



2374 – “Strengthening the Coordination of Anti-Corruption Policies and Practices in Turkey” (TYSAP)

First Steering Committee Meeting

Ankara, Turkey – 5th July, 2013

Participants:

Prime Ministry Inspection Board: Yunus ARINCI, Mete DEMİRCİ, Sefa ÇAĞLIYAN, Süleyman BEŞLER

Co-Beneficiaries: Ministry of Justice, General Directorate of International Law and Foreign Affairs; Ministry of Labor and Social Security Inspection Board; Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, Directorate of Guidance and Inspection; Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, Directorate of Guidance and Inspection; Ministry of Finance, Presidency of Tax Inspection Board; Ministry of Transportation, Maritime Affairs and Communication, Presidency of Inspection Services; Presidency of Treasury Controllers Board; Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency. (The list of participants is attached)

Council of Europe: Adrian BUTLER, Pinar BAŞPINAR, Leila MARSHANIA, Corinne ILGÜN, Burçin CROMPTON

Observers: Erol ÇOBAN (Central Finance and Contracts Unit); Gamze KÖSEKAHYA (European Union Delegation to Turkey)

Agenda

1. Opening Remarks
 - Yunus ARINCI, Chairman of Prime Ministry Inspection Board
 - Adrian BUTLER, Council of Europe, Head of Ankara Programme Office
 - Gamze KÖSEKAHYA, Justice, Freedom and Security Institutional Development and Civil Society Sector Manager, European Union Delegation to Turkey
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Draft Work Plan: Presentation and Discussions
4. Working Groups: Presentation and Discussions
5. Launch Event: Presentation and Adoption of the Agenda
6. Conclusion and Closing Remarks

1. Opening Remarks

1.1. Mr Yunus Arıncı, Chairman of the Prime Ministry Inspection Board, opened the first steering committee meeting of the project on “Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Policies and Practices in Turkey (TYSAP)”. Mr Arıncı reminded that the project preparations started in 2009, and mentioned that the project activities will need to be completed by December 2014. He then stated the objectives of the first Steering Committee meeting:

- Discuss/approve activities and technical papers mentioned in the draft work plan,
- Review the setting-up of the working groups,
- Discuss/approve the agenda of the Launch event to be held on 12th June 2013 and the list of participants.

Mr. Arıncı concluded his speech by stressing that Steering Committee Meetings were expected to be held every six months starting 06/2013.

1.2 Mr Adrian Butler, Head of the Council of Europe Ankara Programme Office, reminded that the project on “Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Policies and Practices in Turkey (TYSAP)” is a joint EU /CoE project. Mr BUTLER introduced the project team members, talked about the IPA contract signed between the Council of Europe and the European Union and briefly presented the projects implemented by the CoE Ankara Programme Office. Mr BUTLER emphasized the project management expertise of the Council of Europe before thanking the Prime Ministry Inspection Board for their contribution towards YYSAP.

1.3 Ms. Gamze Kösekahya, Sector Manager at the European Union Delegation to Turkey underscored that the project on “Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Policies and Practices in Turkey (TYSAP)” had undergone a very long preparatory work. Ms. Kösekahya thanked the Prime Ministry Inspection Board and the other institutions for their contribution and support; and added that YYSAP is the first project to focus on investigation matters in Turkey and also the first project that connects the EU Delegation to Turkey with the Prime Ministry Inspection Board. She moved on with a reminder of the respective responsibilities of each of the institutions involved in the funding and implementation of the project: EU Delegation to Turkey to observe activities; the Prime Ministry Inspection Board to ensure coordination of the project, and the Council of Europe to provide technical and financial support to the project implementation.

2. Adoption of the agenda

2.1 No objection was made to the agenda introduced by Mr Mete Demirci, Senior Project Officer (SPO) at the Prime Ministry Inspection Board.

2.2 Mr Demirci then informed participants about:

- why such a project had been developed,
- how the project will help collect and analyse corruption-related data.

2.3 Mr Demirci explained that the reason behind the high number of co-beneficiaries (9) is the willingness to have a large number of people benefitting from project activities. He added that co-beneficiaries include Inspection and Auditor Boards within the following line ministries:

- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, Directorate of Guidance and Inspection
- Undersecretary of Treasury Controllers
- Ministry of Interior
- Presidency of Tax Inspection Board
- Ministry of Transportation, Maritime Affairs and Communication,
- Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock,
- Ministry of Labor and Social Security,
- Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency

2.4 Mr Demirci pointed out to the overall objective of the project: to contribute to a more effective and efficient structure in the Fight against Corruption in Turkey.

2.5 Mr Demirci then presented the results which are expected at the end of this project:

- The current legislative framework covering investigations, information sharing, anti-corruption strategies and coordination of investigations is analysed and compared with the requirements of international conventions. Based on the results, an investigation guide and reporting standards are developed.
- Data regarding investigations of corruption cases is gathered and analysed, and a corruption map of risky areas is produced,
- Inspectors are trained on developing sector specific anti-corruption strategies, coordinating corruption investigations, modern investigation, reporting techniques, and information sharing.

2.6 Mr Demirci explained that the reason why the Steering Committee consists of Senior officials from the various co-beneficiary entities is to allow for ownership and commitment at the highest level. This composition was also considered as a solution to speed up the decision-making process whenever approval of SC members is required or when seeking their guidance on the activities to be carried out.

2.7 Last, Mr Demirci introduced the project team members from the PMIB side.

3. Draft Work Plan: Presentation and Discussions

3.1. Ms Leila Marshania, Project Manager at the Council of Europe and based in Strasbourg thanked the main beneficiary and co-beneficiaries for their support. She commended the main beneficiary and co-beneficiaries for their commitment to this project and presented this as an indicator of anticipated success. Ms Marshania informed participants that the Long-Term Advisor who will work with the project teams, Ms Suzanne Hayden, would take up her duty in Ankara in September 2013, and is expected to attend the Opening Conference.

Ms Marshania reminded that the project agreement was signed between the Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) and the EU Delegation to Turkey, and underscored the necessity to abide by that contract throughout the implementation period of the project. She emphasized the importance of strictly adhering to EU and CoE procedures during the implementation period of this contract. She underlined the need to consider the Work Plan as a pillar document of the project and insisted on the need to start implementation as soon as it gets adopted by the Steering Committee.

3.2 Ms Corinne Ilgün, Senior Project Officer at the Council of Europe Ankara Programme Office presented the Draft Work Plan and invited Steering Committee members to share their views, especially with regard to the indicators, risks and assumptions mentioned in the draft document. Consequently:

- Referring to the Overall Objective, Objectively Verifiable indicators item 1 and 2, Mr Demirci suggested to add one more risk to the existing assumptions and risks. The suggested additional risk, i.e., “the involvement of a third party (i.e. Transparency International or Global Integrity) in the assessment of the project performance by the end of 2014 would constitute a risk factor” was accepted and added to the work plan.
- Referring to the Project Purpose, Article 2(i), Mr Demirci suggested to change the Turkish translation of “corruption investigations” from “yolsuzluk araştırmaları” to “yolsuzluk soruşturmaları “. The suggestion was accepted and taken into account.
- Referring to the Project Purpose (PP), Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI), item 3, Mr Demirci drew participants’ attention to “the number of investigations and reports to prosecutor”. He suggested that this matter be discussed by the relevant working group in due time and that the nature of the reports to be submitted to prosecutor be clarified. The suggestion was accepted.

Ms Marshania reminded that it was not possible to change the contract but that it might be possible to make the wording more explanatory.

- Referring to PP, OVI, Item 2 (Quality of investigation and strategy guide), Mr Demirci suggested to clarify the indicator by adding “increase in the” quality of investigations “as conducted at present”, and adding “preparing a” strategy guide “in those institutions that do not have any such guide at present”. The suggestion was accepted.

Ms Marshania again reminded that EUD and the Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) should be consulted and their approval should be received prior to making any change to the workplan.

Mr Erol Çoban from CFCU confirmed that the suggested changes were in line with the contract given that those changes are meant to clarify the content of the document.

Ms. Kösekahya from EUD agreed with Mr. Çoban and approved the process.

- Referring to Expected Result 1 (ER1), OVI, item 2: suggestion was made to add the Organization for International Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) regulations to UNCAC and domestic regulations (pls. see “decrease in the gaps between the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and the national regulations”). It was also suggested

to replace the terminology national “regulations” by “national legislations”. Both suggestions were accepted and taken into account.

- Referring to ER1, OVI, item 4: “increase in the number of inspected cases compared to the annual numbers in the last 2 years prior to starting the project”: Participants decided that the above-mentioned workgroup would be in charge of fine-tuning this indicator and would be asked to clarify the nature of reports to be submitted to the prosecutor.
- Referring to ER 1, Means of verification: Participants agreed to add OECD Reports to the list.

3.3 Mr Demirci reminded that the original contract was written and signed in English. He therefore requested not to pay too much attention to the semantic shifts that may have occurred while translating the document into Turkish. He stressed that the English document takes precedence over the Turkish document.

3.4 Mr Demirci underlined that activities need to be completed within the limits of the financial resources allocated by the project. However, the number of participants to the trainings might be increased if the budget is well managed. Co-beneficiaries were invited to consider using part of their own budget to cover participation costs of additional staff members to the planned activities should their participation be deemed relevant by the co-beneficiary institutions.

3.5 Ms Ilgün urged Steering Committee members to carefully examine the proposed calendar of activities and reminded that the calendar would be adopted alongside the Work plan during the Opening Conference.

3.6 Mr Demirci invited Steering Committee members to share any additional input they may have concerning the Draft Work Plan after the meeting and before June 12 given that it will be difficult to make changes once the Work plan gets adopted at the Launch event.

4. Working Groups: Presentation and Discussions

4.1. Mr Demirci emphasized the need to set up the working groups in order to start carrying out the activities. The first working group will be in charge of the following activities:

- Setting reporting standards,
- Identifying corruption prone areas,
- Reviewing the national legislative framework and analysing the gaps with international legislations. Due to the unavailability of the Ministry of Justice, participants were warned that this activity could only be dealt with in September 2013.

4.2. It was agreed to set up the working groups immediately after the Opening Conference in order to start with the above-mentioned activities as soon as possible. It is expected to have two officials from each institution in each working group.

4.3 Participants were reminded that short-term experts would also join the working groups on a needs basis and as mentioned by the Work Plan.

4.4. Steering Committee members were asked to share their views on the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations to future Steering Committee Meetings. Ms KÖSEKAHYA (EUD) was asked to share a list of relevant NGOs to be submitted to the Steering Committee members for review and selection. It was agreed that the selected NGO(s) would participate to the next Steering Committee Meeting.

5. Launch Event: Presentation and Adoption of the Draft Agenda

5.1 Mr Demirci mentioned that the purpose of the opening conference is to introduce the Project and raise public awareness about TYSAP.

5.2. Information about the list of participants, the draft agenda, and the venue of the opening conference was shared with Steering Committee members.

6. Conclusion and Closing Remarks

6.1. Coming back to the suggestion to hold Steering Committee Meetings every three months instead of every six months, participants agreed to take the time to assess the need for more frequent meetings, and chose to raise this matter again in the next Steering Committee Meeting.

6.2. Ms Ilgün said that CoE expected to share the English version of the Draft Inception Report with Steering Committee Members by 7th June 2013, and that the report would ideally be disseminated at the Opening Conference, once it has been translated into Turkish.

6.3. Ms Kösekahya (EUD) mentioned that it could be useful to invite the Ministry of European Union to the next Steering Committee Meeting. Mr Çoban (CFCU) reminded that the Ministry of European Union (MoEU) is to be invited at the discretion of the SPO (Prime Ministry Inspection Board) and mentioned that should the MoEU participate, they would be given observer status.

6.4. The meeting was suspended after participants agreed to hold the next Steering Committee meeting in December 2013.