



Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi ve Trkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.



Avrupa Birliđi Bakanlıđı
IPA II Teknik Destek Projesi

Ministry for EU Affairs
Technical Assistance for IPA II

Findings and recommendations of
External Evaluation and
Mid-term Review of IPA II

Tatjana Arsova
24 January, 2018





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.



**External Evaluation of the Instrument for
Pre-accession Assistance (IPA II)
(2014 – mid 2017)**

**Final Report
Volume 1: Main report
June 2017**

Evaluation carried out on behalf of the European Commission

Neighbourhood
and Enlargement
Negotiations

External evaluation of IPA II – Specific conclusions for Turkey and recommendations of the evaluation report





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Scope and method of IPA II evaluation



- ▶ Evaluation carried out from August 2016 to May 2017
- ▶ Managed by the EC
- ▶ Covers IPA II in the period 2014 – mid 2017
- ▶ Methodology:
 - ▶ Documents review
 - ▶ Analysis of statistics and quantitative data
 - ▶ Consultation of stakeholders (via interviews, group discussions, online-survey focusing on EU Delegations) and open consultation of draft report
- ▶ Final report - June 2017





Specific conclusions for Turkey (Positive lessons learned)



Components III, IV and V of IPA I - **foundation for the delivery of the sector-like approach in Turkey.**

Including: sectoral monitoring and multi-annual programmes.

Lessons learned on the experiences of Turkey:

- ▶ the use of a **multi-annual programming approach to address sector needs;**
- ▶ the definition and use of **sector indicators**, both output as well as outcome;
- ▶ conducting **sector monitoring in practice** (and the constraints on this happening)
- ▶ managing **large grant schemes under indirect management;**
- ▶ resources and **capacity needed to make indirect management work in practice;**





Specific conclusions for Turkey (Critical factors)



- ▶ **efficiency of the indirect management**
- ▶ **relatively limited scale of IPA II funds comparative to national budgets in several sectors**
- ▶ **Non existence of a stable consensus between the EU and Turkish institutions** which underpins policy dialogue
- ▶ **The current accession perspective** for Turkey - uncertainty over the value of IPA II in the country





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Key recommendations (Sectoral Approach)



- ▶ **Need for a longer-term perspective in implementations**
- ▶ **Explore the potential for wider deployment of sectoral approach even after 2020**
- ▶ **Clarify the sector approach planning with all relevant parties**
the overall quality of (work) documents used for sector approach planning
- ▶ **DG NEAR** should have adequate capacity **to mainstream horizontal issues**





Key recommendations

(Indirect Management with Beneficiary Countries)



- **A strategic vision for countries under indirect management needs to be created as a basis for strengthening the capacities of the institutions involved in its delivery**
- This should also include **a proportionate use of technical assistance to support these institutions**
- **Cost effectiveness** of indirect management needs to be fully assessed





Key recommendations (M&E)



- ▶ **Weaknesses in monitoring systems** and indicators at sector level need to be addressed on a systematic basis.
- ▶ DG NEAR to continuously support the NIPACs, EUDs and LIs in reviewing and **improving the sector performance indicators** to ensure they are fit for purpose





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Recommendation for Turkey (1)



Based on a through analysis, **IPA II funds in Turkey should be allocated into those sectors with a proven track record of delivering results under IPA I and where the planned results for IPA II are most likely to be achieved given current constraints**





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Recommendations for Turkey (2)



- The **experience and lessons learned from IPA I components III, IV and V should be utilised**
- Within Turkey this would be between the multiannual OSs and the Lis
- This should be extended to IPA countries that are just now starting their programmes in these areas





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.



2. Mid-Term Review – December 2017





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Mid-term Review Report (MTR)



- ▶ Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “**Mid-term Review Report on the External Financing Instruments**
- ▶ Commission Staff Working Document - Evaluation of the IPA II
- ▶ **Legal base:** The Mid-term review is required by the Common Implementing Regulation (CIR) Article 17, by the end of December 2017





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Conclusions of the MTR - Overall



- ▶ The IPA II is **overall relevant**
- ▶ IPA II, compared to IPA I, **has a stronger focus on key reforms**
- ▶ IPA II is **more strategic and results-oriented**, and has allowed greater leverage of other donors' funds





Conclusions of the MTR – Flexibility



- ▶ **In parallel to this focus on long term reforms**, IPA II has also demonstrated some **flexibility** to face emerging priorities:
 - ✓ support to the countries along the Western Balkans to manage the **influx of refugees** trying to reach the EU
 - ✓ **Facility for Refugees** in Turkey which draws funds from both Member States (EUR 2 billion), and from the EU budget – mainly IPA II and humanitarian aid (EUR 1 billion)





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Conclusions of the MTR – Sector Approach



- ▶ Improved the **strategic focus of IPA II** over its predecessor
- ▶ **More conceptual approach to programming, prioritising sector level**
- ▶ Implementation of the sector approach **remains uneven across sectors**





Conclusions of the MTR –



indirect management with beneficiary countries

- ▶ **It offers improved ownership**
- ▶ **Challenges in the indirect management in Turkey**
- ▶ The Commission takes much more prudent approach in assessing efficiencies of IMBC





Conclusions of the MTR – Monitoring and evaluation



- ▶ **Monitoring and evaluation systems at national level and many indicators**, especially at outcome level, are **still weak**
- ▶ Need of further **strengthening statistical capacities**
- ▶ **Solid system of data gathering**, encoding and analysis
- ▶ Commission's new information management system (**OPSYS**)





Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.

Conclusions of the MTR – Complementarity and coordination



- ▶ Strengthening **public consultation** with the civil society and other actors, in particular at the planning and programming stages





Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi ve Trkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.



“IPA II: Taking EU funding to the next level”

www.ipa2teknikdestek.com

