

Ex-post evaluation 2008

**Qualification of Municipal Services,
Turkey**

Brief Report

gtz

**Produced by: Dr. Wolfgang Meyer, Sonja Wolf,
Oya Uysal, Sabit Imren**
**for: Center for Evaluation (CEval), Saarland
University, Saarbrücken**

**This report was produced by independent external experts.
It reflects only their opinion and assessment.**

Published by:
Deutsche Gesellschaft für
Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH

Evaluation Unit

Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5
65760 Eschborn
Germany
Internet: <http://www.gtz.de>

Eschborn, July 2009

Tabular overview

The evaluation mission

Evaluation period	09/2008 – 07/2009
Evaluating institute / consulting firm	Center for Evaluation (CEval), Saarland University, Saarbrücken
Evaluation team	Dr. Wolfgang Meyer, Sonja Wolf (international consultants), Oya Uysal, Sabit Imren (national consultants)

The development measure

Title according to the offer	Qualification of Municipal Services
Number	1998.2179.4
Overall term broken down by phases	11/2002 – 12/2006 (only one term)
Total costs	1,680 Mio. € (German contribution) ¹
Overall objective as per the offer, for ongoing development measures also the objective for the current phase	<p>„Selected municipalities have improved their technical, business and administrative management capacities in the areas of water supply, waste water treatment and waste disposal” (project objective)</p> <p>The IPN and corresponding vocational training measures in the areas of water supply, waste water treatment and waste disposal improve the political, institutional and professional framework for services in selected municipalities (phase objective 2005)</p>
Lead executing agency	Ministry of Interior, Turkey
Implementing organisations (in the partner country)	Turkish Institute for Public Administration (TODAIE); Turkish Municipality Association (TBB)
Other participating development organisations	CIM (Center for International Migration and Development), DWA (German Association for Water, Wastewater and Waste)
Target groups as per the offer	Inhabitants of municipalities, especially of those in which projects on water supply, waste water treatment and waste disposal were implemented (or should be

¹ planned: 10.285 TDM, included German contribution: 6.385 TDM

	<p>implemented in the near future) by the KfW, the EIB or the Illerbank. Project measures are directed towards political decision makers as well as towards technical and administrative staff of the municipalities or their services companies.</p>
--	---

The rating

<p>Overall rating <i>On a scale of 1 (very good, significantly better than expected) to 6 (the project/program is useless, or the situation has deteriorated on balance)</i></p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Individual rating</p>	<p>Relevance: 3; Effectiveness:3; Impact:4; Efficiency:3; Sustainability: 3</p>

This evaluation was executed by CEval on behalf of GTZ's Evaluation Office. Oya Uysal, Sabit Imren, Sonja Wolf and Dr. Wolfgang Meyer formed the evaluation team which conducted the evaluation between May 2008 (first contact and inspection of files) and July 2009 (final report). The research in Turkey was done in three separated missions between September 9th and October 11th 2008. Following the GTZ Standards for independent evaluation, the five OECD/DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability) were used for project assessment. The evaluation was carried out with enhanced analytical methods ("Rigorous Impact Evaluation").

The object of this evaluation was the project "Qualification of municipal services Turkey", implemented by GTZ in cooperation with the Turkish Institute for Public Administration TODAIE and the Turkish Municipality Association TBB between October 2002 and December 2006. Due to the belated project start and an adaptation of the project conception, the original project objective „Selected municipalities have improved their technical, business and administrative management capacities in the areas of water supply, waste water treatment and waste disposal" was replaced in 2005 by the following objective for the first project phase: "The inter-institutional professional network (IPN) and corresponding vocational training measures in the areas of water supply, waste water treatment and waste disposal improve the political, institutional and professional framework for services in selected municipalities".

The need for such a project had been justified by the specific framework conditions in Turkey. Turkey is characterized by a dynamic development of population, resulting in high migration into cities and one of the highest urbanization rate globally. For municipal management, providing a sufficient infrastructure for fresh and waste water as well as for waste disposal becomes more and more difficult. In general, the main problem in Turkey is not the quantitative but the qualitative aspect of such kind of management. Due to climate reasons, fresh water supply is difficult and the poor quality of line systems additionally leads to high losses. Waste water treatment is still not widespread throughout the country: only one fourths of urban population is attached to treatment plants, while modern plants are still a small minority. For waste disposal, the small number of controlled landfills and missing recycling management systems are the main challenges. Six major problems were recognized during an independent feasibility study of the project : deficits in municipalities' organizational development, lack of financial and personal resources, deficits in the qualification of personnel, insufficient equipment and lack of customer orientation.

In order to achieve more independence and flexibility for the municipalities (or their private and public service companies) especially in fresh and waste water and in solid waste management, an essential reform of administration with a strong decentralization tendency was initiated by the Turkish government. This is where the project "Qualification of

Municipalities Services” joined in. By focusing on the implementation of an inter-institutional professional network (IPN), twelve pilot municipalities were selected as a result of a baseline exploration.

The results chain of the project can be described as follows: the main input was provided by two experts from Germany and Turkey who supported the implementation of the inter-institutional professional network and its working results (outputs). The use of these outputs was expected to lead to an extension and improvement of qualification offers for municipalities and its service companies as well as to a durable institutionalization of the network by the partner organizations TODAIE or TBB respectively. The municipalities should benefit from this organizational framework by working in technical expert committees, which developed guidelines (approved rules for technique) to be used within the municipalities for enhancing the management of solid waste, fresh and waste water management. This improvement in working material and knowledge should lead to an upgrading of service quality (outcome of the project). Moreover, overarching indirect development results (impact) like an increase in participation, better access to fresh water and more care about natural resources should be at least supported.

The main difficulty associated with this concept was due to the fact, that the project was planned for three phases but only one phase could be implemented. Hence, both activities and outputs were significantly reduced while the envisaged objectives and impacts of the concept remained the same. In principle the plan to establish an inter-institutional professional network seemed to be realistic for the initial long-term project design (nine years), but could not be reached within three years.

The feasibility study of the project had proposed both TBB and TODAIE as implementing agencies of the project. In September 2004, TBB was strengthened by a new law and since the project focused its activities primarily on the establishment of a technical network (and not on vocational training) TODAIE was pulled out. However TBB had not been able to provide appropriate rooms for the project which led to a termination of the project ahead of schedule.

The overall rating of the project has been assessed as “unsatisfactory” (4) due to its premature ending consequently resulting in a limited impact. The high expectations connected with this project at the beginning and its intended results could not be achieved with the decreased financial resources and time reduction. The project concept was not adequately adjusted to these reductions.

The results for the five criteria are justified as followed:

Relevance (3)

While the project was well-integrated into the political framework, the IPN had not yet reached the aimed position as a central institution for supplying approved rules for technique and widespread guidelines. Within a highly dynamic sector, the IPN remained at a marginal position with rather limited political influence. Therefore, the relevance is only assessed as “satisfactory” (3).

Effectiveness (3)

The four indicators defining the success of the projects were achieved to a limited extend, only at completion of the project (two of four target values were reached). This had only slightly improved by the time of this ex-post evaluation. However, it is positive that the efforts to achieve the goals continue. The circulation of information by the network worked successfully while the elaboration of guidelines lacked behind. Nevertheless, the expert committees are still working on this issue. The development of a vocational training concept on infrastructure management was dropped and no trainings on these issues were held in 2009. The assessment of effectiveness is therefore only “satisfactory” (3).

Impact (4)

A widespread diffusion of the IPN working guidelines is missing: only the pilot municipalities who had been involved in the development of the guidelines are using them. With regard to human resource development a significant difference can be observed between the municipalities involved in the project and those who where not. The training courses run by TODAIE at the beginning of the project contributed to an improvement of management competence and the quality of services. Nevertheless, this is the only positive impact visible, the overarching developmental goals have not been achieved so far, therefore the impact of the project is assessed as “non satisfactory” (4).

Efficiency (3)

The financial resources used for the project were quite low (1.68 Mio. EUR), but this is not a sufficient indicator for efficiency. Regarding the insufficient achievement of the results the reduction of resources caused by the early ending is not a specific strength of the project. Moreover, the constellation of two implementation agencies (TODAIE and TBB) caused delays and additional need for coordination. From the perspective of efficiency, one has to mention positively the high extend of voluntary work which made it possible to unite people from very different organizations. It has also shown that the German DWA-model may work as well in Turkey. Hence, the project is an example for the efficient scope of self-organization in this sector. Nevertheless, the project can only be assessed as “satisfactory” (3) regarding the efficiency criteria.

Sustainability (3)

The activities of the IPN have been continued after completion of the project more or less in the same way as during the implementation phase of the project. This is to some extent due to the assignment of an integrated expert by CIM who had been deployed to up the sustainability of the project. Since the IPN is not yet established on a sustained basis and since its impact is still not visible, sustainability of the project has been assessed as “satisfactory” (3).

The following conclusions are made by the evaluation team:

Management of infrastructure has become more professional in the big towns, so one can recognize a slightly positive trend in Turkey in general. This is also true for the development of organizations, although the project did not deal with this in particular. The lack of financial and personal resources hindered many municipalities to send their staff to join the IPN expert commissions. The project could not develop any measures to change this situation. Qualification deficits had been and still are one of the main hindering factors for developing municipalities' services in Turkey. The project had been successful here to a certain extent, but due to the shortage of its duration, it was not able to develop the strongly needed training concepts. Unfortunately, since the end of the project no training courses had been offered on infrastructure. The project focused on technical solutions, but did not improve the situation very much. This was the case because the project focused on a general increase of standards and not on short-term solutions. So far the IPN has not developed as a central platform for exchange and development of technical standards and information.

Five general recommendations have been derived from the evaluation results. For future projects, the implementation agency and especially the constellation of different organizations should be examined more carefully with regards to the risks and opportunities offered by these actors. During the implementation phase, the problems and hindering factors mentioned in the feasibility study should be taken seriously. They have to be monitored and systematically assessed by the project team. The project concept should consider the results of the feasibility study. As a basis for all planning, monitoring and evaluation activities, a baseline should be done to make expectations on impacts more realistic. A systematic Monitoring and Evaluation system offers the opportunity to make changes during the implementation phase visible. Finally, projects like this should be part of a broader program-concept with a multi-level approach and merging all actors (especially all donors) within one sector. Institution Building on the meso-level – like the IPN – requires additional measures on micro- and macro-level supported by more than one organization. All singular projects should be well integrated in a master plan and all activities must be adjusted for maximizing the impact.