## Management Response and Action Plan Project on Improving the Capacity of the Administrative Judiciary and Strengthening the Institutional Capacity

## of the Council of State

Name of Evaluation Report:	External final evaluation report on Improving the Capacity of the Administrative Judiciary and Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of the Council of State				
Date of Evaluation Report:	uation Report: 30/05/2023 Date of Action Plan: 01/03/2024				

## Overall management response to the evaluation:

This evaluation comprehensively analysed the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the project, with a particular focus on possible improvements for new projects. The project team, Head of Türkiye Unit and Head of Co-operation Programmes Division have reviewed the recommendations outlined in the evaluation report and has largely accepted them. Many of these recommendations have already been incorporated into the ongoing projects, demonstrating the team's commitment to continuous improvement and responsiveness to feedback.

The accepted recommendations align closely with the insights received from the project teams, partners and individual meetings with national stakeholders conducted in the framework of different projects.

However, while most recommendations have been embraced, two have been rejected based on the rationale provided below. These decisions were made after careful deliberation and consideration of their potential impact on project outcomes and sustainability and taking into consideration specificity of implementation of projects in Türkiye.

Overall, this evaluation process has served as a valuable tool for assessing project performance, identifying areas for enhancement, and informing strategic decision-making moving forward.

**Dissemination plan for the evaluation:** The report was shared internally, including with the donor and beneficiaries by email and was published on the relevant website – DIO <u>website</u>. The Management response was prepared in close collaboration with the Council of Europe Ankara office, the Head of Türkiye Unit and the Head of the Co-operation Programmes Division.

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action			
systems - 'left behind'	Recommendation 1: Needs assessment/project design in justice reform should systematically include participation by those not accessing justice systems - 'left behind'/disempowered for whatever reasons, with CSOs actively engaged in project design and delivery (even where duty-bearer institutions are primary project partners) to ensure outreach to such rights-holders as a matter of project effectiveness and as a human right.							
⊠Accepted □ Rejected □Under consideration	COE Directorate General Human Rights and Rule of Law (DGI), Cooperation Programmes Division and Ankara Office	project website and hard-copy publications. Additionally, at the level of Türkiye Unit, activities		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit			

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The management decision is in relation to the Recommendation (Accepted, Rejected, Under consideration).
 <sup>2</sup> For implementing accepted recommendations.
 <sup>3</sup> For recommendations that are rejected or under consideration.

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		Furthermore, in alignment with			
		the agreement with the EU for the			
		upcoming programming of the			
		Civil Society Facility, the CoE is			
		preparing to implement a project			
		directly involving civil society			
		institutions in Türkiye. This			
		project, slated for execution			
		during 2024-25, will focus on			
		critical areas including migration,			
		women's access to justice,			
		environment and human rights.			

Recommendation 2: Future justice/administrative justice projects should ensure more substantive expertise within the project team and where projects involve a wide range of themes, activities and institutions, a designated long-term consultant should be contracted for the project duration (even if not working on the project full-time).

□Accepted	COE HQ, and	After some period of
☑ Rejected	Ankara Office	observation and
□Under		analysis, it became
consideration		evident that the
		utilisation of long-term
		consultants was not
		conducive to optimal
		project efficiency. This
		is for a number of
		reasons identified over
		the course of several
		years. Consequently, a
		strategic decision was

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
			made to exclusively		
			engage short-term		
			international		
			consultants. Despite		
			their short-term		
			contracts, these		
			consultants are able to		
			maintain continuous		
			involvement in the		
			project by undertaking		
			various tasks and		
			contracts as required.		
			This adjustment reflects		
			the commitment to		
			maximising project		
			effectiveness and		
			adaptability while		
			ensuring that the		
			consultancy		
			arrangements align		
			with the strategic		
			objectives of the		
			projects.		
			Furthermore, the		
			contractual policy		
			generally does not		

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
			permit the hiring of long-term consultants.		
		of projects managed by CoE Anka projects, and with other CoE proje		amme Coordinat	or should be considered <sup>4</sup> to
□Accepted ☑ Rejected □Under consideration			The basis for this recommendation lies in the previous context of the large number and volume of projects managed by the CoE Ankara Office. This recommendation was formulated in response to the demands posed by the high volume of projects at a previous point in time, but circumstances have since profoundly changed.  In light of the recent and significant changes in the operational landscape and project		

 $<sup>^{\</sup>scriptscriptstyle 4}\!$  Even assuming the currently vacant post of Office Director of Operations post is filled.

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
			portfolio at the CoE		
			Ankara Office, it is fully		
			clear that the		
			circumstances under		
			which this		
			recommendation was		
			made no longer hold		
			true.		
			Therefore, given the		
			evolving dynamics and		
			priorities at the CoE		
			Ankara Office, and the		
			specificity of Türkiye, it		
			has been determined		
			that accepting this		
			recommendation at the		
			present time is not		
			realistic or appropriate.		
			The decision not to		
			accept this		
			recommendation		
			reflects the need for		
			alignment with the		
			current operational		
			context, needs and		

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
			strategic objectives of the CoE Ankara Office.		
	•	re- and post-training knowledge test application of knowledge in court p		•	
⊠Accepted □ Rejected □Under consideration		The recommendation to enhance impact assessment of capacity-building initiatives by incorporating longer-term assessments of knowledge application in court procedures, judicial decision-making, and court staff functioning has been accepted and is presently being integrated into the planning, implementation, and/or monitoring phases of projects.  Specifically, resources and insights gained from the impact assessment of capacity building under the IMEAJ Project are being leveraged to inform and guide similar assessments in other projects. Additionally, where feasible, the Division intends to		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
	•	conduct targeted evaluations focused on behaviour change.  While evaluating longer-term effectiveness and impact is inevitably very difficult within a short project-lifetime, there is full commitment to following this recommendation and further assessing the sustained impact of capacity-building interventions beyond immediate post-training evaluations.  roactively use its standing and just es, bi-lateral donors (including CoE N		•	
⊠Accepted □ Rejected □Under consideration		There is currently not a pre-fixed or systematic cooperation agreement between the Council of Europe Programme Office in Ankara and UN institutions. However, the Council of Europe actively supports UN activities by sharing expertise in specific areas upon request, particularly in domains such as migration and human trafficking.		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		Moving forward, the Council of Europe remains committed to promoting cooperation and information-sharing with UN agencies, particularly those working on justice sector reforms in Türkiye and possessing the mandate to do so. Specifically, collaboration may be facilitated in areas such as migration as well as women's and children's rights, where both organisations share			
		common objectives and expertise.  This approach aligns with the recommendation to increase cooperation between the CoE and UN agencies, thereby fostering synergies and enhancing the effectiveness of justice sector reform efforts in Türkiye. Efforts will be made to explore avenues for a more structured coordination and information-exchange in future projects to strengthen cooperation between the CoE and UN. It should be			

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		noted, however, that this is a two-way street of communication and depends on all actors being committed to genuine cooperation.			
including enhancing the participatory MandE n	e capacity of just nethodologies th	us on project monitoring and evalua tice partner institutions to engage in at measure qualitative as well as qu ction with key partner institutions. <sup>5</sup>	n MandE, to formulate ba antitative, outcomes and	selines, and indic	ators and implement
⊠Accepted ☐ Rejected ☐Under consideration		The recommendation to prioritise enhanced focus on project monitoring and evaluation (M&E), coupled with the allocation of additional time and resources, has been acknowledged and will be implemented in future projects, where possible.  Specifically, this recommendation will be shared and incorporated into the planning and execution of other projects within the Division		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Some relatively new institutions should be central to this, such as the CoS Statistical Unit, MoJ Data Monitoring and Evaluation Board, as well as the Justice Academy's Research and Development Unit and the CJP, Office of Efficiency of Judiciary. This can identify issues/trends affecting large number of people, root causes and help target 'upstream' solutions (whether training of public servants, awareness-raising of the public, system changes etc) to ensure pre-emption and early resolution of complaints and to minimise litigation.

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		and Department. However, it also			
		must be taken into account that			
		the workload of implementing			
		projects and activities is already			
		enormous and the human resources are limited and already			
		stretched. The capacity for			
		constant monitoring and			
		evaluation therefore needs to be			
		realistic, fair and effective in light			
		of the strains.			
		This said, recognising the			
		importance of building the			
		capacity of justice partner			
		institutions to engage in M&E activities, efforts will be made to			
		provide training, where relevant			
		and possible, aimed at further			
		formulating baselines, indicators,			
		and implementing participatory			
		M&E methodologies that			
		encompass both qualitative and			
		quantitative measurements of			
		outcomes and outputs.			
		It is worth poting that or improve			
		It is worth noting that an impact			
		assessment of training was			

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		conducted under the IMEAJ Project, yielding valuable insights and lessons learned. These findings will be utilised in other projects to enhance the quality and impact of M&E activities.  By prioritising enhanced focus on project M&E and investing in capacity-building initiatives, the CoE aims to strengthen its ability to assess project outcomes, measure impact, and ultimately improve the effectiveness and			
	•	sustainability of its interventions.  uld include contingency planning fo ct extensions arise, more cross-ferti		-	<u> </u>
⊠Accepted ☐ Rejected ☐ Under consideration		A lot of effort is already put into contingency planning for possible loss of project personnel, and it shall continue.  This is an extremely demanding issue, and it is well recognised how very important it is. The management has already done its		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		utmost to ensure a proactive approach to mitigating risks and ensuring the smooth continuation of the projects.			
		Therefore, the recommendation regarding the inclusion of contingency planning in project design, particularly focusing on potential personnel loss and the need for bridging finance to retain staff during project extensions, is well taken.			
		Significance of addressing potential delays in project extensions and retaining of project personnel is recognised at the level of both the Unit, Division and Department. The formulation of strategies to retain key staff members through the provision of bridging finance is a matter already executed and under continuous consideration by the relevant entities of the DGI and DPC			

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action		
Recommendation 8: Sustainability of project outputs and results should be addressed by all partners earlier in the project timeline, including a Sustainability Plan, with designated responsibility for various project elements, drafting of dissemination plans, any necessary protocols for							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ongoing use of project materials etc.						
⊠Accepted		Measures for addressing		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit		
☐ Rejected		sustainability concerns will be					
Under		integrated into project planning,					
consideration		ensuring comprehensive					
		consideration of longevity and					
		impact.					
		Communication on this with all					
		partners will be encouraged to					
		ensure the implementation of					
		sustainability measures					
		throughout the project lifecycle.					
		The recommendation will be					
		shared with different projects					
		teams.					
Recommendation 9. S	ustainability sho	uld be linked to ongoing 'demand'	for reform. Even where	duty-bearer inst	itutions are the most logical		
project partners, CoE s	should use its sta	nding and credibility to help 'legiting	mize' CSOs' role in advoca	acy and monitori	ng of justice reform progress		
and to proactively enc	ourage state inst	itutions cooperation with CSOs (as	representatives of rights-l	holders)			
⊠Accepted		This recommendation is to be		Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit		
☐ Rejected		implemented during the design					
□Under		and implementation of the					
consideration		relevant projects. Efforts to					
		integrate sustainability into					
		projects will be strengthened,					
		where relevant with a focus on					

Management	Entity in	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup>	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non-	Target Date	Person Responsible for Action
Decision <sup>1</sup>	Charge	(determined by Entity)	Acceptance	for Action	
		leveraging the Council of Europe's influence to legitimise CSOs' roles and proactively encourage cooperation between state institutions and CSOs. Collaboration with relevant stakeholders will be pursued to ensure the effective implementation of these measures. The recommendation will be shared with different projects teams and discussed at Division meetings to ensure its implementation.			

Recommendation 10. Ongoing CoE project partnership with the Justice Academy should be used as a basis for encouraging future use of project outputs by the Academy. Going forward, any impediments to project participation by key institutions should be addressed at an early stage, through high level engagement, by Steering Committee, Donors etc.

⊠Accepted	The CoE cooperates with the	Continuously	Head of Türkiye Unit
☐ Rejected	Justice Academy via various		
□Under	projects. The IMEAJ Project		
consideration	outputs were shared with the		
	Justice Academy. Justice		
	Academy had been kept informed		
	the IMEAJ Project as the		
	participant of the Steering		
	Committee as well. The CoE HQ		
	and Ankara Office will continue		

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
	ling issues of ge	highlighting the project outputs to other relevant key institutions to ensure sustainability of the project.  assessment should determine pronder issues, and intersectional discontinuous.		-	•
☑Accepted ☐ Rejected ☐Under consideration		Efforts will be made where relevant, to conduct thorough needs assessments to ascertain partners' understanding of HRBA and gender mainstreaming principles. These aspects could be added to the ToR of the consultants involved in need assessment.			Head of Türkiye Unit

Recommendation 12 To ensure systemic integration of cross-cutting themes, awareness of the core principles of Human Rights/HRBA, (including gender mainstreaming) should be enhanced, in management teams, in partner institutions, among consultants etc, with project Log Frame/reporting, Steering Committee reviews, consultants' reports etc explicitly addressing progress on these core principles as an integral part of measuring progress towards expected results

<sup>6</sup> Core CoE tools should be integral to this process, including the <u>CoE</u>, <u>Practical Guide on the Human Rights Approach for Co-operation Projects (2021)</u>, and CoE, <u>Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit For Co-Operation Projects</u> 2019.

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
⊠Accepted		This recommendation was and is			Head of Türkiye Unit
☐ Rejected		being taken into account both in			
□Under		this project and in other projects.			
		this project and in other projects.  Further efforts will be made to systematically enhance awareness of Human Rights/HRBA principles across all project stakeholders. Workshops can be organised, where relevant, to ensure understanding and integration of these principles into the relevant polices. Currently, gender mainstreaming reports prepared at the early stages of implementation of the projects are shared with the beneficiaries, which raise their awareness of gender aspects of the projects. Likewise, under HF 13, activities on HRBA and gender-sensitive approaches to migration management are conducted. In another project improvement of the gender equality is an integral part of			
		expected results.			

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non- Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
		Also, project team members			
		continue being encouraged to			
		attend Gender Mainstreaming			
		trainings and new Help course			
		which will be available in March			
		2024, and improve their skills to			
		identify the related challenges			
		and find solutions. Capacity-			
		building and awareness raising			
		activities can also be organised			
		for the beneficiary/partner			
		institution on the topics.			