



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Harnessing sustainable linkages for the SMEs in Turkey's textile sector – Final Joint Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Turkey*

Final Evaluation : *December 2012*

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent Joint*

Technical Area: *EMP/SEED*

Evaluation Management: *United Nations
MDG Fund – (ILO lead) Partners: IOM, FAO
and UNDP; Consultant: Ümit Evren*

ILO Project Code: *TUR/10/50/UND*

Donor: *United Nations MDG Fund
US\$ 2,700,000 - UNIDO: US\$858,675;
UNDP: 1,428,922 and ILO 410,880*

Keywords: *Youth employment, migration,
small enterprises, textile industry, Decent
Work, employment creation*

Taken from the Executive Summary of the MDG Joint Evaluation Report

The main objective of the JP is to increase competitiveness of Turkey's textile and clothing industry by (a) increasing productive and innovative capacities of the T&C SMEs, through enhanced collaboration and networking, and (b) integration of sustainable development, CSR principles and gender equality into the business processes and practices of the T&C SMEs, articulated in the form of two outcomes, each supported by four outputs.

At the national policy level, the JP aimed to develop a "CSR Strategy for the Turkey's T&C Industry" which included recommendations on

sustainability of the T&C supply chain from (a) social and economic equality (MDG1), (b) environmental (MDG7) and (c) social (MDG3) perspectives. Also at the national level, the JP aimed at deployment of an online value chain management portal, enhancing collaboration and networking among the T&C businesses (both SMEs and large-scale companies). The meso-level objectives of the JP were geared more towards creating and/or developing institutional capacities for sustained impact of the JP. At the micro-level the JP addressed the specific needs of businesses, through training and counselling services as well as facilitating clustering for enhanced collaboration at the regional level.

The JP was implemented in Malatya, Kahramanmaraş, Gaziantep and Adıyaman (collectively referred to as "the pilot provinces") and in Istanbul – the HQ of Turkey's T&C industry, in collaboration with national and local stakeholders, including government institutions at national and local levels, business representative organizations (BROs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector.

The final evaluation was initiated, in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the MDG-F. The Final Evaluation's main objective is to measure to what extent the JP has fully implemented its activities, delivered outputs, attained outcomes, specifically focusing on development results and potential impacts. The evaluation generated substantive evidence-based

knowledge by identifying lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions for scalability and replicability. The findings, presented in this report, are supported by the evidence gathered from (a) internal documents (e.g. the JP document, mid-term evaluation reports, technical reports, minutes of meetings, monitoring reports etc.) and external documents (e.g. national development plan, national textile strategy, UNDCS etc.); and (b) interviews with representatives of the implementing parties (i.e. ITKIB and UN agencies), and representatives of the national, regional and local stakeholders (i.e. governmental organizations, BROs, NGOs, companies etc.).

Relevance and Consistency of the Design

Conclusion 1. The design and strategy of the JP were both highly relevant to the MDGs (particularly to MDG1,3 and 7, the national priorities, the UNDCS, the needs of industry and the target region.

Both outcomes of the JP are clearly linked to the policy-level objectives, as indicated in the Ninth National Development Plan, and to the sectoral priorities and strategies, as presented in the National Textile Strategy. Furthermore, relevance to the UNDCS, more specifically to the seventh outcome therein, is very high. The macro-level problems and needs, identified in the design phase, are rather challenging in the sense that they can neither be fully solved in 2.5 years nor with the contribution of a single JP. However there are strong evidences (e.g. the VCMP, CSR Strategy, improved capacities, awareness and ownership) which provide very promising indications as to the JP's significant contribution to the progress towards overcoming such needs and problems. Most notably, the JP created, almost in all cases from scratch, the tools (e.g. the value chain management portal, CSR compliance tool etc.), the mechanisms (e.g. CSR strategy, Sustainable Competitiveness Center) and the capacities (e.g. training of trainers, cluster development agents, etc.) in the absence of which such problems cannot be addressed, and which did not exist before the JP.

Conclusion 2. The joint programming approach was highly efficient, with implementing partners' value added being

highly visible, thus making such approach indisputably the best option available for the second outcome of the JP.

From a joint programming perspective; JP's second outcome; which aimed at integration of sustainable development, CSR principles and gender equality into the business processes and practices, can be named a good practice -if not a best practice. The design of the second outcome provided ample room for the three partaking UN agencies to leverage on their individual as well as each other's specialized knowledge and know-how, complemented with ITKIB's sectoral experience and knowledge. The spirit of the joint programming approach, adopted during the design phase, was skilfully executed by giving the overall coordination and leadership role to ITKIB, which is ideally and uniquely positioned to secure national ownership as well, and by tasking the UN agencies to focus on the individual pillars of CSR where they have the highest level of knowledge, experience and know-how. The resultant CSR Strategy Report, thus, is very balanced and gives a holistic picture, which would probably might have not been the case, had this had been a single-agency effort.

The first outcome of the JP was not as efficient as the second outcome in terms of joint programming and execution. ILO did not have specific responsibility in Outcome 1. The three of the four outputs of Outcome 1 were designed to be implemented by UNDP, and a fourth one (Output 1.2) by UNIDO. Although the Inception Report made a genuine effort to benefit from the joint programming approach, due to unforeseen difficulties and resource constraints, experienced during development of the value chain management portal, possible synergies could not be exploited.

Conclusion 3. The extent of the usefulness and reliability of the JP's M&E and C&A strategies was negatively affected from overdue deployment by JP Management. The positive impact of deployment after the mid-term evaluation is an indication of missed opportunities.

The JP had significant difficulties in mobilizing a JP Manager. The JP Manager was mobilized in June 2010, some 6 months later than the official starting date of the JP. The inception phase took longer than anticipated,

with the inception report being endorsed in April 2011. Although some of the JP activities had already been started by then, some had to be postponed, leaving a limited time for execution.

Efficiency and Ownership

Conclusion 4. The JP efficiently turned resources and inputs into results, mainly as a result of the appropriateness of the management model, and the effectiveness of the governance structure.

The management model used in implementation was efficient, and has successfully brought all the key actors together at different decision-making levels. Although the JP was rather efficient overall, the fact that ITKIB and UN agencies are located in different provinces caused some challenges in the coordination, management and implementation process.

Conclusion 5. The joint programming approach increased JP's efficiency in turning resources and inputs into results particularly as far as Outcome 2 is concerned.

Overall, the JP efficiently piloted the "One UN" approach. For Outcome 2, each Agency's specific value added to the intervention and the synergetic effect of collaboration were quite evident.

Conclusion 6. There is strong evidence that suggest a highly effective leadership being exercised by the national partners. Leadership by the regional/local partners was mixed and thus inconclusive.

In terms of ownership, the final evaluation concentrated on determining the extent to which leadership by the country's national/local partners was effective in the JP. The Istanbul Textile and Apparel Exporters' Association (ITKIB) commitment to sustain and expand the value chain management portal, as evidenced by the additional funding raised for the Value Chain Management Platform (VCMP), is one such evidence. Active involvement of and the leadership that the Ministry of Labor and Social Security demonstrated in promotion of social conduct tools is yet another such evidence. The establishment of the Sustainable

Competitiveness Center and its membership structure is a positive indication.

Effectiveness and Sustainability

Conclusion 7. All of the objectives of the JP have been reached, indicating a high level of effectiveness. However, a higher level of effectiveness could have been possible, had the synergies between the outputs and outcomes been fully exploited.

All activities of the JP have been completed and corresponding outputs have been produced, almost in all cases exceeding the performance targets, indicated in the original programme document. Overall JP's outputs and outcomes were only moderately synergistic and coherent, and such coherence and synergies were rather unbalanced – sometimes to the extent of being so strong as to be named a best practice (Outcome 2) and sometimes falling on the less favourable side of the spectrum (Outcome 1).

Conclusion 8. National level impact both at the policy and institutional levels has been substantial and potentially long lasting. There is also evidence of impact at the local level, but to a lesser extent with some doubt on sustainability.

The JP has managed to create substantial national impact at both the policy (i.e. CSR Strategy) and the operational (CSR tools, VCMP) fronts. However, the impact, especially transformational impact, of the JP at the regional/local level is visible only in the medium- to long-term. For instance, with regard to clustering and networking, the final evaluation reached different conclusions at national and local levels. At the national level, there was strong evidence of policy level sustained impact. At the local level, however, the sustainability of the clustering initiatives, launched within the scope of the JP, hinged heavily on the ability of these clusters benefitting from support schemes. With this caveat, it is safe to argue that the results and deliverables produced by the JP hold strong potential for creating a long-term replicable, scalable and sustainable impact. The JP has been quite successful in contributing to institutional capacities at national level for securing sustained impact. UNIDO's partnership with TTGV (Turkish Technology Development Foundation) and ILO's strong

cooperation with Ministry of Labor and Social Security have increased the probability of sustained impact and replication potential of JP's outputs in the fields of social and environmental conduct.

Cross-Cutting Conclusions

Conclusion 9. Some of the assumptions, made during the design phase, did not hold true. Although this does not make the JP less relevant or consistent, it had an impact on the JP's effectiveness and efficiency, especially in the absence of a properly functioning M&E system.

Although the design of the JP can be considered highly relevant overall, one particular weakness with regard to design is related to the "level of ambition". The JP was designed to attack at challenges not only at macro and meso levels, but also at the micro level. The design of the JP rather optimistically assumed that the transformational changes, which the JP intended to introduce, can be absorbed fully by the SMEs in the target region (i.e. pilot provinces) within the lifespan of the intervention. Hence the design of the JP was more responsive to the macro- and meso-level problems within its lifespan; micro-level (i.e. enterprise-level) impact is to be seen in the long-run.

Another design-related deficiency relates to an assumption that the VCMP would leverage on the previous work done by ITKIB. In practice the VCMP had to be built from scratch, requiring more resources and time than projected initially.

Conclusion 10. Mid-term evaluation of the JP was very timely, and had contributed to the efficiency and effectiveness of the JP.

Overall the mid-term evaluation has had a positive impact on the JP. Most of the recommendations, raised in the MTE Report were taken up and put into immediate action by the JP Management.

The budget-neutral extension suggested by the MTE report (and later reinforced by the MDG-F Secretariat) was taken into consideration by the JP management; however, the JP management concluded that

such extension would not yield the expected benefits.

Lessons Learned:

- Lesson #1: Set the level of ambition realistically and manage the expectations carefully for increased ownership of results
- Lesson #2: Outcome-level is too high to foster cooperation between implementing partners in joint programming and implementation arrangements
- Lesson #3: JP management team should be located in the same province
- Lesson #4: The JP Manager should have full coordination, if not control, over the JP

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that in future endeavours towards joint programming and implementation, a system that facilitates achievement of synergistic effects and coherence be pursued at output level rather than outcome level.
- UN agencies that would have an important specialized role with but with a limited budget may be considered as associates of a JP. The roles, defined in the European Union's grant scheme models might be a source of inspiration.
- In terms of M&E a more structured method is to be enforced by the Programme Authority (in this case the MDG-F Secretariat), including measures such as tying release of funds to presence of an efficiently and effectively functioning M&E system or ensuring that each JP has at least one focal point responsible for proper implementation of M&E and C&A strategies.
- UN agencies modes of engagement with the national implementing partner differ considerably. Partaking UN agencies agree on a single implementation modality at the outset of implementation.
- It is recommended for future JPs that the final evaluation is scheduled after all activities are completed, all outputs are prepared and final internal monitoring has taken place, and even the final report has been endorsed by the programming authority (in this case the MDG-F Secretariat).