

Turkey

Mid-Term Evaluation

Thematic window: Environment and Climate Change

Programme Title: Enhancing the Capacity of Turkey to Adapt to Climate Change

Author: Virginia Ravndal, Consultant

Prologue

The current mid-term evaluation report is part of the efforts being implemented by the Millennium Development Goal Secretariat (MDG-F), as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy, to promote learning and to improve the quality of the 128 joint programs in 8 development thematic windows according to the basic evaluation criteria inherent to evaluation; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The aforementioned mid-term evaluations have been carried out amidst the backdrop of an institutional context that is both rich and varied, and where several UN organizations, working hand in hand with governmental agencies and civil society, cooperate in an attempt to achieve priority development objectives at the local, regional, and national levels. Thus the mid-term evaluations have been conducted in line with the principles outlined in the Evaluation network of the Development Assistant Committee (DAC) - as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In this respect, the evaluation process included a reference group comprising the main stakeholders involved in the joint programme, who were active participants in decisions making during all stages of the evaluation; design, implementation, dissemination and improvement phase.

The analysis contained in the mid-term evaluation focuses on the joint program at its mid-term point of implementation- approximately 18 months after it was launched. Bearing in mind the limited time period for implementation of the programs (3 years at most), the mid-term evaluations have been devised to serve as short-term evaluation exercises. This has limited the scope and depth of the evaluation in comparison to a more standard evaluation exercise that would take much longer time and resources to be conducted. Yet it is clearly focusing on the utility and use of the evaluation as a learning tool to improve the joint programs and widely disseminating lessons learnt.

This exercise is both a first opportunity to constitute an independent 'snapshot' of progress made and the challenges posed by initiatives of this nature as regards the 3 objectives being pursued by the MDG-F; the change in living conditions for the various populations vis-à-vis the Millennium Development Goals, the improved quality in terms of assistance provided in line with the terms and conditions outlined by the Declaration of Paris as well as progress made regarding the reform of the United Nations system following the "Delivering as One" initiative.

As a direct result of such mid-term evaluation processes, plans aimed at improving each joint program have been drafted and as such, the recommendations contained in the report have now become specific initiatives, seeking to improve upon implementation of all joint programs evaluated, which are closely monitored by the MDG-F Secretariat.

Conscious of the individual and collective efforts deployed to successfully perform this mid-term evaluation, we would like to thank all partners involved and to dedicate this current document to all those who have contributed to the drafting of the same and who have helped it become a reality (members of the reference group, the teams comprising the governmental agencies, the joint program team, consultants, beneficiaries, local authorities, the team from the Secretariat as well as a wide range of institutions and individuals from the public and private sectors). Once again, our heartfelt thanks.

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views of the MDG-F Secretariat.

Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the Joint Programme
“Enhancing the Capacity of Turkey to Adapt to Climate Change”
(MDGF 1680)

Prepared for the Spain MDG Fund (MDGF)

Virginia Ravndal
Independent Consultant



July 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....

SUMMARY.....

THE SITUATION.....

GENERAL OVERVIEW.....

MOST SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE.....

INTRODUCTION

1. THE CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

1.1 General Objective of the Evaluation & Approach to be Adopted

1.2 The Scope and Specific Objectives of the Evaluation.....

2. THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sources and Procedures for Collecting Background Information

2.2. Persons Interviewed

2.3 Field Visits

2.4 Documentation Reviewed

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION

3. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

LEVELS OF ANALYSIS (Sections 4-10)

4. THE DESIGN OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

4.1 The PRODOC

4.2 The Process of Designing the JP

4.3 The Relevance of the JP

4.4 The Strategy and Scope of the JP

4.5 The Time Frame of the JP

4.6 The JP Pilot Area/s.....

4.7 The Implementing Partners

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

5.1 Implementation of Activities.....

5.2 Collaboration between UN Agencies

5.3 The JP Team.....

5.4 Composition and Performance of JP Committees

5.5 Financial Planning and Management

6. KEY RESULTS/IMPACTS OF THE JP TO DATE

7. STAKEHOLDER OWNERSHIP

8. CONSISTENCY WITH THE PARIS DECLARATION & THE ACCRA AGENDA FOR ACTION.....

9. LEARNING , SHARING & BUILDING ON LESSONS/EXPERIENCES.....

10. COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY STRATEGY.....

11. MONITORING OF THE JP

11.1 Adequacy of the Monitoring System.....

11.2 The JP M&E Framework

11.3 MDGF Secretariat Support to the JP.....

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Terms of Reference for the Independent Mid-Term Evaluation.....

Annex 2. Agenda of Meetings.....

Annex 3. Documentation Reviewed.....

ACRONYMS

CBA	Community Based Adaptation
DMI	Turkish State Meteorological Service
DRR	Deputy Resident Representative
DSI	General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITU	Istanbul Technical University
JP	Joint Programme
MARA	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund
MDG-F 1680	Enhancing the Capacity of Turkey to Adapt to Climate Change
MDT-F	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MIS	Management Information System
MoIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forestry
NAS	National Adaptation Strategy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSC	National Steering Committee
PMC	Project Management Committee
RC	Resident Coordinator
SPO	State Planning Organization
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TTGV	Technology Development Foundation of Turkey
TUSIAD	Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNJP	United Nations Joint Programme

SUMMARY

THE SITUATION

- 14 months remain (39% of the project life) with 36% of the total budget of \$7 million still to be committed and spent.
- \$3.0 million (43% of the total budget) has been disbursed and an additional \$1.5 million (21%) has been committed.
- Many of the activities related to Output 1 have only recently begun, most activities related to Outputs 2 and 3 are well underway, few activities related to Output 4 have been initiated.
- While there are some activities within each Output that are behind schedule (Activities 2.2.2, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 related to Outcome 2), the situation as described above is mostly according to plan. This is not the case, however, for Outcome 4 (Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into UN programming network in Turkey), which is not only behind schedule but mostly irrelevant and could in fact have negative consequences if implemented.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

- ✚ This is a strategic point in time for this JP in Turkey. Turkey became a party to the UNFCCC in May, 2004 and ratified the Convention in February, 2009. Turkey's draft National Climate Change Strategy (December, 2009) includes a chapter on adaptation to climate change and the Government considers adaptation to be relevant and a priority in their climate change agenda. The Government is now developing its Climate Change Action Plan. In this context, the JP is both relevant and timely.
- ✚ The JP design is overly ambitious and even though it contains numerous important activities, it does not represent a strategic intervention overall but rather seemingly mostly unrelated outputs, and in some cases activities that do not correspond well to any Output (for example, the arboretum).
- ✚ Despite the overly ambitious design of the JP, important achievements have been made that promote sustainability and impact over the medium to long term. For example, the MoEF has indicated its intent to adopt the JP model to establish its own grant programme including more transparent and participatory processes than what are currently common place in Turkey and including a Technical Advisory Committee. As a result of its participation in the Participatory Vulnerability Assessment (PVA) exercises, the MoEF has indicated its intent to adopt this model and apply it in other areas of the country, doing so with Government resources and with the capacity to implement this model without further assistance. The 6th Regional Directorate of the State Hydraulic Works (DSI), which is responsible for planning, management, development and operation of water resources in the JP area and which has far greater resources than the JP, has as a direct result of its involvement in the JP, widened its perspective and basis for planning dams and irrigation projects to incorporate aspects of climate change. One of the JP grants has resulted in a positive Government commitment (at the highest level) to enhance living conditions of some of the most vulnerable and poorest people in the country living in tent villages. Other achievements are highlighted throughout this report.

- ✦ The JP team is good and is led by an experienced and well-qualified JP Manager. The Team saw beyond the JP document (PRODOC) and took advantage of opportunities that may not have been recognized or acted upon by a less aware, informed and dynamic JP team. As an example, the team recognized the importance of ensuring the involvement of the Provincial Governor's office in Adana, and in particular the Deputy Governor who is a champion for many JP issues. As a result, there is greater probability that JP issues will be kept on the agenda and greater follow-up by the Governorate. Another example of the strategic initiative taken by the JP team is the relationship established with the Cukurova Regional Development Agency. This enhances the probability of impact over the medium and long term. Other examples are highlighted throughout this report.
- ✦ The JP would benefit from a greater presence of the JP team in the programme pilot area (the Seyhan River Basin). In particular, the M&E Expert (who focuses exclusively on the grants programme) should be based somewhere in the project pilot area.
- ✦ The JP would benefit from a greater presence of the JP team in the MoEF. The JP Manager should spend at least several days of each week based at the MoEF (which has offered desk space for this purpose). A common mistake is to assume that all team members must be housed in the same place. In fact, this is rarely the most desirable choice as it leads to insulation rather than integration and misses the added value of building institutional capacity and promoting sustainability.
- ✦ The JP would benefit from a more proactive and dynamic PMC in which each member participated more actively and understood their responsibilities for the overall programme. The impression is of a PMC that is comprised mostly of representatives of the various implementing entities (UN and Government) that perceive their role on the PMC as more limited to the activities in which they are directly involved and not so much as in managing the overall JP to ensure that it achieves its objectives. The PMC would also benefit from the participation of the SPO, civil society, and someone focused on ensuring that the needs of the most vulnerable groups (including women and poor people) are adequately addressed in all JP activities.
- ✦ It is possible and even probable that without technical oversight and intervention, some of the grants funded by the JP will have unintended negative environmental consequences.
- ✦ The JP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) would benefit from more technical expertise and a more rigorous and formal review of proposals. As the MoEF has indicated they intend to replicate the grants programme model and are actively planning in this regard, it is important that this model be perfected beforehand (including the composition and functioning of the TAC), even if it is too late to apply in the review of the JP grants.
- ✦ Greater focus and concrete mechanisms for translating principles into practice are required regarding the UN core value of addressing the needs of the most vulnerable groups. As women and poor people are disproportionately affected by climate change, and as the MDGs include gender equality as well as poverty alleviation, these aspects of the JP need to be strengthened in concrete ways. One such way would be to involve the Women's Council in Adana in JP activities and/or decision making bodies and to ensure the JP focuses attention on the "tent villages", doing so perhaps through its MDG communication strategy. The tent villages offer the opportunity to focus concurrently on five of the eight MDGs.

- ✚ The JP Communication Strategy should focus heavily on communicating the MDGs with a climate change (adaptation) perspective, and not exclusively on communicating the experiences and lessons of the JP itself. The part-time Coordinator of the Communications Strategy should view herself as one of many “tools” for getting the word out. It’s not just about websites, press releases, newspaper articles and events (although all of these are important); it’s about taking concrete strategic actions to improve the lives of people as per the MDGs.
- ✚ Given the existing M&E framework: a) it will not be possible to adequately gauge the impact of the JP on the MDGs, b) some grants may have unintended negative environmental consequences because of inadequate technical monitoring/oversight, c) the JP will not receive credit for many of the positive impacts resulting from the JP.
- ✚ Some opportunities for undertaking joint efforts between UN agencies have been overlooked. One such example is having FAO provide technical monitoring of agricultural grants administered by UNDP under the grants programme.
- ✚ Serious scrutiny of Output 4 to see if it is: 1) strategic, 2) relevant given advances that have taken place since the JP formulation, and, 3) realistic to implement within the existing time frame, would be helpful at this stage.
- ✚ The description of several activities as presented in the PRODOC leads the reader to imagine something other than what is really being done. For example, establishment of an “ecoefficiency center” which is really more of a network, or the establishment of an “environmental information management system” which is really more about creating portals and links. Greater definition should be required in the PRODOC of what is intended to avoid confusion and to enable assigning realistic resources. If there is not clarity of what is required at that stage of a JP that is an indication of insufficient understanding and analysis of the problem.
- ✚ Although the JP has collaborated closely with the MoEF, mostly thru UNDP and UNEP, and with MARA thru FAO, its collaboration with the MoIT (thru UNIDO) has not been strong enough. Although UNIDO is collaborating closely with TTGV, closer collaboration with MoIT would be helpful.
- ✚ The JP would benefit from greater support from the Secretariat of the MDGF. Substantive feedback on the inception report would have been especially helpful, and substantive feedback and support will be important immediately following the review by all parties of the mid-term evaluation report.
- ✚ Opportunities for learning and sharing lessons and experiences between JPs in the Environment and Climate Change “window” in different countries are not being fully realized. Such sharing of lessons and experiences between Joint Programmes in different countries could be beneficial and cost-effective. It would be helpful for the Secretariat of the MDGF to take the initiative to facilitate and broker these exchanges. One opportunity to initiate this would be COP 16 (Nov-Dec, 2010 in Mexico) where the Secretariat could facilitate an exchange between Environment and Climate Change JPs from around the world.

MOST SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

- ✚ Because of the JP, the 6th Regional Directorate of DSI is now using climate modeling to project water availability, and is using this information in their planning of dams and irrigation schemes. There is excellent buy-in (staff staying overtime to work on this on their own time, DSI investing their own resources) and good replication prospects. Because the Regional Directorate is responsible for water management in the JP pilot area, and because they have the ability to have a very significant effect through their own projects (either successfully adapting practices to climate change or exacerbating the negative effects), their buy-in is key and has significant implications for the medium and long term.
- ✚ There is strong buy-in and ownership of the JP by the Governorate of the Adana Province which will greatly enhance prospects of sustainability.
- ✚ The State Planning Office (SPO) has expressed interest in becoming even more involved in the JP (perhaps through participation on the PMC), which is an indication of their perception of the relevance and importance of the JP in Turkey. As the SPO is a very powerful entity and one with little extra time on their hands, this expression of interest on their part is indeed meaningful and should be acted upon by the JP. The evaluator does not believe there would be any conflict of interest in involving the SPO in both the PMC and the NSC. UNDP is also on both the PMC and NSC. The matter could be discussed with UNDP, the SPO, and the MDGF Secretariat.
- ✚ As a direct result of the JP, the Cukorova Regional Development Agency (the Regional office of the SPO in the JP pilot area) has now included climate change adaptation projects in their call for proposals, thus paving the way for more focus on climate change adaptation initiatives undertaken by a broad array of stakeholders with the Government's own financing. As the funding available through the Regional Development Agency is much, much greater than any single JP initiative, this has important implications.
- ✚ The MoEF has expressed interest in starting their own grants programme based on the JP grants programme model, adopting a more participatory and transparent approach than what is now commonplace in Turkey. The MoEF is preparing to submit proposals to the SPO for financing to replicate the JP grants model in several other river basins around the country. They expect to submit a proposal to the SPO for funding by the October deadline for proposals.
- ✚ The MoEF has also expressed their interest in adopting and replicating the PVA methodology introduced by the JP in other areas of the country. The institutional capacity of the MoEF to apply the PVA methodology has been enhanced to the point where they can do this without further assistance. This is a positive step for Turkey although it would be helpful for the JP to be aware of other even more participatory JP PVA initiatives (such as that in Colombia, for example) so as to be able to share them as alternative models for consideration by the MoEF.
- ✚ One of the grant projects funded by the JP has opened the door to work in the "tent villages", where some of the most vulnerable and poorest people in the country live, and where few if any UN agencies, bilaterals or NGOs have presence. As a result of a report prepared by the JP grantee (which was sent to the Governor of the Province who then forwarded the report to the Prime Ministry's Office), the Prime Ministry's Office has issued a directive to the two Governorates in which tent villages exist (which coincide with the JP pilot area) to take action to enhance the living conditions in these villages, providing basic services that at present are not available.

- ✚ Several grants funded under the grants programme are already having perceptible positive impact, such as, for example, the grant focused on the impact of climate change on disease in the tent villages, the “Surface Water Resources Potential” grant undertaken by the Regional Directorate of DSI, “Girls take Pictures”, and several grants to provide training for farmers and to enhance their awareness of the impacts of climate change.

1. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

1.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION & APPROACH TO BE ADOPTED

Monitoring and evaluation is part of the Secretariat’s mandate as stipulated in the decisions made by the Steering Committee of the MDG-F. The M&E function encompasses the MDG-F as a cooperation instrument as well as all the Joint Programmes financed by the Fund. In order to fulfill this duty the MDG-F Secretariat has designed a comprehensive M&E strategy during 2009 that is currently being implemented.

The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation strategy instruct that an independent mid-term evaluation financed by the MDG-F Secretariat should be conducted for all Joint Programmes lasting more than 2 years.

Mid-term evaluations are highly formative in nature and seek improved implementation of the programmes during their second phase of implementation. They also seek and generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be transferred to other programmes. The conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be directed at the following principle users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee, and the Secretariat of the MDG-F.

It is important that those involved in the JP understand the evaluation exercise as one which can help to assure that the expected results are achieved. It is a participatory exercise in which the implementing partners, intended beneficiaries and the independent consultant/s participate, and in which the consultant/s provide an independent point of view. The evaluation seeks to improve the implementation of the JP during the second half of its execution as well as to generate information regarding best practices and lessons that can be learned. The report of the evaluation should be seen as an input that forms the basis for a dialogue between key stakeholders in the country and the Secretariat of the MDG-F at a strategic point in the implementation of the JP. The purpose of the evaluation is *not* to assign a score to the JP.

The evaluation process is divided into 3 phases:

1. **Design:** The main product in this phase is the adaptation of the generic terms of reference (TOR) provided by the Secretariat to the joint programme information needs.
2. **Implementation:** The main product and milestones for this phase are the inception report, the field visit and the final report.
3. **Dissemination and improvement plan:** The main deliverable here is an action plan to disseminate the results of the evaluation and an improvement plan for the joint programme that incorporates the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation.

There are 3 main actors engaged in the evaluation process with a high relevant role in the activities and decisions to take during the evaluation process, their functions and roles are described as follows:

- **The MDG-F Secretariat** manages, promotes, facilitates and supervises the overall evaluation process and its products.
- **The Consultant**; her main mission is to conduct the evaluation and deliver the products required in the TOR.
- **The evaluation reference group**: is a consultative body comprised by a representation of the most relevant stakeholders in the joint programme. These individuals and institutions are the natural users of the conclusions and recommendations derived from the evaluation study.

In addition to the above, this independent mid-term evaluation serves a broader purpose in contributing credible and reliable information on progress and results of the Fund to the numerous agents with a role in accountability. The experiences supported by the MDGF are constructing a large database of information and knowledge encompassing the majority of UN Joint Programmes actually in operation, covering 53 countries and involving 34 UN agencies working together with the aim to “deliver as one” while adhering to the principles of the Paris Declaration and the resolutions taken in the Accra Agenda for Action (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for development results and mutual accountability). Lessons learned from this and other monitoring and evaluation activities are expected to provide important inputs into the process of designing and implementing One UN.

The Fund supports innovative solutions and anticipates learning important lessons on ways to make progress on MDGs. The Fund places great importance on transparency in obtaining, sharing and disseminating this wealth of knowledge to development agents as well as to the general public around the world.

1.2 SCOPE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The object of study of this evaluation is Turkey’s Joint Programme on “Enhancing the Capacity of Turkey to Adapt to Climate Change”. The mid-term evaluation consists of a systematic and rapid analysis of the design, process and impacts or achievements of the JP based on the scope and criteria included in the attached TOR (Annex 1) using an expedited evaluation process. This expedited methodology permits obtaining conclusions and recommendations for the JP in a period of approximately 3 months.

The specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation are outlined in the attached Terms of Reference.

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Although the Secretariat accepted the evaluator’s suggestion to contract an independent National Consultant (perhaps one from the Seyhan River basin) to participate in the evaluation mission, there was not enough time to contract such a person by the time the decision was made. The suggestion had been to contract a National Consultant who was: a) intimately familiar with national, regional and local institutions in the pilot areas, b) intimately familiar with the culture, c) generally familiar with the JP but objective and with no self- interest in the JP, and d) familiar with the key themes and practices of relevance to the JP to work together with the international consultant (i.e., this evaluator).

2.1 SOURCES AND PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The evaluation methodology used interviews as an essential means of collecting information. Given the large number of stakeholders involved in the JP, individual meetings as well as meetings with small groups involving key persons were held.

Some adjustments had to be made in the field to ensure that meetings involved only key individuals and to avoid large numbers of participants in single meetings. Some adjustments were also made to avoid planned PowerPoint and other such presentations, as these are not normally effective means of gathering targeted information in a tight time frame. Because, as stated in the evaluator's inception report, the purpose of the meetings was to have an informal dialogue to share facts and opinions in an open, honest and forthright manner, large, formal meetings were avoided as much as possible as they do not encourage this type of exchange. Whenever possible, meetings took place in the field (on site of the pilot projects) rather than in offices.

In a few cases there was apparent confusion regarding the purpose of the meetings with persons interviewed believing that the evaluator was a representative of the financing agent (which clearly has implications which are not desirable for an honest evaluation). Although this confusion was cleared up at the beginning of meetings, it indicates the need for improved explanation of the intended purpose of the evaluation at the time meetings are arranged.

In several cases, photo and film coverage (apparently for publicity reasons) of the evaluation visit had been arranged by grantees. This is not appropriate and could have perhaps been avoided by ensuring that interviewees better understood the purpose of the visit. Given tight time frames of evaluation missions, it is also essential to avoid as much as possible meetings of protocol and too many large group meals. The JP Manager demonstrated great flexibility and because of this many less-than-ideal situations were readily resolved.

Ensuring that the evaluator and the JP Manager have adequate time to agree on the agenda of visits before the evaluation mission begins is essential. Although a telephone conference took place between the evaluator, the Secretariat, and the JP Manager, it would have been helpful for this to have taken place even two weeks earlier. This points to the need to ensure realistic time planning especially when one consultant is involved in several concurrent JP evaluations.

The JP Manager and other members of the JP team (normally based in Ankara) accompanied the evaluator to the Seyhan River basin. This allowed time for discussion along the way (a car trip of approximately 14 hours in total one way/return by air), and ensured that the JP Manager and others were on hand if needed for clarification and other purposes. At the request of the evaluator, the JP Manager and other JP Team members participated in some meetings, however, the evaluator normally met with interviewees without the presence of JP team members (except for the JP Programme Assistant who acted as translator).

In some cases separate meetings were scheduled (as requested) with different stakeholders instead of combining numerous stakeholders in a single meeting. In other cases, meetings were scheduled to meet with both the Government entity and the UN agency working with that entity in a single meeting. As stated in the inception report, it is best to have separate meetings with UN agencies and with the Government counterparts instead of having one single meeting. Although an evaluator may request subsequent joint meetings between the parties, the opportunity to meet individually should be scheduled.

Arrangements had been made between the Secretariat and the JP for the JP Programme Assistant to act as translator for the evaluator during her mission. Although the JP Programme Assistant did an excellent job, involving a team member of the JP being evaluated in this way is not considered best practice and an independent translator (not associated with the JP) should normally be contracted for this purpose.

2.2 PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Interviews were held with all major stakeholders (see Annex 2 for a complete list of persons interviewed). Meetings took place with key staff members of 3 of the 4 UN agencies involved. As UNEP is not a resident UN agency in Turkey, no meetings were held with UNEP staff, although both UNEP consultants were interviewed (one based in Turkey and one based outside the country). The UNDP Environment Programme Officer was unfortunately out of the country during the evaluation mission. The evaluator met several times with the UNDP DRR, who chairs the PMC. This was very helpful. Nonetheless, in future it would be best to ensure that evaluation missions are planned so as to ensure that all key persons are present during the country visit.

During an earlier visit to the Secretariat in NY, the evaluator had the opportunity to meet briefly with the Programme Officer of the Secretariat responsible for Turkey and following this had one telephone conference with two members of the Secretariat and the JP Manager.

2.3 FIELD VISITS

The evaluation included a 9 day visit to Turkey, including a four day visit to three provinces of the Seyhan River basin (Kayseri, Nigde and Adana), areas in which JP grants were awarded to establish pilot projects to build capacity for community-based adaptation to climate change. See Annex 2 for a complete list of the places visited during the evaluation mission.

2.4 DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

The evaluation methodology included as a first step the analysis of all relevant sources of information such as annual reports, JP documents, internal monitoring reports, JP archives, national development strategies and other documents which helped inform opinion regarding the JP. See Annex 3 for a complete list of documentation reviewed.

3. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

As stated in the PRODOC, the objective of the JP is “to develop capacity for managing climate change risks to rural and coastal development in Turkey. The proposed program will apply a three-pronged approach to achieving fully fledged mainstreaming of climate change adaptation: (i) mainstreaming into the national development framework; (ii) mainstreaming through local pilot action; and (iii) mainstreaming into the UN country programmatic framework. As a cross-cutting methodological approach, adaptive capacity development will be applied at all levels (systemic, institutional and individual), to build on existing systems of knowledge, policy and institutional framework for long term sustainability.”

The JP anticipates the following four outcomes as described in the PRODOC:

“Outcome 1: Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into Turkey’s plans.

A National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy will be developed to address key requirements for climate change adaptation. Legislative and policy changes will be proposed to mainstream climate change risks into development and regional planning. Capacity will also be built for research and knowledge on adaptation to climate change in Turkish institutions.

Outcome 2: Institutional capacity developed for managing climate-risks, including disasters.

The capacity of national and regional institutions to respond to climate change risks in Turkey will be enhanced. In particular, capacity will be developed in the Turkish Government to ensure that appropriate climatic data is systematically collected and disseminated to relevant end-users via early warning systems. This will also include public health concerning water – borne diseases.

Outcome 3: Capacity for community-based adaptation in the Seyhan River Basin developed.

Present initiatives in the Seyhan River Basin to increase the resilience of communities to climate change will be further developed. The approach will be multi-faceted and will aim to maintain agricultural productivity, ecosystem goods and services, and the natural resource base in the context of a warming and drying climate. It will also focus on improving preparedness for an increase in the frequency of droughts and floods. Public private partnerships will be a key component of this outcome. Also activities to enhancing public awareness will be performed.

Outcome 4: Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into UN programming framework in Turkey.

The UNDAF framework will be revised and used for mainstreaming climate change adaptation within MDG-based UN programming in Turkey. The focus will be on areas where the UN has a comparative advantage and can develop long-lasting in-country capacities at individual, institutional and societal levels. Adaptation to climate change will be integrated into all multi-agency projects targeted at achieving the MDGs.”

4. THE DESIGN OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

4.1 THE PRODOC

- ✚ Instead of representing a strategic intervention to address a well-defined problem (with a demonstrated thorough understanding of the problem and its root causes as well as a thorough analysis of the possible options for addressing the problem), the PRODOC appears to be a conglomerate of activities.
- ✚ Only minor changes were made to the PRODOC in the Inception Report. Greater scrutiny of the PRODOC and of the Inception Report, especially with the participation of the implementing agencies and an independent expert with experience as a manager of a large project, may have proven helpful in improving the design of the JP at the earliest possible stage. The Secretariat relies on the expertise of the implementing agencies and on their knowledge of the country, and it is they who are ultimately accountable for a sound and realistic design.
- ✚ Indicators do not always correspond with outputs and are often not SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable and Attributable, Relevant and Realistic, Time-bound). For example, the “number of references to adaptation to climate change or climate change risks in UN programming framework and projects” is not a good indicator of Output 4.1 “Revision of UNDAF with a coordinated approach to

mainstreaming climate change undertaken.” Likewise “Number of tests of screening tools implemented” is not a valid indicator of Output 4.2 “Screening mechanism on climate change (with a gender approach” agreed upon and established among UNCT agencies.”

- ✚ Many outputs and activities are only vaguely defined, leaving much to interpretation. A few examples follow: Activity 1.2.1 “facilitate student training at school and university levels”. Activity 2.1.3 “Prepare an implementation plan for an environmental information management system that can integrate available climate change data across all relevant institutions and disseminate this information to end-users.”, Output 2.3 “Capacity of end-users to respond to early warnings developed.” Who are these “end-users”, what kind of early warnings?, what type of capacity is to be built?
- ✚ Whereas most outputs are very vague and broad, Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 disaggregate too much. The distinction between them is not clear. Output 2.1 is “Technical capacity for data management developed.” How does this differ from Output 2.2 which is “Technical capacity for analysis and interpretation of data developed.”?
- ✚ It is sometimes not clear how activities relate to the Outputs they are under or how some Outputs relate to Outcomes. This is the case for Output 4.3 “demonstrating the carbon footprint offsetting of JP activities through establishment of an MDG arboretum”.

4.2 THE PROCESS OF DESIGNING THE JOINT PROGRAMME

- ✚ It would have been helpful to adopt a more rigorous logical framework (LOGFRAME) approach to designing the JP. A “loose” logframe approach was adopted. A threats analysis was done, but did not involve an in-depth analysis as well as construction of a solution tree to the problem tree, resulting in inclusion of some activities that do not address core threats or are not the most strategic responses to these threats and sometimes omitting activities to address other threats.
- ✚ It appears that the presentation on the MDGF website of “illustrative interventions for priority areas of support” within the context of the Terms of Reference for the Environment and Climate Change window (which outlines key outcomes sought by the Fund and identifies illustrative activities to consider in preparing proposals, specifying that “The MDG-F will welcome funding applications that aim to...” may have had the unintended affect of acting as a menu of possible activities to choose from and in this way may possibly affect prospects for adhering fully to the Paris Principles as countries may have oriented their proposals more to those activities described by the Fund and not entirely to their own priorities.
- ✚ The process was as participatory as possible given the tight time frame of three months from the time the call for proposals was announced until the deadline for receipt of proposals, and 6 months to develop the full proposal once the concept was accepted. This is not, however, participatory enough to ensure adequate stakeholder consultation, in depth problem/threats analysis, comprehensive consideration of options to address the problem, identification of institutional arrangements for JP implementation (with both conventional and non-conventional partners), secure private sector participation, investigate innovative co-financing possibilities, etc... The problem in this case is not with the effort made by the JP, but with the time frame set by the MDGF Secretariat. The time frame of 3 months from the time a “window” is opened (in this case the Environment and Climate Change window) and the time in which JP concepts must be received is perhaps long enough, but the time of 6 weeks given to develop the concept into a full JP proposal once the concept is approved is inadequate and in this case may have

contributed to a less than ideal JP design. If the desire of the MDGF is to support ongoing activities, fortifying these and expanding upon these without much innovation, this time frame may be adequate. If, on the other hand, as is stated in the MDGF guidelines, innovation is important, more time is needed.

- ✚ It would be beneficial to ensure that at least one member of any JP design team, indeed the key member, have practical experience as the manager of a large project of at least 3 years of duration. Although this is good practice, it is rarely the case¹. It is unfortunately much more common to contract consultants who know how to draft good-looking project documents and who are familiar with terminology and with the donor and international agencies, but who have not had actual experience as project managers. The end result is often a well-written project document, but a less than optimally designed project. There is little that can be done about the initial design at this stage, but the recommendations address what can be done now.

4.3 THE RELEVANCE OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

Turkey is undoubtedly susceptible to the effects of climate change and climate variability and the focus of the JP on adaptation to climate change is relevant and timely especially as Turkey begins to prepare its Climate Change Action Plan.

4.4 THE STRATEGY AND SCOPE OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

- ✚ The scope is far too broad and comprehensive. The JP includes policy and legislative review and development of options for policy, legislative and institutional modifications, capacity building, development of an environmental information management system, development of an “ecoefficiency center” for industries, pilot projects with a variety of industries to reduce water use, disaster preparedness, risk and crisis management, establishment of an arboretum, student training at school and university levels, strengthening of the Turkish Agriculture Drought Master plan, climate modeling, climate change adaptation projects ranging from crop and animal agriculture to wetlands and coastal zone conservation and the effects of climate change on tropical diseases (amongst others).

Even though the JP includes many important activities which in their own right may be strategic, the overall intervention cannot be considered as a coherent, strategic intervention. As one example, given the time frame and the budget, and given that in the selected pilot area agriculture is much more predominant compared with industry, it does not make sense to include Output 1.5 (Industrial practices amended to reduce vulnerability to climate change), which is to enhance water efficiency in different industries (food and beverage, textiles, fisheries, etc..) in the scope of this JP. Likewise, this doesn't really fit under Outcome 1 (Climate change adaptation mainstreamed in Turkey's development plans). Another example of an output that just doesn't seem to fit, and which in fact did not appear in the PRODOC but was later included at the Inception Report stage, is Output 4.3 (demonstrating the carbon footprint offsetting of UNJP activities through establishment of an MDG arboretum). Again, in addition to not fitting well within the scope of the JP, it also does not fit logically under Outcome 4 (where it is listed) which is “climate change adaptation mainstreamed into UN *programming* framework in Turkey”. This appears to be a pet project and one that could in fact result in confusion regarding carbon footprint offsetting (which is anyhow not a climate change *adaptation* related activity but rather a climate change

¹ This statement relates to projects in general and not specifically to MDGF Joint Programmes, although it may perhaps also apply to JPs.

mitigation activity which is not the subject of this JP), and, if adopted by others as a model could actually prove harmful because it is not a valid model for carbon footprint offsetting.

- ✚ The strategy adopted in practice by the JP to go directly from *assessing vulnerability* to climate change (even if in a very general sense) to *implementing adaptation measures* without either assessing the *impact* that climate change would have on the area (and understanding that this will vary significantly depending on topography and other factors that vary greatly within a very small area) or *defining a range of adaptation options* (other than the one proposed by the grant proponent) to be considered and furthermore without *defining the conditions and time frames* in which adaptation measures should be implemented, is lacking in scientific rigor and assumes an overly simplistic view to adaptation to climate change. This resulted in large part because of a lack of adequate scientific scrutiny of proposals, and also to guidelines that do not place adequate emphasis on the logical framework process of identifying a problem along with various threats and root causes, identifying a range of possible solutions, identifying a logical sequence of response, etc. Furthermore, it should not be de-facto taken for granted that all adaptation measures need to be immediately implemented.
- ✚ If adaptation alternatives are obvious and are indeed the same ones that would apply if only sustainable development (without climate change) is considered, then there is no need to bother with a vulnerability assessment. If, on the other hand, a vulnerability assessment is to be done, it must be done at a meaningful scale – at a much greater level of resolution. This would require climate models that could predict climate change at a much greater level of resolution. This is especially critical in the Seyhan River basin as topography and climatic variables differ significantly within a small area. PVA methodology was followed but the evaluator does not believe that it served as the basis for determining responses. In this way the PVA was not really used in the implementation of subsequent components. Nevertheless, the reality is that it may not have been possible to do so because of the problem with the level of resolution of the climate models. This is really a problem, as is the appropriate timing of a response to future climate change (an immediate response may not always be appropriate for changes that are expected but not yet seen). There is a distinction between climate variability and climate change, and although many projects are justified under the later, the issue they are truly confronted with is the former.
- ✚ Some activities do not fit well within the strategy. The establishment of an arboretum, for example, was not in the original prodoc and was added later on, being justified as a JP carbon footprint offsetting activity. In addition to other concerns which should be addressed before going forward with this activity (amongst these legitimacy as a carbon footprint offsetting activity, the location of the arboretum in a place where no trees have existed for centuries, biodiversity concerns, sending a confusing message, not serving as a valid model for companies and others who may have a significant carbon footprint (unlike the JP) and who are looking for a model to replicate), this JP is about climate change adaptation and not mitigation.

4.5 THE TIME FRAME

Given that the maximum allowable time frame for JPs financed by the MDGF is three years, and given that those submitting JP proposals must be aware of this time frame, one cannot legitimately claim that the time frame is too short to enable achieving the expected outcomes. Rather, the problem in this case is that the design is overly ambitious given the time frame (see above section on JP scope).

The time frame of a maximum of one year for the grants financed by the JP grants programme is, however, a time frame established by the JP. This time frame will almost certainly prove to be too short to be able to fully implement, learn and share lessons, and apply these in the formulation of new policies, strategies and plans (as is indicated in the PRODOC). Many of the grants are projects that may well require five years or more to achieve their objectives. There are plenty of examples of similar projects from around the world that demonstrate that a one year time frame for what is promised is unrealistic. Learning from past experiences in development assistance would have been helpful in setting more realistic time frames for the grants. My recommendation would be to extend the time frame of many of the grants (an individual review of each would be required to make this determination) if this is possible within the timeframe of the JP, but also that the JP should place significant focus on facilitating links between these grantees and other possible donors to promote sustainability after end of JP.

4.6 THE JOINT PROGRAMME PILOT AREA

The pilot area covers the entire Seyhan River Basin, spanning an area of approximately 20 730 km². This huge area includes many different ecosystems ranging from glaciers to forests to grasslands to wetlands to coastal zones, a variety of economic zones ranging from industrial areas to agricultural ones, tremendous cultural diversity, different agricultural basis and practices ranging from very large-scale, input-intensive crop monoculture, to very small-scale agro-pastoral systems. A single three-year initiative cannot realistically assess vulnerability to climate change at a meaningful scale (vulnerability which will vary tremendously within the pilot area according to all of the diversity of factors described above), understand the possible impacts of this climate change on diverse sectors, develop adaptation alternatives within these sectors, and implement pilot adaptation initiatives. It may be able to develop some adaptation measures, making use of ICCAP study findings, to cope with climate change but in this case a smaller more homogenous pilot project area could have helped to ensure that models were developed (which could be replicated by others) while also having an actual impact on ground. It is not possible to make changes to the pilot project area at this point in time in the JP as grants have already been awarded throughout the project area.

The evaluator does not question the logic of selecting the Seyhan River Basin as the pilot area, but rather believes that because the area is huge and extremely heterogeneous in almost every respect (ecologically, economically, socially, culturally), that it would have been best to limit the pilot area to *a certain area within* the Seyhan River Basin that was more homogeneous, i.e., a small geographic area with greater similarities. This is especially important given the short time frame of the JP (3 years) and the limited funding. It would have been more efficient, more cost-effective and more impact might result, had a smaller, more homogenous area within the Seyhan River Basin been chosen.

4.7 THE IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

With few exceptions, the key stakeholders for ensuring JP success and sustainability of JP outcomes are involved in the JP in one capacity or another. In addition to those identified in the PRODOC, because of the initiative taken by the JP Team, numerous other key stakeholders such as the Governorate of Adana, the Cukurova Regional Development Agency (the Regional office of the SPO in the JP pilot area), and the 6th Regional Directorate of DSI are aware of and involved in the JP. More private sector involvement would possibly help to ensure success and sustainability. The evaluator believes it would be helpful for the JP to place greater emphasis on identifying private sector partners even at this stage.

A new Directorate of Disasters and Emergency Management was established last year under the Prime Ministry. It is still not fully staffed. Because of this situation, there has been little involvement of the new Directorate in JP flood and drought disaster-related activities.

More NGO involvement could have been anticipated and planned for. The Red Crescent Society, for example, is not involved in any way in the JP, even though they are a key player in disaster risk management and response in the country. The involvement in the JP of women's groups, such as The Women's Council of Adana (one of the strongest of such councils in the country) may be helpful in strengthening the gender equality focus, translating this into concrete action on the ground.

Given the strength of the private sector in Turkey, more private sector involvement in the JP would be helpful both in securing additional financing and enhancing awareness about both the JP and its themes, including the MDGs. It may not be easy to involve the private sector, especially with the global economic situation, but it is worth pursuing. The private sector may be involved in many ways, not just direct financing. The JP should think outside the box on who to involve and how. Maybe the JP could sponsor a practical (not formal or theoretical) workshop involving some private sector representatives to brainstorm on this.

Regarding the involvement of the UN agencies, these are indeed the key agencies that should be involved given the scope of the JP. Although in most cases, the agencies are responsible for the activities that one would imagine they should be responsible for according to their institutional mandates and expertise, in a few cases this logic seems to be lacking. For example, UNDP is the responsible UN agency for the activities associated with Output 2.3, when it seems more logical for FAO to play this role.

In other cases, important opportunities for realizing added value of involving several UN agencies in a joint initiative have not been realized. One example of this is that even though a large number of the grant projects are agricultural, UNDP instead of FAO has been monitoring these. UNDP manages the grants programme and is monitoring the progress of the grants, but there is a need for more technical monitoring and FAO, which is involved in other agricultural-related activities in the JP would be the logical agency to involve in technical monitoring of these grant projects.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

5.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES

A few activities which have reached a point of maturity where they can be evaluated or which are of particular concern are highlighted below. The reader is referred to the latest Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report (covering the period 1 January to 31 December, 2009) prepared by the JP for a more comprehensive view of progress to date.

The Grants Programme

The Grants programme of the JP is seen by the MoEF as very innovative and a model which they intend to replicate. A small grants programme may be innovative for the MoEF, but as a country, Turkey has had experience with such programmes including the GEF Small Grants Programme and an EU-financed grants programme, amongst others. Some of these have had quite a long history in the country. Nevertheless, because many of these grants programmes work directly with NGOs and CBOs and do not work with Government

entities, the JP grants programme which is not limited to NGOs and CBOs has offered a new model which has had a strong impact.

Portfolio management of the grants programme would have been helpful. The JP Manager was apparently told by the UNDP procurement officer that this was not possible and that a simple call for grants should be made without stipulating for example that a certain number of grants would be funded (if qualified) on health issues related to climate change adaptation, or that a certain number of grants would be funded (if qualified) dealing with climate change adaptation as it relates to the most vulnerable groups, thus leaving it up to chance that at least some of the grants would be focused on the most vulnerable groups.

Although the evaluation of grant proposals was transparent and participatory, many of the criteria (28 in total) used to evaluate grants are stated in such general terms that they become meaningless. For example, Criteria #12 “Does the proposal address gender issues”, or Criteria # 13, “Does the proposal address ecosystem services”. These criteria are not well defined and presenting them in this way practically ensures that they will not be adequately considered.

The JP team has experience with other grant programmes (on which they formerly worked together as a team) and in addition they studied the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP). A continued collaboration with the SGP to study and learn further from their experience may be helpful.

The time frame for many of the grants will almost certainly prove to be too short to allow for their full implementation.

The Eco-Efficiency Center

There is confusion regarding the eco-efficiency center. During a meeting held with the MoIT it became clear to the evaluation mission that the Ministry understood the eco-efficiency center (as did the evaluator) as an actual building, when according to UNIDO, the eco-efficiency center is basically a network that requires (at least for the near to medium term) only a place to be housed in the sense of an institution which could coordinate a network of existing infrastructure and expertise. UNIDO has worked closely with TTGV, although much less so with MoIT, and TTGV has offered to be the host of the so –called eco-efficiency center. Meanwhile, during the meeting with MoIT, the Ministry expressed concern that, although they felt establishment of such a center was very much needed and would be of great help, they did not want the center to be located in the Seyhan River Basin. The Ministry even indicated that they would be willing to co-finance the establishment of the center, but only if it were located in a different region (other than Seyhan River Basin) where industry is more important.

This confusion points to a few lessons: 1) it is important to be precise and clear in a prodoc so that terms such as “eco-efficiency center” are understood clearly by all parties, 2) there is need for a much closer relationship between UNIDO and the MoIT, 3) there is need for the JP Manager to be more actively involved in overseeing these activities (as he has already indicated he intends to be).

The Arboretum

The arboretum is an add-on to the original prodoc (added at the inception report stage). It is a project which was looking for financing for some time before the JP came along. Simply calling it an “MDG” arboretum, does not change the fact that it does not belong in this JP. The arboretum has been justified as a JP carbon footprint offsetting measure that would also serve as a model for others who want to do carbon footprint

offsetting and finally as a means of enhancing awareness about the MDGs. There are several problems with this. Carbon footprint offsetting is a mitigation not an adaptation measure. This JP is about climate change adaptation. Even if the JP were about mitigation, this sends a confusing message to people who may not be fully aware of what a carbon footprint is or how to offset a carbon footprint. Additionally, if the model is to offset carbon, then why not choose an industry that has a significant carbon footprint. Compared to many of the most common industries in Turkey, the JP (which is of course only a programme, and only a three year one at that) has a very insignificant carbon footprint. If the JP really wants to create a model, it should work with a company like Turkish Airlines (a company with high profile and a significant carbon footprint) or perhaps one of the industries involved in the UNIDO activities, to both enhance the involvement of private sector in the JP (a missed opportunity) and to create a valid model that people would much more easily understand. Moreover, what amount of carbon would be offset (and over what period of time) by establishing an arboretum? Would this really be a cost-effective means of offsetting carbon? Finally, there are other questions that should be addressed if it is decided to go forward with this idea despite the recommendation to the contrary of this evaluation. These include biodiversity concerns regarding planting tree species in an area where there are currently no trees and where apparently there never were, and sustainability concerns regarding who will pay for the significant recurrent costs in maintaining an arboretum after the end of the JP.

5.2 COLLABORATION BETWEEN UN AGENCIES

There are numerous examples of UN agency collaboration. UNEP experts and UNDP are working closely together in order to establish a sound National Adaptation Strategy development process and on other issues such as the climate change training program. FAO and UNDP are collaborating on the climate modeling unit in ITU. The short-listing committee of the JP grants programme included representatives of all four UN partner Agencies. Most of the partner agencies participated in PVA trainings and workshops, and in the Systems Analysis workshop. All participating UN agencies are clearly more aware than they might otherwise be of the activities of others involved in the JP. Only the final evaluation will be able to determine if there is significant value-added by this approach and if it is cost-effective.

While there are instances of cooperation between participating UN agencies (such as UNDP realization of payments for UNEP), and while it is clear that the JP has enabled some UN agencies to work with new partners that they may not otherwise have collaborated with, there are also some opportunities for undertaking joint efforts that have been overlooked. One example of an overlooked opportunity is having FAO provide technical monitoring of agricultural grants that are administered by UNDP under the grants programme, instead of having UNDP do this monitoring for which they do not have the technical expertise. It must be clear here that if the Ministry of Agriculture and FAO is to do the technical monitoring of the agricultural grants, they must ensure that the necessary expertise including ecological expertise and not merely conventional agricultural production expertise be applied.

5.3 THE JOINT PROGRAMME TEAM

The JP team is good and is led by an experienced and well-qualified JP Manager. Having had the opportunity to work as a team on other projects prior to the JP, the JP team is well consolidated and efficient in working as a team. The Team saw beyond the JP document (PRODOC) and took advantage of opportunities that may not have been recognized or acted upon by a less aware, informed and dynamic JP team.

The base of operations for several team members should be reviewed. Although the JP Manager should be based in Ankara (as he is), it would be preferable if he could have at least a part-time office in the MoEF instead

of being based exclusively out of the UNDP office. He is amenable to this idea and the MoEF has already indicated their willingness to provide him with a desk.

The Regional Project Coordinator should spend considerable time in Adana to facilitate a close working relationship with strategic partners including the Adana Province Governors office, the Cukorova Regional Development Agency, and the Regional Directorate of DSI, and also to help ensure a greater focus on the tent villages. It is, however, recognized that the RPC will continue to be based in Ankara (where he is) as he is not solely responsible for grants but also other activities like the work with ITU, capacity building and public awareness activities, early warning pilot study, strategy processes, as well as relations with non-JP institutions like WHO, and the World Bank. Additionally the RPC provided and will provide support to the National Adaptation Strategy development process to feed the lessons learned on the ground into the national strategy which is coordinated by UNEP.

The JP M&E Expert (who is solely focused on the grants programme) should spend more time in the “field” visiting grantees.

5.4 COMPOSITION AND PERFORMANCE OF JP COMMITTEES

The PMC

- ✚ More active participation by PMC members would be helpful
- ✚ From interactions with several PMC members it is not clear if they fully understand their role and responsibilities for the overall JP.
- ✚ Although all PMC members understand and speak English (the language in which PMC meetings are held), not all are fully fluent and it may be uncomfortable for some to express themselves
- ✚ PMC meetings are held at the UN office. Although this is the norm, to enhance active participation and ownership, it may be helpful to consider holding PMC meetings in the MoEF instead.
- ✚ SPO is a key government entity but is not represented on the PMC.
- ✚ Although there are numerous Turkish environmental NGOs, there are none on the PMC.
- ✚ Although there are numerous women’s groups in Turkey, including a strong Women’s Council in Adana, and even though gender equality and women’s empowerment is a key theme of the JP, there is no representation on the PMC.
- ✚ The natural disaster element of the JP is not represented on the PMC. As described in another section of this report, there is significant institutional restructuring underway regarding how the country deals with natural disasters. The new agency, although legally established over a year ago, is not yet fully operational. They should be operational by now (or if not now, very soon), and an effort should be made to include them on the PMC.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

- ✚ The TAC which was responsible for reviewing grant proposals for funding under the JP grants programme included some persons with relevant technical backgrounds but an even stronger technical presence, especially in the areas of sustainable agricultural practices, biodiversity conservation, and watershed management would have been helpful.

5.5 FINANCIAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

The financial planning and management of the JP appears to be sound. A financial audit was carried out in May 2010 for 2009 expenditures. No issues were raised in the report.

The financial management issues highlighted by the JP Team are:

- There was no financial guideline that the JP Team could refer to. Nevertheless, any questions that have been raised were shared with the MDTF and satisfactorily solved.
- The budget format linked to activities was not easy to work with. For example, it is not possible to divide the cost of supplies (like a laptop) to different activities. To address this issue, the JP Team added a “#0” activity where they extracted the cost of JP staff, supplies, travels and similar costs from the activities budgets and added this to the budget submitted as an attachment to the Inception Report.
- There were a few budgetary modifications made during the early stages of the JP, including some reallocations, which were shared with the PMC and approved by the NSC, and subsequently submitted to the Secretariat and MDTF.
- Since every agency has different interpretations of budget line descriptions, the JP Team experienced some difficulties in financial reporting. These were solved by email correspondences with the agencies and the Secretariat.
- The annual financial reporting is handled by the finance units of partner agency HQs. In the latest administrative agent brief, the JP notes that annotation of budget items is still not standardized. For example, the grants contracts exist under the “Contracts” budget line in the one budgeting process, whereas the payments to these contracts are classified under “Other direct costs” in another. The JP Team felt that this was not likely to create a major problem and could be solved during the process of requesting the third installment.

6. KEY RESULTS/IMPACTS OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME TO DATE

- ✚ Because of the JP, the 6th Regional Directorate of DSI is now using climate modeling to project water availability, and is using this information in their planning of dams and irrigation schemes. There is excellent buy-in (staff staying overtime to work on this on their own time, DSI investing their own resources) and good replication prospects. Because the Regional Directorate is responsible for water management in the JP pilot area, and because they have the ability to have a very significant effect thru their own projects (either successfully adapting practices to climate change or exacerbating the negative effects), their buy-in is key and has significant implications for the medium and long term.
- ✚ There is strong buy-in and ownership of the JP by the Governorate of the Adana Province which will greatly enhance prospects of sustainability.
- ✚ The State Planning Office (SPO) has expressed interest in becoming even more involved in the JP (perhaps thru participation on the PMC), which is an indication of their perception of the relevance and importance of the JP in Turkey. As the SPO is a very powerful entity and one with little extra time on their hands, this expression of interest on their part is indeed meaningful and should be acted upon by the JP.
- ✚ As a direct result of the JP, the Cukorova Regional Development Agency (the Regional office of the SPO in the JP pilot area) has now included climate change adaptation projects in their call for proposals, thus paving the way for more focus on climate change adaptation initiatives undertaken by a broad array

of stakeholders with the Government's own financing. As the funding available through the Regional Development Agency is much, much greater than any single JP initiative, this has important implications.

- ✚ The MoEF has expressed interest in starting their own grants programme based on the JP grants programme model, adopting a more participatory and transparent approach than what is now commonplace in Turkey. The MoEF is preparing to submit proposals to the SPO for financing to replicate the JP grants model in several other river basins around the country. They expect to submit a proposal to the SPO for funding by the October deadline for proposals.
- ✚ The MoEF has also expressed their interest in adopting and replicating the PVA methodology introduced by the JP in other areas of the country. The institutional capacity of the MoEF to apply the PVA methodology has been enhanced to the point where they can do this without further assistance. This is a positive step for Turkey although it would be helpful for the JP to be aware of other even more participatory JP PVA initiatives (such as that in Colombia, for example) so as to be able to share them as alternative models for consideration by the MoEF.
- ✚ One of the grant projects funded by the JP has opened the door to work in the “tent villages”, where some of the most vulnerable and poorest people in the country live, and where few if any UN agencies, bilaterals or NGOs have presence. As a result of a report prepared by the JP grantee (which was sent to the Governor of the Province who then forwarded the report to the Prime Ministry's Office), the Prime Ministry's Office has issued a directive to the two Governorates in which tent villages exist (which coincide with the JP pilot area) to take action to enhance the living conditions in these villages, providing basic services that at present are not available.
- ✚ Several grants funded under the grants programme are already having perceptible positive impact, such as, for example, the grant focused on the impact of climate change on disease in the tent villages, the “Surface Water Resources Potential” grant undertaken by the Regional Directorate of DSI, “Girls take Pictures”, and several grants to provide training for farmers and to enhance their awareness of the impacts of climate change.

7. STAKEHOLDER OWNERSHIP

There is strong ownership of the JP by the MoEF which has expressed interest in starting their own grants programme based on the JP grants programme model, adopting a more participatory and transparent approach than what is now commonplace in Turkey. The MoEF is preparing to submit proposals to the SPO for financing to replicate the JP grants model in several other river basins around the country. They expect to submit a proposal to the SPO for funding by the October deadline for proposals. The SPO itself has demonstrated increasing interest in the JP which is an indication that they are convinced it is making a positive contribution. Other key Government entities including the Cukurova Regional Development Agency (who has as a result of the JP has included climate change adaptation projects in their own call for proposals), the Governorate of Adana (the Governor's office participates in many JP activities in the project area and helps to ensure that a high profile is given to these activities), and the 6th Regional Directorate of DSI which as a result of their involvement in the JP is now using climate modeling to project water availability, and is using this information in their planning of dams and irrigation schemes.

8. CONSISTENCY WITH THE PARIS DECLARATION & THE ACCRA AGENDA FOR ACTION

There appears to be good consistency with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in that there is strong ownership of the JP (as described elsewhere in this report). There is also good alignment and harmonization with national policies.

As described in the PRODOC, the core objective of the Joint Programme is to develop capacity for managing climate change risks to rural and coastal development in Turkey. According to the background information presented in the PRODOC, “Turkey is highly vulnerable to anticipated climate change impacts. Turkey’s First National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2007 reports that present climate change effects include rising summer temperatures, reduced winter precipitation in the western provinces, loss of surface waters, greater frequency of droughts, land degradation, coastal erosion, and flooding. This is having a major negative effect on water availability for food production and rural development. The severity of these impacts is predicted to increase. It is estimated, for example, that 50% of surface waters in the Gediz and Büyük Menderes Basins along the Aegean coast of Turkey will be lost in this century, creating extreme water shortages for agricultural, domestic and industrial water users. The reduced water availability (in soils, rivers, dams, lakes and ground reserves) is likely to have devastating effects on agricultural production, with knock-on effects being a reduction in food production, a reduction in power and influence of rural woman’s groups, and increased degradation of rural landscapes. A strategy to respond to all negative climate change impacts is in the national agenda.” Thus there is no question that the JP is relevant and timely to Turkey’s needs and development agenda.

The objective is to be achieved by “mainstreaming climate change adaptation into the national development framework, building capacity in national and regional institutions, piloting community-based adaptation projects in the Seyhan River Basin, and integrating climate change adaptation into all UN agencies in Turkey.” The focus on mainstreaming into the national development framework and on building national capacity is also in keeping with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

Developing a National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy which addresses the key requirements for climate change adaptation in Turkey as stipulated in Turkey’s Ninth Development Plan 2007-2013 and in rural development strategies such as The Regional Development Plan for the Eastern Black Sea Region (2002) is also consistent with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action. Turkey’s Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) highlights the importance of addressing climate change impacts and managing water and ecological resources in a sustainable manner. The JP also intends to propose legislative changes to mainstream climate change risks into development and regional planning.

9. LEARNING, SHARING & BUILDING ON LESSONS/EXPERIENCES

It would be helpful and timely for this JP to learn from and share their own experiences with other JPs in the Environment and Climate Change window in other countries. One opportunity for doing this would be at COP 16 (Nov-Dec, 2010 in Mexico). The Secretariat could help to organize a forum for this purpose, perhaps inviting different JPs to share their experiences every day during the meetings and providing contact information before hand so that JP Managers can take direct contact with each other.

Although the JP has had interchanges with the GEF Small Grants Programme, given that the SGP has now had well over a decade of experience with grants programmes around the world, a continued and even stronger sharing of lessons and experiences between the JP grants programme and the GEF SGP (not just the Turkey SGP) should be encouraged.

Greater awareness and screening of the grants funded through the grants programme to ensure they incorporate lessons learned from development assistance around the world is important. As one example, the Saanen goats project appears to be a very conventional, non-sustainable livestock production project with little if any attention given to environmental impact or ecological sustainability.

10. COMMUNICATIONS & ADVOCACY STRATEGY

According to JP documentation, the “Communication strategy focuses on strengthening the level of understanding and awareness on the issues of climate change among related parties through effective usage of media and public information events and by using Article 6 of UNFCCC as a base. The aim of the strategy is to generate awareness on the climate change issues with a special emphasis on adaptation to climate change. The **objectives** of the communication strategy:

- ✚ to raise further awareness and to ensure coordination and enhancing the capacities among relevant parties working on adaptation to climate change.
- ✚ to mobilize people and make them act for change and influence policy
- ✚ to ensure public involvement in climate change agenda
- ✚ to make strategic partnerships with wide range of actors from media to private sector
- ✚ to position MDG-F brand with high visible events
- ✚ to create synergy between other climate change projects of UNDP”

Although the JP Communications Strategy is well developed in the areas of using media to share the lessons and experiences of the JP, it should place greater focus on spreading the word about the MDGs. In this regard it would be strategic for the JP Communications Strategy to focus on the tent villages as there is good opportunity to address at least five of the eight MDGs in these areas. This would also be timely and responsive to Government given the recent directive of the Prime Ministry’s office to the Governorates of Adana and Mersin to enhance living conditions in the tent villages. The Adana province contains the largest number of tent villages in Turkey and is in the JP pilot project area. Regarding efforts underway to increase awareness on the issues addressed by the JP, and or advocacy to put these issues at the forefront of action plans and policies, the Communications Strategy has in fact placed emphasis on both enhancing awareness about the issues addressed by the JP and on putting these issues at the forefront of action plans and policies. The issue is that more emphasis needs to be placed in the strategy on the MDGs as a whole (especially with the CC adaptation focus), and the project lends itself to acting on this opportunity especially in the context of the tent villages.

The communications strategy should also ensure that there is adequate exchange of information between the various grant projects funded by the JP. For example, although one grant project visited by the evaluation mission dealt with livestock production (improved dairy goat breed), the grantees had little information about pasture and livestock management (which was being taught through another grant) and the probability of further environmental degradation (in an already degraded pastureland) because of this project seems highly likely. Likewise, another grant project dealing with improved pasture management and other agricultural practices

indicated they were not aware of the improved breed of dairy goat (the Saanen goat) being promoted in the other grant project. This is an indication of inadequate sharing of information between grants funded by the JP grants programme.

Finally, there is a need to ensure greater communication between the grants projects themselves and the Coordinator of the JP communications strategy. The Coordinator of the Communications Strategy became aware of numerous important press releases done thru one grant visited by the evaluation mission (the Transmitted Diseases Observation and Control System) when these were shared with the evaluation mission.

The Coordinator of the Communications Strategy should herself be a tool (in addition to websites, press releases, TV shows), spending more time in the pilot area, using her voice to get the word out about the JP and the MDGs.

11. MONITORING OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

11.1 ADEQUACY OF THE MONITORING SYSTEM

Both a mid-term and a final evaluation are planned and budgeted for. All required monitoring reports have been prepared and submitted on a timely basis. More detailed comments regarding the M&E framework follow in the next section.

11.2 THE JOINT PROGRAMME M&E FRAMEWORK

- ✚ The system for monitoring the impact of the JP on achievement of the MDGs is weak. The JP would appreciate assistance from the Secretariat in designing a better means of monitoring the impact of the JP in this regard, learning from what other JPs are doing.
- ✚ Even though indicators often do not correspond well with outputs, no one saw the need to significantly alter any of these at the inception report stage. Even though the M&E framework is being used as a management and monitoring tool, one can be monitoring progress against indicators and targets that do not in the end add up to expected outcomes. Furthermore, the JP team has never been asked to prepare any reports that require them to compare their progress according to these indicators. According to information received from the Secretariat, starting from the reporting period of July to December 2009, all JPs are being asked to report progress on the M&E framework.
- ✚ Indicators should be more outcome and output oriented. Although there is adequate monitoring of progress (deliverables and products produced), this does not necessarily add up to impact, especially if the indicators are not the best (which is the case for many indicators in this M&E framework).
- ✚ Only minimal changes were made to the M&E framework or to the Results Framework during the inception report preparation or subsequent to this. There could have been many improvements made to the frameworks. It is the primary responsibility of the JP team, as implementors and managers of the JP, to carefully scrutinize the Results and M&E frameworks and suggest changes as appropriate. As for the reason why the JP team did not suggest changes, whether or not this is correct, they did not see the need for modifications. Substantive feedback from the Secretariat on the inception report may have helped the JP team realize that the framework could have been improved.

M&E OF THE JP GRANTS PROGRAMME

In addition to monitoring the grants funded by the JP to ensure they are on track, it is essential that technical monitoring of the grants be done by persons with the appropriate technical expertise.

The JP team is in the process of revising the format they use for monitoring the grants incorporating suggestions of UNDP (the new format was not available at the time of the evaluation).

Although the JP M&E Expert is monitoring the *progress* of the grants, there is need for *technical* monitoring of the grants to ensure they achieve their objectives and also, importantly, to ensure they do not have unintended negative environmental impacts.

There was no awareness of potential unintended negative environmental impacts resulting from the grants by any of the parties interviewed during the evaluation mission. Immediate attention is required to avoid this consequence in the case of at least several of the grants visited during the evaluation mission including the “Project for Poor Farmers and Women Living in Seyhan River Basin to Breed Saanen Dairy Goats”, and the “Adaptation and Mitigation to Sea-Level Change Related to Global Climate Change in Seyhan Delta”, a project granted to the Bird Research Society Adana Branch. Numerous questions arise about these projects: 1) why fight drought with goats, potentially one of the most destructive livestock species, in an area that is already significantly degraded and in which the project is simply providing more goats (where goats used to exist but no longer do) without understanding the reasons for their disappearance and without applying any ecological or sustainable agricultural principles or practices or monitoring the impact of this on the environment. The comment of the University professor overseeing the grant was that there would be no negative environmental consequence “because there are no trees” in the area. This response is an indication that stronger technical oversight of this project is required and a stronger technical evaluation of the proposal should have been undertaken. Likewise, the explanation of the Bird Research Society project was that species that are native to Turkey (but not native to the sand dunes) would be planted on the sand dunes to act as a detriment to incursion of sea waters into agricultural areas. Because these species would bear fruits, they would be attractive to local people who would choose to preserve these trees instead of destroying the sand dunes (as they are doing) to expand extensive agricultural lands. Those overseeing the project were seemingly unaware of any potential negative impact on the biodiversity or ecology of the dunes, nor were they concerned with the sustainability (who would maintain these trees over the long-term). When asked who would plant the trees, the answer was volunteers from the Bird Research Society. When asked what would happen if local people chose not to protect the trees, the answer was the police would be called. These two projects demonstrate very little learning of lessons from similar failed projects over the years, and, as previously mentioned have a strong probability of not only not being successful, but of having unintended negative environmental consequences. Finally, even a well designed dune conservation/restoration project would take much longer than one year (the maximum allowable time for any grant project).

The JP had identified the need for an independent evaluation of the grants programme. This evaluator questions the need, in principle, of an independent evaluator, as one would assume that such a role should be played by the JP M&E Expert himself. Nevertheless, given that the M&E expert does not have the technical background to technically monitor and evaluate the grants, there is a need for such monitoring. The recommendation (see recommendations section) is for FAO in partnership with an environmental NGO to undertake the technical monitoring of the agricultural grants. This requires transferring some funds from UNDP to FAO for this purpose.

It would have been beneficial for the M&E expert to be more proactively involved in assisting grantees with the development of indicators and expected impacts instead of leaving this completely to their judgment (the M&E Expert only provided input when requested by the grantees, but did not take the initiative to suggest any modifications after reviewing the proposals).

The JP M&E Expert is based in the capital city and not in the project pilot area.

It is important to modify the M&E framework in such a way as to capture important unanticipated positive impacts resulting from the JP that will otherwise go undocumented. (For example, the opening of the door to the tent villages through the Tropical Diseases grant, the buy-in of the Cukurova Regional Development Agency, a key partner who as a direct result of the JP included climate change adaptation in their call for proposals, the buy-in of the Governorate of the Adana Province, etc.)

11.3 MDGF SECRETARIAT SUPPORT TO THE JP

- ✚ Although the substantive support received from the Secretariat has invariably been of high quality, there is need for even more of it and a need to provide this in a more timely fashion.
- ✚ Reports submitted to the Secretariat by the JP are typically only acknowledged with no input provided by the Secretariat.
- ✚ Substantive feedback on the inception report would have been especially helpful, and substantive feedback and support will be important immediately following the review by all parties of the mid-term evaluation report.
- ✚ Opportunities for learning and sharing lessons and experiences between JPs in the Environment and Climate Change “window” in different countries are not being fully realized. Such sharing of lessons and experiences between Joint Programmes in different countries could be beneficial and cost-effective. It would be helpful for the Secretariat of the MDGF to take the initiative to facilitate and broker these exchanges. One opportunity to initiate this would be COP 16 (Nov-Dec, 2010 in Mexico) where the Secretariat could facilitate an exchange between Environment and Climate Change JPs from around the world.

13. RECOMMENDATIONS

- ✚ Place greater emphasis on MDG 3 (promote gender equality and empower women) and MDG 1 (eradicate extreme poverty), addressing in this way the UN core value of focusing on the most vulnerable groups, which are also the most vulnerable to climate change. The JP should adopt guidelines that ensure application of concrete gender equality practices and should involve strategic partners (such as, for example, the Women's Council in Adana) in planning and implementing activities. Experience around the world demonstrates that numbers do matter when it comes to promoting gender equality. In this regard, the JP should ensure it adopts gender equality guidelines and practices and applies these, even when this means redoing some indicators and involves re-planning of some workshops and trainings. 50% women-50% men in all JP activities should be the guideline and the actual practice. This exact percentage may not always be possible but offering 1 training session for women while offering 11 training sessions for men (which is the case in one of the JP grants) is not acceptable. The reason for this discrepancy may be lack of adequate gender sensitivity and lack of sufficient priority placed on gender equality by the JP Team. There are many women farmers (as was noted during the field visits of the evaluation mission) and there are many opportunities to involve them, even if this does require more effort.
- ✚ Ensure that the communications strategy of the JP not only share the experiences and lessons of the JP, but also focus heavily on communicating and promoting the MDGs. One practical recommendation in this regard would be for the communications strategy to focus on the MDGs as they relate to the tent villages in the JP pilot area (especially the province of Adana), as this would provide an opportunity to address several MDGs (Goals 1, 3,4,5,6, and 7) in an integrated way under the umbrella of adaptation to climate change. It would be helpful for the Communications Strategy Coordinator to work as a communications tool for the MDGs herself, spending significant time in the tent villages getting the word out about the MDGs.
- ✚ Improve M&E frameworks (both the overall framework as well as that of the Grants Programme) by: a) focusing more on impact-oriented indicators (not only on deliverables and products) so as to enable gauging the impact of the JP related to the stated outcomes and on the MDGs, b) ensuring that the right expertise is involved in technical monitoring of the grants projects to ensure they achieve their objectives and do not have unintended negative environmental consequences, and, c) ensuring the JP receives credit where due for the positive impacts resulting from the JP, including those that may not have originally been envisaged. (This is especially important because some of the most important impacts to date were not specifically envisaged in the M&E framework and it is important that these successes not be overlooked in future evaluations or in sharing of lessons).
- ✚ Ensure grant activities supported by the JP do not have unintended negative environmental impacts. This may best be done by involving more biodiversity/ecological expertise in the PMC, in the Technical Advisory Committee, and in the monitoring of existing grant projects. It is important to involve technical expertise at all levels, not just in TACs. FAO should be involved in the technical monitoring of the agricultural grants, supported by the involvement of ecological/biodiversity experts from NGOs.
- ✚ There are numerous NGOs in Turkey with environmental expertise, and their participation on the PMC and TAC and in the technical monitoring and backstopping of some of the grants should be encouraged.

- ✦ Even though no further grants will be given during the JP, it is important to modify the existing criteria for grants selection and for technical monitoring to ensure that it serves as the best model possible (especially because the MoEF has indicated its interest in adopting the model).
- ✦ Best practice would be to require formal written technical reviews (following a standard outline) from all TAC members reviewing grant proposals.
- ✦ Greater field presence in the pilot area by JP team members, especially the Regional Project Coordinator, the M&E Expert for the Grants Programme, and the Communications Strategy Coordinator. The Regional Project Coordinator should be based in Adana (instead of Ankara).
- ✦ Greater presence of the JP Manager in the MoEF. The JP Manager should make the MoEF his base of operations for at least part of the regular work week. The JP Manager has indicated his agreement with this recommendation and the MoEF has also already responded (during the evaluation mission debriefing/PMC meeting) to the recommendation positively, offering desk space for this purpose. A mistake often made by projects is to assume that the entire project team should be housed together (whether in a government office, a UN building, or elsewhere). Experience shows that a better approach is usually for project team members to be dispersed throughout key relevant ministries and UN agencies, and, of course in the field where pilot projects exist. This helps build capacity and ownership, even if logistically it can sometimes be more challenging. Proper coordination can be ensured and the risk of a fragmented team avoided with joint weekly meetings to ensure team integrity and synergy.
- ✦ Stronger partnerships between several UN agencies and Government Ministries. In particular it is important that UNIDO spend more time with the MoIT. UNIDO's partnership with TTGV is strong, but the MIT is also a key strategic partner for ensuring replicability and long-term sustainability, and it is important that a stronger partnership between UNIDO, MIT and TTGF be established.
- ✦ Find ways of ensuring true joint initiatives between UN agencies participating in this joint programme. One concrete example of such an initiative could be for UNDP and FAO to collaborate in the grants programme (currently managed exclusively by UNDP) in the area of technical monitoring of the agricultural grants (which form a large part of the whole grants programme).
- ✦ Ensure Outcome 4 is revised significantly to reflect realities and to ensure that it represents a truly strategic approach, or discard it altogether.
- ✦ The JP should adopt a catalytic role in helping (thru its grant project and thru its communications strategy) to open the door to UN agencies and others that could help to follow up in the longer-term on working with local partners and communities to achieve the MDGs in the tent village communities which represent some of the most vulnerable populations in the country.
- ✦ Encourage more private sector involvement in the JP.
- ✦ Regarding the PMC:
 1. Encourage more active participation by PMC members
 2. Ensure PMC members fully understand their role and responsibilities for the overall JP
 3. Consider language translation in PMC meetings (this may help encourage non-fluent English speakers to participate more)
 4. Consider holding PMC meetings in the MoEF instead of in the UN House

5. Include the SPO, an environmental NGO and a representative of a women's group on the PMC
6. Invite the Foreign Relations Department of the MoEF to be an observer at PMC meetings (they are interested in being involved so that they can ensure lessons learnt in this JP are shared in other projects in the ministry and to avoid any duplication with other efforts)
7. Ensure the natural disaster element of the JP is adequately represented on the PMC

- ✚ Rename the so-called "environment information management system" to reflect what it is really intended to be (portals, network). The same applies to the "eco-efficiency center".

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MDG-F SECRETARIAT

- ✚ Although the quality of the feedback provided by the Secretariat to the JP is good, more of it is required and in a more timely fashion. Reports from the JP to the Secretariat are often merely acknowledged without providing substantive feedback. It could have been especially important to provide substantive comments on the inception report.
- ✚ Agree on the evaluation mission agenda with enough time before the beginning of the mission to avoid wasting time during the mission sorting out the agenda.
- ✚ Facilitate the sharing of information/lessons/experiences between Environment and Climate Change JPs in different countries. The Secretariat could help each country identify the most relevant JPs to their own and facilitate initial contact between these.
- ✚ Greater scrutiny of the draft PRODOC and Inception Report by the Secretariat and perhaps an independent expert with experience as a manager of a large (minimum 3 year) project, may have proven helpful in improving the design of the JP at the earliest possible stage.
- ✚ The time frames from the time a "window" is opened (in this case the Environment and Climate Change window) and the time in which JP concepts must be received, and the time given to develop the concept into a full JP proposal once the concept is approved may be inadequate and may contribute to a less than ideal design.
- ✚ For future JPs, clarify the purpose of the presentation of "illustrative interventions for priority areas of support" within the context of the Terms of Reference for the Environment and Climate Change window on the MDG-F website to ensure that it is not interpreted as a "menu" of activities to choose from.
- ✚ Numerous changes have been made to templates and reporting requirements making it difficult for JP Managers to keep abreast of these changes. It would have perhaps been helpful for the Secretariat to have taken more time at the beginning to set itself up properly and perfect templates and reporting requirements before opening windows. Some modifications would undoubtedly still have to have been made, but these may have been fewer.