

# Review of Twinning in Turkey

## Final Report

In the context of the framework contract on Evaluation and  
Evaluation-Related Services no. BUDG  
N°06/PO/01/003/101911

Client: European Commission, DG Enlargement

ECORYS Nederland BV, 23 May 2011

Ferrie Pot (TL)  
Roland Blomeyer  
Sevil Geveci  
Hülya Günaydin



ECORYS Nederland BV  
P.O. Box 4175  
3006 AD Rotterdam  
Watermanweg 44  
3067 GG Rotterdam  
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)10 453 88 00  
F +31 (0)10 453 07 68  
E [netherlands@ecorys.com](mailto:netherlands@ecorys.com)  
W [www.ecorys.com](http://www.ecorys.com)  
Registration no. 24316726

ECORYS Macro & Sector Policies  
T +31 (0)31 (0)10 453 87 53  
F +31 (0)10 452 36 60



# Table of contents

<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1 Background of the Evaluation</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1 Object of the Evaluation	13
1.2 Objective of the Evaluation	13
1.2.1 Objective	13
1.2.2 Evaluation questions	13
1.3 Methodological Framework	14
1.3.1 Review of Interim Evaluation Reports	14
1.3.2 Horizontal interviews	15
1.3.3 Sector Studies	15
1.3.4 Case studies	15
1.3.5 Round table meetings	16
1.4 Structure of the Report	17
<b>2 Relevance</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1 General notes	18
2.2 Has the underlying strategic rationale and design of Twinning assistance been appropriate for Turkey, at programme/sectoral levels?	19
2.3 Has Twinning been used in the circumstances foreseen in the Commission’s Twinning Manual?	19
2.4 Are there certain sectors or Accession Partnership fields in Turkey where Twinning could be an adequate tool but is not used?	20
2.5 Can synergies be identified between Twinning and other types of EC projects, and/or with projects funded by other donors?	21
2.6 Is the needs assessment relevant, i.e. are mandatory results precisely defined in the Project Fiches	22
2.7 Is the interaction between key stakeholders (beneficiary institutions, ECD, DG ELARG) adequate and performing efficiently to ensure successful programming of Twinning?	23
<b>3 Efficiency</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1 General notes	25
3.2 Are inputs/activities being efficiently transferred into the planned outputs?	26
3.3 Is the selection of twinning (as opposed to any other instrument, i.e. Technical Assistance or Direct Agreements) adequately assessed and justified?	27

3.4	Could the same results and impacts be achieved more cost-effectively?	28
<b>4</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	General notes	29
4.2	Has the Twinning support under evaluation achieved (or will likely to achieve in the case of ongoing support) the objectives pursued?	30
4.3	Are quality and quantity of resources allocated by both beneficiary and the Member State/Twinning partner appropriate?	31
4.4	Is the interaction between key stakeholders adequate and performing effectively to ensure successful implementation of Twinning?	32
<b>5</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1	General notes	34
5.2	To which extent have the outputs generated by assistance been translated into results and impact?	35
5.3	To which extent does Twinning act as a catalyst for wider organisational and regulatory change in Turkey?	36
5.4	Are there administrative and/or organisational gaps at beneficiary level which undermine the translation of outcomes into results?	40
<b>6</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>41</b>
6.1	General notes	41
6.2	Is there continuity in the reform process after the projects have been completed? What is the level of ownership of outputs obtained and how are these outputs used by the beneficiaries?	42
6.3	Does cooperation between the beneficiary administration and the Member State administration continue after the project has been completed?	43
<b>7</b>	<b>Horizontal evaluation questions</b>	<b>45</b>
7.1	Are the Turkish structures and systems adequately planning and successfully implementing Twinning projects?	45
7.2	What constitutes good practice in Twinning and to what extent is it ensured in Turkish Twinning projects?	46
7.3	Overall conclusion and recommendation	47

# List of Abbreviations

AP	Accession Partnership
AU	Australia
BC	Beneficiary
CFCU	Central Finance & Contracts Unit
EC	European Commission
EUD	Delegation of the European Union
EMRA	Energy Market Regulatory Authority
ES	Spain
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union of the DEAF
EUSG	Secretariat General for European Union Affairs
FR	France
GE	Georgia
GtoG	Government to Government
HU	Hungary
IERs	Interim Evaluation Reports
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession
ITMS	Page 34
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MS	Member State
NL	Netherlands
NPAA	National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis
PL	Project leader
RTA	Resident Twinning Advisor
STE	Short Term Expert
TA	Technical Assistance
TCA	Turkish Court of Accounts
UCTE	Page 19
UK	United Kingdom

# Executive Summary

ECORYS has been contracted through the framework contract on Evaluation and Evaluation-related services (BUDG N°06/PO/01/Lot N°3) of DG Budget of the European Commission to prepare a thematic evaluation on the assistance provided by the EC to Turkey through the Twinning instrument.<sup>1</sup>

## *Methodology*

The object of this evaluation report is the Twinning instrument as it has been applied in Turkey in the period 2002 - 2009. In this period, 92 Twinning projects in Turkey were initiated and financed under the Pre-accession assistance and IPA programmes by the European Commission.

The methodology has used five methods for data collection:

- Review of Interim Evaluation Reports;
- Sector studies on the use of Twinning per sector;
- Case studies of individual Twinning projects;
- Interviews with key horizontal stakeholders;
- Round table sessions with Member State's National Twinning Contacts points.

## *Conclusions*

The following conclusions respond to the evaluation questions:

- i. The underlying strategic rationale of Twinning assistance, being an instrument to support the candidate accession countries to comply with the Acquis, is being applied for Twinning in Turkey as all projects are closely related to the National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis.
- ii. Twinning projects in Turkey have been applied in most of the cases in circumstances foreseen in the Commission's Twinning Manual. Non-fulfilment of these conditions in a few cases has resulted in low Twinning performance.
- iii. Twinning is used across all sectors or Accession Partnership fields in Turkey where it could be an adequate tool. However, the use of Twinning in some sectors is less frequent than in others. The main reasons not to use Twinning in such sectors are less political will (e.g. social sectors), structural shortages in qualified staff (e.g. agriculture and fisheries) and, possibly, lack of awareness of the Twinning instrument.
- iv. In successful Twinning projects, clear synergies between Twinning and other donor-funded projects are often identified. Since such synergies are often lacking in the less successful projects, it is concluded that the presence of synergies between Twinning

---

<sup>1</sup> ECORYS is part of the consortium comprising of COWI A/S, ECORYS, ECOTEC, IDEA and CSIL



and other EC and/or donor funded projects is key factor supporting the success of Twinning projects.

- v. A needs assessment underpins the mandatory results of most of the Twinning projects. However, the long time for Twinning projects that is required to complete the steps from project identification, via programming to contracting and implementation jeopardizes the relevance of the needs assessment.
- vi. The quality of interaction between key stakeholders in programming is another key factor for successful Twinning performance. In Turkey, the involvement of the EUD together with beneficiary institutions is considered to be adequate to ensure successful programming of Twinning. The role of the EUSG could be more prominent.
- vii. A critical issue in the domain of efficiency is the timely delivery of the activities. Factors negatively affecting the efficiency of Twinning in Turkey are:
  - delays in preparing the final Twinning contract reducing the implementation time of the project;
  - interdependence with other supplies/works/TA components and the delay in procurement procedures therein.
- viii. Although a formal assessment of the costs/benefits of Twining versus TA is not conducted in the project fiches, there is no indication that Twinning projects could have been more efficiently/effectively implemented by technical assistance delivered by the private sector.
- ix. Results and impacts could be achieved more cost-effectively by reducing the delay in the delivery of the activities (see conclusion vii).
- x. Based on the positive average score of Twinning projects in Turkey given by the IERs and the confirmation of the IER scores in the case studies, it can be concluded that, by and large, Twinning projects achieve their objectives. In case Twinning projects do not deliver fully on their objectives, the reasons are diverse. The most important fail factors are lack of commitment, too ambitious project results, lack of commitment due to workload, lack of political commitment, problems with procurement, inadequate expert mobilization from the Member State institution and/or an outdated needs assessment.
- xi. In general, both beneficiary and member state institutions allocate enough resources in terms of quantity and quality to the Twinning project. The most structural problem would be the lack of full time availability of beneficiary's project members due to the workload of their parallel duties and the frequency of staff turnover during project implementation. From the side of the member state institution, the quality of the RTA and the mobilisation of STE are only incidentally raised as critical issues.
- xii. The interaction between the key stakeholders has been effective ensuring successful Twinning implementation. However, in some cases CFCU's involvement in contractual issues and EUSG's involvement in coordination and monitoring is open for improvement.
- xiii. The outputs generated by the Twinning assistance have in most cases been translated into achievement of the expected results. Wider impact in the form of further institutional and or legal alignment to the Acquis is in most cases still pending and awaiting political adoption of the relevant legislative or organisational reforms.
- xiv. The impact of almost all Twinning projects extends beyond its immediate and wider results. In this way, Twinning acts as a catalyst for wider organisational and regulatory change in Turkey. The extent of this catalyst impact varies among sectors.

Twinning has been significantly more important as an instrument for institutional and legislative alignment to the Acquis in the sector ‘environment’ than in the sector ‘agriculture and fisheries’. Its role in the Justice and Home Affairs is so far mixed and requires more sustained efforts.

- xv. Given the background of Twinning as an instrument to support alignment to the EU Acquis, the political preference among the political and administrative management of the beneficiary institution with regard to the accession of Turkey to the EU affects commitment to project objectives either positively or negatively.
- xvi. For successful Twinning projects, the reform processes continue after the projects have been completed and the beneficiaries demonstrate ownership of the outputs obtained. Both factors indicate that the results and impact achieved by successful Twinning projects are sustained after project closure. The main risk to sustainability is the delay in the institutionalization (organizational restructuring or adoption of legislation) of the Twinning results.
- xvii. Notwithstanding constructive intentions for further cooperation, ongoing cooperation between the beneficiary and the member state institution is not widespread in practice.

In sum, there are clearly issues that need the attention in programming and implementing of Twinning projects, such as:

- Alignment with strategic documents;
- The availability of a recent needs assessment;
- Capacity and quality of the expertise provided by the member state institution;
- Full time availability of the beneficiary staff;
- The complexity of the design with preferably no complex mix of TA, supplies and Twinning components.

There are also circumstantial factors that affect the likelihood that the Twinning performance will be satisfactory, such as:

- Earlier Twinning experience of the beneficiary institution;
- Synergies with other reform projects implemented by the beneficiary institution;
- Existing sectoral structures facilitating or inhibiting Twinning.

Notwithstanding these observations, it is concluded that Turkish institutions have proven to be capable of adequately planning and successfully implementing Twinning projects. However, assuming that achievement of sustainable impact is the ultimate goal of Twinning projects, this study concludes that high level political commitment is the key bottleneck preventing success. Twinning has contributed towards strengthening the institutional and administrative capacity of Turkey in line with the requirements from the Acquis through a large number of successful Twinning projects. However, its contribution could have been more prominent if political commitment would have supported the implementation of all individual Twinning projects.

### *Recommendations*

As political will to engage in Twinning projects, to allocate resources to them, to deal swiftly with procedural bottlenecks and to sustain the results by adopting new legislation and to engage in organisational restructuring determines whether individual Twinning projects provide value for money in Turkey, a key recommendation is to ensure political

commitment from the start of the project till finalisation when project results need to be institutionalised. It is recommended to elaborate various options to ensure such political commitment:

- a. In line with the Twinning manual such commitment can be assessed at the start of the project. In that case, it is recommended to make the criteria to support the decision on whether a beneficiary is fit for Twinning more objectively verifiable. For example, genuine political commitment could be supported by the presence of wider reforms approved by the beneficiary.
- b. To enhance commitment, it is recommended to pay more attention to the involvement of sectoral stakeholders in the project identification phase.
- c. If during project implementation, it becomes unambiguously clear that the circumstances foreseen in the Commission's Twinning Manual no longer apply, it is recommended to freeze the Twinning project until circumstances have improved.
- d. A final option to ensure political commitment is to engage the Turkish government to a greater extent in the financial costs of the project. In other words, it is recommended that the burden of the financial costs of the projects is more equally divided between the Turkish government and the European Union. The current rate of co-financing is 10 per cent. This percentage should be raised to at least 30 per cent.<sup>2</sup>

Other recommendations relate to more practical aspects of implementing Twinning projects. The following table lists the recommendations and indicates the responsible stakeholders for implementation.

No	Recommendation	Stakeholder
1	Provide training on the Twinning instrument and/or provide background information on Twinning projects in other accession countries in order to stimulate the use of the Twinning instrument in sectors where the instrument could be used more intensively.	EUD and EUSG
2	The existence of synergies with other projects appears as a key success factor and needs to be stimulated by including it as selection criterion for competing Twinning project proposals.	EUD and EUSG
3	Review the procedures for programming and contracting in order to shorten the time between the needs assessment and the actual start of the Twinning project.	DG ELARG
4	The key stakeholders in preparing the Twinning contract, the beneficiary and the Member State institution, need to be encouraged to finalise the Twinning contract within 3 months after the bid of the Member State is selected. The EUSG and the ECD should closely monitor progress and be allowed to issue sanctions, such as the re-allocation of the project budget.	EUD and EUSG
5	In order to properly assess the use of Twinning versus other technical assistance, the recommendations issued in the evaluation report "TA versus Twinning" (DG ELARG, 2011) should be implemented.	DG ELARG
5	CFCU and EUSG should prepare a policy how the interdependence between Twinning and supply components can be optimally addressed. Such a policy could contain a procedure that in case Twinning projects are selected that include parallel supply components, the CFCU will prepare a detailed procurement plan that will facilitate the Twinning project. The	CFCU / EUSG

<sup>2</sup> Regarding this key recommendation, such a decision may not be taken only for Turkey, but needs to apply to all IPA countries on the basis of the "equal treatment of candidate countries".

	EUSG should monitor compliance.	
6	The beneficiary should ensure full time availability of its staff members that are directly involved in the management of the Twinning project. The EUSG should monitor and interfere in case such availability is not guaranteed.	EUSG
7	The selection of the Member State institution should be carefully based on RTA availability and competences as well as the institutions' capacity to endow short term experts to the project. The EUD and EUSG have a role in advising the selection team on these matters.	EUD / EUSG
8	Ensure the sustainability of project results by programming follow up projects that build on achieved results of previous Twinning projects.	EUD / EUSG
9	Whilst there might not always be a possibility for immediate follow up in the form of bilateral cooperation, it might be worthwhile for the EUD or the EUSG to organize annual twinning conferences inviting Turkish beneficiaries and Member State representatives to 'force' the maintenance of contacts and thus prepare the grounds for bilateral follow-up.	EUD / EUSG

# 1 Background of the Evaluation

## 1.1 Object of the Evaluation

The object of this evaluation report is the Twinning instrument as it has been applied in Turkey in the period 2002 - 2009. In this period, 92 Twinning projects in Turkey were initiated and financed under the Pre-accession assistance and IPA programmes by the European Commission. More background information on the object of the review – Twinning in Turkey – , is included in **Annex 1**.

## 1.2 Objective of the Evaluation

### 1.2.1 Objective

The review is guided by two objectives. The first objective is to provide an assessment of the Twinning assistance in terms of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. This objective is essentially retrospective in nature. The second objective is of a forward looking nature by providing lessons learned and recommendations for programming future Twinning assistance.

### 1.2.2 Evaluation questions

The study answers the following 20 evaluation questions that were pre-formulated in the Terms of Reference:

#### *Relevance:*

- i. Has the underlying strategic rationale and design of Twinning assistance been appropriate for Turkey, at programme/sectoral levels?
- ii. Has Twinning been used in the circumstances foreseen in the Commission's Twinning Manual?
- iii. Are there certain sectors or Accession Partnership fields in Turkey where Twinning could be an adequate tool but is not used. If so why? What method or approach could be used to make Twinning more acceptable in these areas?
- iv. Can synergies be identified between Twinning and other types of EC projects, and/or with projects funded by other donors?
- v. Is the needs assessment relevant?
- vi. Is the interaction between key stakeholders adequate and performing effectively to ensure successful programming of Twinning?

#### *Efficiency:*

- vii. Are inputs/activities being efficiently transferred into the planned outputs?

- viii. Is the selection of twinning (as opposed to any other instrument, such as Technical Assistance or Direct Agreements) adequately assessed and justified?
- ix. Could the same results and impacts be achieved more cost-effectively?

#### *Effectiveness*

- x. Has the Twinning support under evaluation achieved (or will likely to achieve in the case of ongoing support) the mandatory results?
- xi. Do the beneficiaries allocate enough resources for a proper running of IPA Twinning projects in Turkey? Are quality and quantity of resources allocated by both beneficiary and the Member State/Twinning partner appropriate?
- xii. Is the interaction between key stakeholders adequate and performing effectively to ensure successful implementation of Twinning?

#### *Impact*

- xiii. To which extent have the outputs generated by assistance been translated into results and impact?
- xiv. To which extent does Twinning act as a catalyst for wider organisational and regulatory change in Turkey?
- xv. Are there administrative and/or organizational gaps at beneficiary level which undermine the translation of outcomes into results?

#### *Sustainability*

- xvi. Is there continuity in the reform process after the projects have been completed?
- xvii. What is the level of ownership of outputs obtained and how are these outputs used by the beneficiaries?
- xviii. Does cooperation between the beneficiary administration and the Member State administration continue after the project has been completed?

#### *Horizontal questions*

- xix. What constitutes good practice in Twinning and to what extent is it ensured in Turkish Twinning projects?
- xx. Are the Turkish structures and systems adequately planning and successfully implementing Twinning project

## 1.3 Methodological Framework

The methodology has used five methods for data collection:

- 1 Review of Interim Evaluation Reports;
- 2 Sector studies on the use of Twinning in the Sector;
- 3 Case studies of individual Twinning projects;
- 4 Interviews with key institutions at horizontal level;
- 5 Round table sessions with Member State Twinning Focal points.

### 1.3.1 Review of Interim Evaluation Reports

All Twinning projects have been subjected to monitoring reviews during and after their implementation. The results of these reviews have been reported in sectoral Interim Evaluation Reports (IERs) that have been prepared by the EC in the period 2003-2008.

On the basis of the available IERs, the performance ratings of 67 Twinning projects in terms of the five evaluation criteria – (1) relevance; (2) efficiency; (3) effectiveness, (4) impact and (5) sustainability – have been retrieved. The rates vary between ‘-3’ (highly unsatisfactory) and ‘+3’ (highly satisfactory).<sup>3</sup> **Annex 2** contains a list of the IERs reviewed and provides an analysis of their findings.

### 1.3.2 Horizontal interviews

Interviews have been conducted with the following horizontal stakeholders:

- i. Secretariat General for European Union Affairs (EUSG);
- ii. Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU);
- iii. Delegation of the European Union in Turkey;
- iv. European Commission, DG ELARG.

Interview reports are presented in **Annex 3**.

### 1.3.3 Sector Studies

The Twinning projects have been conducted in the following sectors:

- a. Justice and Home affairs;
- b. Environment, Energy and Transport;
- c. Finance and Statistics;
- d. Agriculture and Fisheries;
- e. Internal Market and Standardization;
- f. Social Sectors.

For each of these sectors, the role of the Twinning instrument in approximating the requirements of the Acquis Communautaire has been analysed. **Annex 4** presents these sector studies.

### 1.3.4 Case studies

Sixteen Twinning projects have been selected for in-depth case studies. The case studies have two aims. A first aim is to validate the assessment of the Interim Evaluation Reports on the five evaluation criteria. A second aim is to identify the key success and fail factors for Twinning projects in Turkey. Eight comparative sets of case studies were selected, including successful and less successful projects, within one and the same sector (16 case in total).<sup>4</sup> In this way, sector specific explanations for the relative degree of success could be ruled out and project specific issues stand out as explanatory factors. Table 1.1 shows the 16 case studies included in this study. The details of the case studies are reported in **Annex 5 and 6**.

---

<sup>3</sup> For projects based on project fiches dating from 2007 such scores are still lacking as a consequence of the short time of their implementation and no interim performance ratings have yet been issued.

<sup>4</sup> The selection of successful versus less successful was based on the rating given by the IERs (see Annex 2).

Table 1.1 Selected Twinning projects for the case studies per sector

Sector	Selection (score and MS)	
	Good practice cases	Bad practice cases
Justice and Home affairs	TR0404.04 Development of a training system for border police (+5, ES)	TR0501.05 An Independent Police Complaints Commission and Complaints System for the TNP and Gendarmerie (-4, UK)
	TR0601.01 Support to the set up of an Asylum and Country of Origin system (+5, GE)	TR0601.03 Training of Gendarmerie offices on European human right standards (-1, Italy)
	TR0603.05 Strengthening the capacity of Turkish Grand National Assembly (+10, HU)	TR0404.03 Enhancement of the professionalism of the Turkish Gendarmerie in its law enforcement activities (+3, UK)
Environment, energy and transport	TR0603.04 Water sector capacity building (+8, NL)	TR0403.08 Assistance to the Turkish road transport sector (-3, NL)
	TR0603.03 Improvement of the conditions for Cross Border Electricity Trade (+9, FR)	TR0202.01 Institutional strengthening of the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA) (-4, Italy)
Finance and statistics	TR0302.05 Strengthening the Audit Capacity of the Turkish Court of Accounts (11, UK)	TR0403.02 Tax administration capacity building (+4, GE)
Agriculture and Fisheries	TR0503.05 Establishment of an IPA Rural Development Agency (8, AU)	TR0403.03 Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey (-10, GE)
Internal market and certification	TR0403.01 Customs Modernization Project II (+6, GE)	TR0503.01 Reinforcement of Institutional Capacity for Establishing a Product Safety System in Turkey (-7, ?)

Implementation of the case studies was hampered due to the unavailability of the key project documents. The evaluation team was presented with the project fiches of all selected case study projects. However, the final RTA-report of the Resident Twinning Advisor (RTA) were only made available after the field phase was concluded.<sup>5</sup> None of the Twinning contracts or any other project files were made available.

### 1.3.5 Round table meetings

In order to validate the findings and conclusions from the field work, the preliminary results have been discussed in round table meetings in Turkey and Germany. The latter

<sup>5</sup> The availability of the final RTA reports was hampered by the absence of electronic copies of the reports. Both the CFCU and DG Elarg archive hard copies of these reports. However, these hard copies are not easily accessible and could only be retrieved with great effort. The development of an electronic archive per Twinning project would improve project management and facilitate monitoring and evaluation missions.



country is the most active Member State in Twinning projects (39 % share).<sup>6</sup> **Annex 7** presents the key points raised in the meeting in Germany.

## 1.4 Structure of the Report

The structure of this report is based on the evaluation questions as required by the Terms of Reference. The evaluation questions are categorised according to the evaluation criteria: relevance (Chapter 2), ‘efficiency’ (Chapter 3), ‘effectiveness’ (Chapter 4), ‘impact’ (Chapter 5) and ‘sustainability’ (Chapter 6). The remaining horizontal questions are responded to in the final concluding Chapter. In line with the preferences of DG ELARG, the main report is limited to about 30 pages.

---

<sup>6</sup> The National Twinning Contact Point of the United Kingdom was contacted but was unable to organize a Round Table Meeting with UK Twinning experts. In the Netherlands a meeting was prepared. Unfortunately, the majority of attendants had no Twinning experience in Turkey. For Spain, in view of the limited number of Twinning experts with experience in Turkey available, a round table was replaced by separate individual interviews with Twinning project leaders.

## 2 Relevance

### 2.1 General notes

The table below shows the average scores of all Twinning projects based on the IERs on the various evaluation criteria. Relevance has an average score of 1.07 (on a scale from -3 to 3). In comparison to the other criteria, ‘relevance’ is rated the highest indicating that the Twinning projects address the needs of the Turkish authorities in their effort to achieve alignment with the Acquis.

	Nr of projects		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability
	total	rated					
Average score	91	67	→ <b>1.07</b>	0.28	0.90	0.79	0.86

A more detailed overview shows that around one in 5 projects feature a negative score on relevance (see Annex 2). Table 2.1 shows that in comparison to the average rating on relevance of Twinning projects in Turkey:

- projects in the sector ‘Finance and Statistics’ are rated to have substantially more relevance;
- projects in the sectors ‘Justice and Home Affairs’ and ‘Internal Market’ are on average;
- projects in the sector ‘Agriculture and Fisheries’ and ‘Environment, Energy and Transport’ are rated to have substantially less relevance.

Table 2.1 Average ratings on ‘relevance’ per sector

	Total projects per sector	Average per sector	Total average (Twinning in Turkey)	Deviation sector from total average
Justice and Home Affairs	20	1.15	1.07	Slightly above
Environment, Energy and Transport	12	0.75	1.07	Substantially below
Finance and Statistics	10	1.6	1.07	Substantially above
Agriculture and Fisheries	7	0.57	1.07	Substantially below
Internal Market and Certification	7	1.14	1.07	Slightly above
Social Sectors	2	1	1.07	Slightly below

## 2.2 Has the underlying strategic rationale and design of Twinning assistance been appropriate for Turkey, at programme/sectoral levels?

### *Judgement criterion*

- Presence of a clear link between the project, the Accession Partnership (AP) and the National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis (NPAA).

### *Findings*

Both the Sector Reports (annex 4) as the case studies (annex 5 and 6) show that in all cases there is a link between the AP and the NPAA and the Twinning projects. The twinning interventions also mostly respond to important concerns raised in the EC Country Progress Reports.

#### Box 1 TR 0203.02: Support to the enhancement of the safety of maritime transport in Turkey

The Maritime Safety project is relevant to the commitments of the Turkish Government outlined in the AP and the NPAA, including alignment of legislation on maritime safety, improvement and enforcement of maritime safety standards and strengthening the maritime administration. The project is also in line with the National Action Plan (2004-2008 to improve capacity to adopt and enforce the relevant Acquis.

Given that the maritime sector has the largest (86%) share in international transportation of goods, the project is also relevant as it aims to decrease the risks related to the transportation of dangerous cargo (petroleum, chemicals, oil, gas) which comprises 50% of all cargo transported through Turkey's seven busiest ports.

### *Conclusions*

The underlying strategic rationale of Twinning assistance, being as instrument to support the candidate countries to comply with the Acquis, is being applied for Twinning in Turkey.

### *Recommendations*

There is no need for a recommendation. It appears that the current practice is adequate.

## 2.3 Has Twinning been used in the circumstances foreseen in the Commission's Twinning Manual?

### *Judgement criterion*

Twinning should be used in the following circumstances foreseen by Twinning manual:

- the goal is relatively clear, i.e. the BC has a good understanding of the relevant part of the Acquis or the relevant area of co-operation, and has selected the type of system it intends to adopt;
- sufficient political will exists in the BC to create the best possible conditions for drafting and adoption of the relevant legislation;
- sufficient BC commitment exists to ensure that the required resources (financial, staff) are mobilised in a Twinning project.

### *Findings*

In most of the case studies, the circumstances foreseen by the Twinning manual apply. Only in a few cases of less-successful projects, it is unclear whether there was sufficient political will due to the imprecise definition of this circumstance.

Only in one case that it was clear that not sufficient political will existed - as it was reflected in the non-fulfilment of the preconditions included in the project fiche – and the project was nevertheless approved, the ultimate results of the Twinning project in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability was low.<sup>7</sup>

#### Box 2 TR 0403.03: Restructuring and strengthening of the food and safety and control system in Turkey

Even though the government has expressed its commitment, Turkey showed weak interest to bring about the reform in legislation and organisation urgently needed in order to move towards EU standards. The Food Law (No. 5179) has been approved in 2004 but had to be in line with the EU Acquis. Within the framework of this law, secondary legislation in the form of implementation regulations and communiqués has been adopted, but the new Framework Law on Food, Veterinary, Hygiene and Official Controls (No. 5996), which has been ratified on 11 June 2010 by the Parliament, made it necessary for the secondary legislation to be prepared again. Thus, the Twinning project has been limited in effectiveness, impact and sustainability due to a longstanding legislative and institutional standstill: “almost all of the outputs were delivered, but the outputs are of very limited use in the absence of a compliant food law”.

### *Conclusions*

Twinning projects in Turkey have been applied in most of the cases in which the circumstances foreseen in the Commission’s Twinning Manual apply. Non-fulfilment of these conditions in one case has resulted in low performance on the other performance criteria. In other cases, it is more difficult to relate the low performance of the Twinning project to the conditions stated in the Twinning manual as these conditions are not precisely defined.

### *Recommendations*

- The criteria to support the decision on whether a beneficiary is fit for Twinning should be made more objectively verifiable. For example, genuine political commitment could be supported by the presence of wider reforms approved by the beneficiary.
- In cases that it is unambiguously clear that the circumstances foreseen in the Commission’s Twinning Manual do not apply, the Twinning project should be frozen.

## 2.4 Are there certain sectors or Accession Partnership fields in Turkey where Twinning could be an adequate tool but is not used?

### *Judgement criterion*

Twinning should be used in all Accession Partnership fields where it can be an adequate tool.

---

<sup>7</sup> TR0404.03 – Restructuring and Strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System.

### *Findings*

Twinning has been used across most chapters of the Acquis. In some sectors, the instrument is clearly used more intensively than in others. Interventions in sectors like Justice and Home Affairs, Environment, and Rural Development have utilised the twinning instrument rather extensively. Ministries and institutions within these sectors have developed capacity such as EU Departments and sufficient staff competent in English language.

In other sectors, Twinning is less frequently used an instrument for capacity building. Different reasons underpin this variation:

- Political will: in some sectors, such as human rights, social sectors, there is less political will to undertake Twinning projects.
- Capacity: in some sectors there are structural shortages in quality and knowledge of language, such as Agriculture and Fisheries, which would make a Twinning project more cumbersome.

However, in some reasons there are no clear reasons for the limited use of Twinning. For example, in the sector Finance and Statistics most projects have focussed on strengthening capacities in the fields of financial control and tax (and customs, see IM) administration. Twinning activities in the field of statistics have been limited – there is one recent project, which has not been completed yet – although there remain a substantial number of issues in that field.

### *Conclusions*

Twinning is used in all sectors or Accession Partnership fields in Turkey where it could be an adequate tool. However, the use of Twinning in some sectors is less frequent than in others although the Twinning instrument could be useful. The main reasons not to use Twinning in such sectors are less political will (e.g. social sectors) and sectors with structural shortages in qualified staff (e.g. agriculture and fisheries).

### *Recommendations*

- In case the use of the Twinning instrument is considered to be less than optimal, the use of instrument could be stimulated by providing training on the Twinning instrument and/or providing background information on Twinning projects in those sectors in other accession countries could be presented in more easy to read documents.
- In other sectors, such as Agriculture and Fisheries, where Twinning projects appear to be more cumbersome due to structural shortages in qualified staff, the Twinning instrument should be applied with more restraint.

## **2.5 Can synergies be identified between Twinning and other types of EC projects, and/or with projects funded by other donors?**

### *Judgement criterion*

The Twinning project should be complementary and build on other projects and not duplicate efforts of other projects

### *Findings*

The case studies show that the occurrence of synergies between Twinning and other types of EC projects and/or with projects funded by other donors is significantly more present among the relative successful Twinning projects. It appears that the more successful Twinning build upon previous donor funded projects. Especially in case beneficiary institutions have previous experience with Twinning, the Twinning project appears to be more successful. For the Twinning projects that are less successful, such synergies could in most cases not be identified.

#### Box 3 TR 0603.03: Improvement of the conditions for cross border electricity trade

The project has complemented the two EC projects supported within the 2003 and 2004 financial programmes. Those had served as the first steps for the synchronisation and frequency of the Turkish power system with the UCTE Power System, supporting the establishment of the technical conditions for integration to the EU system and market. This twinning project has built on the outputs and provided the grounds for implementation. The system was connected in September 2010 and is currently under testing phase.

### *Conclusions*

In most of the more successful Twinning projects clear synergies are identified between Twinning and other donor-funded projects. As such synergies are often lacking in the less successful projects, it is concluded that the presence of synergies between Twinning and other EC and/or donor funded projects is a factor that contributes to the success of Twinning projects.

### *Recommendations*

The existence of synergies with other projects needs to be stimulated and could be included as selection criterion for competing Twinning project proposals.

## 2.6 Is the needs assessment relevant, i.e. are mandatory results precisely defined in the Project Fiches

### *Judgement criterion*

The project fiches should contain precisely defined mandatory results based on a needs assessment.

### *Findings*

The case study shows that the design of all successful Twinning project has been based on a relevant needs assessment on the basis of which mandatory results have been identified. Four among the sample of eight less successful Twinning projects were either not based on such a needs assessment or the needs assessment was outdated and irrelevant.<sup>8</sup> The time to complete the steps between project identification, programming and contracting until the start of project implementation is on average 2.5 years and may take more than three years. This time has been increased under the IPA-procedures.

---

<sup>8</sup> For example, TR0503.01 Establishing a Product Safety System

#### Box 4 TR 0503.01 Reinforcement of institutional capacity for establishing a product safety system

Membership to RAPEX is not only a membership requirement for EU, but also a requirement of Customs Union. Member States are connected to RAPEX system to ensure product safety measures. The Twinning project focused on developing a central/national database for future RAPEX connection was relevant. However, the needs assessment needed modification at the time of twinning contract drafting, due to the fact that relevant institutions had already started developing their own databases in the long time interval between project identification and contracting.

#### *Conclusions*

A needs assessment underpins the mandatory results of most of the Twinning projects included in the case studies. However, the long time for Twinning projects that is required to complete the steps project identification, programming and contracting jeopardizes the relevance of the needs assessment.

#### *Recommendations*

Review the procedures for programming and contracting in order to shorten the time between the needs assessment and the actual start of the Twinning project.

## 2.7 Is the interaction between key stakeholders (beneficiary institutions, ECD, DG ELARG) adequate and performing efficiently to ensure successful programming of Twinning?

#### *Judgement criterion*

Programming should not be inhibited by bottlenecks preventing adequate interaction between the key stakeholders.

#### *Findings*

In all successful Twinning projects is the coordination between the relevant institutions (EUSG, EUD and the beneficiary institutions) in programming Twinning regarded as very constructive. Especially, the interaction between the beneficiary institutions and the EU Delegation has been recognised as adequate. Some beneficiaries have built up capacity for this purpose (e.g. Gnl Directorate Security has established a new department for Twinning projects). However, other beneficiaries still have problems in preparing project fiches as reflected by shortcomings in a large proportion of the project fiches.<sup>9</sup>

The role of EUSG in coordination has been considered less apparent in the past, but has been increasing in recent years in line with its increasing capacity.

In a number of less successful Twinning projects, this interaction is regarded as less adequate. Issues that were raised are:

- Long time between project identification and project implementation (see section 2.6);

<sup>9</sup> More than 100-120 project fiches are prepared every year. However, almost half of them are not selected because of shortcomings.

- The presence of stakeholders with interests in the sector whom are not involved in programming and preparing the project fiche.

**Box 5 TR 0503.01 Reinforcement of institutional capacity for establishing a product safety system**

The structure in the sector is fragmented and the system lacks active involvement of consumer organisations. This is likely to undermine future institutional capacity building. Stakeholder involvement should have been ensured at project design phase to include training for consumer organisations.

*Conclusions*

The quality of interaction between key stakeholders is another key factor for successful Twinning performance. In most cases, this interaction is considered to be adequate and performing efficiently to ensure successful programming of Twinning.

*Recommendations*

- Same as above: amend the procedures for programming to shorten the time between the needs assessment and the actual start of the Twinning project.
- Ensure involvement of sectoral stakeholders in the project identification phase.



## 3 Efficiency

### 3.1 General notes

The table below shows the average scores of all Twinning projects based on the IERs on the various evaluation criteria. Efficiency has an average score of 0.28 (on a scale from -3 to 3). In comparison to the other criteria, ‘efficiency’ is rated the lowest indicating that Twinning projects could be conducted more cheaply and/or more timely.

	Nr of projects		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability
	total	rated					
Average score	91	67	1.07	→ <b>0.28</b>	0.90	0.79	0.86

A more detailed overview shows that around one in three projects feature a negative score on efficiency (see Annex 2). Table 3.1 shows that in comparison to the average rating on efficiency of Twinning projects in Turkey:

- projects in the sector ‘Justice and Home Affairs’ are rated to substantially more efficient;
- projects in the sectors ‘Environment, Energy and Transport’, ‘Finance and Statistics’ and ‘Internal Market’ are on average;
- projects in the sectors ‘Agriculture and Fisheries’ and ‘Social Sectors’ are rated to be substantially less efficient.

Table 3.1 Average ratings on efficiency per sector

	Total projects per sector	Average per sector	Total average (Twinning in Turkey)	Deviation sector from total average
Justice and Home Affairs	20	0.6	0.28	Substantially above
Environment, Energy and Transport	12	0.42	0.28	Slightly above
Finance and Statistics	10	0.3	0.28	Slightly above
Agriculture and Fisheries	7	-0.42	0.28	Substantially below
Internal Market and Certification	7	0.28	0.28	On average
Social Sectors	2	-1.5	0.28	Substantially below

### 3.2 Are inputs/activities being efficiently transferred into the planned outputs?

#### *Judgement criterion*

Efficient transfer of inputs into outputs is demonstrated by:

- timeliness of contracting;
- expenditures remain within budgets;
- timely delivery of activities;
- project logistics are ensured within a few month of contract signature.

#### *Findings*

The case studies show similar findings across successful and less successful Twinning projects. For both categories, all Twinning projects score positively on the following criteria:

- expenditures remain within budgets;<sup>10</sup>
- timely arrangement of project logistics.

In contrast, almost all projects, across both successful and non-successful Twinning projects, have experienced problems in timely delivery of their activities. For successful Twinning projects, the delay in the delivery of activities is primarily related to delay in contracting.

For Twinning projects with a low rating in efficiency, a common problem appears to be the interdependence with parallel projects for which supply/works or other technical assistance need to be procured. The delays that occur during such procurement procedures managed by the CFCU affect the timeliness of the Twinning projects negatively

#### Box 6 TR 0403.02 Tax administration capacity building

Twinning activities had problems with timely delivery of supply (IT hard and software) creating delays for training activities. Extension for 4 months was taken to complete twinning activities related to IT training and for testing of software.

#### Box 7 TR 0404.03 Enhancement of the professionalism of the Turkish gendarmerie

Efficiency constraints include a one-year delay over a required Project Fiche amendment and protracted Twinning Contract negotiations (reducing implementation time from 24 to 15 months), and limitations related to coordination between stakeholders.

#### *Conclusions*

A critical issue in the domain of efficiency is the timely delivery of the activities. Factors affecting the efficiency of Twinning in Turkey negatively are:

- delays in preparing the final Twinning contract;
- interdependence with supplies/works/TA and the procurement delay therein.

<sup>10</sup> Within the budget lines of Twinning projects, a general observation is that translation costs are underestimated. During project implementation virements towards translation appear necessary for many projects.

#### *Recommendations*

- The key stakeholders in preparing the Twinning contract, the beneficiary and the Member State institution, need to be encouraged to finalise the Twinning contract within 3 months after the selection of the Member State institution. The EUSG and the ECD should monitor progress and be allowed to issue sanctions, such as the re-allocation of the project budget.
- CFCU and EUSG should prepare a policy how to address the interdependence with supplies. Such a policy could contain a procedure that in case projects are selected that include other supply components in parallel to the Twinning project, the CFCU will prepare a detailed procurement plan that will facilitate the Twinning project. The EUSG should monitor compliance.

### 3.3 Is the selection of twinning (as opposed to any other instrument, i.e. Technical Assistance or Direct Agreements) adequately assessed and justified?

#### *Judgement criterion*

There should be a clear justification of using Twinning as opposed to T.A.

#### *Findings*

- The study ‘Twinning versus Technical Assistance’<sup>11</sup> indicates that beneficiary institutions prefer the more flexible and controllable instrument of ‘technical assistance’ rather than the instrument Twinning which is considered to be more inflexible. EU Delegations tend to insist more on the use of Twinning.
- No formal cost benefit analysis is done. Instead a number of non-quantifiable criteria are used for the selection.
- On the other hand, there are no indications that the choice of Twinning as an instrument has been inappropriate. Twinning appears to be used in cases that (-) the relevant knowledge is only available in the public sector, and/or (-) reforms are politically or bureaucratically ‘sensitive’ which require that it is crucial that the expertise needs to be provided on equal terms.

#### *Conclusions*

Although a formal assessment of the costs/benefits of Twinning versus TA is not conducted in the project fiches, there is no indication that Twinning projects would have been more efficiently/effectively implemented by technical assistance delivered by the private sector.

#### *Recommendations*

- Implement the recommendations issued in the evaluation report “TA versus Twinning” (ECORYS, 2011).

---

<sup>11</sup> This study was commissioned by the EC-DG ELARG and implemented by ECORYS.

### 3.4 Could the same results and impacts be achieved more cost-effectively?

#### *Judgement criterion*

Results and impact could have been achieved more cost effective if:

- i. Inputs/activities are not efficiently transferred into the planned outputs, or:
- ii. Is the selection of twinning (as opposed to any other instrument, i.e. Technical Assistance or Direct Agreements) adequately assessed and justified.

#### *Findings*

It is referred to the answer on questions raised in section 3.2 and 3.3. In Section 3.3 it was concluded that the instrument Twinning seems to be well-chosen in most cases, but Section 2.2 concludes that the implementation of the instrument can be more efficient. Especially, efficiency could be improved by enhancing the timely delivery of project activities. Issues that need to be addressed to enhance the timely delivery of project activities have been identified as:

- Delay in preparing the Twinning contract;
- Delay in procurement procedures of supply components that run in parallel to the Twinning project.

#### *Conclusions*

Results and impacts could be achieved more cost-effectively by reducing the delay in the delivery of the activities (see section 3.2)

#### *Recommendations*

See recommendation issued in section 3.2.

## 4 Effectiveness

### 4.1 General notes

The table below shows the average scores of all Twinning projects based on the IERs on the various evaluation criteria. Effectiveness has an average score of 0.9 (on a scale from -3 to 3). In comparison to the other criteria, ‘effectiveness’ is rated relatively high indicating that most Twinning projects achieve their mandatory results.

	Nr of projects		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability
	total	rated					
Average score	91	67	1.07	0.28	→ <b>0.90</b>	0.79	0.86

A more detailed overview shows that around one in six projects feature a negative score on effectiveness (see Annex 2). Table 4.1 shows that in comparison to the average rating on effectiveness of Twinning projects in Turkey:

- projects in the sector ‘Environment, Energy and Transport’ and ‘Finance and Statistics’ are rated to substantially more effective;
- projects in the sectors ‘Justice and Home Affairs’, ‘and ‘Social Sectors’ are rated on average;
- projects in the sector ‘Agriculture and Fisheries’ and ‘Internal market’ are rated to be substantially less effective.

Table 4.1 Average ratings on ‘effectiveness’ per sector

	Total projects per sector	Average per sector	Total average (Twinning in Turkey)	Deviation sector from total average
Justice and Home Affairs	20	0.8	0.90	Slightly below
Environment, Energy and Transport	12	1.42	0.90	Substantially above
Finance and Statistics	10	1.2	0.90	Substantially above
Agriculture and Fisheries	7	0.14	0.90	Substantially below
Internal Market and Certification	7	0.57	0.90	Substantially below
Social Sectors	2	1	0.90	Slightly above

## 4.2 Has the Twinning support under evaluation achieved (or will likely to achieve in the case of ongoing support) the objectives pursued?

### *Judgement criterion*

To be judged adequate, the majority of the Twinning projects should have achieved their objectives

### *Findings*

The average score on 'effectiveness' in the IERs is 0.9 which is slightly positive. The case studies validate the scores in the IERs. For those Twinning projects that were positively assessed, the achievement of the mandatory results was confirmed by the case studies. For the selected Twinning projects that were selected as being 'less successful', the case studies confirm that the mandatory results were only partly achieved. The reasons for non-delivery on all mandatory results are mixed:

- TR0501.05: institutional resistance to implementation at working level;
- TR0601.03: complex nature of activities / too ambitious project design;
- TR0202.01: lack of management commitment due to high workload, insufficient mobilization of experts from member state institutions;
- TR0403.02: problems with procurement;
- TR0403.03: components were frozen & suspended due to insufficient political commitment;
- TR0503.01: outdated mandatory results/ change of conditions at the time of project implementation.

### *Conclusions*

Based on the positive average score of Twinning projects in Turkey given by the IERs and the confirmation of the IER scores in the case studies, it can be concluded that by and large Twinning projects achieve their objectives. In case Twinning projects do not deliver fully on their objectives, the reasons are diverse. The most important fail factors are lack of commitment, too ambitious project results, lack of commitment due to workload, lack of political commitment, problems with procurement, inadequate expert mobilization from the Member State institution, outdated needs assessment.

### *Recommendations*

Each of the fail factors underlying the occurrence of (partial) non-delivery on the objectives are addressed in other sections. For the detailed recommendation, it is referred to these sections:

- Lack of political commitment / lack of the circumstances foreseen by the Twinning manual (see section 2.3);
- High workload / insufficient beneficiary staff available (see section 4.3);
- Problems with procurement (see section 3.2);
- Inadequate expert mobilization from the Member State institution (see section 4.3),
- Outdated needs assessment / long time between project identification and contracting (see section 2.6).

The formulation of too ambitious results is another potential fail factor that is not being addressed in any of the other sections and need the attention of both the Turkish government and the EU. It can be referred to the Special Report 6/2003 of the European

Court of Auditors which concluded that the targets of the projects were too ambitious, and recommended that fewer targets should be made.

### 4.3 Are quality and quantity of resources allocated by both beneficiary and the Member State/Twinning partner appropriate?

#### *Judgement criterion*

Both the beneficiary and the member state institution express satisfaction with the way the projects were run.

#### *Findings*

In general, the member state institutions perceive the resources allocated to the Twinning project by the beneficiary as appropriate. Both staff numbers and staff quality have been regarded as positive.

#### Box 8 TR 0603.05 Strengthening the capacity of the Turkish Grand National Assembly

Senior-level commitment on the beneficiary and Member State sides is evidenced by high-level participation in the assignment's kick-off meeting and beneficiary staff was mobilised quickly and is of good quality (e.g. English language skills, participation in project cycle management prior to the start of the twinning etc.). Finally, the RTA final report notes the successful completion of 37 activities and 4 Steering Committee meetings within one year – a further indicator for appropriate beneficiary resources.

However, in several of the less successful projects, the beneficiary had problems in appointing full time staff to the project. In such cases, the RTA counterpart and the project staff is working on the project and their jobs concurrently and lack sufficient time to fulfil their project responsibilities. Only in one project, there are clear indications that the Turkish beneficiary fell also short in allocating qualified staff resources to the project.

#### Box 9 TR 0501.05 An independent police complaints commission

The project implementation was hampered by (...) limited beneficiary team capacities and inappropriate logistics (the implementation office being located far from the main beneficiary), and poor beneficiary's English language skills. Further efficiency constraints are related to beneficiary staff changes (the beneficiary project leader, RTA counterpart and Senior Project Officer changed shortly after the project started; the beneficiary project leader changed again at the end of the project). Finally, the RTA counterpart and Senior Project officer started working full-time on the project, were then assigned parallel duties, resumed full-time commitment further to Member State and EUD concerns, and again limited their time commitment in the last months of the project.

Similar findings appear on the perception of the beneficiary organisation on the contribution of the member state institution. For all of the successful Twinning projects, this perception is, without exceptions, positive. However, for four of the less successful Twinning projects, the perception is mixed. Issues that occurred in these projects and that have negatively affected the perception on the member state contribution are:

- Malfunctioning RTAs;
- Problem of member state organization to mobilize STE.

#### Box 10 TR 0202.01 Institutional strengthening of the Energy Market Regulatory Authority

The quality of resources provided by the Member State has been high and the quantity has been adequate. However, change of Italian PL is reported to have negatively affected Italian STE flow. In effect, the mobilization of experts from MS institutions proved to be time consuming. This is linked to the small size and large number of tasks for the MS institutions. Substitution of expert from MS institutions by other experts (e.g. from the private sector) was not allowed. In the end some people from other public sector institutions were mobilized.

#### *Conclusions*

In general, both beneficiary and MS allocate enough resources in terms of quantity and quality to the Twinning project. The most structural problem would be lack of availability of beneficiary's project members due to the workload of their parallel duties and the frequency of staff turnover during project implementation. From the side of the member state institution, the quality of the RTA and the mobilisation of STE are raised as critical issues.

#### *Recommendations*

- Beneficiary should ensure full availability of its staff members that are directly involved in the management of the Twinning project.
- The selection the Member State institution should be carefully based on RTA availability and competences as well as the MS institutions' capacity to endow short term experts to the project.

### 4.4 Is the interaction between key stakeholders adequate and performing effectively to ensure successful implementation of Twinning?

#### *Judgement criterion*

- To be judged adequate, all key stakeholders (horizontal stakeholders and MS and beneficiary) must have been involved actively in project implementation
- Existence of clear division of tasks and responsibilities between the Turkish stakeholders

#### *Findings*

The case studies provide the following feedback on the role of the key stakeholders:

- EUD: the contribution is perceived in most cases as highly positive. The EUD appears to be closely involved and acts constructive. RTAs may be advised to use the EUD more frequently in case project implementation stumbles.

#### Box 11 TR0403.03 Restructuring and strengthening of the Food Safety and Control System in Turkey

EUD has contributed to the analysis of the components' implementation and informed the DG ELARGE on time for taking the necessary actions in freezing the first two components, even though the beneficiary wanted to continue with the assumption that the legal improvements would be achieved. EUD has contributed to corrective actions and the Twinning activities to be more effective.



- EUSG: the contribution is considered still to be too low profile. The EUSG appears not to be involved as much as the other stakeholders mostly due to lack of staff.
- CFCU: the experiences with the involvement of the CFCU are mixed. Especially, in case there is interdependence with procurement of supplies/works/TA, and the CFCU is involved in the procurement procedure, delay occurs for which blame is – rightly or not – put on the CFCU. However, recent Twinning projects (TR0603.05) indicate smooth operation of parallel procurement procedures. Other projects emphasize the close involvement and constructive role of the CFCU in Steering Committee meetings (TR0603.04).

### *Conclusions*

In general, the interaction between the key stakeholders has been effective ensuring successful Twinning implementation. However, in some cases CFSU's involvement in contractual issues and EUSG's involvement in coordination and monitoring is open for improvement.

### *Recommendations*

- CFCU improves its involvement in managing Twinning contracts in order to better facilitate Twinning projects that involve a procurement component;
- EUSG increases its staff capacity so that it can strengthen its coordinating and oversight role of EU projects aiming to achieve alignment to the Acquis.

## 5 Impact

### 5.1 General notes

Impact indicates the extent to which Twinning projects have supported the Turkish authorities in achieving institutional and legal alignment to the Acquis. The table below shows the average scores of all Twinning projects based on the IERs on the various evaluation criteria. Impact has an average score of 0.79. This is mildly positive.

	Nr of projects		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability
	total	rated					
Average score	91	67	1.07	0.28	0.90	→ <b>0.79</b>	0.86

A more detailed overview shows that around one in six projects feature a negative score on impact (see Annex 2). Table 5.1 shows that in comparison to the average rating on impact of Twinning projects in Turkey:

- projects in the sector ‘Finance and Statistics’ and ‘Environment, Energy and Transport’ are rated to have substantially more impact;
- projects in the sectors ‘Justice and Home Affairs’, ‘and ‘Internal Market’ are rated on average;
- projects in the sectors ‘Agriculture and Fisheries’ and ‘Social Sectors’ are rated to have substantially less impact.

Table 5.1 Average ratings on ‘impact’ per sector

Impact	Total projects per sector	Average per sector	Total average (Twinning in Turkey)	Deviation sector from total average
Justice and Home Affairs	20	0.7	0.79	Slightly below
Environment, Energy and Transport	12	1.08	0.79	Substantially above
Finance and Statistics	10	1.2	0.79	Substantially above
Agriculture and Fisheries	7	0.28	0.79	Substantially below
Internal Market and Certification	7	1	0.79	Slightly above
Social Sectors	2	-1	0.79	Substantially below

## 5.2 To which extent have the outputs generated by assistance been translated into results and impact?

### *Judgement criterion*

To be judged adequate, the majority of the Twinning projects must have achieved their expected results ('immediate impact') and contributed to either institutional or legal alignment to the Acquis ('wider impact').

### *Findings*

The case studies provide detailed findings on the immediate and wider impact of the Twinning projects. Table 5.2 summarizes the findings from the case studies.

Table 5.2 Summary findings on 'impact' per case study

Successful twinning projects	Less successful Twinning projects
<p><b>TR05404.04: Training system border police</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Further alignment depends on setting up of 'border security faculty'.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0601.03 Asylum and country of origin system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Wider impact: too early as project closed in May 2010.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0603.05: Turkish Grand National Assembly</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Legislative alignment is pending for political decision-making.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0603.04 Water sector capacity building</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Legislative alignment still awaits adoption.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0603.03 Cross border electricity trade</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Legislative alignment has been achieved, institutional alignment is pending.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0302.05 Turkish Court of Accounts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Legislative alignment awaits adoption of Law by Parliament.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0503.05 IPA Rural Development Agency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved and used;</li> <li>➤ Further alignment depends on effectiveness of projects managed by IPARD.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0403.01 Customs Modernization Project</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results fully achieved;</li> <li>➤ Legislative alignment awaits adoption of tariff law expected mid 2011.</li> </ul>	<p><b>TR0501.05: Police Complaints Commission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results only partly achieved;</li> <li>➤ No contribution to alignment is expected.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0601.03 European human right standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results largely achieved;</li> <li>➤ Wider impact depends on financial investment to improve interrogation facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR04040.03 Professionalism of gendarmerie</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ No evidence for translation into results;</li> <li>➤ Limited institutional and no regulatory reform.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0403.08 Road transport sector</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results largely achieved;</li> <li>➤ Wider impact depends on coordination between policy and enforcement</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0202.01 Energy Market Regulatory Authority</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results largely achieved;</li> <li>➤ Wider impact is pending on further approval for institutional reform.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0403.02 Tax administration capacity building</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results largely achieved;</li> <li>➤ Impacts: yes, adoption of new legislation and institutional restructuring</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0403.03 Food safety and control system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results are not achieved due delay in adoption of framework law as basic condition for the Twinning project.</li> </ul> <p><b>TR0503.01 Product safety system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expected results only partly achieved;</li> <li>➤ Impact: limited</li> </ul>

Table 5.2 shows that in each of the 8 successful projects, all outputs have been fully translated in results. This has not necessarily resulted in further alignment to the Acquis. For most of the projects, such wider impact is still pending and awaits adoption of new legislation.

**Box 12 TR0302.05 Strengthening the audit capacity of the Turkish Court of Accounts**

The outputs of the project have served as the preparatory steps for upgrading the Turkish Court of Accounts to serve in line with the internationally accepted external audit standards and EU practices with the required structure and with legislative and procedural changes. The capacity built is likely to disseminate through the available Training of Trainers and the country wide implementation is likely to be achieved through the dissemination of piloted activities. However, the legal basis for the wider organisational and regulatory change in the country requires the Parliament to enforce the new TCA law. The impact of assistance is undermined if adoption of the law keeps to be pending at the Parliament. Within the context of the project a contingency paper has been prepared that indicates how each project-activity can be implemented in the absence of adoption of the new TCA law.

Table 5.2 shows also that for the eight case studies of less-successful projects, in nearly all case this translation in results has been partial. In most cases, the partiality of the achievement of results is related to deficiencies in the criteria relevance, efficiency or effectiveness of the project.

### *Conclusions*

The outputs generated by the Twinning assistance have in most cases been translated into achievement of the expected results. Wider impact in the form of further institutional and or legal alignment to the Acquis is in most cases still pending and awaiting political adoption of the relevant regulatory reforms.

### *Recommendations*

- Legislative reform is often essential, either as an outcome of projects, or as an essential condition of projects. As it is an essential condition for the success of projects, it should be addressed as such. If no explicit political commitment to changes exists, which may relate to the full project or to specific components, commitment should be found prior to the start of the project.

## 5.3 To which extent does Twinning act as a catalyst for wider organisational and regulatory change in Turkey?

### *Judgement criterion*

The presence of evidence that the Twinning project has initiated change that goes beyond the immediate and wider impact related to the projects outputs.

### *Findings from the case studies*

The case studies have observed various illustrations of wider organisational and institutional change that can be linked to the Twinning projects.

Table 5.3 Summary findings on 'wider organisational and regulatory change' per case study

<b>Twinning projects</b>	<b>Wider organisational and regulatory change</b>
<b>Successful Twinning projects</b>	
TR05404.04: Training system border police	Enhanced international activity of the Turkish border police, for example, participation in FRONTEX activity's (+the EU agency coordinating operational coordination)
TR0601.03 Asylum and country of origin system	It is considered too early to assess wider impact since the project was only closed in May 2010.
TR0603.05: Turkish Grand National Assembly	The intensive cooperation among STEs (especially the key experts of each component) and the relevant staff of the GNAT has strengthened the ties and created a networking, with several other EU Parliaments whose experts were involved in the activities. 13 Member States were involved which has created fruitful long-standing relationships for the GNAT'.
TR0603.04 Water sector capacity building	It has acted as a catalyst for re-structuring of relevant ministry through a GtoG project with the Netherlands. Furthermore, it served as a base for following EC (IPA) project proposals.
TR0603.03 Cross border electricity trade	The project acted as a catalyst for the creation of conditions for Turkey to be connected to a powerful energy transmission system through 2 EU Member States (Bulgaria and Greece). This has enabled integration with the European electricity market providing institutional/technical alignment.
TR0302.05 Turkish Court of Accounts	The project has acted as a catalyst to some extent. The capacity built is likely to disseminate through the available Training of Trainers and the country wide implementation is likely to be achieved through the dissemination of piloted activities.
TR0503.05 IPA Rural Development Agency	The Regional Development Agencies recently established in Turkey have taken IPARD Agency as an example during the establishment and capacity building.
TR0403.01 Customs Modernization Project	It acted as the first step for change in the area of customs alignment with regard to harmonisation of the Customs Tariff System. It will enable use of the relevant IT infrastructure (ITMS) with connection to the national BILGE system, throughout Turkey. The next step is interconnectivity of BILGE to the EU system.
<b>Less successful Twinning projects</b>	
TR0501.05: Police Complaints Commission	No clear wider changes (speculatively: increased general awareness putting pressure for political action).
TR0601.03 European human right standards	Enhanced consciousness regarding statement taking during interrogations.
TR04040.03 Professionalism of gendarmerie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased willingness of the Gendarmerie to engage with the EU (e.g. via cooperation in EUROPOL).</li> <li>• Accreditation of a forensic science laboratory.</li> </ul>
TR0403.08 Road transport sector	The project acted as a catalyst between the identification of needs and shortcomings of land transport sector and the further steps of the reform process which had started with legislative and institutional developments in 2004/2005. It has supported deepening and widening of the process
TR0202.01 Energy Market Regulatory Authority	Not to a high extent. Political issues and the position of EMRA as a formally independent, but practically not fully independent organization do play a role in this respect. Establishment of new institutional structures has been discussed at an international workshop. However, no new institutional structure is brought about.

TR0403.02 Tax administration capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two relatively new concepts have been included into the Turkish Tax system and awareness has been raised for these concepts: 'voluntary compliance' and 'risk analysis'.</li> <li>• Twinning has also served for the establishment of a new Risk Directorate within the beneficiary institution.</li> <li>• The recent law (amendments to law No.6009) issued in June 2010 includes the concepts and proposals introduced by the twinning activities as well as providing legal base for the establishment of the Risk Directorate.</li> </ul>
TR0403.03 Food safety and control system	The new Framework Law of 2010 which foresees institutional changes leading to a semi-independent food safety and control administration has been adopted.
TR0503.01 Product safety system	Twinning acted as a catalyst to a limited extent due to the fact that project objectives could not be fully achieved. Nonetheless, it has acted as a catalyst for ownership at the Ministry of Industry and Trade and consumer organisations for general product safety.

### *Findings from the sector studies*

The case studies demonstrate the catalyst impact of Twinning projects at a project level in small domains of the Acquis. The sector studies show the impact of the Twinning instrument a sectoral level. Below, short summaries of the sector studies in the three largest Twinning sectors – 'Justice and Home Affairs' and 'Environment' and 'Agriculture' – provide an indication of the importance of Twinning at sectoral level.

#### Box 13 Wider impact at sectoral level in the sector Justice and Home Affairs

An in depth review of the twinning projects in this area reveals many important contributions of Twinning to institutional alignment. For example, twinning support for the border police, the gendarmerie or the Turkish Grand National Assembly has made a substantial contribution to strengthening these institutions' capacities and performance. However, whilst there has been substantial progress in the sector since 2003, the ultimate indicator of accession progress is the closing of specific accession chapters. This has only been achieved for chapters of comparatively less importance. Many of the required legal and institutional reforms in the area of justice and home affairs require several years to result in genuine change e.g. in terms of an improved functioning of the justice system. This does not only require continuous capacity building to ensure effective application of new legislation and maintain institutional performance but also significant investments in infrastructure (e.g. court houses, prisons etc.) and human resources (e.g. judges, probationary officers etc.). Finally, twinning operates in a politically highly sensitive area (e.g. with regard to the justice sub-sector), and this constrains the speed of reform.

#### Box 14 Wider impact at sectoral level in the sector 'Environment'

The sector lines as third in the use of twinning instrument among the sectors, since 2002. Stakeholders, as well as the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as the main beneficiary, confirms the value of experience gained with working as twinning partners. The sector is reported to be well advanced with the transposition and adoption of the Acquis. Directives on solid waste management (including special waste), noise, air quality and chemicals have been aligned and adopted. Outputs of the following twinning projects are reported to have contributed to the current level of alignment with the Acquis as they have served for the initial steps for legislative harmonisation:

- TR 060304 "Capacity Building Support to Turkey for the Water Sector"
- TR 040209 "Strengthening the capacity of the Ministry of Environment and Forests in the field of special waste management and noise management"

- TR 030203 “Air Quality, Chemicals, Waste”

As for institutional alignment, establishment of a national environment agency is pending. The Regular Report 2009 notes the need for further strengthening of the administrative capacity and the need for coordination between the relevant authorities at all levels to ensure effective implementation of the legislation. The beneficiary ministry has recognised the need for further institutional strengthening and has therefore proposed 6 twinning projects for IPA funds for 2008 and 2009 all focusing on capacity building for institutional alignment.

#### Box 15 Wider impact at sectoral level in the sector ‘Agriculture and Fisheries’

The Agriculture and Fisheries sector for alignment to the Acquis includes three Chapters of 11, 12 and 13 with reference to more than 1200 EC Directives. Twinning projects implemented by MARA since 2002 have contributed to the legislative and institutional alignment of agriculture and fisheries Acquis. However, the overall progress recorded in agriculture and fisheries sector is limited within the 2002-2009/2010 period, the progress in Fisheries subsector being the least.

Main concern for the alignment in the agriculture and fisheries sector is the restructuring of MARA for which the legislation has been forwarded to the Parliament in 2009, but still waiting for its ratification. Upon enforcement of this law, development of the secondary legislation and intensive capacity building and development would be required as indicated in the NPAA 2008 of the Turkish government.

Opening of negotiations for Chapters 11 and 13 are subject to the fulfilment of the political criterion referring to Cyprus. Two screening meetings were held for Chapter 11 in 2005 and 2006; similarly two screening meetings were held for Chapter 12 in 2006. Negotiations have started for Chapter 12 in June 2010 with 7 opening and closing benchmarks. According to the beneficiary and stakeholder opinions, the Twinning projects undertaken by different Directorates General of MARA had an important contribution. Based on the experiences in member states reflected by RTAs or by study visits to the member countries, the 10 twinning projects have contributed to the preparation for the screening meetings as well as the negotiations of the relevant priorities under these Chapters in terms of primary and secondary legislation as well as institutional alignment.

Since 2002, in comparison to the other two chapters, most progress has been recorded for alignment to the Acquis in Chapter 12 Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Policy. The Chapter has been opened for negotiation after enforcement of the relevant Framework Law in June 2010 replacing several dispersed and overlapping legislation. Unfortunately, the late adoption of this Framework Law has caused that previous secondary legislation developed with the support of Twinning projects to be outdated and in need for modification.

#### *Conclusions*

The impact of almost all Twinning projects extends beyond its immediate and wider results. In this way, Twinning acts as a catalyst for wider organisational and regulatory change in Turkey. The extent of this catalyst impact varies among sectors. Twinning has been significantly more important as an instrument for institutional and legal alignment to the Acquis in the sector ‘environment’ than in the sector ‘agriculture and fisheries’. Its role in the Justice and Home Affairs is so far mixed and needs more sustained efforts.

#### *Recommendations*

No specific recommendations.

## 5.4 Are there administrative and/or organisational gaps at beneficiary level which undermine the translation of outcomes into results?

### *Judgement criterion*

No judgement criterion has been adopted as the question is explorative by nature.

### *Findings*

The most notable two hindrances to achieve results are delays in the adoption of legislation necessary for completion of projects and lack of cooperation between institutions working in the same area but with different responsibilities. Both issues need to be resolved by political power. Given the objective of Twinning projects – to support the beneficiary institutions in aligning its structure and regulations to the EU Acquis – the political will to engage with and respond to Twinning partners is affected by the political will to have Turkey entering the EU. Given that also administrative management of the various institutions are politically influenced, it is not surprising that some institutions are more European-minded than others. Institutions that are less inclined to adjust in response to EU standards will be more reluctant to implement particular elements of the Acquis.

### *Conclusions*

As the Twinning instrument is shaped by the objective to align to requirements of the EU, the political preference among the political and administrative management of the institution implementing Twinning projects in the accession of Turkey to the EU affects its commitment to the project objectives either positively or negatively.

### *Recommendations*

Full respect needs to be given to the Twinning manual's condition that Twinning projects should only be initiated in circumstances that high level commitment to the project objectives exists (see section 2.4).



## 6 Sustainability

### 6.1 General notes

The table below shows the average scores of all Twinning projects based on the IERs on the various evaluation criteria. Sustainability has an average score of 0.86 (on a scale from -3 to 3). This is mildly positive.

	Nr of projects		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability
	total	rated					
Average score	91	67	1.07	0.28	0.90	0.79	→ <b>0.86</b>

A more detailed overview shows that around one in six projects feature a negative score on impact (see Annex 2). Table 6.1 shows that in comparison to the average rating on sustainability of Twinning projects in Turkey:

- projects in the sector ‘Finance and Statistics’ and ‘Environment, Energy and Transport’ are rated to be substantially more sustainable;
- projects in the sectors ‘Justice and Home Affairs’, ‘and ‘Internal Market’ are rated on average;
- projects in the sectors ‘Agriculture and Fisheries’ and ‘Social Sectors’ are rated to be substantially less sustainable.

Table 6.1 Average ratings on ‘sustainability’ per sector

Sustainability	Total projects per sector	Average per sector	Total average (Twinning Turkey)	Deviation sector from total average
Justice and Home Affairs	20	0.95	0.86	Slightly above
Environment, Energy and Transport	12	1.33	0.86	Substantially above
Finance and Statistics	10	1.1	0.86	Substantially above
Agriculture and Fisheries	7	-0.14	0.86	Substantially below
Internal Market and Certification	7	1.14	0.86	Slightly above
Social Sectors	2	-1	0.86	Substantially below

## 6.2 Is there continuity in the reform process after the projects have been completed? What is the level of ownership of outputs obtained and how are these outputs used by the beneficiaries?

### *Judgement criterion*

Continuity in the reform process is adequate in case:

- results that have been achieved by the Twinning projects are maintained;
- the turnover of the beneficiary staff that has been trained is not too large;
- the financial and human resources allocated by the beneficiary to support the outputs are sufficient;
- follow up projects have been initiated indicating management's ongoing commitment;

### *Findings*

The following table shows how each of the eight successful Twinning projects included as case study have developed after project closure.

Table 6.2 Indicators demonstrating continuity in the reform process for eight successful Twinning projects

Twinning projects	Prospects for maintenance of results	Turnover of trained staff	Allocation of financial and human resources	Commitment to follow up projects
TR05404.04: Training system border police	Mixed	Unclear	Sufficient	No
TR0601.03 Asylum and country of origin system	Too early	Unclear	Sufficient	Yes
TR0603.05: Turkish Grand National Assembly	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Yes
TR0603.04 Water sector capacity building	Good	Low	Sufficient	Yes
TR0603.03 Cross border electricity trade	Good	Potential risk	Sufficient	Yes
TR0302.05 Turkish Court of Accounts	Unclear	Low	Sufficient	No
TR0503.05 IPA Rural Development Agency	Good	Low	Sufficient	Yes
TR0403.01 Customs Modernization Project	Good	Low	Sufficient	Yes

Overall, table 6.2 shows that the achievements of the Twinning projects are sustained. The majority of the projects aspects seems to maintain the project outputs, allocate sufficient financial and human resources in the reform areas and are committed to ongoing reform. The most critical appears to be the turnover of.

A problematic issues in the maintenance of the results is the unclarity whether the project results will be formally anchored in legislation or integrated in dedicated institutional structure.

#### Box 16 TR0302.05 Strengthening the audit capacity of the Turkish Court of Accounts

The level of ownership of the outputs obtained depends on the adoption and publishing of the law which will then require drafting of secondary legislation by the beneficiary. The beneficiary foresees no problem in the allocation of financial resources at the required level, once the law is enacted and the relevant secondary legislation is accordingly prepared and adopted.

A potential risk affecting the sustainability of the Twinning outputs is staff turnover. Given the stability of employment in the Turkish public sector, this risk is only apparent in sectors competing with the private sector:

#### Box 17 TR0603.03 Improvement of the conditions for Cross Border Electricity Trade

Although the majority of the relevant staff is maintaining project results since the adoption of the legislation, the beneficiary reports the problem of qualified and trained staff transfer to the private sector.

Finally, management commitment to sustaining the reforms is indicated by approval of new reform projects building on the achievements of the Twinning project.

#### Box 18 TR0603.04 Water sector capacity building

Cooperation is continuing with further IPA and Government to Government (GtoG) projects: (-) the GtoG project with the Netherlands focuses on training of trainers and institutional re-structuring; (-) the IPA 2009 project aims at Capacity Building on Water Quality Monitoring. Allocation of financial resources for these projects are in total €550.000 for GtoG projects and €M2.0 for twinning.

### *Conclusions*

For successful Twinning projects, reform process continues after the projects have been completed and the beneficiaries demonstrate ownership of the outputs obtained. Both factors indicate that the results and impact achieved by successful Twinning projects are sustained after project closure. The main risk to sustainability is delay in the institutionalization (organizational restructuring or adoption of legislation) of the Twinning results.

### *Recommendations*

Ensure the sustainability of previous project results by programming follow up projects.

## 6.3 Does cooperation between the beneficiary administration and the Member State administration continue after the project has been completed?

### *Judgement criterion*

The number of Twinning projects for which the beneficiary and the member state institution engage in ongoing cooperation after project closure.

### *Findings*

Continuous cooperation between MS institutions and Turkish counterparts occurs but not too frequently. From the 16 case studies, ongoing cooperation has been observed in only

5 cases. In such cases, the intentions to continue cooperation has hardly resulted into new projects or other substantive evidence of ongoing cooperation. Only in one case is the scope of the cooperation clearly defined.<sup>12</sup> In the other cases, the cooperation remains at the level of good intentions.

**Box 19 TR0603.03 Improvement of the conditions for cross border electricity trade**

An agreement (MoU) is signed by the beneficiary and twinning partner for future cooperation which should reflect in participation in conferences etc. To date, no such events have yet taken place.

*Conclusions*

Notwithstanding constructive intentions for further cooperation, in practice ongoing cooperation is not widespread.

*Recommendations*

Whilst there might not always be a possibility for immediate follow up in the form of bilateral cooperation, it might be worthwhile for the EUD or the EUSG to organize annual twinning conferences inviting Turkish beneficiaries and Member State representatives to ‘force’ the maintenance of contacts and thus prepare the grounds for bilateral follow-up.

---

<sup>12</sup> TR0603.04 Water sector capacity building is followed up by a GtoG funded project with the Netherlands focuses on training of trainers and institutional re-structuring

## 7 Horizontal evaluation questions

### 7.1 Are the Turkish structures and systems adequately planning and successfully implementing Twinning projects?

In the period 2002-2009, 92 Twinning projects across various sectors have been initiated and most of them have been finalised. An answer to the question whether Turkish structures and systems are adequately planning and successfully implementing Twinning projects needs reference to the entire set of Twinning projects and to be sensitive to sectoral differences.

Table 7.1 provides an overview of the IER-ratings across all projects and sectors.<sup>13</sup>

Table 7.1 Average performance ratings per evaluation criterion and per sector

	Nr of projects		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability
	Total	rated					
Average	91	67	1.07	0.28	0.90	0.79	0.86
Per sector							
Justice and Home Affairs	30	20	Somewhat above (1.15)	Substantially above (0.6)	Somewhat below (0.8)	On average (0.7)	On average (0.95)
Environment, Energy & Tr.	21	15	Somewhat below (0.75)	Somewhat above (0.42)	Substantially above (1.42)	Substantially above (1.08)	Substantially above (1.33)
Finance and Statistics	16	12	Substantially above (1.6)	On average (0.3)	Somewhat above (1.2)	Substantially above (1.2)	Somewhat above (1.1)
Agriculture and Fisheries	10	8	Substantially below (0.57)	Substantially below (-0.42)	Substantially below (0.14)	Substantially below (0.28)	Substantially below (-0.14)
Intern market & certification	11	10	Somewhat above (1.14)	On average (0.28)	Somewhat below (0.57)	Somewhat above (1.0)	Somewhat above (1.14)
Social Sectors	3	2	Somewhat below (1.0)	Substantially below (-1.5)	Somewhat above (1.0)	Substantially below (-1.0)	Substantially below (-1)

From the table it can be concluded that the overall ratings are mildly positive. Especially the relevance and the effectiveness of the Twinning projects stand out as positive features of Twinning projects in Turkey. Least satisfactory is the rating on efficiency.

<sup>13</sup> The case studies conducted by the evaluation team have validated the ratings of the IERs which indicates that the IER ratings can be safely used for overall conclusions.

From the table it also appears that Twinning performance is not equal across all sectors. The sectors in which Twinning projects appear to be most successful are ‘environment, energy and transport’ and ‘finance and statistics’. The social sector and the sector ‘agriculture and fisheries’ are least successful in programming and implementing Twinning projects. The sectors ‘justice and home affairs’ and ‘internal market and certification’ perform largely in line with the national average.

## 7.2 What constitutes good practice in Twinning and to what extent is it ensured in Turkish Twinning projects?

The evaluation methodology including the most and the least successful Twinning projects within similar sector as case studies allows for the identification of success and fail factors for Twinning projects in Turkey.

The following factors underlying successful Twinning performance were observed:

Criteria	Factor explaining successful performance
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linkage with Accession documents (NPAA and AP);</li> <li>• Beneficiary being well informed of the relevant Acquis requirements;</li> <li>• Previous experience of the beneficiary with Twinning;</li> <li>• Comprehensive needs assessment/ analysis conducted;</li> <li>• Productive cooperation between the EUD and beneficiary at programming level;</li> <li>• Project design complementing previous interventions.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project logistics timely in place;</li> <li>• Availability of qualified staff particularly at beneficiary side;</li> <li>• Allocation of qualified MS experts;</li> <li>• Cooperative involvement of horizontal stakeholders (EUD/EUSG/CFCU).</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level cooperation between beneficiary and Twinning Partner;</li> <li>• Availability of qualified staff from both beneficiary and member state institution ensuring timely delivery and adequate quality of outputs.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timely adoption of drafted legislation;</li> <li>• Timely implementation of institutional re-structuring /establishment of new units/departments;</li> <li>• Wider dissemination of project results.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative and institutional alignment with the Acquis, being on the agenda of the Ministry/Government;</li> <li>• Programming of ‘follow up’ projects;</li> <li>• Continuing cooperation between the beneficiary and Twinning partner following interventions.</li> </ul>

The following factors are related to less successful Twinning performance:

Criteria	Factors explaining unsuccessful performance
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delayed project start undermining relevance of the needs assessment;</li> <li>• Complex design of the twinning project along with other components such as technical assistance and supplies.</li> </ul>

Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-fulfillment of the circumstances as mentioned in the Twinning manual, especially high level political commitment;</li> <li>• Lack of legal basis for implementation of project outputs;</li> <li>• Non involvement of all relevant stakeholders in project design.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delayed start/implementation due to delay in the preparation of the Twinning contract creating constraints for completion of activities within project period;</li> <li>• No timely contracting together with other components such as technical assistance and supplies;</li> <li>• Lack of experts with sufficient language proficiency causing communication problems, high translation costs and time consumption.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No timely contracting together with other components such as technical assistance and supplies;</li> <li>• Staff turnover during the project at both beneficiary side as well as the member state institution (RTA);</li> <li>• Lack of sufficient number of beneficiary staff available full time for the project as the staff has parallel duties besides the twinning project.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political commitment to adopt legislation/ institutional re-structuring in line with the Acquis.</li> <li>• Delay in the adoption of legislation/institutional structure leaving project outputs in a vacuum;</li> <li>• Absence of follow up projects.</li> </ul>

## 7.3 Overall conclusion and recommendation

### *Conclusion*

Overall, assuming that achievement of sustainable impact is the ultimate goal of Twinning projects, this study concludes that high level political commitment is the most important key factor for success. This study shows that the Turkish institutions are very capable of adequately planning and successfully implementing Twinning projects, but that political commitment underlies the ultimate success or failure of Twinning projects.

In the end, it is the political will to engage in Twinning projects, to allocate resources to them, to deal swiftly with procedural bottlenecks and to sustain the results by adopting new legislation and to engage in organisational restructuring that will determine whether the Twinning instrument provides value for money in Turkey.

### *Recommendation*

A key recommendation is therefore to ensure political commitment from the start of the project till finalisation when project results need to be institutionalised. Such political commitment is reflected by the willingness of Turkish structures to pay for the project results. Therefore, it is recommended that the burden of the financial costs of the projects is more equally divided between the Turkish government and the European Union. The current rate of co-financing is 10 per cent. This percentage should be raised to at least 30 per cent. Regarding this key recommendation, such a decision may not be taken only for Turkey, but needs to apply to all IPA countries on the basis of the "equal treatment of candidate countries".