**Strategic Quality Rating:**

1. **Does the project’s Theory of Change specify how it will contribute to higher level change? (Select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

3:

Evidence

Building on the results of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector Phase I and II, the third phase of the Project will deepen previous results in terms of organisational changes and put pilot local boards into practice in most provinces of Turkey. Phase I raised the awareness of the MoI about the concept of civilian oversight; assessed the gaps vis-à-vis EU standards in MoI and developed the concept of “local governance of ISFs”. Phase II raised the capacity of MoI at central level with regard to strategy development and best mechanisms for overseeing the ISFs. In addition, a “tailor made” local governance model was implemented in 8 districts. Parallel to the Civilian Oversight Projects Phase I and II, Turkey also realised other focused initiatives with the EUD, United Nations and bilateral partners to lay the groundwork for a transition from a narrowly conceived, bureaucratically and legalistically managed oversight of policing to a system of security sector governance based on a human centred understanding of security and public safety. In 2016 a series of state-of-emergency decrees were issued on the overall structuring (organisational and educational structure) of the internal security sector in Turkey, mainly in terms of institutional affiliations, roles and responsibilities, education system etc. and in May 2016*,* a Law on Establishing the Law Enforcement Oversight Commission and Amending Various Laws were adopted. Phase III of the Project will therefore start at a very critical time, namely when laws and regulations have been updated according to the new system. The Project will also support the Government in establishing the best model for ISF and its effective functioning under MoI in line with international principles and best practices in the EU. The two phases of the Project under IPA I (2007-2013) have identified the main requirements for an effective and human centred civilian oversight mechanism over the internal security sector, which are briefly summarised below. The Action at hand is based on the recommendations of Phase I-II and the changed structure of the internal security system, especially in the aftermath of the coup attempt of July 2016.

The project will reach its results via 4 components. In Component A (Legislative and Institutional Framework**),** the training curriculum, strategies and the basic legislative and regulatory framework governing the Police, Gendarmerie and Coast Guard as well as the Local Security System will be improved in the light of civilian/democratic oversight and accountability principles. It is also planned that the performance evaluation system of MoI over ISFs will be strengthened. Component B will focus on Parliamentary Oversight anddevelop a strategy to systematically oversee the work of ISFs through the work of relevant Commissions of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. In Component C, the pilot security governance structures nationwide will be scaled up and their effective functioning through capacity development and technical assistance will be supported. Finally Component D will build institutional and individual capacities of the Governors, District Governors and citizens to enhance the understanding and internalisation of citizen-focused security services.

1. **Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

2:

Evidence

The project will respond to inclusive and effective democratic governance area of development work specified in the Strategic Plan and its Logical Framework includes relevant indicator with indicator No: 2.1.4.5 number of local level civilian oversight mechanisms over internal security forces in place.

1. **Does the project have strategies to effectively identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of targeted groups/geographic areas with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

2:

Evidence

In previous phases LPSBs were established for engaging citizens (through civil society organisations, Mukhtars and media) into decision-making processes to improve the services provided by the law enforcement agencies. The boards also aims at fostering a culture of collaboration and partnership, effective use of resources and increase the impact of prevention programs. In Phase II, 8 LPSBs were established. In this Phase with Component C the LPSBs will be scaled up in 10 additional districts/provinces following an assessment of impact of LPSBs on the lives of the individuals with a specific focus on disadvantaged groups including women, children, youth, elderly, persons with disability and refugees and a Develop a strategy paper for the establishment of the 10 new LPSBs will be prepared. The pilot provinces/districts will be selected during the Inception Phase of the Project based on geographical position, interest of the Governorates and the current security environment in consultation with the Ministry of Interior. A list of criteria for the selection of the 10 provinces and/or districts, where LPSBs will be established and criteria for the selection of members of the LPSBs will be defined with the aim to ensure broad representation of local actors/communities in the LPSBs and local security plans will be developed with the participation of LPSBs members in each 10 districts/provinces. Additionally in Component D, individual capacities citizens to enhance the understanding and internalisation of citizen-focused security services will be developed via structured awareness raising programs for civil society and public at large in the pilot districts/provinces where the LPSBs exist. In design of awareness raising programmes tools and processes for the women, children, youth, elderly, persons with disability and refugees as disadvantaged groups will be given equal representation.

1. **Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

3:

Evidence

Phase III simply was built on the results of previous two phases and especially in the set of recommendations and lessons learned resulted in Phase II was used in design and implementation of Phase III activities:

* Reform projects that simultaneously work with both the central government (and other Internal Security stakeholders) and local authorities (and other stakeholders from civil society) on policy issues and on improving the internal services provided to the population are extremely desirable initiatives that are recommended to be improved and scaled up,
* Strengthen MoI at central level: establishment of a strategy unit, of a crime prevention unit, and Human Rights Office at MoI,
* Put emphasis on protection of human rights of citizens by MoI itself at the central level by raising its institutional capacity and specialisation of units on that issue,
* Deepen Phase II results in terms of organisational changes for the participation of citizens in local security policies, put LPSBs into practice in 10 provinces of Turkey, provide state funds to those boards.

Parallel to the Civilian Oversight Projects Phase I and II, Turkey also realised other focused initiatives with the EUD, United Nations and bilateral partners to lay the groundwork for a transition from a narrowly conceived, bureaucratically and legalistically managed oversight of policing to a system of security sector governance based on a human centred understanding of security and public safety. The Project design also benefitted from these initiatives. The two phases of the Project under IPA I (2007-2013) have identified the main requirements for an effective and human centred civilian oversight mechanism over the internal security sector, and the 3rd Phase is based on the recommendations of Phase I-II and the changed structure of the internal security system, especially in the aftermath of the coup attempt of July 2016.

1. **Does the project use gender analysis in the project design and does the project respond to this gender analysis with concrete measures to address gender inequities and empower women? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

1:

Evidence

The project design did not benefitted from a special gender analysis but instrumentalized the experience of the former phases and other project experiences and analysis of UNDP. Thus, it was decided that Gender mainstreaming will be one of the main crosscutting themes of the project. A gender mainstreaming approach will be applied through the following measures:

* Composition of the trainees and members of the Local Security Boards: Trainees of the training programs will be determined with a gender sensitive approach, as was the case in the two previous phases of the Project. In addition, in order to reflect a gender equality perspective, the Project will promote the inclusion of specific sessions on gender mainstreaming in internal security policies in training programs. The participation of women trainees will be recorded by the Project team. The Project will also encourage that the members of the Local Security Boards will equally involve women NGOs.
* Review of legislative framework on internal security forces: Police and Gendarmerie basic laws will be reviewed in the light of civilian/democratic oversight and accountability principles. As women and men have different security related risks and needs, gender mainstreaming in concerned laws will also be promoted.
* Local security plans: The gender dimension in the development of local security plans will be ensured as women and men have different security related risks and needs. This would also strengthen the delivery of gender-sensitive security policies by the ISFs.
1. **Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-a-vis national partners, other development partners, and other actors? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

3:

Evidence

The Project aims to build capacity of the Ministry of Interior for effective oversight of the ISFs and its starting point is to support Turkey in its efforts to expand enjoyment of rights by citizens and its zero-tolerance policy against torture and ill-treatment. Therefore, there is an important aspect related to the empowerment of the citizens for the internalisation of the human-focused security services and civilian/democratic oversight of ISFs.

The project will tackle the overarching problem of insufficient framework conditions for effective civilian and democratic oversight of internal security forces, at four levels: (1) legislative and institutional framework; (2) parliamentary oversight, (3) scale up of the pilot security governance structures and (4) individual and institutional capacity building. This approach is derived from the result of the first and second phases of the project, global experience and the literature on the subject which makes clear that civilian/democratic oversight can be, and is increasingly being, defined to include both civilian authorities (elected and appointed, administrative, legislative and judicial) and representation or participation from civil society.

The MoI through its provincial administration system will contribute to Turkey’s ability to further integrate the legislative and other reform processes into its administrative structure and align its practice to international and particularly EU norms for democratic governance. The MoI will prepare detailed study of mechanisms of MoI in EU countries at the central level for consulting with civil society and development of their strategic plan. In addition to the type and publicity of produced strategic plan, the capacity, staff, resources, the working principles, the remit, appointments of members and accountability line will be reviewed and analysed, supporting the Strategy Development Department of MoI. It will prompt a full fledge usage of the Governors powers given by law over the ISFs as well as their role for consulting with civil society though the dissemination of structures trialled during the first phase of the ICOISS Project (local security commissions).

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey will be provided with recommendations for new arrangements within its structure for effective oversight that it has to play over the ISFs. The importance of its oversight role enhanced with the Constitutional Change in 2017 and the Project will have an opportunity to contribute to its regulating frameworks on parliamentary oversight.

This Project will be the third phase of the recently implemented Project on the same subject and as referred above, the MoI is the Beneficiary of the project whereas the Grand National Assembly of Turkey acts as the co-beneficiary. The MoI has committed itself institutionally to take a lead in further integrating the legislative and other reform processes on human rights into the public administration system of Turkey which is essentially overseen by Governors and District Governors at local levels.

In addition to the strengthening of the capacity of the Ministry of Interior and the GNAT in this crucial field, focus will be on the individuals, including the most disadvantaged- women, children, youth, elderly, persons with disability and refugees. This phase of the Project will focus on the scale up of the local security governance structures piloted in the scope of first and second phase of the ICOISS. The Project will also give a specific attention to the professionals of the ISFs and the MoI authorities for the internalisation of the concept.

The institutional commitment of the MoI is manifested in its cooperation with the UNDP in doing the preparatory work necessary for the conduct of this Project at hand and with other bilateral partners in related areas. In this connection, the UNDP has a unique partnership with the MoI through which it provides training and capacity building assistance. UNDP Turkey provides policy advisory and program implementation services for the MoI in the field of human rights with focus on civilian/democratic oversight.

Social & Environmental Standards Quality Rating:

1. **Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

3: Credible evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights, upholding the relevant international and national laws and standards in the area of the project. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option)

Evidence

Turkey has legislated a set of reform measures in the field of expanding human rights and has declared a zero-tolerance policy against torture and ill treatment. The Government has also legislated a set of measures aiming at public administration reform. The Government has abolished the Protocol on Cooperation for Security and Public Order in 2010 and is in an effort to enable civilian oversight of the ISFs at the provincial and local level through legislative packages.

Starting from the first phase of the Improvement of Civilian Oversight of Internal Security Sector (ICOISS) Project, Turkey has initiated with the EC, United Nations and bilateral partners to lay the groundwork for a transition from a narrowly conceived, bureaucratically and legalistically managed oversight of security forces to a system of security sector governance based on a human centred understanding of security and public safety in structured partnership with civil society. The referred structured partnership is piloted in the scope of Local Prevention and Security Boards designed as platforms where the representatives of the ISFs, civilian authorities and civil society are putting joint efforts for the planning and implementation of local security action plans.

In designing the Project activities, the PT will bring together its ability to advocate, advise, promote fundamental rights based on dialogue and consensus as well as transparent and accountable institutions in line with international and EU norms and standards. Promotion of change in the field of civilian and democratic oversight from a fundamental rights perspective both through upstream actions targeting institutional reforms and policy level interventions as well as downstream actions for empowered civil society and individuals especially the disadvantaged groups of women, children, youth, persons with disability will be key in Project interventions. A human rights based approach (HRBA), therefore, will be used in undertaking all project activities, ensuring that the principles of legality, empowerment, accountability and participation are manifest both in the execution of these activities and the effects they produce. This will be enabled by efforts to foster impartial ‘spaces’ for dialogue, agreement, coordination and action across organised and non-organised groups and interests, especially in design and implementation of activities concerning legislative and policy development for improved internal security sector with an enhanced civilian and democratic oversight.

1. **Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? {select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

1

**9. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? [If yes, upload the completed checklist as evidence. If SESP is not required, provide the reason(s) for the exemption in the evidence section. Exemptions include the following:**

No

Evidence

***Management & Monitoring Quality Rating:***

1. **Does the project have a strong results framework? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure all of the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources, and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, sex- disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)

Evidence

Indeed, SMART indicators are incorporated in the DoA.

1. **Is there a comprehensive and costed M&E plan with specified data collection sources and methods to support evidence- based management, monitoring and evaluation of the project?**

Yes

Evidence

The project already includes M&E milestones. Other than the Project M&E mechanism UNDP inner M&E mechanisms are in use. Evaluation and monitoring exercises will be undertaken in compliance with the provisions of the FAFA (Art.1) and the General Conditions (Art. 10). The Project will be evaluated (technical evaluation) by an independent team of experts. The selection of independent team of experts for evaluation will be made in line with UNDP rules and procedures. The evaluation is expected to be conducted 1 month before the Project ends.

The assessment will be on the substance and immediate concrete results of the Project, and will, by no means, include any form of expenditure verification (or Audit) etc. As a result of the assessment, the impacts of the results achieved, lessons learned and good practices in terms of substance will be assessed in a report. Besides, the level of communication and visibility as well as recommendations for sustainability will also be explored in the said assessment.

1. **Is the project’s governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including planned composition of the project board? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

2: The project’s governance mechanism is defined in the project document; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The prodoc lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true to select this option)

Evidence

Management Structure is defined in the DoA of the project at hand and stated below;

EUD is the representative of the donor institution and the contracting authority, UNDP is the implementing partner that will implement the project's activities targeting the final beneficiaries as specified in the Direct Grant Agreement signed between UNDP and EUD.

**Project Steering Committee (PSC)**

For the purpose of this contract, the Steering Committee will be co-chaired by the UNDP and MoI as the main beneficiary and will convene on quarterly basis. The Steering Committee will consist of representatives of UNDP, the EUD (donor institution and contracting authority) the main beneficiary (Ministry of Interior, General Directorate for Provincial Administrations), co-beneficiary (GNAT), EU Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Lead Institution on Fundamental Rights sector) and Presidency of Strategy and Budget Office as the natural member of the all PSCs of UNDP projects in Turkey. The Steering Committee will meet to discuss the progress of the Project, verify the achievement of the outputs and mandatory results and discuss actions to be undertaken or whenever deemed necessary by its members. Study visit programmes and the profiles as well as numbers of participants will be agreed by the Project Steering Committee. Relevant representatives of the CSOs or other relevant actors may be invited as observers.

The responsibility for the organisation of the Steering Committee meetings including preparation of minutes lies with the UNDP.

**Additional coordination meetings** might be held on ad-hoc basis if deemed necessary. Those meetings shall be arranged and co-chaired by the UNDP and MoI involving relevant stakeholders.

**Advisory Bodies of the Project** mainly Legislation Drafting Committee and Curriculum Development Committee will be established for the successful implementation of the project and ensure that the sustainability of the results achieved.

1. **Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risks? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified and no initial risk log is included with the project document.

Evidence

Main assumptions of the project’s smooth implementation are defined as stakeholders’ dedication to participate and cooperate throughout the process and continued commitment to the EU Accession Process and institutionalization of civilian oversight over ISFs. There is a clear risk that political climate and conjuncture may affect the progress and timely implementation of the Project activities and there might be factors outside project management's control that may impact on the output-outcome linkage.

Efficient Quality Rating:

1. **Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design?**

This can include: i) using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.

Yes

Evidence

The project follows a portfolio management approach to make better use of the budget and the available resources. The Project will be conducted under the Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio of UNDP Turkey CO. This enables the creation of “cost-synergy” opportunity to reduce or eliminate expenses associated with running the Project; especially with regards to Human Resources. Key positions such as Portfolio Manager (PM), Projects Coordinator and Portfolio Administrator (PA) will support the implementation of the Project, depending on the nature of the work and complexity a number of technical and administrative roles and services which will be majorly covered by the UNDP. Based on the needs of the Project and the projected inputs, the afore-mentioned positions are included, in the Project Budget on a pro-rata basis, as direct costs to the action. Accordingly, it is envisaged that Portfolio Manager will be key contact between project partners and will be responsible ensuring effective implementation of Actions. PM will also be responsible for linking the Project to the other programmes of UNDP Turkey. PM will serve on part time basis during the whole period of the Action (20% part-time). Projects Coordinator and Portfolio Administrator are contracted UNDP Staff responsible for ensuring oversight on smooth, timely and effective financial and contractual implementation as per UNDP rules and regulations. They will serve on part-time basis during the whole Action. The time allocation is based on the existing workflow in the UNDP office and is pro-rated to the scale of the budget and the scope of the action requiring different time inputs from different positions. Thanks to portfolio management approach, positions that are viewed as duplicate within the Project and the UNDP CO are merged and the entailed costs are shared instead of allocating additional budget to resource these key positions under Project.

Finally, it is explicitly mentioned in the Project document that for the provision of goods and services under the Project UNDP’s rules and regulations will be followed, making procurement a strategic function essential to delivering cost-effective and efficient project results.

1. **Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners, to achieve more efficient results (including, for example, through sharing resources or coordinating delivery?)**

No

Evidence

**16. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?**

3:

Evidence

During the preparation of budget, starting point was the accumulated cost data from similar projects implemented by the UNDP. Project budget is established thanks to relevant historical data, especially collected from Greek Border Project, that accurately matches with the current project. During the process, the specific deliverables and activities are clearly identified, and the process that is required to deliver each one is mapped out so to accurately estimate the budget for the duration of the project period. Budget is designed in a flexible and adaptable way and provides room for a range of the costs that may effect the smooth delivery of activities such as inflation and exchange rate fluctuations.

1. **Is the Country Office fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?**

3: The budget fully covers all direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)

Evidence

Direct Project Costs (DPC) are included in the project budget and charged directly to the project budget to reflect in the appropriate project budget the true direct costs of achieving the development results and objectives funded from regular (core) and other (non-core) programme resources. DPC together with GMS, which covers the UNDP’s costs in support of its corporate structure, for the implementation of its development activities and services are included in the Budget of the Project. With the inclusion of Portfolio Manager position as one of the DPC items into the Budget of the Project; UNDP’s strategic country programme planning and advisory services are ensured. In addition, with the Portfolio Administrator position included in the Budget of the Project, UN’s operational and administrative support to project; including services related to finance, procurement, human resources; is safeguarded. Services that will result in DPC are disclosed transparently and agreed by all concerned parties, and clearly included in the Project Document and the budget as an integral part of the project.

***Effective Quality Rating:***

1. **Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

1: The required assessments have not been conducted, but there may be evidence that options for implementation modalities have been considered.

Evidence

1. **Have targeted groups, prioritizing marginalized and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination?**

1: No evidence of engagement with marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project during project design. No evidence that the views, rights and constraints of populations have been incorporated into the project.

1. **Does the project conduct regular monitoring activities, have explicit plans for evaluation, and include other lesson learning (e.g. through After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops), timed to inform course corrections if needed during project implementation?**

Yes

Evidence

In regard with project management monitoring activities, the Inception and Annual Progress reports serve to this requirement. Moreover the project already includes M&E milestones. Other than the Project M&E mechanism UNDP inner M&E mechanisms are in use. Evaluation and monitoring exercises will be undertaken in compliance with the provisions of the FAFA (Art.1) and the General Conditions (Art. 10). The Project will be evaluated (technical evaluation) by an independent team of experts. The selection of independent team of experts for evaluation will be made in line with UNDP rules and procedures. The evaluation is expected to be conducted 3 months before the Project ends.

1. **The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.**

Yes.

Evidence

The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2. Gender mainstreaming will be one of the main crosscutting themes of the project. A gender mainstreaming approach will be applied through the following measures:

* Composition of the trainees and members of the Local Security Boards: Trainees of the training programs will be determined with a gender sensitive approach, as was the case in the two previous phases of the Project. In addition, in order to reflect a gender equality perspective, the Project will promote the inclusion of specific sessions on gender mainstreaming in internal security policies in training programs. The participation of women trainees will be recorded by the Project team. The Project will also encourage that the members of the Local Security Boards will equally involve women NGOs.
* Review of legislative framework on internal security forces: Police and Gendarmerie basic laws will be reviewed in the light of civilian/democratic oversight and accountability principles. As women and men have different security related risks and needs, gender mainstreaming in concerned laws will also be promoted.
* Local security plans: The gender dimension in the development of local security plans will be ensured as women and men have different security related risks and needs. This would also strengthen the delivery of gender-sensitive security policies by the ISFs.
1. **Is there a realistic multi-year work plan and budget to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within allotted resources? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)**

3: The project has a realistic work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the activity level to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within the allotted resources.

Evidence

The DoA already holds an Action Plan which consists of every activity and the timing for those activities stated.

***Sustainability & National Ownership Quality Rating:***

1. **Have national partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?**

3: National partners have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.

Evidence

All partners were informed by all stages until contract signature and all their comments are reflected in the DoA.

1. **Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/ comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted? (select from options 0-4 that best reflects this project):**

1.5: There is mention in the project document of capacities of national institutions to be strengthened through the project, but no capacity assessments or specific strategy development are planned.

1. **Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems {i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?**

Not applicable

Evidence

1. **Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation strategy)?**

Yes

Evidence

The intervention modality proposed for implementation of the Project includes a number of measures to optimise the multiplier effects and sustainability of the impact after completion of the Project. These elements include, but are not limited to, improved legislative base, comparative analysis and good practice reports. In addition to such outputs, the Project is expected to contribute significantly to the improvement of capacities both at the central and local levels of the beneficiary organisations including the Ministry of Interior, the Governorates and District Governorates and ISFs. Not only the legislative experts but the MPs themselves will benefit from the capacity building programs. An important multiplier effect will be on the communities and citizens where the Local Prevention and Security Boards will be scaled up as there will be continuous training programs on civic engagement, human security and citizen focused service delivery. The civil society and media aspects will create sustainable mechanisms to improve the capacities at the “demand-side”.

This Phase of the Project will lay the grounds for scale up, institutionalisation and sustainability of the outputs and results of the previous phases. This Phase will ensure the follow up of the enactment of the drafted framework documents, scale up of the local security governance structures and contribute to the mindset of the appointed local authorities by incorporating civilian oversight of the ISFs and citizen focused service delivery.

The Project will support policy-level sustainability mainly through the replicable pilot actions that will be fulfilled throughout the Project.

The Action is geared towards establishment of required institutional capacity and the funds will be used for this specific purpose. As such, once the required institutional capacity is established and the MoI and LPSBs are entitled with the skills and tools, they will be able to expand the implementation of the recommendations of the Project from its own resources.

The Project will develop significant capacities both at the central level and the local levels through implementation of pilot projects in selected provinces and structured training and capacity building programs. The clear emphasis placed on the inclusion and engagement of the civil society, both organised and unorganised, and the media in the Project activities will also develop much needed capacities in these two particular sectors as well. At this point, it is important to note that the training modules will be used by the MoI for further training programs to be delivered by provincial administrations.

The MoI will ensure policy-level sustainability of the Action. The policy level impact of the Project will be most observable upon achievement of project outputs as a result of the activities defined in Component A (Legislative and Institutional Framework), Component B (Parliamentary Oversight) Component C (Scale Up Pilot Security Governance Structures). Within these particular components considerable progress is planned to be achieved towards improvement in relevant legislative pieces, development of strategies for the Grand National Assembly of Turkey to fulfil its oversight function and scale up of the local governance structures for their definition as part of public administration of Turkey.