has enacted several pieces of legislation to harmonize with corresponding EU legislation on energy labeling of electrical household appliances. Currently the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology is responsible for implementing and following developments in EU legislation in this area.

The former Ministry of Public Works and Settlement has published Regulation on Energy Performance of Buildings in December 2008, which has subsequently been amended several times, and yet the Ministry of Environment and Urban Affairs is responsible for implementing and following it.

The Strategic Planning Department of the MoTMC is in charge of preparing all strategies with input from other related departments, general directorates and from other stakeholders. This role to the department is given by law. In Turkey, each Ministry is obliged to establish Strategic Planning Departments as per the Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, of 2003 which foresees each public institution to prepare strategic plans under the coordination of the Ministry for Development (Article 9. Strategic Planning and Performance Based Budgeting).

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

Based on the document studies, there is not sufficiently qualified staff especially at the specific sector general directorates and the central Strategic Planning Department, which is in charge of developing all strategies, with input from other related departments and general directorates. Hence, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, counts on limited staff for strategic planning and relies on external resources to achieve the necessary requirements.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

Besides, there is no intent for an integrated sector based approach, the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources does not have the capacities for implementation, monitoring and evaluation, both on IPA projects and on nationally funded project, which may provide the basis for a complete sector coherent follow up.

At the moment, the coordination of the sector-based approach is conducted by the EU Affairs and General Directorate of Foreign Relations and EU. Although the EU department under the GD of Foreign relations and EU is the lead department in charge for coordinating the IPA funds within the MENR; there is no specific capacity for the implementation. As the Ministry has no accredited body for the implementation, this duty is given to CFCU. Yet, the implementing body for the 2012 projects is defined as the World Bank and not CFCU. However, the World Bank has re-delegated the implementation of the 2012 projects to the MENR, which makes the situation blur, as the Ministry does not have any capacity to implement the projects. However, the EU sees the World Bank responsible and therefore does not seem to be interested with the subcontracting of the process.

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* Overall institutional capacity for MENR strategic planning and skilled internal resources capacities can be defined as moderate based on the strategy documents prepared
* Due to the diversity of beneficiaries and lack of experience in managing EU IPA funds, no sufficient strategic planning/programming capacities have been built all over these years. Saving measures within the MoE and outsourcing to external expertise have not also helped to strengthen the capacities in terms of Programming.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* Technical know-how and capacity needs to be strengthened especially for the General Directorate of Foreign Affairs and EU on sector-based programming, with particular emphasis on the development of indicators;
* The strategic planning and programming coordination capacities require to be strengthened substantially at central level
* Sector-based monitoring system should be established;
* Coordination capacities with all stakeholders would need support; including the development of code of conduct for consultations, coordination manuals etc.
* Key stakeholders such as CSOs involved in IPA programming should also be provided an increased technical capacity for sectorial planning
* In addition, the new appointed staff within the Energy sector institutional framework should receive the necessary trainings in strategic planning, programming and sector approach

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach ?**

The coordination mechanisms mainly rely in the establishment of working groups and the set-up of coordination procedures. Those are still necessary to be put in place, in particular with the delegated bodies.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach ?** |

Sector donor coordination does not exist at the level of the Energy sector. It should be noted however that for Component II, the major donor in Turkey is the EU. Yet, at individual projects, International Organizations notably EIB, EBRD and the World Bank are also active in Turkey ensuring financing for sustainable projects.

Furthermore, the Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs.

A second EU-WB Turkey Country Day was organised in Brussels on 2 May 2012 in order to explore further areas where synergy and value added can be found through a joint approach.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* There is no specifically defined mechanism for the sector coordination.
* Some strategic level and sector level coordination is apparent, especially for strategies that include multiple stakeholders although the efficiency and effectiveness of these mechanisms cannot be assessed at this stage.
* There is no Sector Donor coordination and no regular meetings with donors take place

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* Sector-based coordination should move from a project/programme basis towards a more strategic scope thus increasing ownership of key institutions involved.
* A Sector Working Group should be formally appointed in order to better coordinate the programming, implementing and monitoring & evaluation process.
* Establishing a sector-specific donor mechanisms, including IFI’s stated above (EIB, EBRD, UNDP, WB, etc.) would improve the coordination.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach ? Is the sector approach suitable ?**

The Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Strategic Plan 2010-2014 represents a relevant and coherent overall strategic framework for the sector. Despite tackling the major sector problems through the different set of global objectives defined, the specific objectives lack the necessary measures.

The strategic plan and the subsectors are missing detailed Action Plan or prioritization of projets. Therefore, it is actually difficult to assess the degree of advancement of the different measures/operations planned. Deadlines are missing, indicators are not adequately defined and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support.

In terms of Criteria 1, the Energy sector obtains a score of 23,42 out of 36, below the minimum at which the sector strategic planning mechanisms can be considered to meet good quality standards. Hence, improvements are necessary:

* Better definition of priorities and measures updating its list of “strategic projects” list and reviewing the new needs to be defined based on the updated European concepts of energy efficiency and renewal source of Energy.
* Designing in a SMART way all relevant output, result and impact indicators as necessary tools for providing adequate monitoring implementation mechanisms.
* There is need for prioritization of selected projects gathered within the measures/priorities identified. The prioritization could be based on a multi criteria analysis having as a key requirement the source of financing approved.

The assessment of the capacities for sector planning within the field Energy (Criteria 2) brings a score of 7,25 out of 12. This score shows the continuous need to improve the capacity and develop experience.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms reaches 4,5 out of 8, bringing to light that some actions to reinforce the interaction and communication mechanisms between the Lead Institution and the other Ministries in addition to developing donor coordination mechanism.

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, we obtain an overall rate of 35,17 out of 56. This score is the lowest among the sectors mapped in Turkey allowing saying that the Sector is theoretically not ready for Sector Approach.

## TRANSPORT SECTOR

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector ?**

The Transport sector is based on the “Turkey's Transport and Communication Strategy 2011-2023”, which is a comprehensive document which presents a detailed analysis of the Transport sector, and gives a full coverage of needs and strategies required for the next years. Although the strategy is related to the already elapsed 9th NDP, it is also correlated with the current 10th NDP.

The sector strategy document is based on the “Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication Council” reports which brings the stakeholders and highlights the development strategy for the Transport sector. The sub strategies are based on the institutions’ own strategic plans. In general, the main strategy covers well all subsectors of the transport sector.

1. Traffic Safety Action Plan
2. Shipping Undersecretariat Strategic Plan (2009 - 2013)
3. Highways GD Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016
4. Civil Aviation GD Strategic Plan 2013 – 2017
5. Railroad GD Strategic Plan 2013 – 2017
6. Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication Strategic Plan 2013-2018

*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub strategies in the Transport sector*

The strategy document of the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication (MoTMAC) has a SWOT that summarizes well the reasoning of the situation and sector/ sub sector background in relation with the Ministry.

Individual strategies within the scope of the transport sector are also based on the institutions’ strategy plans as GD strategy plans listed above. All these ‘subsectors’ strategy documents’ are relevant, except the shipping strategic plan which will be renewed. Highways General Directorate has its own individual planning for safety improvement and for development and maintenance. Each strategic plan has its own background analysis, and a SWOT analysis, which mostly do not have deep rationale assessment and diagnosis. The needs of the different transport modes have been clearly addressed and are in line with the concept of European transport corridors.

Furthermore, the relation with transport and environment is handled at the subsector strategic document “the National Action Plan on Climate Change”.

Activities defined within the strategic documents do not count on sufficient assessment analysis. Mostly analyses are based on identifying the main problems of the sector and reviewing factors affecting its development.

To fill the gap assessment analysis and to cover the implementation base of the sector strategies, a master plan is planned to be prepared which is at negotiation stage with EU in order to provide support via Technical Asssistance.



*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity Transport sector strategy*

No major overlaps between sub sectors have been detected and the individual strategies are, per se, complementary among each other.

The collection of sub strategies covers well the different modes of transport. Roads have developed individual GD strategic Plan similar to the Railway GD and Civil Aviation GD. The maritime transport mode relies mainly on the Strategic Plan of Maritime Undersecretariat.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

The main strategy preparation was coordinated by the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication and based on the process of the Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication Council. The main reference framework strategy for the transport Sector has been prepared through extensive consultation process through the Council. At the 9th Council held in 2009, the national relevant stakeholders were highly involved, where consultation conferences with civil society representatives, regional authorities, thematic public associations and research organizations have been realized.

The specific needs for each subsector of transport sector are well addressed in the institutional strategic plans of each GD. In each GD strategic plan, extensive consultation processes involving more than 100 different stakeholders from central, regional and local level have been carried out.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

The transport sector is considered as one of the priorities in 10th NDP. The “Turkey's Transport and Communication Strategy 2011-2023”, has been approved by the Government in 2011, and all individual subsector plans/strategies, in particular for roads, railways maritimes and civil aviation have been also adopted by the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication.

Important progress has been achieved in alignment in this field and efforts to strengthen the implementation capacity are continuing. The two projects funded under IPA-I 2009 Programming, “Strengthening Intermodal Transport in Turkey” and “Weight and Dimension Controls of Commercial Vehicles” have started and continue to be implemented. Studies are still continuing for realizing the required changes in the Law on Road Traffic (No. 2918). As regards to maritime transport, remarkable progress was achieved. One of the important indicators in this improvement is the placement of Turkey to the white list of the Paris Memorandum of Understanding.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified ? Are the identified objectives coherent ? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact ?**

The overall goal of the main reference strategy covers a sum of objectives: “*To create a sustainable transportation system that offers safe, accessible, affordable, comfortable, fast, environmentally sensitive, continuous, balanced that contribute to improving quality of life and competitiveness of our country and society”*.

*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives Transport sector strategy*

The overall objective is sufficiently large to cover the challenges for the sector. In addition, the specific objectives of the main strategy are corresponding well with the overall objective for the transport sector. The overall rationale and connectivity between needs, problems, situation analysis and objective definition is highly relevant and well formulated.

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table clearly shows that Transport sector is considered in the main EU accession strategies.



*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency Transport sector with EU accession strategies*

The Transport sector is clearly identified in the NPAA as a priority as defined in Chapter 14, remains one of the main sector of concentration within the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) and has been defined as one of the main reference sectors within the IPA II indicative Policy areas within Component II Regional Development.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies ?**

The priorities/objectives from the main transport development strategy contributes to the 9th and 10th NDPs, as well as the draft Regional development National Strategy document, interconnecting different regions to each other and increasing the connectivity of localities to national and international markets.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

No AP has been prepared for the transport strategy general framework. Although the main transport strategy presents a proposed realization plan for the selected “strategic projects, or goals in the words of the plan no specific target indicators, activities and logical steps required for each type of infrastructure projects has been given. No AP can also be found for neither Railways, nor road or Maritimes or Civil Aviation strategic plans. A list of project tasks per infrastructure type is presented. APs for road and maritime transport mode apparently do not exist. Only a very simple AP is prepared on an annual basis for the road safety strategy.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place ?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

Having only institutional strategy plans, and one basic AP, no indicators have been designed at project level. Hence, although projects can be monitored through their implementation, sector based monitoring is not in place. Furthermore, although the certification of DIS has been approved, the existence of the SPO unit does not bring an additional monitoring capacity except the approved and financed IPA projects, as well as with project implementers.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

For the goals and activities within both the national transport strategy and institutional strategic plans, deadlines are missing, indicators are not adequately defined and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support. Budget allocation is left to annual budget programmes of the Government and implementation plans. The financial cooperation with EU in the Transport sector has been under Component III Regional Development for which the allocations are presented hereby:



*Table 1.6 Budget commitments from IPA for Component III Regional Development including the Transport Sector*

The final IPA contribution for the period 2011-2013 for the Transport OP will amount to approximately 336,29 Million Euro , representing 13% of the total IPA contribution



*Table 1.7 Budget commitments from IPA for Transport Sector between 2007-2011 (MIPD 2011-2013)*

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* The Turkey's Transport and Communication Strategy 2023 and the subsector strategy documents (Strategic Plans of GD’s) are well prepared, complementing the priorities of both 9th and 10th NDPs. The Turkey's Transport and Communication Strategy 2023 represents a relevant and coherent overall strategic framework for the sector.
* There is no prioritization between different transport modes in order to improve accessibility and mobility rates.
* If the strategy plans of the General Directorates are seen as subsector strategy documents, the majority of specific objectives for the sector are corresponding well with their respective global objectives defined for the individual sub sector strategies. The strategy plans of the GD’s rely sufficient analysis but have weak identification of resource allocation and division of tasks.
* The main transport strategy is missing a detailed AP or prioritization. Similarly, the individual sub strategies per transport mode do not have an Action Plan. It is stated that a master plan for transport that will cover these issues is in progress. As the current strategy does not have any prioritization of infrastructure per different transport mode, it is stated that this will be included in the master period. Similarly, the individual sub strategies per transport mode do not have an AP and it is actually difficult to assess the degree of advancement of the different measures/operations planned.
* Monitoring of the implementation of the strategy is weakly defined as is mostly based on the legislative requirements of strategic planning.
* Strategies mostly refer to good level of participation of stakeholders in preparatory activities although details are not provided.
* The collection of individual subsector strategies presents no gaps in terms of thematic coverage of the sector, and most of the strategies have not expired and continue to be relevant.
* No prioritization of infrastructure per different transport mode is made in order to better estimate gains in accessibility and mobility rates.
* The consultation process has been widely arranged and extended to several stakeholders including dissemination at regional level within the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication Council.
* Deadlines are missing, indicators are not adequately defined and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support. Budget allocation is left to annual budget programmes of the government and implementation plans.
* For last few years, Transport has been the first sector in terms of concentration of government funds allocation and is still expected to contribute similar amounts in the next years.
* The majority of the specific objectives for the sector are well corresponding with their respective global objectives defined for the individual sub sector strategies.

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* The Turkey's Transport and Communication Strategy 2023 should go together with an AP as a basis for monitoring and following its implementation. The Action Plans related to each of the subsectors and their priorities should be also developed.
* Sub strategies should be separated from institutional strategic plans and should only focus on sub sector. These transport mode sub strategies and its related APs should be in line with the main transport development strategy matching the corresponding needs.
* Financial allocations should be established more at the level of measures/operations than as a simple sum of budget/ cost investments per projects.
* The list of selected projects gathered within the strategy as defined goals should be prioritized based on a multi criteria analysis such as degree of maturity, having as a key requirement the source of financing approved and in particular the public private partnership and co-financing rates.
* Monitoring should be consolidated at priority level and not at project level. Indicators should address not only the maturity of the different project infrastructure phases (identification, financing, feasibility study, technical drawings, construction) but also the degree of advancement of each of the main environment infrastructure projects.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

The lead institution in the implementation of the relevant strategies is the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication (MoTMC). Key stakeholders are the Ministry of Development, the Ministry of Environment and Urban Affairs, the Ministry of Family and Social Policies, the Ministry of Economy, the Ministry of Interior, Municipalities, NGOs (working on issues of disability, environment, urban transport, and passengers), Chambers of commerce and professional associations, and universities.

The Strategic Planning Department of the MoTMC is preparing all strategies with input from other related departments, general directorates and from other stakeholders and Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication Council. This role to the department is given by law. In Turkey, each ministry is obliged to establish Strategic Planning Departments as per the In Turkey the Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, of 2003 foresees each public institution to prepare strategic plans under the coordination of the Ministry for Development (Article 9. Strategic Planning and Performance Based Budgeting).

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

As the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication (MoTMC) covers all sub sectors, sector based approach is not new to the institution. Based on the field interviews, there is a highly qualified staff especially at the specific sector general Directorates and the central Strategic Planning Department, which is in charge of developing all strategies, with input from other related departments and general Directorates.

Furthermore the MoTMC Council is an important asset for Turkey as it creates a highly qualified and collaborative base for the sector at strategic planning with respect to sector approach also.

The assessment shows that strategic planning staff must also take seriously into consideration the project pipeline and verify the maturity of the infrastructure projects in order to verify consistency with the identified priorities and measures.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

All over these years, the MoTMC and its related modal transport institutions have been cumulating significant experience on implementation procedures including reporting based on the projects implemented through IPA fund financing. The new monitoring mechanisms set up within the Transport OP 2007-2013 for the MoTMC will provide the basis for establishing a methodology based on monitoring priorities and measures (including target indicators) giving the opportunity to further expand towards a complete sector coherent follow up.

Within the Transport OP 2007-2013, the MoTMC has benefitted from the DIS assessment and gap plugging exercise for improving its implementation and IPA management systems. In November 2012, CFCU functions related to tendering and contracting and financial management systems have been transferred to the MoTMC. Although there is no intent for an integrated sector based approach due to the limited impact of the EU support within the total national transport budget envelope, the MoTMC has high capacities for implementation, monitoring and evaluation, both on IPA projects and on nationally funded project, which may provide the basis for a sector approach .

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* Overall institutional capacity for strategic planning of Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication and the capacity in terms of skilled internal resources are assessed as very good. The Strategic Planning Department of the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication has a clear mandate and skills in strategic planning.
* A very good level of experience in EU funded programmes, gained in Programming through the preparation and design of and implementing IPA Component III OP Transport 2007-2013.
* The MoTMC and the associated institutions under its umbrella have gained substantial experience in Programming through the preparation, design and recently full decentralized implementation of IPA Component III OP Transport 2007-2013
* Reporting tasks have been prepared based on the implementation of several individual projects. It requires to be based on the AP correctly designed for the sector as a whole as well for individual modal transport subsectors.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* Besides the Transport Maritime and Communication Council, support to improving coordination and consultation mechanisms with key stakeholder institutions is recommended;
* The monitoring mechanisms set up within the OP Transport 2007-2013 for the MoTMC should be reinforced in order in a first phase to consolidated experience in monitoring priorities and measures (including effective tools with target and results indicators) to further expand in the long term towards a complete sector coherent follow up.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach ?**

The main sector coordination mechanism is mainly based on the “Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication Council” event, the 11th of which has been held at September 2013. At the Council, the new strategies are discussed with all stakeholders and highlight the sector development for the following years.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach ?** |

Sector donor coordination does not exist at the level of the transport sector. It should be noted however that for Component II, the major donor in Turkey is the EU. Yet, at individual projects, The main source of external finance provided for transportation sector is the commercial banks notably EIB, EBRD and the World Bank are also active in Turkey within the Transport sector.

The implementation of the Operational Programme for “Transport” under IPA component III started in late 2009 when the Financing Agreement was signed and the management powers were conferred.Furthermore, the Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs. A second EU-WB Turkey Country Day was organized in Brussels on 2 May 2012 in order to explore further areas where synergy and value added can be found through a joint approach.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* The coordination mechanisms mainly rely in the establishment of working groups and the set-up of coordination procedures. There is no Sector Donor coordination in place.
* The Sector Working Group for transport is in charge of programming activities in particular for IPA funds.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* Some consideration can be given to improving the Working Groups with high level participation; in order to better coordinate the programming, implementing and monitoring & evaluation process
* The overall coordination mechanism should be consolidated taking into account all lower level coordination platforms, hence ensuring that micro/sub level coordination mechanisms relate well to the overall sectorial coordination mechanisms.
* Establishing a sector-specific donor mechanisms, including IFI’s stated above (EIB, EBRD, UNDP, WB, etc.) would improve the coordination.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach ? Is the sector approach suitable ?**

“Turkey's Transport and Communication Strategy 2011-2023 represents an overall relevant and coherent strategic framework for the sector. Despite not addressing well the multimodality aspects and putting too much emphasis on developing specific objectives more than addressing priorities and measures, the main strategy covers well all transport modes. Therefore, no prioritization of infrastructure per different transport mode exists. Yet, it is missing a detailed Action Plan or prioritization of infrastructure. Similarly, the individual sub strategies per transport mode do not have an Action Plan.

Still, the strategies in place are suitable for a more programme based support to be provided by the EU and other donors as they identify priority actions, financial needs and the timeframe for the required support.

In terms of Criteria 1, the Transport sector obtains a score of 29,21 out of 36. Yet, some improvements are still necessary:

* Sub strategies should be separated from institutional strategic plans and should only focus on sub sector.
* Preparing detailed Action Plans for the strategy as a whole and for each transport mode should be prepared including a prioritization of selected projects gathered within the measures/priorities identified.
* Coherence between the sub-strategies would benefit from improvement; especially when selected projects are prioritized based on a multi criteria analysis

The assessment of the capacities for sector planning within the Transport (Criteria 2) brings a score of 10,25 out of 12, which is the highest among all sectors in Turkey. This score shows the potential and the experience gained so far:

* The good level of monitoring capacity on the project level should be strengthened in terms of strategic monitoring capacity per performance indicators.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms reaches 5,75 out of 8. Improvements can be expected in overall Donor Coordination

The cumulated scores for the three criteria a rate of 45,21 out of 56, the highest among the sectors analyzed in Turkey, and shows that the Sector is theoretically ready for Sector Approach.

## ENVIRONMENT SECTOR

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector ?**

There is no specific strategy covering the sector, yet the “EU Integrated Environmental Approximation Strategy” can be seen as an overall document that highlights the gap that should be closed to reach the EU within the sector of Environment. It has been adopted in 2006, before the opening of the Chapter 27 negotiations. The work plan and costs related to transposition and implementation of the EU directives have been laid down including a financing plan for the heavy cost investment needs. The same priorities are covered by the 9th and 10th NDPs.

The MoEU has designed a Strategic Plan (2013-17) which covers Strategic Environmental Assessment study and implementation in all sectors by 2017. Yet, the strategic plan of the Ministry is an institutional plan and does not only contain actions within the Environment sector, but also involves “Urban Planning and Transformation” and “public works”.

The strategic goals of the plan are as following;

1. Healthy and livable urban spaces (summary);
2. To prevent environmental pollution, raise environmental standards, combat climate change and to improve and preserve natural assets;
3. Improve monitoring system of Public works (summary);
4. Capacity building for efficient and high quality service;

Within these four goals, the second defines the Environmental framework sector and has 18 sub targets.

National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2007-2017) is the main policy document on nature conservation, which set up the basis for nature and biological diversity protection and sustainable development of the ecosystem. In the area of climate change mitigation and adaptation, National Climate Change Strategy (2010-20) and National Climate Change Action Plan (2011-23) are relevant policy documents setting out the objectives and a time frame for actions. Waste management action plan (2008-2012) and the Clean Air Action Plan (2010-2013), which identifies some measures and goals for improving quality of the air, are the other two actions plans of the sector.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subsectors/priorities** | **Environment** | Adopted | Period |
| Waste management | Waste Management Action Plan | 2008 | 2008-2012 |
| Waste water treatment |  |  |  |
| Air quality | Clean Air Action Plan | 2010 | 2010-2013 |
| Natural resources |  |  |  |
| Climate Change | National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy & Action Plan | 2010 | 2010-2020 |
| Biologic Diversity | National Biologic Diversity Strategy and Action Plan | 2007 | ? |

*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub strategies in the Environment sector*

Although the majority of the individual sub strategies have APs, only National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy & Action Plan has a planned implementation period going beyond the 2020. The rest have newly extended and need renewal.



*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity Environment sector strategy*

In general, priorities are well covering all main specific objectives for the Environment sector. No major overlaps between sub sectors have been detected. Degree of coherence and complementarity among the priorities are more than satisfactory.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

In the majority of the cases, strategies have been prepared through extensive consultation process involving different stakeholders from central, regional and local level.

The main strategy preparation was coordinated by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization Strategy Department as required by law, which is also the institutional strategy plan of the Ministry.

Yet, the strategic plan lives a collision due to the duality of ‘’environment and ‘urban’, which distorts the overall approach to the sector.

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

Environment has been defined one of the priority sectors in order to achieve the overall objective of sustainable development and livable urban. The main reference strategic document for the Environment sector “EU Integrated Environmental Approximation Strategy” has been approved at government level in 2006 and its update is at the Ministry’s agenda.

If the approximation strategy is put aside, no clear reference strategic framework has been approved by the Government so far. However, the proposed measures are very specific and carried according to the institutional strategic plan in line with the problems and related objectives set up in the main strategy for enhancing the sector.

In the past years, the reforms in the field of environment have been oriented towards improvement of legal and institutional system and establishment of infrastructure. Furthermore, achievement has been reached in the field of international and regional integrations through ratification of conventions, protocols and signing international agreements. Still further efforts to improve and ensure implementation of environment legislation measures as well to strengthen the capacities of the administration for implementing and monitoring IPA funds.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified ? Are the identified objectives coherent ? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact ?**

At the “EU Integrated Environmental Approximation Strategy” objectives are clearly stated. However, at the strategic plan of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, the specific goal is " *to provide high-quality urban Life and sustainable environment, business and operations on planning, construction, conversion, and environmental management will be made with participatory, regulatory, supervisory and solution-oriented approach*" and the strategic goals of the plan are as following:

* Healthy and livable urban spaces;
* To prevent environmental pollution, raise environmental standards, combat climate change and to improve and preserve natural assets;
* Improve monitoring system of Public works;
* Capacity building for efficient and high quality service;

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Environment** |
| **Specific Objectives** | to provide high-quality urban Life and sustainable environment, business and operations on planning, construction, conversion, and environmental management will be made with participatory, regulatory, supervisory and solution-oriented approach |
| air quality assessment will be made and published, national emission inventories and projections to be prepared; strategic noise maps in the dense metropolitan railways, highways and industrial areas will be prepared | x |
| For integrated pollution prevention and cleaner production best technical guidance documents will be prepared and put into practice in at least 5 industries. | x |
| Legislative acts will be adopted and reports will be prepared as required by international obligations, | x |
| for the reduction of Air, land and sea pollutants, waste collection and tracking system will be improved | x |
| Integrated area management approach within the framework of cooperation with national and international investigation of natural and cultural values, conservation and monitoring will be provided for protected areas; | x |

*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives Environment sector strategy*

As the overall goal has been defined in a very broad way, all specific objectives can be connected with it. There is a huge overlapping as 18 sub objectives exists only for the Environment component. When summarized and grouped; *air quality assessment will be made and published, national emission inventories and projections to be prepared; strategic noise maps in the dense metropolitan railways, highways and industrial areas will be prepare; For integrated pollution prevention and cleaner production best technical guidance documents will be prepared and put into practice in at least 5 industries; Legislative acts will be adopted and reports will be prepared as required by international obligations; for the reduction of Air, land and sea pollutants, waste collection and tracking system will be improved; Integrated area management approach within the framework of cooperation with national and international investigation of natural and cultural values, conservation and monitoring will be provided for protected areas*. They are all relevant and in line with EU initiatives. Yet, they should nevertheless be formulated in a more focused way.

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table clearly shows that Environment sector is considered in the main EU accession strategies.



*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency Environment sector with EU accession strategies*

The Environment sector is clearly identified in the NPAA as a priority as defined in Chapter 27, is considered as an important sectors within the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) and has been defined as one of the main reference sectors within the IPA II indicative Policy areas within Component II Regional Development.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies ?**

The priorities/objectives from the main environment strategic plan contributes to the 10th NDP as a whole, which means that although in general Environment is included in the NDP and draft Regional Development National Strategy, its involvement is rather as a framework. In the 10th NDP, there is a section for environment and the draft Regional Development National Strategy includes environment within all sectors focusing on regional development and environmental protection.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

If the approximation strategy is put aside, no AP has been prepared for the Environment strategy general framework. As the main environment strategy is an institutional strategic plan document for both environment and urbanization, it presents a proposed realization plan for the selected “strategic projects”. No specific target indicators, activities and logical steps required for each type of infrastructure projects can be found.

For waste management, detailed follow up is carried out at project infrastructure level but no proper timeframe and follow up measures is defined so far. Both given timeframe and budget needs are more designed as a wish list and does not seem to be based on detailed analysis.

The ‘Clean Air Strategy and Action Plan’ provides valuable information from analysis, and gives scenarios for regions, but does not provide sufficient strategic actions.

The biodiversity strategy provides a list of actions to be taken for the realization of the strategic targets. Yet, no time frame and monitoring mechanism for the actions exists.

In each AP, the bodies responsible for specific actions are not clearly given. Although all responsible bodies are listed their roles are not clear according to the APs. Furthermore, the monitoring mechanisms for the implementation processes remains very weak.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place ?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

Although there is four APs for subsectors, no indicators have been designed at project level. Furthermore, as projects are monitored through their implementation, monitoring in terms of analyzing the advancement of a certain corridor through different sections are missing. The strategic plan and the APs have a very draft basic chapter on monitoring and evaluation.

Although the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization is the lead institution for the sector, both Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs are coordinating the monitoring mechanisms according to their roles given by the Law. However, despite having the IPA I Component III Regional Development, Environment priority approved, the monitoring approach is still based on project and not as a whole sector. For all projects financed under IPA I Component I, the SPO unit at the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization is responsible for gathering the information related to all projects being implemented within the Sector.

Furthermore, the APs to implement the strategies within the Environment sector are more presented as a list of projects than some specific measures per component helping to achieve the pursued objective, and are not clearly distinguished from their corresponding outputs/results indicators.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

The Approximation Strategy gives a mature and well-studied budget based on cost according to analysis. However, financial resources are not ensured.

For the goals and activities within both the national Environmental Strategy within the institutional strategic plan of the Ministry of Environment and urbanization, deadlines are missing, indicators are not adequately defined and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support. Budget allocation for projects are left to annual budget programmes of the government and implementation plans.

Consequently, financial data are presented more from the bottom up approach (individual cost calculations of specific projects per core content/components) than a budget allocation per measures/operations. Furthermore, which projects will be implemented at which year is left to the budget discussions at government level. In these annual programmes, budget allocation by the Government remains insufficient to enable the programmes to meet their goals.

The projects' portfolio and investments reached up to project applications of EUR 855 million EU contribution, including all available pre-accession instruments. Under Component I and III, 85 contracts were signed so far. 22 water, wastewater or solid waste infrastructure projects were approved and are at different stages of implementation.

the final IPA contribution for the period 2007-2013 will amount to approximately EUR 682 million for the Environment OP.

The financial cooperation with EU in Environment sector has been under Component III Regional Development, the allocations of which has been as follows:



*Table 1.6 Budget commitments from IPA for Component III Regional Development including the Environment Sector*

*Table 1.7 Budget commitments from IPA for Environment Sector between 2007-2011 (MIPD 2011-2013)*

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* A balance has still to be found at the MoEU between the environment and development agendas.
* The analysis of needs have been carried out several years ago and requires an update in terms of projects completed, on-going, under preparation or simply abandoned.
* Most aspects of the sector are covered by sub-strategies; complementarity and coherence of sub-strategies to the overall sector strategy is assessed as above average.
* The sector strategies have good coherence with 9th and 10th National Development Plans as well as EU enlargement related documents. The strategies present no gaps in terms of thematic coverage of the sector. Main problems and Priority areas are identified; Measures are specified and the given recommendations are appropriate.
* A large number of the strategies have expired;
* The APs list a certain number of measures/projects that are well corresponding with their respective global objectives.

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* The sector requires an overall framework to provide coherence and coordination of actions to be implemented avoiding when possible overlaps. The EU Integrated Environmental Approximation Strategy had been prepared seven years ago so requires to be reviewed. This strategy should be relevant for both Ministries and it should go together with an AP as a basis for monitoring and following up its implementation.
* The list of selected projects gathered within the measures/priorities should be prioritized based on a multi criteria analysis such as degree of maturity, having as a key requirement the source of financing approved and in particular the public private partnership and co-financing rates.
* Monitoring should be defined not at project level but at priority level.
* There is need for an overall AP for the Environment Sector, besides the Approximation Strategy and İnstitutional Strategic Plan. The missing Action Plans related to each Waste water treatment and Natural resources should be also developed.
* Action Plans should include financial allocations that should be established at the level of measures/operations.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

The lead institution in this sector is the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. However in the area of water, biodiversity and nature conservation, the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs is in charge. At the river basin management plans, the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs defined the roles and responsibilities of Basin Management Commissions.

The Strategic Planning Department is in charge of developing all strategies, with input from other related departments and general Directorates;

In Turkey, each ministry is obliged to establish Strategic Planning Departments as per the Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, of 2003 which foresees each public institution to prepare strategic plans under the coordination of the Ministry for Development (Article 9. Strategic Planning and Performance Based Budgeting). In this respect, the Strategic Planning Department of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization has been in charge of developing all strategies with input from other related departments and general Directorates.

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

The split of the former Ministry of Environment and Forestry into two in 2011 and the further reorganizations within the new Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU) have substantially weakened Turkey’s administrative capacity to pursue robust environmental and climate change policy. Hence, following the transfer of the water sector from the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization to the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs, the strategic planning capacity has decreased and most trained and qualified staff has left the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization.

The duality of the ministries has resulted in high circulation of personnel in the Ministry of Environment after the separation of Forestry from the Ministry. Some well-educated and qualified staff left the ministry in order to work at the other. This was translated into an important capacity decrease.

Hence, the very high rate of staff turnover is something to worry about, as it has resulted in a loss of competence in specialized units. There are some concerns relating to the loss of provincial competences in the field of environmental management, in particular as regards inspection, monitoring and permits.

Furthermore, in practice it seems that staff has a substantial workload, are working in several activities at the same time and no clear distinction between implementation and monitoring is made.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

Before the separation of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), its institutions have been cumulating significant experience on implementation procedures including reporting based on the waste water infrastructure projects implemented. Although this kind of reporting is merely focused on project results, capacity has been dramatically lost after 2011 with the separation of Environment from Forestry and Water Affairs.

All over these years, the MEF and its related environmental delegated body institutions have been cumulating significant experience on implementation procedures including reporting based on the projects implemented through IPA fund financing. The new monitoring mechanisms set up within the Environment OP 2007-2013 for the MEF have provided the basis for establishing a methodology based on monitoring priorities and measures (including target indicators) giving the opportunity to further expand towards a complete sector coherent follow up. At that time the, MEF benefitted from the DIS assessment and gap plugging exercise for improving its implementation and IPA management systems. In January 2011, CFCU functions related to tendering and contracting and financial management systems have been transferred to the MEF.

Based on the field interviews and on institutional documents, within both Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs, it is not clear how the capacities built within the MEF in terms of monitoring priorities and measures (including target indicators) will remain within the new structure of MoEU.

Therefore besides the average capacity of the MoEU, due to the separation of the MoFWA, the IPA department in the MoEU has a good internal capacity in strategic planning, not very high turnover.

There is no intent for an integrated sector based approach, and despite the separation of the Ministries, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization has high capacities for implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* The separation in 2011 of the former Ministry of Environment and Forestry into two and the further reorganizations within the new Ministry of Environment and Urbanization have substantially weakened Turkey’s administrative capacity to pursue robust environmental and climate change policy. This has substantially influenced the development of the sector environment’.
* The duality of the two Ministries has resulted in high circulation of personnel in the Ministry of Environment after the separation of Forestry from the Ministry. Some well-educated and qualified staff left the Ministry in order to work at the other. This resulted in an important capacity decrease.
* The very high rate of staff turnover is something to worry about, as it has resulted in a loss of competence in specialized units. There are some concerns related to the loss of provincial competences in the field of environmental management, in particular as regards to inspection, monitoring and permits.
* Monitoring and implementation mechanisms have been decentralized however there is no certainty how transfer of know-how will be ensured with the new Operating Structure.
* Systematic participation of external stakeholders such as civil society is not always apparent and strategies mostly refer to good level of participation of stakeholders in preparatory activities although details are not provided.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* More clearly defined relations and collaborative working among Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs are needed. Especially support to improving coordination and consultation mechanisms with key stakeholder institutions is recommended;
* Although the internal capacity knowledge is high, in order to strengthen its capacity efficiently, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization should stabilize the non- permanent staff and set up the necessary steps to retain the skilled working force, in particular those who have gained experience under OP Environment 2007-2013
* Coordination capacities of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization with all stakeholders would need support; Key stakeholders such as CSOs involved should also be provided increased technical capacity for sectorial planning
* The monitoring mechanisms set up within the OP Environment 2007-2013 for the MoEU should be reinforced in order in a first phase to consolidated experience in monitoring priorities and measures (including effective tools with target and results indicators) to further expand in the long term towards a complete sector coherent follow up.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –* Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach?**

The coordination mechanisms mainly rely in the establishment of working groups and set up of coordination procedures primarily dedicated to programme/project level monitoring.

Some strategic level and sector level coordination is apparent, especially for strategies that include multiple stakeholders although the efficiency and effectiveness of these mechanisms cannot be assessed at this stage.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach ?** |

Sector donor coordination does not exist at the level of the Environment sector. Yet, at individual projects, International Organizations notably EIB, EBRD and the World Bank are also active in Turkey but it should be noted that their role in Transport sector. The donor coordination working group on Sustainable Development (Environment, Energy and Climate Change) is chaired by UNDP and UNIDO.

Furthermore, the Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs.

A second EU-WB Turkey Country Day was organised in Brussels on 2 May 2012 in order to explore further areas where synergy and value added can be found through a joint approach.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* Following the transfer of the water sector from the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization to the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs, institutional coordination has become problematic due to the lack of a clear division of responsibilities.
* Mostly project based coordination exists with key ministries and agencies; the coordination mechanisms mainly rely in the establishment of working groups and set up of coordination procedures.
* There is no Sector Donor coordination in place. Donor coordination is managed at central level by the Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* Sector-based coordination should move from programme basis towards a more strategic scope thus increasing ownership of key institutions involved
* Establishing a sector-specific donor mechanisms, including IFI’s stated above (EIB, EBRD, UNDP, WB, etc.) would improve the coordination.
* Internal capacities of the representatives of the Sector Working Group in terms of guidance and preparation of the Programming and strategic planning needs to be consolidated

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach ? Is the sector approach suitable ?**

The Approximation strategy represents a relevant and coherent overall strategic framework for the Environment sector. The analysis of needs have been carried out several years ago and requires an update in terms of projects completed, on-going, under preparation or simply abandoned. However, the Institutional Strategic Plan lacks a sectorial strategic framework due to the urban–environment duality. It is missing a detailed AP or prioritization of infrastructure. Similarly, the individual sub strategies and their APs do not have a prioritization and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support. To address these needs the implementation of projects necessitates an overall sustainable environmental investment strategic and integrated approach (including river basin management plans in the water sector)..

In terms of Criteria 1, the score obtained 26,94 out of 36 shows that the sector strategic planning mechanisms meet rather average standards. Hence, some improvements are proposed:

* Improving the prioritization of actions/measures and the quality of the subsector APs by building them more as a sector programme implementing and monitoring tool and not as a cumulative list of projects per core content/components
* These APs should include financial allocations that should be established at the level of measures/operations.
* Designing in a SMART way all relevant output, result and impact indicators as necessary tools for providing adequate monitoring implementation mechanisms.
* Updating the Approximation strategy in terms of projects completed, on-going, under preparation or simply abandoned.
* Monitoring should be defined not at project level but at priority level. Indicators should address not only the maturity of the different project infrastructure phases (identification, financing, feasibility study, technical drawings, construction) but also the degree of advancement of each of environmental infrastructure.

Capacities for sector planning within the Environment (Criteria 2) are judged almost satisfactory. The score of 10 out of 12 shows the potential and the experience gained so far in comparison to other sectors.

* Improving collaboration among Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs is needed.
* Improving coordination and consultation mechanisms with key stakeholder institutions is recommended;
* Ministry of Environment and Urbanization should stabilize the non- permanent staff and set up the necessary steps to retain the skilled working force.

The score for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms reaches 5,5 out of 8, shows the need for improving coordination mechanisms and donor meetings within the Environment sector to take place on an annual basis.

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, we obtain an overall rate of 42,44 out of 56 which might be interpreted as the Sector is ready for a Sector Approach through EU IPA financing.

## AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT SECTOR

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: Quality of the beneficiary’s strategic planning (assessment and analysis)**

**CRITERIA 1: National sector strategies and budget appropriation**

***Criteria 1.1: Overall relevance***

* ***EQ1.1 –*To what extent the examined sector is covered by active sector strategies, which are relevant to the sector? To what extent are sector strategies coherent and complementary to each other in a strategic framework for a particular sector ?**

The Agriculture and Rural Development Sector in Turkey counts on a main sectoral strategy that had been prepared seven years ago covering the period 2007-2013. Already expired, the Strategy is a coherent document which presents a detailed background analysis of the agriculture sector and also has a SWOT that summarizes the reasoning of the situation and sector background. Nevertheless, the objectives are defined taking into account the problems identified and seem to correspond to the real needs of the sector.

The Strategic Objectives of the National Rural Development Strategy are :

* 1. Economic Development and Increasing Job Opportunities
  2. Strengthening Human Resources, Organization Level and Local Development Capacity
  3. Improving Rural Physical Infrastructure Services and Life Quality
  4. Protection and Improvement of Rural Environment

The second document that can be considered as a sector strategy which has recently been adopted by the Ministry and is in correlation with the National Rural Development Strategy is the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (2013-2017) which prioritizes EU alignment.

Organic Agriculture Strategic Plan (2012-2016) is the only subsector strategic plan. Besides the Organic Agriculture Strategic Plan, there is an action plan prepared by the former Ministry of Environment and Forestry, which is the National Climate Change Action Plan (2011–2023) and the National Climate Change Strategy Paper (2010-2020) aim at preparing Turkey to adapt to climate change and to mitigate its effects on the agriculture sector.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subsectors/priorities** | **Agriculture and Rural Development** | Adopted | Period |
| Plant Health, Animal Health and Welfare |  |  |  |
| institutional Capacity |  |  |  |
| Protection and Improvement of Rural Environment | National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy & Action Plan | 2010 | 2010-2020 |
| The reliability of food (supply safety) |  |  |  |
| Rural infrastructure and diversification of economic activities in rural areas |  |  |  |
| Organic Agriculture | Organic Agriculture Strategic Plan | 2012 | 2012-2016 |

*Table 1.1.1 Number of sub strategies in the Agriculture and Rural Development sector*

The majority of the individual sub strategies do not have a plan. The subsectors relies on the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (2013-2017)

*Table 1.1.2 Degree of coherence and complementarity Agriculture and Rural Development sector strategy*

No major overlaps between sub sectors have been detected. The main strategic goals defined in the ARD sector are coherent with the identified subsectors/priorities. Synergies can be found in most of the topics as they are largely interrelated, this is particularly relevant for the first specific objective.

***Criteria 1.2: Ownership/ stakeholder involvement / Ownership involvement***

* ***EQ1.2 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the sector strategies are clearly defined and address the identified problems and needs of beneficiaries? To what extent are sector strategies consulted with stakeholders?**

The main reference framework strategy for the ARD sector has been prepared in the light of the 2nd Agriculture Council which has been organized with the participation of almost all stakeholders, which included several participatory workshops, focused groups and consultation conferences with civil society representatives, regional authorities, thematic public associations and universities.

On the other hand, the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (2013-2017) has been prepared through extensive consultation process as required by the national law, involving stakeholders from central, regional and local level. Both strategies have been prepared and coordinated by the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock

***Criteria 1.3: Political commitment/endorsement***

* ***EQ1.3 –*To what extent the government has defined as a priority a specific sector? To what extent are sector strategies endorsed by the relevant competent authorities? To what extent sector strategies contribute to the achievement of National priority goals and objectives?**

The 10th NDP over-arches the sectorial strategies and provides the pillars for establishing a well-organised, highly productive and competitive sector as; “*It is aimed to the creation of an agricultural sector that is based on advanced technology, has solved the infrastructure problems, with efficient organization, sustainable use of natural resources, and effective and demand-driven production structure increased international competitiveness, to ensure a society based on adequate and balanced diet”.*

The National Rural Development Strategy (2007-2013) has been approved at government level, and the IPARD Programme (2007-2013) concentrate on enhancing rural areas and meeting EU food safety standards. Yet, although the National Rural Development Strategy (2007-2013) has expired, the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (2013-2017) overtakes the strategies within the same lien and corresponds with the 10th NDP.

***Criteria 1.4 Clear indication of objectives***

* ***EQ1.4 –*To what extent are the objectives stated in the strategies clearly identified ? Are the identified objectives coherent ? How well formulated are they? Are there still relevant in order to achieve impact ?**

Compatible with Turkey’s long-term development perspective, the main purpose in the National Rural Development Strategy (2007-2013) is to *“improve and ensure sustainability of living and job conditions of rural community in their territory, in harmony with urban areas, based on utilization of local resources and potential, and protection the environmental and cultural assets”.*  This objective is well formulated but do not correspond to the overall objectives in the plan.

As the overall strategic goal in the plan is as; “*In need of our country and the world market, to identify and implement policy in order to perform accessibility of food a reliable and high-quality agricultural products, ensure the sustainable use of agricultural and ecological resources, to raise the standard of living in rural areas”*.



*Table 1.4 Degree of coherence of objectives Agriculture and Rural Development sector strategy*

All specific objectives are connected with the overall goal pursued within the main strategy. No doubt they are relevant enough but they should have been addressed more in connection with the problem tree finding the root casual effect.

The overall rationale and connectivity between needs, problems, situation analysis and objective definition is highly relevant and well formulated.

***Criteria 1.5 Consistency with EU accession strategy***

* ***EQ1.5 –*To what extent are priorities/objectives stated in the strategies consistent with the EU accession strategy?**

The following table clearly shows that ARD sector is considered in the main EU accession strategies.

*Table 1.5 Degree of consistency Agriculture and Rural Development sector with EU accession strategies*

The ARD sector is clearly identified in the NPAA as a priority as defined in Chapter 11, is considered as one of the main sector of concentration within the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) and has been defined as one of the main reference sectors within the IPA II indicative Policy areas within Component II Agriculture. Furthermore, for the sector, the screening Reports Approved at the Council of the European Union with Benchmarks.

For the agriculture sector, although there are important gaps with the EU acquis which has to be better aligned, the strategic documents do not emphases an opposition to the EU acquis. Therefore the high score comes from the fact that the strategies of agriculture only developed on areas that are in line with EU, and are very narrow. Most areas that need to be aligned with EU acuis are omitted at strategic documents, which make the score of the strategic documents high, although there is need for important steps for the sector to reach the total EU policy framework.

***Criteria 1.6 Consistency with relevant regional strategies***

* ***EQ1.6 –*To what extent priorities/objectives stated in the strategies contribute relevant national regional strategies ?**

The priorities/objectives from National Rural Development Strategy contribute to the 9th and 10th NDPs, as well as the draft Regional Development National Strategy document. Although the draft Regional Development National Strategy document includes Agriculture as an important overall topic, it also handles Rural Development as a tool for the under developed regions and slightly omits the needs of rural development in developed regions. On the other hand, RD aspects of agriculture are partially addressed by National Rural Development Strategy for the Agriculture and Rural Development sector, considering the development differences between the regions.

***Criteria 1.7 Timeframe***

* ***EQ1.7* –To what extent are sector strategies followed by concrete measures/actions for implementation, which are defined with clear timeframe and responsibilities for implementation? To what extend are long-term strategies supported by annual plans for implementation?**

No action AP has been prepared for the National Rural Development Strategy, or for the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. No specific target indicators, activities and logical steps required for each projects can be found. Not even the link is established with the specific objectives previously identified.

Only a very simple Action Plan is prepared on Organic Agriculture, in which a set of recommendations per components are defined at the end of the document. The National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy & Action Plan, on the other hand, aims at preparing Turkey to adapt to climate change and to mitigate its effects on the agriculture sector.

There is no budget cost calculations, assigned responsibility bodies for implementation, defined timeframe and estimated deadlines. Furthermore, no clear indicators of achievement not to say impact indicators are provided. The roles given by law to the Government bodies are seen enough.

***Criteria 1.8 Monitoring framework / indicators***

* ***EQ1.8 –*Are there monitoring mechanisms in place ?To what extent do objectives stated in the sector strategies include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators to measure progress towards achievement of objectives?**

As no Action Plans are available for neither main strategy nor subsectors, no indicators have been also designed at project level. In that sense, projects can be monitored through their implementation but no monitoring can be found in terms of analyzing the advancement in the sector.

Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, as the lead institution for the sector, has been coordinating the monitoring mechanisms. The monitoring approach is still based on projects and not for the sector as a whole.

For all projects financed under IPARD I Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute (ARDSI) is responsible for gathering the information related to all projects being implemented within the Sector.

***Criteria 1.9 Budget appropriation***

* ***EQ1.9 –* To what extent have the sector strategies been appropriately costed and ensured with financial resources (internal and/or external sources, EC, other donors)? To what extent have financial resources been earmarked for the implementation of measures, actions, activities from the national state budget or other governmental spending sources?**

In general, strategies are not appropriately costed and there is no financial resource ensured. Financial data are presented more from the bottom up approach (individual cost calculations of specific projects per core content/components) than a budget allocation per measures/operations. The financial needs of specific projects are discussed and accepted at the annual budget discussion at the parliament, and therefore, there is no long-term allocation of budget per subsectors.

In the case of IPARD funds, through the Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute (ARDSI), this case is different and the budgets allocated for projects are previously negotiated and ensured. Furthermore, the ARD sector has been receiving since several years a substantial part of the IPA contribution envelope.

As seen below, the *Agriculture and Rural Development* had an increasing commitment of EU funds. National co-financing has been maintained between 10-20% of the total budget.

*Table 1.6 Budget commitments from IPA for the Agriculture and Rural Development sector*

*Table 1.7 Budget commitments from IPA for Agriculture and Rural Development Sector between 2007-2011 (MIPD 2011-2013)*

Conclusions CRITERIA 1:

* There is no specific Action plan for any subsector.
* There are no written procedures/ manuals for monitoring of the overall strategy.
* Although the overall sectorial strategy comparatively covers most priorities, and represents a relevant and coherent overall strategic framework for the sector, in which main problems are identified, its date has expired in 2013 and a draft new one is not in circulation yet.
* The Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (2013-2017) is still an institutional strategic plan and lacks important assets of a sector oriented strategy.
* Deadlines are missing, indicators are not adequately defined and most of them do not refer to any budget financial support.
* Differences between output, result and impact indicators for monitoring the implementation of strategies seem not to be correctly understood by the relevant authorities.

Recommendations CRITERIA 1:

* The main Rural Development Strategy requires updating and requires to be extended in time covering at least the period up to 2020.
* There is need for subsector strategies which should be in coherence with the strategic framework given at the Rural Development Strategy, each sub strategies and its related APs should be in line with the main development strategy matching the corresponding needs.
* Action Plans should be prepared including a prioritization of selected projects gathered within the measures/priorities identified.
* Financial allocations should be established more at the level of measures/operations than as a simple sum of budget/ cost investments per projects.

**CRITERIA 2: Institutional setting, leadership, capacity and performance framework**

***Criteria 2.1 Lead institution***

* ***EQ2.1 –* Are the administrative and organisational structures in place ensuring strategic planning in each sector? Is there a clear leadership (ownership) of specific government institutions in sector policy areas?**

The Strategic Planning Department of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock is in charge of preparing all strategies with input from other related departments, general Directorates and from other stakeholders. This role to the department is given by law. In Turkey, each inistry is obliged to establish Strategic Planning Departments as per the Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, of 2003 which foresees each public institution to prepare strategic plans under the coordination of the Ministry for Development (Article 9. Strategic Planning and Performance Based Budgeting).

With regards to IPA I 2007 - 2013, the Turkish Government has established accredited structures for Decentralized Implementation System (DIS) of IPA funds and specifically the Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute (ARDSI) which is the lead department in charge for coordinating and implementing IPARD funds. The ARDSI ensures monitoring on the OP level. However, this monitoring capacity is not diffused the overall Ministry and Agriculture and Rural development sector.

***Criteria 2.2 Capacity assessment***

* ***EQ2.2 –*What is the overall level of assessment of the capacities, needs and potentials of the beneficiary country in the field of strategic planning in the selected sectors with respect to a sector approach?**

As the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock covers all sub sectors, sector based approach is not new to the institution. Based on the field interviews, there is a highly qualified staff especially at the specific sector general directorates and the central Strategic Planning Department, which is in charge of developing all strategies, with input from other related departments and general Directorates.

The Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute (ARDSI) has the capacity to monitor, implement and plan the activities, where particular distinction can be made for staff assigned to Programming, implementation and monitoring. It has qualified sufficient staff of approximately 2000, for the implementation and monitoring individual projects at the 42 provincial offices. However, the strategic planning capacity is less developed especially for the staff other than ARDSI where there is need for training for capacity building not only on strategic planning but also on monitoring.

For this, to spill over the capacity in terms of monitoring and planning of ARDSI would improve the Ministry’s strategic planning and sector approach in ARD. However, this should be taken cautiously as it should not cause a capacity loss at the ARDSI.

***Criteria 2.3 Actual implementation***

* ***EQ2.3 –*Are there effective tools/mechanisms in each beneficiary country which ensure the quality in drafting, adopting, implementation, revising, monitoring and reporting of sector strategies within a sector?**

The Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock with its General Directorates have been cumulating significant experience on implementation procedures including reporting based on the projects. Although, this kind of reporting is merely focused on project results, the sectoral characteristic of the Ministry gives the opportunity to further expand towards a complete sector coherent follow up.

Furthermore, the Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute is gaining experience through IPARD fund financing. However, as the unit is strictly separated from the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, the staff at the ministry cannot benefit from the experience of the implementation of the projects at the Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute.

At the end of 2012, the delegation of decentralized management system was extended to additional offices of IPARD Agency. Still, absorption capacity has not been sufficient translated into a de-commitment of 2009 funds in December 2012.

Conclusions CRITERIA 2:

* Overall institutional capacity for strategic planning of Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock is assessed as over average.
* The Strategic Planning Department of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock has a clear mandate and skills in strategic planning related issues. Yet, sectorial strategies do not seem to be at the agenda, and their Action Plan development capacity is considerably under developed.
* Furthermore, the strategic planning capacities are still not sufficient and there is no clear separation of functions between strategic planning, implementation and monitoring & evaluation. Staff has to work at the same time which in some cases decreases their effectiveness.
* The Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute has sufficient and skilled personnel. Although the IPARD has started with delay their experience at IPARD has improved in last years.

Recommendations CRITERIA 2:

* Technical know-how and capacity needs strengthening;
* Support to improving coordination and consultation mechanisms with key stakeholder institutions is recommended;
* Capacity building on strategic planning is necessary;
* Separate departments should be in charge of Implementation and Monitoring & Evaluation respectively.

**CRITERIA 3: Sector and donor coordination**

**Criteria 3.1: Sector coordination mechanisms**

* ***EQ3.1 –*Which coordination mechanisms are in place to make efficient the sector approach ?**

The coordination mechanisms mainly rely in the establishment of working groups and the set-up of coordination procedures. The Working Groups do not meet regularly. No efficient coordination mechanism is active.

**Criteria 3.2 Donor coordination mechanisms**

|  |
| --- |
| * ***EQ3.2 –*Whether and how donor coordination is talked by national authorities to make efficient the sector approach ?** |

The Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute and the Foreign Affairs and EU Department in the Ministry are responsible for the coordination with EU. On the other hand, there is no sector donor coordination unit. Yet, at individual projects, International Organizations notably FAO, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Islamic Development Bank (IDB), UNDP, OPEC, and the World Bank are also active in the sector in Turkey as major financing institutions.

Furthermore, the Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of the Treasury (also NAO) does also coordinate regularly with IFIs.

Conclusions CRITERIA 3:

* There are no defined sector based and overall covering coordination mechanisms which are primarily dedicated to programme level monitoring such as Steering Committees. Yet, regular monitoring mechanisms defined under the current IPA implementing regulation, such as SMSC and JMC as already and the regular DIS meetings with the Ministry are filling the gap for EU related projects.
* The role of the Agricultural Council, on the other hand, can be named as the sector’s consulting mechanism, and is more to highlight development path and provide consultancy. It has no ongoing meeting procedure as it is in some other sectors.
* Some strategic and sector level coordination is apparent, especially for strategies that include multiple stakeholders although the efficiency and effectiveness of these mechanisms cannot be assessed at this stage.

Recommendations CRITERIA 3:

* Sector-based coordination should move from a project basis towards a more strategic scope.
* A Sector Working Group should be formally appointed in order to better coordinate the programming, implementing and monitoring & evaluation process
* Establishing a sector-specific donor mechanisms, including IFI’s stated above (FAO, UNDP, IDB, etc.) would improve the coordination.
* The overall coordination mechanism should be consolidated to take into account all lower level coordination platforms, hence ensuring that micro/sub level mechanisms relate well to overall sectorial mechanisms.

***OVERALL ASSESSMENT***

***OA10 –*Which strategies already present a sufficient degree of maturity to enable support by means of a sector approach ? Is the sector approach suitable ?**

The National Rural Development Strategy (2007-2013) and the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (2013-2017) represent a relevant and coherent overall strategic framework for the sector.

Furthermore, in the context of the accession process, Turkey has and will need to further prepare several strategy documents related to this sector, such as the "strategy regarding identification of agricultural lands and how to develop the national farmer's registration system" or the "strategy for transposition and implementation of EU acquis" for Food Safety. The existing strategies are based on sufficient needs assessment in the sector, and are provide a basis for measures to be taken with the help of financial assistance in the coming years, in order to prepare for accession and to contribute to rural development.

In terms of Criteria 1, the ARD sector obtains a score of 27,22 out of 36, below the minimum at which the sector strategic planning mechanisms can be considered to meet good quality standards.

The assessment of the capacities for sector planning within the Agriculture and Rural Development (Criteria 2) brings a score of 10,25 out of 12. This score shows the potential and the experience gained so far.

The score reached for Sector and donor Coordination mechanisms reaches 5,5 out of 8, bringing to light that some actions are needed to reinforce the interaction and communication mechanisms.

If we consider the cumulated scores for the three criteria, we obtain an overall rate of 42,97 out of 56. This score is above 42 allowing saying that the Sector adequate for towards the Sector Approach.
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1. Peer Review Report: 2008 Independence, Impartiality, Administration of Justice, Peer review report: 2009 Penitentiaries, CEPEJ report on the efficiency of the justice system in Turkey (2007, 2009) among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. N.B.: The 10th NDP has been recently adopted. While the new draft JRS should be analysed in light of the 10th NDP, for purposes of methodological coherence, since the analysis is based on the JRS 2009-2013 the 9th NDP to which it is relevant has been taken. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. N.B.: The purpose of the analysis is to draw attention to the number of reforms that have been undertaken for a particular sector as an indicator of the importance attached to the latter by the government concerned. Hence, it is not concerned with existing gaps, remaining challenges and shortcomings – as well as need for further reform- for the sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The SC is chaired by the HoD of Strategic Development and other heads of department and deputy general directors of units. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Note that the translation is made by the author from Turkish and is not the official version. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The objectives include: Establishment of a special unit responsible for migration management, Improved response capacity to unexpected migration flows, Mechanism for the monitoring of migration flows, with data both on regular and illegal migration, Establishment of bodies responsible for collection and analysis of data on migration stocks and flows, Sufficient financial and human resources for effective migration management, including also adequate training programs, Establishment of conditions allowing a voluntary return to third country nationals. In addition to this the introduction of a road map in the field of asylum and migration for the short-term, mid-term and long-term is envisaged. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. A TAIEX Expert Mission which mobilised 2 experts from Germany assisted the Asylum and Migration Bureau in order to build up a general knowledge for the Bureau on the functioning of asylum institutions. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The list of reforms is not exhaustive and does not preclude the necessities for further reforms as also outlined by the Progress Reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. This has been confirmed by some relevant studies such as the Thematic Evaluation on Judiciary and Fundamental Rights which noted that having a sector-based approach where judiciary and fundamental rights are handled by public institutions solely would restrict the scope and extent of activities carried under fundamental rights. However, a sector-based approach would be ill-suited to supporting civil society-led human rights projects, because it would jeopardise the independence of these organisations. Using a sector-based approach to programme future IPA assistance in the Judiciary and Human Rights field is appropriate where institutions are concerned. The report notes: “In some cases NGOs may be involved in documenting or seeking judicial remedy for human rights violations – thus potentially setting themselves at odds with institutions which may act as the focal points for sector-based programming, such as ministries or courts…some NGOs may find it impossible to take part in sector-based programmes managed by institutions they deem responsible for human rights violations. The sensitivity of work in this field therefore makes it necessary to recommend that alternative sources of EU funding should remain accessible to civil society organisations working on judicial and human rights matters.”Letter of Contract N° 2011/277332, <http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012_turkey_jhr_final_report.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Note that the translation is made by the author from Turkish and is not the official version. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <http://www.avrupa.info.tr/fileadmin/Content/Files/File/CSD/Guiding_Principles_for_EC.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The TA has, through a very comprehensive consultation with stakeholders, identified main gaps in CSD, as well as main strategic and operational indications emerging from the consultation. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. <http://stgm.org/tr/icerik/detay/stgm-etki-degerlendirme-arastirmasi-2005-2010-3> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. : <http://tacso.org/documents/reports/?id=225>   [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <http://tacso.org/documents/reports/?id=6060>  [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. TACSO project, EuropeAid/127427/C/SER/Multi/5 – additional services, [www.tacso.org](http://www.tacso.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Sivil Dusun EU Project website http://sivildusun.eu/ [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. <http://www.yasamadair.org/Adminjkl/1.pdf>  [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. For the year 2011 see <http://www.valuenetwork.org.uk/Documents%20for%20Website/Bibliog%20docs/TUSEV%20Monitoring%20Report%202011-Executive%20Summary.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Nevertheless the EC Progress Report of 2013 notes that stakeholders have not always been consulted adequately and the perception was that dialogue with civil society organisations was limited to those close to the government on gender equality, p.57. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. The reports can be found at: <http://www.kadininstatusu.gov.tr/tr/19092/Izleme-ve-Degerlendirme-Raporlari> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Note that apart from IPA funds the EIDHR CBSS as well as the CSF provide financial support to civil society and are highly complementary to IPA funded projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See also forthcoming YADA study on the issue of public sector –CSO collaboration. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Carried out within the framework of the project: “*Support to State Planning Organization to Build Capacity at Central; Regional and Local Level to Implement Economic and Social Cohesion Measures*”, by a consortium led by The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. See for instance: World Bank, Country Report on Turkey, Public Policies and Career Development, 2003 & The Reports of the Education Reform Initiative for the4 Education Sub-sector <http://erg.sabanciuniv.edu/egitimizlemeraporlari> & outputs of the “Strengthening Vocational Qualifications Authority (VQA) and National Qualifications System (NQS) in Turkey” (UYEP) IPA-I 2007 initiated in October 2010 and “Turkey – Review of Human Resources Development” ETF, <http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/D3306C1C9346F124C1257B64006323AE/$file/HRD%20Turkey.pdf> among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Please note that the analysis is made only for those Action Plans to which the mission had access to. Those that are in early draft form could not be analysed. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. established under the provisions of Article 36 of the Framework Agreement between the government of the Republic of Turkey and the European Commission [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, of 2003 foresees each public institution to prepare strategic plans under the coordination of the Ministry for Development [↑](#footnote-ref-28)