

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

<b>Form Status: Approved</b>	
<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Needs Improvement
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00089746
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Demining Phase II
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2016-01-01 / 2020-03-31

<b>Strategic</b>	<b>Quality Rating: Exemplary</b>
<p>1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?</p>	

- 3: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

Demining Project Phase II along with Phase I was the first Humanitarian Mine Action project in Turkey, the project team encountered several challenges during the implementation.

The first change was a year project extension until 18 of December 2018.

One of the major challenge was security situation in the region. As the security situations didn't allow humanitarian demining in Van and Hakkari regions, through the revisions in Project Fiche and Addendum-I, the target for the clearance area was changed from Van - Hakkari regions to Ağrı (Doğubeyazıt) region.

The third Addendum, approved on 18 December 2018, extended the project until the end of 2019 due to concerns that the timeline stipulated in the project would not provide the time necessary to maximize the clearances due to topography, weather, and minefield conditions as well as a high turnover of management and delays in MECHEM's ability to mobilize.

(We may attach Addendums if necessary?)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

**Evidence:**

The overall objective of the Project is to contribute to the social and economic development through demining and more secure borders in Eastern Turkey.

The specific objective of the project is to contribute to the prevention of illegal migration and all types of cross-border crimes at Turkey's Eastern borders in line with EU's IBM policies and strategies via demining the area and providing effective and humanitarian border surveillance tools for a technologically supported modern border surveillance system.

The outcome of the project is :By 2020, central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights, and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender-sensitive governance systems, with the full participation of civil society, including the most vulnerable.

This outcome falls under UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017) outcome which is "Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded".

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- 3: *Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)*
- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The target groups of the project are the Ministry of National Defence (National Mine Action Centre-TURM AC), the Turkish General Staff (Land Forces Command), and the Ministry of Interior (General Directorate of Provincial Administrations, Border Management, Foreign Affairs and Projects Department).

There was a good collaboration and cooperation between all stakeholders along the project duration. During the project implementation there were several meetings with target groups and stakeholders including Steering committee meetings, Operational working group meetings, Field Coordination meetings. Targeted groups were active members in these decision making meetings as a governance mechanism of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

#### Evidence:

As a capacity building activity output, the project had several meetings, workshops, trainings, field visits. Post project review (PPR) workshop, Result Based Management (RBM) evaluation, Independent evaluation, Lessons Learned workshop were conducted during the project implementation.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LessonsLearnedReportDeminingPhaseII_2764_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearnedReportDeminingPhaseII_2764_304.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearnedReportDeminingPhaseII_2764_304.doc</a> )	oyku.ulucay@undp.org	1/15/2020 9:28:00 AM



5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- 3: *There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.*
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

**Evidence:**

The project scope has changed according to available budget according to lessons learned from Phase I. Capacity building activities were conducted as planned, clearance activities' scope was changed because of the security situation in the region. The project is scaled up and Phase III planning is undergoing. Phase I and II was aiming to release 4.5 million sqm land after amendments to the project, 4.7 million sqm land was released at the end of the project. There was 11.7 million sqm land to be released in Eastern Borders of Turkey as stated in Phase I project document. Remaining 4,2 million sqm contaminated area will be released in Phase III between 2020 and 2022.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Principled****Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

**Evidence:**

Please refer to the Pro Doc. Gender gender dimension was analysed during the needs assessment in 2016; gender-sensitive training was provided to all NMAC staff as required and options to mainstream gender into mine action will be explored.

Demining project is very new in Turkey, there were difficulties to find local deminers in the region. To find female deminers were almost impossible because of the cultural norms in the region. Almost all contract medics were female in the teams, providing every demining team one female member. There were contract female administrative and office technical staff working in field locations.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Demining by its nature causes a temporary change in the environment as natural vegetation is destroyed during the demining process. However, the removal of explosives from the ground will limit the longer term effects of soil absorption of explosive compounds.

The project kept an update risk log.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	95861SESP_Demining_Phase_II_2764_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/95861SESP_Demining_Phase_II_2764_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/95861SESP_Demining_Phase_II_2764_307.pdf</a> )	ahmet.doganay@undp.org	12/19/2019 12:12:00 PM

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 1: *Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)*

**Evidence:**

Although there is no evidence that project-affected people was informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism, there were some grievance mechanism in the project. TURMAC was the only main beneficiary in the project. Any grievances related in operation in the project were handled in Operational Working Group meetings, strategic level grievances were handled in steering committee meetings.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

**Evidence:**

The project had a costed M&E plan. Progress data against indicators in Logical Framework of the project were collected and reported through Project Progress Reports, reports submitted by partner institutions and others. Internal Audit reports, progress reports and a final report were prepared to document of the progress made, challenges and lessons learned.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LOGICALFRAMEWORKFORTHEPROJECT_2764_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LOGICALFRAMEWORKFORTHEPROJECT_2764_309.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LOGICALFRAMEWORKFORTHEPROJECT_2764_309.docx</a> )	ahmet.doganay@undp.org	12/18/2019 3:07:00 PM

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.



**Evidence:**

The Project Board consisted of EUD, CFCU, Presidency of Strategy and Budget (PSB), Ministry of Defense (TURMAC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Interior. During the project timeline, 14 Steering Committee meetings were organized. Project Progress Reports were submitted by the project manager to the SC. You can find the latest PSC meeting minutes attached.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SCMeeting5Nov2019Presentation_2764_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCMeeting5Nov2019Presentation_2764_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCMeeting5Nov2019Presentation_2764_310.pdf</a> )	ahmet.doganay@undp.org	12/19/2019 11:59:00 AM
2	20191105SC13MinutesFinal_2764_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20191105SC13MinutesFinal_2764_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20191105SC13MinutesFinal_2764_310.pdf</a> )	ahmet.doganay@undp.org	12/19/2019 11:59:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: *The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

Risks were primarily monitored and discussed locally at the monthly Operational Working Group Meetings. Strategic risks were discussed at the quarterly steering committee meetings

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

The project budget was 13,470,277.50 EU. Most budget was used to achieve the intended results. 1.3 million sqm land was released as planned.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

All the project activities were completed and delivered at the end of two times no cost extensions (amendments):

Demining the border regions of Ağrı (Doğubeyazıt) is completed.

Demined areas are certified in compliance with the international and Turkish mine action standards.

Post Project Review is conducted.

Institutional capacity on border management is enhanced.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.***
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

#### Evidence:

There was as QA/QC Contractor to monitor and evaluate the quality management of demining activities of the project. This evaluation was based on safety not cost efficiency. The project team monitored the work output of all contractors to determine if sufficient effort was being conducted. Any deficiency was discussed at the Operational Working Group Meetings.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

The project had two times one year extension to deliver expected results. According to latest amendment project has delivered the outputs on time.  
Demining the border regions of Ağrı (Doğubeyazıt) is completed.  
Demined areas are certified in compliance with the international and Turkish mine action standards.  
Post Project Review is conducted.  
Institutional capacity on border management is enhanced.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

#### Evidence:

Phase II was redesigned with amendments according to Phase I data, regular reviews post project review and lessons learned reports. Work plan was continuously monitored and amended to achieve the desired results in time. Operational issues were discussed at the Operational Working Group Meetings and strategic issues at the quarterly steering committee meetings.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**



Main targeted group was TURMAC for capacity building output of the project.

Capacity building within TURMAC aimed to support capacity development at three levels: the individual, organizational and the enabling environment for mine action. Facilitated by an international consultant, capacity development focused on the following:

1. Conduct a capacity needs assessment
2. Assist with the development of a strategic mine action plan
3. Assist with the development of Turkish national mine action standards
4. Assist with the development of guidelines on land release
5. Assist with the annual review of the mine clearance completion plan
6. Develop/deliver training on areas of need to support a fully functional TURMAC including a focus on developing a regulatory framework, information management, tasking planning and orders and developing national mine action standards.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

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

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

TURMAC as a main beneficiary of the project was fully engaged in decision making, implementation and monitoring activities. Operational Demining Process (ODP) has been established to enable handover process in the project. ODP also described land release process clearly so handover of the minefields could be done with confidence.

The management of the ODP comes under the responsibilities of the Operational Working Group (OWG), consisting of representatives of UNDP TAT, Clearance and QA/QC contractors and TURMAC. The OWG meets every month and delivers operational guidance to the Project, the role of OWG is to manage task planning, task execution and any other outstanding task related matters.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable*

**Evidence:**

Not applicable

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

**Evidence:**

Phase III was discussed and coordinated through the project steering committee meetings.

The project will be the third phase for the Socio-economic development through demining and increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey. The main problems, needs addressed, and the aims of the project will be similar with that of the first and second phases. Based on the lessons learned of this project, Turkey would like to clear up a minimum of 4.2 million m<sup>2</sup> land in Ardahan, Kars, Iğdır and Ağrı (Doğubeyazıt) region in accordance with the national priorities and to enable other increased border surveillance projects in the region. Along with demining activity there will be Mine Risk Education activity also in the project. The main activities for this component will include the provision of MRE materials for the TURMAC MRE Department. The TURMAC will prioritize MRE in communities near where mine action clearance will occur.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

Discussions and Recommendations of the Steering Committee Members at the last SC meeting.

IPA 2016 (Phase III)

- Phase III is expected to be approved by the IPA Committee on 12th November 2019.
  - EUD states that EU contribution agreement can be signed only when the financing agreement between UNDP and the Turkish Government is signed as the condition for the funding by the EU is Turkish contribution. Negotiations for drafting the contract between the EU and UNDP can continue in parallel.
  - UNDP stated the project was already submitted to the Investment Budget Department with the support of the Presidency of Strategy and Budget, and contribution of the Turkish Government could be received in January earliest and in March latest. UNDP stressed that timely start of the project is critical, in addition to other reasons, for keeping the TAT staff in the project and any support to accelerate the process would be appreciated.
  - TURMAC explained the process of Turkish contribution stating that budget discussions would start at the end of November and budget of Ministry of National Defence would be one of the first budgets to be discussed, and the project was offered to be included in the 2020 budget by the Ministry of National Defence, however, even though the budget was approved by the end of November the allocation would be released in January 2020. TURMAC also emphasized that TURMAC would closely follow the process as NTS is more critical for TURMAC as projection of the mined areas in Turkey could be clear through NTS.
  - EUD requested from UNDP to share the draft budget right after the approval of Phase III by the IPA Committee.
  - MoI stated that, as IPA-II led emergence of leading organizations period and the MoI is the leading organization in terms of IBM, all documents including the contract must be sent to the EUD through the MoI officially, after the approval of the MoI, as CFCU would not be the contracting authority.
- UNDP emphasised that sending the contractual documents to the MoI with official correspondence would not be pra

tical and would take long time and proposed to carry out the procedures in consultation with and by informing the Mol. UNDP requested a written statement on how the procedures should be for all projects, however EUD may not have written rules on the subject. EU Directorate will look for the written procedures and inform UNDP upon a request by UNDP.

#### Temporary Transfer of Equipment

- Parties agree on temporary transfer of the equipment and vehicles to UNDP Country Office as custodian until Phase III starts.
- TURMAC requested from UNDP to send the list of all assets.
- CFCU requested to include justification note in the final report, which will be a notification, regarding the temporary transfer of vehicles to UNDP and attach a written agreement between UNDP and TURMAC. CFCU also requests to include photos of equipment, particularly vehicles, showing compliance with the visibility rules, into the final report.

#### Closure Event

- Attendance and speeches by the Deputy Minister of Interior, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and representative of Land Forces to be confirmed. UNDP to share the draft agenda, invitation and draft list of speakers to all SC members. Mol, MoFA and TURMAC to confirm the speakers from the Turkish Government.
- All visibility items for the closure event must bear logos of all partners, where possible. Designs should be shared with partners for approval.