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1. INTRODUCTION
	1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project ‘Supporting the Implementation of By-law on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)’ (hereinafter also ‘SEA Project’), financially supported by the European Union (EU) and Republic of Turkey, was launched on 18 April 2019 (by Administrative Order No. 1).

The ToR for the SEA Project, activity 2.3 “Delivery of trainings” and activity 2.4 “Awareness raising workshops for universities, NGOs, chambers and public” stipulates implementation of four modules of trainings (each focusing on examples of SEA in a different sector) and four awareness raising workshops. In agreement with the Client the training for module 4 – “Introduction to by-law on SEA and specific implementation on tourism sector” and the first awareness raising workshop were organised in early December 2019.

The programme and training documents for the training and the workshop were prepared and tailored based on the ToR, the findings of Training Needs Analysis (activity 2.1) and gap analysis (activity 1.2) carried out in July – September 2019, as well as the feedback from the Beneficiary. The SEA concept, process and context was presented and examples of SEA focused on tourism sector.

* 1. PURPOSE OF THis REPORT

The purpose of this draft report is to present the results of the training for module 4 “Introduction to by-law on SEA and specific implementation on tourism sector”, organised on 4 and 5 December 2019 and the first awareness raising workshop, organised on 3 December 2019. Furthermore, the draft report provides recommendations for organisation of next trainings and workshops.

1. ACTIVITY 2.3.: DELIVERY OF TRAINING – MODULE 4: Introduction to by-law on SEA and specific implementation on tourism sector
	1. APPROACH

The **content of the trainings** was designed on the basis of specific objectives of the trainings (to introduce a general concept of SEA and the requirements of the SEA bylaw; to explain the SEA process and the role of sectoral authorities; and to provide the participants with useful skills for starting and managing the SEA process. Moreover, the findings of the TNA and gap analysis were considered in order to meet training needs and expectations of the relevant institutions, particularly the additional comments of the survey conducted as part of TNA.

The following **topics** were addressed:

* Introduction to SEA;
* Presentation of SEA Bylaw;
* SEA process:
	+ Screening and scoping: the initial steps of SEA (with group work on scoping),
	+ Baseline data and selection of methods in SEA,
	+ Assessment of impacts of plan/programme and formulation of SEA recommendations (with group work),
	+ Analysis of alternatives,
	+ Integration of SEA recommendations into the plan/programme for its adoption,
* Stakeholder participation in SEA (with group work);
* Preparation of ToR for SEA implementation (with group work).

Four **practical exercises** were conducted in the form of group work in order to provide the opportunity to practically work on SEA issues and achieve better understanding of the key steps of SEA process and the roles of various authorities in SEA process. Group work also intended to provide an opportunity for the exchange of experiences between the participants and using them in planning of SEA. The groups were formed on the basis of the seating. At the end of each group work, groups reported on their findings and conclusions. Snapshots of posters produced during practical exercises are attached in the Annex.

* + 1. Input of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation

The Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation (MoEU) provided comments on the training agenda and training materials. In addition, MoEU suggested lists of participants to which some of the contacts from TNA were added.

The experts from the General Directorate of EIA, Permit and Inspection of MoEU actively participated in the presentations. They presented the Turkish Bylaw on SEA its application, experience so far with SEA application in the tourism sector in Turkey, experience with screening and the SEA section of the MoEU website.

MoEU experts actively participated in Q&A sessions where they explained the details of SEA bylaw and clarified the issues specific for Turkey, such as administrative arrangements, planning procedures and responsibilities of different institutions.

* + 1. Training Materials

Three sets of training materials were prepared:

* PowerPoint presentations,
* Group work materials,
* Additional sources of information for the participants: a compilation of guidelines, examples of SEA documents such as Scoping Reports and Environmental Reports and ToRs for commissioning the SEA.

PowerPoint presentations and group work materials were translated in Turkish and were provided to the participants in the form of printed handouts. All of the training materials were provided in electronic format on an USB key. The final version of PowerPoint presentations and group work materials is provided in the annex, while additional sources were provided earlier in electronic format in the Report on activity 2.2.

* 1. Training Participants

The ToR envisaged 25 minimum participants for the training module 4 on SEA in tourism sector. In tourism sector, the planning is quite limited, resulting in a limited number of institutions relevant for and interested in the training. A list of 30 potential participants was prepared in coordination with MoEU. Primarily, the members of focal points were invited to the training programs and the remaining participants were selected by on the basis of the stakeholder contact list compiled for the TNA and on updated information that MoEU obtained from competent authorities. The participants invited to the training were mostly persons that will be (or are likely to be) dealing with SEA on a practical level, for example as managers of SEA process, managers of the planning process (which needs to be coordinated with SEA process) or managers of public procurement.

35 participants attended the training. Most of the participants were from the tourism sector; the second most represented sector was the fisheries/aquaculture sector. Most of them were representatives of various Ministries as well as several metropolitan municipalities. For the group work 5 groups were formed. Overall, most of the participants were very proactive, contributing valuable questions and comments. As groups often included colleagues from the same institution or from cooperating institutions some of the groups focused on topics and issues that were very specific for their work. As a result, their presentations and ensuing discussion led to focused, practical information on SEA process in the context of their work and operation of their institution, including timing and budgeting of the SEA process.

A small number of participants have attended trainings or awareness raising activities organised during the previous TA project in 2015 and 2016. None of these participants had a practical experience with SEA process so far as the SEAs completed so far (i.e. pilot SEAs supported by previous projects) have not been conducted in their respective sectors. However it was clear that they were building on previously obtained knowledge and trying to put it in the context of practical implementation of SEA according to the SEA bylaw. It is expected that the situation will be different in the next trainings, particularly for the water management sector and agriculture due to two reasons: the first is the experience built with the past pilot SEAs and the second is the experience that is being built right now when numerous RBMPs, Nitrate Action Plans and similar are undergoing (or already underwent) the initial steps of SEA such as screening and scoping.

* 1. Evaluation of the training

In order to monitor the indicators set in the ToR, two sets of feedback questionnaires were prepared (both questionnaires are provided in the annex):

1. Introductory questionnaire on SEA characteristics, filled in at the beginning of the training in order to test the knowledge and awareness on SEA of the participants;
2. Wrap-up questionnaire filled in at the end of the training consisting of three parts:
	1. initial questions on SEA characteristics that were the same as in the introductory questionnaire (in order to test the difference, i.e. show the knowledge gained),
	2. questions on the quality and approach of the training and
	3. questions on technical aspects of the training.

16 questionnaires were returned to the project team. There were 6 questions on SEA characteristics, however it appears that overall only one participant has answered the question no. 6 (about the obligation to integrate SEA recommendations into the plan/programme) correctly and only in the wrap-up questionnaire. As a result, this question was not removed from the analysis thus only the trends in responses to 5 questions were analysed. At the workshop, one quarter of respondents answered the same question correctly. This contrast indicates that the question was clear, but the presentations, analysis of the group work and answers in Q&A sessions did not provide enough information on integration of SEA recommendations into the plan/programme.

The analysis of responses showed that there was already some understanding of the SEA process among the training participants. 2 participants initially responded correctly to 4 questions out of 5; these were likely the ones that already participated in SEA-related activities in the past. In the introductory questionnaire on SEA characteristics the participants correctly answered 2,25 questions on average, while in the wrap-up questionnaire this number has increased to 3,5 correct answers. This indicates improvement of understanding of the SEA process. 5 out of the 16 participants that returned the questionnaires have corrected at least 3 answers, the record holder being a participant that initially answered only 1 answer correctly but having all 5 correct answers in the wrap-up questionnaire. Overall, 10 out of 16 participants that submitted the questionnaire replied correctly to at least 4 answers at the end of the training.

The biggest improvement was seen on the questions on topics of involvement of general public/civil society (question no. 5) and on the screening process at the MoEU (question no. 2): 7 participants corrected their response in the first case and 5 in the second case. This indicates very low understanding of screening process and public participation process among the competent authorities before the training. Improvement in responses indicates that these topics were well addressed by the training, particularly the screening that was explained by MoEU team through their presentations and answers as numerous questions focused on screening. It can be expected that the participants will now assist in starting the SEA process at their respective competent authorities when preparation of new programme starts.

Most of the participants that answered the questionnaire were very satisfied with the quality and approach of the training. A scale of 1-5 was used to rate the experience, with 5 being the highest (excellent). The results were as follows:

* the overall quality was assessed with the average grade of 4,53,
* the quality of lectures scored the average grade of 4,67,
* the quality of group work scored the average grade of 4,47.

Most participants rated the quality with 4 or 5, only the quality of group work received some rating of 3. The three participants that provided this grade did not offer additional explanation of the grade and did not make additional comments on group work. On the other hand it appears that for most participants (9 out of 16 that submitted the questionnaire) group work was the most useful part of the training. In their comments they indicated that the group work created an interactive working that was very useful for different disciplines to come together and express their thoughts and perspectives. One of the participants suggested that it would be more useful if the groups were organized in advance in order to fully mix the participants. This would reduce the chance that people from the same institution were in the same group and increase the exchange of ideas and experience.

Other topics and/or issues that were pointed out as the most useful part of the training were MoEU Expert's presentations, explanation of SEA regulation and stages in general and use of examples from different countries.

The participants have identified the following weaknesses of the training:

* too short time for the group work,
* lack of previous experience of the participants on the subject of SEA,
* lack of community discipline among some of the participants (the respondent felt that some participant did not take the training seriously enough),
* too long training (the respondent indicated that 1,5 day would be enough because in his/her opinion some topics were overlapping),
* need for more than one training to really gain knowledge of SEA,
* not enough examples, not enough practical examples.
* unclear terminology or translation, particularly of the technical terms.

Several participants also provided recommendations for future trainings. Some of them suggested to use more practical examples, both more examples from Turkey and even more examples and case studies from other countries. In addition, more examples of technical and analytical methods were desired. Improved delivery of training materials was also suggested, however no additional explanation what exactly the respondent meant (e.g. different print, timing/delivery ahead of the training) was not provided. One of the participants suggested that the presentations should be in English. One of the participants disliked that the training was focused on tourism, likely because he/she was from a different sector. This participant suggested that additional trainings should be organized on a sectoral basis.

Most of the participants were also very satisfied with the technical aspects of the training. A scale of 1-5 was used to rate the technical aspects, too, with 5 being the highest (excellent). The results were as follows:

* the accommodation received the average grade of 4,58,
* the quality of meeting venue scored the average grade of 4,36,
* the quality of coffee break scored the average grade of 4,36,
* the quality of lunch scored the average grade of 4,71.

Most participants rated the technical aspects with 4 or 5, the only deviation being some grades for meeting venue (rated 2 by one of the participants) and quality of coffee breaks (rated 1 by one of the participants and 3 by another one). No further comments were provided.

* 1. CHALLENGES

Most of the participants were from the tourism sector, however the pool of employees of competent authorities in tourism sector that might get in charge of SEA process is not very large in Turkey. In addition, there are competent authorities in the sectors that are not targeted by the 4 modules of the trainings. As a result, a number of participants from competent authorities from other sectors were invited in agreement with the beneficiary. In line with the suggestion from preparation of trainings (activity 2.2) that five participants at each training module are selected from sectors not listed in the ToR there were participants from other sectors as well. For example, the fisheries/aquaculture sector that were very proactive and showed strong interest in the subject, thus some related examples were discussed in the Q&A session and during the breaks. This indicates that although the training – in particular the practical examples and case studies – focused on the tourism sector, it was a valuable experience for all the participants, regardless of which sector or competent authority they are from.

Nevertheless, more effort to identify relevant participants will be needed for future trainings, also because of the observations of the participants; this might also involve persuading the relevant competent authorities (national and regional authorities, agencies and metropolitan municipalities) to select and permanently assign staff that will be in charge of SEA. Such approach will have an additional effect on SEA implementation in Turkey as the institutional structures will be ready and screening process smoother.

Several practitioners that are interested in SEA participated in the training. However, more practitioners need to be included in the next trainings. This will help to build the practitioners’ base in terms of knowledge, skills and competition that will be able to match the demand for outside support for SEA. Their involvement can be achieved with support of the already involved practitioners as well as closer communication with relevant Chambers and academia.

Most of the participants liked the group work and found it very valuable. The evaluation showed that the participants would appreciate more time for group work and different structure of groups. Given the limited time of the trainings and the topics covered, allocation of more time to group work is going to be difficult without redesigning and reducing the presentations. Some participants expressed interest in learning more about methods of assessment, however given the time available and likely outsourcing of the SEA the training will remain focused on the concepts and processes.

Several participants suggested to include more practical examples, both from Turkey and other countries. Due to early implementation of the SEA in Turkey there are not many examples available at the moment, however the future trainings will make extensive use of the pilot SEAs. Concerning the examples from abroad, the differences in planning systems between the countries make it sometimes difficult to apply in the context of the planning system in Turkey. Care must be taken to balance between providing more detailed explanation of the examples from abroad in the context of planning in Turkey and increasing the number of examples used in the training.

The questionnaire was useful for checking the improvement in participants’ knowledge and understanding of SEA. All questions apart from the last one were clearly understandable and the answers indicated which topics were the least known to the participants. Care should be taken that enough and clear information is given during the training so that the participants could answer all the questions without a doubt.

The translation from English to Turkish and *vice versa* represents a challenge due to technical terms that are specific for each sector. The translation service needs to be more familiarized with the topic and the translation of the presentations and handouts checked prior to printing.

1. ACTIVITY 2.4: DELIVERY OF 1ST AWARENESS RAISING WORKSHOP FOR UNIVERSITIES, NGOS, CHAMBERS AND PUBLIC
	1. APPROACH

The **content of the workshop** was designed on the basis of the discussion with the beneficiary during the kick-off and introductory meeting and the findings of the TNA and gap analysis. No specific objectives of the workshops were specified in ToR of the project, however the ToR mentions that the project should disseminate knowledge on the fundamentals of by-law on SEA to the national and local stakeholders (MoEU, competent authorities, universities, NGOs, chambers and public) through various activities such as trainings, workshops and study visit. The following **topics** were addressed:

* Introduction to SEA: purpose and objectives, benefits and added value, key principles;
* Presentation of SEA Bylaw and current experience with SEA application;
* Stakeholders participation in SEA: main principles, approaches and methods;
* SEA process: steps in SEA process, main actors/stakholders and their role.

Most of the workshop was conducted in the form of **presentations** followed by **Q&A session**. A **group work exercise** was planned in the afternoon that provided some practical insight in the role of the main actors/stakholders in the SEA process. At the end of each group work, groups reported on their findings and conclusions. Groups were created on the spot on the basis of seating.

* + 1. Input of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation

The Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation (MoEU) provided comments on the agenda of the workshop and presentation and handouts prepared. MoEU also substantially expanded the list of participants suggested on the basis of the TNA.

During the workshop, the experts from the General Directorate of EIA, Permit and Inspection of MoEU presented the Turkish Bylaw on SEA its application and current experience so far with SEA application in Turkey. In addition, MoEU experts actively participated in Q&A sessions where they explained the details of SEA bylaw and clarified the issues of interest to the participants, such as screening, timing and methods of involvement of the civil society and responsibilities of the competent authorities.

* + 1. Workshop Materials

Three sets of workshop materials were prepared:

* PowerPoint presentations,
* Group work handout,
* Additional sources of information for the participants: a compilation of guidelines, examples of SEA documents such as Scoping Reports and Environmental Reports and ToRs for commissioning the SEA (the same as for the training).

PowerPoint presentations and group work handout were translated in Turkish and were provided to the participants in the form of printed handouts. All of the workshop materials were provided in electronic format on an USB key. The final version of PowerPoint presentations and group work handout is provided in the annex, while additional sources were provided earlier in electronic format in the Report on activity 2.2.

* + 1. Workshop Participants

53 participants attended the workshop. The ToR envisaged minimum 40 participants for each of the workshop. The analysis of the academic institutions providing lectures or research on SEA showed that their number is very limited. Representatives of these institutions were invited, as well as a number of NGOs and representatives of Chambers. As the number of participants identified in this way was below expected, representatives of various authorities were invited as well. As a result, approximately half of the participants were from the governmental institutions.

Such a structure led to the Q&A session that focused both on the SEA process, particularly the scoping and impact assessment, and public participation. It also provided an opportunity for the participants to meet other stakeholders from a variety of organisations and sectors.

* 1. Evaluation of tHE workshop

In order to monitor the indicators set in the ToR, two sets of feedback questionnaires were prepared (both questionnaires are provided in the annex):

1. An initial questionnaire on SEA characteristics, used at the beginning of the workshop in order to test the knowledge and awareness on SEA of the participants;
2. A longer wrap-up questionnaire used at the end of the workshop, consisting of three parts (like the questionnaire for trainings):
	1. initial questions on SEA characteristics that were the same as in the introductory questionnaire (in order to test the difference, i.e. show the knowledge gained),
	2. questions on the quality and approach of the training and
	3. questions on technical aspects of the training.

After the workshop, 29 questionnaires were returned to the project team. 4 questions on SEA characteristics were asked in the initial questionnaire. The analysis of responses showed that the understanding of the SEA was initially low among the training participants as on average only 1 question was answered correctly. In the initial questionnaire, 7 participants out of 29 that submitted the questionnaire (i.e. almost one quarter) did not answer any of the questions correctly and the maximum number of correct answers was 2. The quality of responses increased significantly In the wrap-up questionnaire, where the average number of correct answers has increased to 1,72 and only one respondent still did respond correctly to any of the responses. Moreover, 5 participants gave 3 correct answers and one participant achieved full score.

The results of the two questionnaires on SEA indicate overall improvement of understanding of the SEA process. 5 out of the 29 respondents (approximately a sixth) have corrected at least 2 answers. On the other hand, 10 respondents (approximately a third) showed no improvement.

The biggest improvement was seen on the question no. 1 about the sectors that are subject to SEA (8 respondents) and the question no. 3 on SEA steps that include participation of general public / civil society. This is the result both of presentation and clear explanation of these topics and the interest of the participants as many of them are representatives of civil society.

Most of the participants that answered the questionnaire were satisfied with the quality and approach of the workshop. A scale of 1-5 was used to rate the experience, with 5 being the highest (excellent). The results were as follows:

* the overall quality was assessed with the average grade of 4,30,
* the quality of lectures scored the average grade of 4,15,
* the quality of group work scored the average grade of 4,19.

Most participants rated the quality with 4, with many rating the quality with 5 and some with 3; none of the respondents rated the quality below 3. In the comments more than a quarter of respondents stated that group work was the most valuable experience and 4 indicated that discussions were the most useful part of the workshop. Several have preferred the presentations. Other respondents indicated that for them, the most useful part of the training were the presentation of examples (especially SEA for Tourism Development Programme), clear explanation of SEA steps and the possibility of outsourcing the SEA (the data collection, analysis etc.).

On the other hand, some participants have commented that the examples presented were to general, not varied enough and that they would appreciate more examples from Turkey. Lack of practical information on application of SEA in Turkey was pointed out, however this is the result of the early stage of SEA application in the country when there are only a handful of real practical examples available. One of the participants indicated that more information on results of stakeholder participation in other countries and Turkey would be appreciated. Another participant felt that it was not explained clearly enough how SEA will generate benefits despite lack of sanctions for not applying it (or for not integrating its recommendations into the plan/programme) and how/whether EIA will still be implemented where the SEA is applied.

Two participants commented that group work was too abstract, not practical enough and that there was no interaction between the groups. One of the participants felt that group working environment was absent, while another one commented that the profile of the participants was not suitable. Another participant was disappointed that that the training experts did not open the discussion about the participating institutions; however it must be noted that the analysis of institutional setup and operation was not the topic of the workshop.

A number of participants provided some recommendations for future workshops. Several of them would like to have more detailed presentation of examples, possibly for every step of SEA and possibly with more examples and detailed data. One of the respondents suggested that more information on regulation should be given and another one would like to have clearer explanation how the planning and SEA process are carried out together. More information on different stakeholders' responsibilities would also be appreciated. In terms of the practical aspects of organization of the workshops, the following recommendations were made:

* presentation of the experience of a local institution (i.e. an institution in Turkey) that has experienced the SEA process would increase the understanding,
* advance information on the workshop and work would help the participants to prepare,
* continuation of practical training would be improve the understanding and skills,
* prior determination of groups would add to the quality of group work.

Most of the participants were also very satisfied with the technical aspects of the training. Again the scale of 1-5 was used to rate the technical aspects, too, with 5 being the highest (excellent). The results were as follows:

* the accommodation received the average grade of 4,68,
* the quality of meeting venue scored the average grade of 4,36,
* the quality of coffee break scored the average grade of 4,72,
* the quality of lunch scored the average grade of 4,28.

Most participants rated the technical aspects with 4 or 5, the only deviation being one low grade (2) for lunch. It is interesting that despite all the technical aspects were the same as in the trainings, the workshop participants rated the quality of coffee breaks quite higher and the quality of lunch lower. This indicates the subjectivity of the preferences and variation of expectations.

* 1. CHALLENGES

It was clear that it will be difficult to get aboard sufficient number of participants from academia, NGOs, chambers and general public, thus government institutions have been invited, too. While the idea of the workshop was to primarily build the capacity of the public and focus the content and discussion on the potential of their involvement in SEA, such composition of participants provided an opportunity for discussion on the role of authorities. Nevertheless, future workshops should remain focused on the participants from the primarily targeted organisations while representatives of government institutions should be streamlined to the trainings. Identification of suitable participants from the targeted organisations remains a challenge, however it can be overcome with additional search and support of the participants of the first workshop. Several participants suggested to spread the information among their colleagues in the civil society and they are also willing to provide additional contacts for invitation to future workshops.

It might also be useful to invite potential SEA practitioners to the workshops instead of to the trainings. The workshops are less time consuming and could provide the practitioners with the first glance to SEA and the opportunities in this field, just as intended by the awareness raising activities. Moreover, they could build rapport with other participants: academic and research institutions could be involved in developing the analytical and assessment methods, while NGOs and chambers could provide information on the socio-economic situation and opinions of civil society.

It is clear that the participants want more detailed information, expanded explanation of steps and methods and more detailed as well as more examples both from Turkey and other countries. However, their wishes are difficult to accommodate in the 1-day format of the workshop as envisaged in the ToR. There are several ways to accommodate their suggestions, for example organisation of further capacity building activities, provision of additional information on the SEA website and distribution of additional materials via email. However, preparation of additional capacity building activities and additional materials goes beyond the current project and the Client and Beneficiary should consider that when planning future activities.

While group work was highly appreciated by the participants, it was not given enough time during the workshop. Improvements can be made by advance distribution of material, advance structuring of the groups and more extensive Q&A session after the workshop. The latter is supported also by the appreciation the participants expressed of the discussions during the workshop.

The questionnaire was useful for checking the improvement in participants’ knowledge and understanding of SEA. 1-2 questions could be added to check for the understanding of the steps and methods used.

1. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The experience from the training for module 4 and the first awareness raising workshop will be used at the organisation of future trainings and workshops. The main conclusions are as follows:

* It was difficult to achieve the planned composition of participants for both training and workshop as there is lack of awareness of SEA and thus assignment of personnel in the government institutions at various levels, as well as lack of information on civil society institutions that are could be interested and involved in SEA. The government institutions of the five sectors targeted by this project have assigned the Focal Points, thus it is easier to involve them compared to the regional or local (metropolitan municipalities) level.
* Illustration by practical examples is highly appreciated by the participants as indicated in the responses to the evaluation questionnaire both in the training and in the workshop. Examples from Turkey are highly appreciated, however due to the early stage of implementation of SEA it is currently not possible to provide more of them.
* Many participants both of the training and of the workshop found the group work particularly useful. The quality of the group work could be further improved by planning the composition of the groups and improved handouts. Due to the intensive programme, there was a problem of running out of time for group work, especially at the workshop.
* The role of MoEU in the training and workshop, particularly presentations of SEA bylaw and examples given by its experts was very valuable. The MoEU’s active participation helped to clarify the SEA process in Turkish context and to establish rapport both with the relevant participants from government institutions and with the civil society organisations.
* The evaluation questionnaire was useful for checking the improvement in participants’ knowledge and understanding of SEA. The comparison between the answers in the training and in the workshop showed which topics were not presented clearly enough to achieve suitable rate of correct responses. The participants also provided useful comments and suggestions, many of which can be addressed at preparation of next trainings and workshops.
* Specific technical and sectoral terminology is difficult to translate from English to Turkish. This is particularly important for the SEA process and methodology in the view of the tasks that the government institutions, especially competent authorities will need to perform.

On the basis of these conclusions, the following recommendations were made:

* Increased care should be taken to ensure suitable composition of participants both in the trainings and in the workshops.
	+ For trainings, the SEA Focal Points are providing improved information for their respective sectors and they can also provide support in terms of information on contacts, interests and planning processes in the target institutions (competent authorities and agencies at different levels). In some cases, such as the water sector, preparation of participants’ list will be relatively easy as the sector is already ahead with planning (due to RBMP preparation) and SEA process (due to the pilot SEA in the past TA project) and at least some institutions have already assigned the persons responsible for SEA. Selection of participants for the spatial planning/ICZM sector on the other hand might prove to be difficult because of large number of potential participants and possibly large interest for the training among them. In such case, selection should be made on the basis of the level (national having advantage over regional), plans and/or programmes in the pipeline and possibly the priority of the areas subject to planning (for example, an area or a section of coastline under strongest development pressure, containing large Protected Areas of national importance and similar). Some participants from other, non-priority sectors should be invited to the trainings as well.
	+ Additional research and the network of participants of the past workshop should be used to expand the network of potential participants of the future workshop. It is suggested that potential SEA practitioners are invited to the workshops instead of to the trainings. Workshop might be preferred by the practitioners because it is less time intensive, but nevertheless provides a range of useful information.
* Practical examples for future trainings should be prepared with more details on key aspects that are most important for the targeted participants. This is particularly important for examples from the targeted sector for each training module as the participants are experts in their respective fields and will likely crave for more specific information. In addition, examples used in this training and workshop could be published on the SEA website to enable their broader dissemination. For presentation of examples from Turkey active participation of the authorities involved in the past and present pilot SEAs should be considered.
* Group work should be improved by defining the group composition in advance so that the participants would mix to a larger extent, better exchange their experience and opinions and to avoid group bias towards a particular institution or organisation. Handouts and instructions for the group work will be revised and improved. If possible, they will be emailed to the invited participants ahead of the trainings and workshop in agreement with the beneficiary. More attention will be paid to keeping to the schedule and allowing sufficient time for presentation of group work results and following discussion.
* The MoEU needs to keep its role and build on it. In the next trainings and workshops, particularly on spatial planning/ICZM and agriculture MoEU experts should play an important part in presenting the current experience with the pilot SEAs. The possibility to include representatives of the authorities that participated in the pilot SEA both of the past TA project and the current one should be considered.
* The evaluation questionnaire on SEA for the workshop will be slightly expanded to include additional topics. In addition, more care will be taken during preparation of the presentations and handouts that clear information is presented and possibly illustrated by examples for all the questions so that the questions will be better understood, and the participants will be able to determine the correct answer.
* More care will be taken to verify the translation of the presentations and handouts and to familiarize the translation service with the topics.
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ANNEX-I FINAL AGENDA FOR THE TRAINING – MODULE 4: INTRODUCTION TO BY-LAW ON SEA AND SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION ON TOURISM SECTOR

**DAY-1 / 4 December 2019**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | **Agenda** | **Speakers** |
| 09:30 | 10:00 | **Registration of participants and welcome coffee / tea** |
| 10:00 | 10.15 | **Opening remarks** **Introduction to the SEA Project** | Kemal DAĞ (Head of Department)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and InspectionMartin Smutný (Team Leader)SEA Project Team |
| 10.15 | 10.30 | **Introduction to the workshop and expectations of the participants** Introductory presentation and group discussion (participants’ expectations and their view on SEA e.g. World Cafe Method) | Mojca Hrabar (Training Expert)SEA Project Team |
| 10.30 | 11.15 | **Introduction to SEA: purpose and objectives, its benefits****Turkish Bylaw on SEA its application in Turkey implementations**Presentation and QA session  | Mojca Hrabar (Training Expert)SEA Project Team Nihan ŞAHİN HAMAMCI(Head of Unit)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and Inspection  |
| 11:15 | 11:30 | **Coffee break** |  |
| 11:30 | 13.00 | **SEA process: steps in SEA process, main actors/stakholders and their role** **•** Examples of SEA application from EU countries • SEA application in Turkey, with focus on the tourism sector• Presentation and QA session | Mojca Hrabar (Training Expert)SEA Project Team (process, example from EU countries)Aysun BOŞÇA (Environmental Expert)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and Inspection (application in Turkey) |
| 13:00 | 14:00 | **Lunch** |  |
| 14:00 | 14.30 | **Screening and scoping: the initial steps of SEA** **•** Examples of SEA application from EU countries **•** Experience so far in Turkey (screening)**•** SEA Web-site in Turkey**•** QA session | Martin Smutný (Team Leader)SEA Project Team Özge ERDEM(Environmental Expert)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and InspectionHakan ACAR (Expert)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and Inspection |
| 14:30 | 15:30 | **Conducting a SEA scoping** **•** Group work (preparation of scoping, data analysis, consultation, decision making)• Presentation by the groups | To be facilitated by the SEA Project Team and the MoEU  |
| 15:30 | 16:00 | **Coffee break** |  |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | **Baseline data and selection of assessment methods in SEA** * Examples of SEA application from EU countries
* Presentation and QA session
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project Team |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | **Closing remarks**  | Kemal DAĞ (Head of Department)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and InspectionMojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project Team |
| 17:15 |  | **End of the training** |  |

**DAY-2 5 December 2019**

| Time | Agenda | Speakers |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 09:305 | 09:45 | **Registration of participants and welcome coffee / tea** |
| 09:45 | 10:30 | **Assessment of impacts of plan/programme on the environment and formulation of SEA recommendations for the plan/programme*** Initial presentation
* Group work (envisage potential impacts, analyse whether/how they could be avoided)
* Presentation of group work and group discussion
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project TeamGroup work to be facilitated by the SEA Project Team  |
| 10:30 | 11:00 | **Analysis of alternatives*** Examples from EU countries
* Presentation and QA session
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project Team  |
| 11:00 | 11:15 | **Coffee break** |  |
| 11:15 | 12:00 | **Integration of SEA recommendations into the plan/programme for its adoption*** Examples from EU countries
 | Martin Smutný(Team Leader)SEA Project Team |
| 12:00 | 13:00 | **Stakeholder participation in SEA: main principles and planning for participation*** Initial presentation
* Examples from EU countries
* Group work (prepare a stakeholder consultation plan, including involvement of related sectors and public participation)
* Presentation of group work and group discussion
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project Team Group work to be facilitated by the SEA Project Team and the MoEU |
| 13:00 | 14:00 | **Lunch**  |  |
| 14:00 | 15:00 | **Preparation of ToR for SEA implementation*** Introductory presentation
* Group work (prepare a viable ToR, with emphasis on cooperation with the planning team, process management, quality control and public participation)
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)To be facilitated by the SEA Project Team and the MoEU  |
| 15:00 | 15:30 | **Presentation of group work on ToR and group discussion on:** * ToR preparation process,
* Exchange of information between different sectors,
* Support that can be provided by the MoEU
* Selection procedure and management of SEA process
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)To be facilitated by the SEA Project Team and the MoEU |
| 15:30 | 16:00 | **Coffee break** |  |
| 16:00 | 16:45 | **Mapping of the next steps for SEA implementation in the sector (summary of the training)**Group work/facilitated discussion on:* What are the main challenges for efficient SEA application in the sector and how to overcome them?
* What are the main benefits of efficient SEA application and how could they be used elsewhere in the sector?
* How will the results of SEA be integrated in the plan/programme?
* What will be your role in future application of SEA and how to organise the activities?
* Which stakeholders should you engage in the in SEA process in your sector?
* How will the efficiency of SEA process and stakeholder participation be ensured?
 | Mojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project Team |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | **Closing remarks**  | Kemal DAĞ (Head of Department)MoEU-DG of EIA, Permit and InspectionMojca Hrabar(Training Expert)SEA Project Team |
| 17:00 |  | **End of the training** |  |

ANNEX-II TRAINING MATERIALS FOR MODULE 4

PowerPoint presentations

Group Work Materials

* 1. **Group Work no. 1: Scoping for a Tourism Development Plan**

You have received basic information on a Tourism Development Plan. Please have a look at it and discuss the following questions within the group:

* What environmental issues will you focus on?
* Which data will you need? Do you have access?
* Who will you consult? How?
* Who, how will prepare the SEA and make the decisions?
	+ Department, section, person in charge?
	+ Contracting of external consultants?

You can use some of the tools below to prepare the conclusions. Please select a member of the group that will present your conclusions.

Group Work: Tourism Development Programme for Lala Region

PowerPoint Presentation

Environmental issues: scoping matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Environmental issue | Challenges (Any problems? Any sensitive areas – see annex 4 of bylaw?) | Opportunities | To be included in SEA? Y/N | Potential indicators |
| Biodiversity, fauna, flora |  |  |  |  |
| population, human health  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil |  |  |  |  |
| water  |  |  |  |  |
| Air |  |  |  |  |
| climatic factors  |  |  |  |  |
| material assets |  |  |  |  |
| cultural heritage  |  |  |  |  |
| Landscape |  |  |  |  |

Sources of data and institutions to consult

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Environmental issue | Sources of data: database  | Quality/level of data | Institution to contact |
| Biodiversity, fauna, flora |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| population, human health  |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| Soil |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| water  |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| Air |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| climatic factors  |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| material assets |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| cultural heritage  |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |
| Landscape |  | Good/poor/unknownNational/regional/local |  |

* 1. **Group Work no. 2: Assessment of impacts for a Tourism Development Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Environmental issue | Potential impacts of the plan on environmental issue | Potential impacts of the plan on sustainability objectives | Is alternative better? Y/N | Recommandations to avoid impacts |
| Biodiversity, fauna, flora |  |  |  |  |
| population, human health  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil |  |  |  |  |
| water  |  |  |  |  |
| Air |  |  |  |  |
| climatic factors  |  |  |  |  |
| material assets |  |  |  |  |
| cultural heritage  |  |  |  |  |
| Landscape |  |  |  |  |

* 1. **Group Work no. 3: Preparation of a stakeholder consultation plan for SEA of a Tourism Development Plan**

Organisations to consult in the process of SEA preparation

Please think about the organisations and institutions that can contribute to the quality of SEA due to their role and experience, and about the organisations, institutions and communities that will be affected by the plan implementation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of institution | Institution or Directorate | Environmental issues relevant for these institutions |
| Biodiversity, fauna, flora | population, human health  | Soil | water  | air | climatic factors  | material assets | cultural heritage  | Landscape |
| Organisations/institutions with which consultations are obligatory | MoEU |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other environment and health institutions/organizations(National/regional/local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other related institutions/organizations (National/regional/local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organisations/institutions with which consultations are obligatory | Civil society depending on the plan/programme characteristics  | universities, institutes, research institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| profession chambers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| labour unions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| associations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| environmental NGOs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other organisations (optional) | business community in tourism sector (e.g. tour operators, hotel chains,…) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Institutions dealing with recreation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Infrastructure providers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neighbouring regions/municipalities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Steps of SEA in which to conduct the consultation

Consultation can go beyond the obligatory consultation meetings; it can be used to collect useful information, recommendations and to build on synergies with other plans/programmes. There are many methods of consultations, for example:

* interviews,
* large meetings,
* focus groups,
* surveys,
* peer reviews etc.

Think which organisations and institutions you would like to involve in the process and when (in which SEA step) – but also how much time will you need/you have available.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SEA step | Organisations/institutions with which consultations are obligatory | Other organisations |
| Y/N | Explanation why | Y/N | Which organisations? | Explanation why |
| Scoping | Y | Consultation meeting is obligatory. |  |  |  |
| Baseline analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of alternatives |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations (mitigation) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultations on Environmental Report | Y | Consultation meeting is obligatory. |  |  |  |
| Consultation on integration into the plan |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. **Group Work no. 4: Preparation of Terms of Reference**

Prepare Terms of Reference for the external consultant that will carry out SEA process and prepare the Environmental Report. Think about:

* how much time the preparation of the plan will take,
* how much time each SEA step will take,
* how much environmental data is available and related flexibility regarding the methods,
* how demanding and time-consuming will be the assessment process,
* how intensive should consultation with stakeholders be.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sections of ToR | Topics | Content |
| Background information | Plan/programme in question (short description) | **Tourism Development Plan** |
| Other relevant plans/programmes |  |
| Background information on data available |  |
| Objectives of the project |  |
| Scope of work | SEA process (information beyond SEA bylaw requirement) |  |
| The timeline |  |
| Suggested methods and flexibility regarding them |  |
| Extent of public participation (minimum – scoping, environmental report, additional?) |  |
| Requirements regarding access to data, support at data acquisition  |  |
| Cooperation with the client, the planning team, SEA authorities and other institutions |  |
| Requirements on dissemination of information on SEA |  |
| Estimated number of days |  |
| Deliverables | Timing, type, form of submission: * Scoping Report, Environmental Report
* Any technical reports?
* Any other material (leaflets, website,…)?
 |  |
| Deadlines | Deadline for submission of bid |  |
| Deadline for scoping  |  |
| Deadline for final SEA report |  |
| Payment schedule |  |
| Process management | Expertise required:* Qualifications and experience
* number of experts
* company references
 |  |
| Quality control |  |
| Client’s contact person |  |
| Planning Team contact’s person |  |
| Other useful contacts |  |

ANNEX-III QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING – MODULE 4

* 1. Initial questionnaire

We would like to test your knowledge of SEA before the training. Your responses are anonymous and will serve solely for the assessment of changes in knowledge we have achieved with the trainings. The responses will not be used for any personal assessments.

1. SEA bylaw is implemented for plans and programmes subject to SEA and prepared for 12 specific sectors. Are all the sectors already subject to SEA?
2. Yes, all are subject to SEA since the SEA bylaw was passed,
3. No, each year an additional sector becomes subject to SEA, so it will take 12 years for the SEA bylaw to be fully applicable to all 12 sectors,
4. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2020 or 2023,
5. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2025.
6. How does the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization assess in the screening process whether a plan/programme requires SEA?
7. On the basis of a list of plans set in the SEA bylaw, presence of sensitive areas and a set of criteria for case-by-case assessment,
8. On the basis of a list of plans set in the SEA bylaw,
9. On the basis of a set of criteria,
10. Solely on the basis of previous and/or similar examples of plans/programmes,
11. On the basis of an independent committee decision.
12. Which organisation is responsible for conducting SEA?
13. Competent Authority,
14. Ministry of Environment and Urbanization,
15. External consultant (when hired),
16. Both Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Competent Authority,
17. Other authorities.
18. Which SEA steps include preparation of reports?
19. Screening, scoping and final assessment of impacts,
20. Scoping and final assessment of impacts,
21. Scoping, final assessment of impacts and consultation meetings,
22. final assessment of impacts.
23. Which SEA steps include participation of general public / civil society?
24. Screening, scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
25. Scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
26. Scoping, assessment of alternatives and consultation on Environmental Report,
27. consultation on Environmental Report.
28. Do the SEA recommendations have to be integrated into the plan/programme?
29. Yes,
30. No,
31. Depends on the situation.
	1. Wrap-up questionnaire

Your responses to Part 1 of this questionnaire will help us to assess how the training influenced the knowledge of the participants on SEA. The responses will not be used for any personal assessments. Your feedback in the Part 2 will help us to assess the effectiveness of our trainings and indicate possible improvements in preparation of subsequent training activities.

**Part 1**

1. SEA bylaw is implemented for plans and programmes subject to SEA and prepared for 12 specific sectors. Are all the sectors already subject to SEA?
2. Yes, all are subject to SEA since the SEA bylaw was passed,
3. No, each year an additional sector becomes subject to SEA, so it will take 12 years for the SEA bylaw to be fully applicable to all 12 sectors,
4. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2020 or 2023,
5. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2025.
6. How does the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization assess in the screening process whether a plan/programme requires SEA?
7. On the basis of a list of plans set in the SEA bylaw, presence of sensitive areas and a set of criteria for case-by-case assessment,
8. On the basis of a list of plans set in the SEA bylaw,
9. On the basis of a set of criteria,
10. Solely on the basis of previous and/or similar examples of plans/programmes,
11. On the basis of an independent committee decision.
12. Which organisation is responsible for conducting SEA?
13. Competent Authority,
14. Ministry of Environment and Urbanization,
15. External consultant (when hired),
16. Both Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Competent Authority,
17. Other authorities.
18. Which SEA steps include preparation of reports?
19. Screening, scoping and final assessment of impacts,
20. Scoping and final assessment of impacts,
21. Scoping, final assessment of impacts and consultation meetings,
22. final assessment of impacts.
23. Which SEA steps include participation of general public / civil society?
24. Screening, scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
25. Scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
26. Scoping, assessment of alternatives and consultation on Environmental Report,
27. consultation on Environmental Report.
28. Do the SEA recommendations have to be integrated into the plan/programme?
29. Yes,
30. No,
31. Depends on the situation.

**Part 2**

**Content of the training**

1. Please rate the overall quality of the training.

 5 4 3 2 1 

1. Please rate the quality of the different types of activities by circling the grade you consider adequate (1 – poor, 5 – excellent).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lectures | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Group Work | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fill Comment: |

1. What part of the training was most useful or valuable to you?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What were the weaknesses of the training?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Do you have any recommendations in terms of content or methods? Your comments will help us improve the next training.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Technical Aspects**

1. Please rate the technical aspects of the training:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accessibility of the venue, accomodation | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Quality of the venue | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Coffe breaks | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Lunch | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |

ANNEX IV LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE TRAINING – MODULE 4

ANNEX V PHOTOS FROM THE groupwork at the training – module 4

ANNEX VI AGENDA FOR THE 1ST AWARENESS RAISING WORKSHOP FOR UNIVERSITIES, NGOS, CHAMBERS AND PUBLIC

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Agenda | Speakers |
| 09:30 | 10:00 | Registration of participants and welcome coffee / tea |
| 10:00 | 10:15 | Opening remarks Introduction to the SEA Project  | Kemal DAĞ (Head of Department)Representative of the MoEU-Directorate of EIAMartin SmutnýRepresentative of the SEA Project Team  |
| 10:15 | 10:30 | Introduction to the workshop and expectations of the participants Introductory presentation and group discussion (participants’ expectations and their view on SEA e.g. World Cafe Method) | Mojca HrabarRepresentative of the SEA Project Team  |
| 10:30 | 11:00 | İntroduction to SEA: purpose and objectives, its benefits and added value, key principles of its efficeint applicationPresentation and QA session  | Martin SmutnýRepresentative of the SEA Project Team  |
| 11:00 | 11:15 | Coffee break |  |
| 11:15 | 11:45 | SEA in Turkey: main requirements of the Bylaw on SEA, current experience with SEA application Presentation and QA session | Nihan ŞAHİN HAMAMCI, Aysun BOŞÇARepresentatives of the MoEU-Directorate of EIA |
| 11:45 | 12:30 | Examples of SEA application from EU countries Presentation and QA session | Mojca HrabarRepresentative of the SEA Project Team  |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | Lunch  |  |
| 13:30 | 14:15 | Stakeholders participation in SEA: main principles, approaches and methods, examples from EU countries Presentation and QA session | Mojca HrabarRepresentative of the SEA Project Team |
| 14:15 | 15:00 | SEA process: steps in SEA process, main actors/stakholders and their role Introductory presentation Group work (design of SEA process with emphasis on stakeholders’ participation)Presentation by the groups  | Mojca HrabarRepresentative of the SEA Project Team  |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | Coffee break |  |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | Further development of SEA in Turkey Group discussion on: * What major benefits of SEA application in Turkey do you see?
* What are main challenges for efficient SEA application in Turkey and how to overcome them?
* How do you see your/your stakeholder group role in future application of SEA?
* What actions should be taken to enable your/your stakeholder group efficeint participation in SEA process?

Presentation by the groups | Mojca HrabarRepresentative of the SEA Project Team To be facilitated by the SEA Project Team  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | Closing remarks  | Nihan ŞAHİN HAMAMCIRepresentative of the MoEU-Directorate of EIAMojca HrabarRepresentative of the SEA Project Team |
| 16:45 |  | End of the workshop  |  |

ANNEX VII 1ST AWARENESS RAISING WORKSHOP MATERIALS

PowerPoint presentation

Group Work Material: Preparation of a stakeholder consultation plan for SEA

Consultation can go beyond the obligatory consultation meetings; it can be used to collect useful information, recommendations and to build on synergies with other plans/programmes. There are many methods of consultations, for example:

* interviews,
* large meetings,
* focus groups,
* surveys,
* peer reviews etc.

Look at the SEA steps and decide in which SEA step you would like to participate. Think how many qualified colleagues you have and how much time will you need/you have available.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Would you participate? Y/N | Explanation why |
| Scoping |  |  |
| Baseline analysis |  |  |
| Analysis of alternatives |  |  |
| Impact assessment |  |  |
| Recommendations (mitigation) |  |  |
| Consultations on Environmental Report |  |  |
| Consultation on integration into the plan |  |  |

ANNEX VIII QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EVALUATION OF THE 1ST AWARENESS RAISING WORKSHOP

Initial questionnaire

We would like to test your knowledge of SEA before the training. Your responses are anonymous and will serve solely for the assessment of changes in knowledge we have achieved with the workshop. The responses will not be used for any personal assessments.

1. SEA bylaw is implemented for plans and programmes subject to SEA and prepared for 12 specific sectors. Are all the sectors already subject to SEA?
2. Yes, all are subject to SEA since the SEA bylaw was passed,
3. No, each year an additional sector becomes subject to SEA, so it will take 12 years for the SEA bylaw to be fully applicable to all 12 sectors,
4. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2020 or 2023,
5. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2025.
6. Which organisation is responsible for conducting SEA?
7. Competent Authority,
8. Ministry of Environment and Urbanization,
9. External consultant (when hired),
10. Both Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Competent Authority,
11. Other authorities.
12. Which SEA steps include participation of general public / civil society?
13. Screening, scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
14. Scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
15. Scoping, assessment of alternatives and consultation on Environmental Report,
16. consultation on Environmental Report.
17. Do the SEA recommendations have to be integrated into the plan/programme?
18. Yes,
19. No,
20. Depends on the situation.

Wrap-up questionnaire

Your responses to Part 1 of this questionnaire will help us to assess how the workshop influenced the knowledge of the participants on SEA. The responses will not be used for any personal assessments. Your feedback in the Part 2 will help us to assess the effectiveness of our trainings and indicate possible improvements in preparation of subsequent training activities.

**Part 1**

1. SEA bylaw is implemented for plans and programmes subject to SEA and prepared for 12 specific sectors. Are all the sectors already subject to SEA?
2. Yes, all are subject to SEA since the SEA bylaw was passed,
3. No, each year an additional sector becomes subject to SEA, so it will take 12 years for the SEA bylaw to be fully applicable to all 12 sectors,
4. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2020 or 2023,
5. No, 5 sectors became subject to SEA immediately when SEA bylaw came into force, while the rest will become subject in 2025.
6. Which organisation is responsible for conducting SEA?
7. Competent Authority,
8. Ministry of Environment and Urbanization,
9. External consultant (when hired),
10. Both Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Competent Authority,
11. Other authorities.
12. Which SEA steps include participation of general public / civil society?
13. Screening, scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
14. Scoping and consultation on Environmental Report,
15. Scoping, assessment of alternatives and consultation on Environmental Report,
16. consultation on Environmental Report.
17. Do the SEA recommendations have to be integrated into the plan/programme?
18. Yes,
19. No,
20. Depends on the situation.

**Part 2**

Content of the workshop

1. Please rate the overall quality of the training.

 5 4 3 2 1 

1. Please rate the quality of the different types of activities by circling the grade you consider adequate (1 – poor, 5 – excellent).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lectures | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Group Work | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fill Comment: |

1. What part of the workshop was most useful or valuable to you?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What were the weaknesses of the workshop?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Do you have any recommendations in terms of content or methods? Your comments will help us improve the next workshop.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Technical Aspects

1. Please rate the technical aspects of the workshop:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accessibility of the venue, accomodation | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Quality of the venue | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Coffe breaks | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |
| Lunch | Smiling face with no fill 5 4 3 2 1 Sad face with no fillComment: |

ANNEX IX LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE 1ST AWARENESS RAISING WORKSHOP

ANNEX-IX ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PARTICIPANTS

The following additional sources of information for the participants were delivered on USB key:

**Examples of SEA:**

* AECOM Limited (2018) Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the A414 Corridor Strategy. Environmental Report. Hertfordshire County Council, November 2018
* Arbter, K. (2007) Strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Viennese waste management plan 2007. Presentation at the UNECE Aarhus Workshop on Public Participation in Strategic Decision-making, 3 – 4 Dec. 2007, Sofia
* Ayrshire & Arran Tourism Strategy 2012-17. East Ayrshire Council, North Ayrshire Council, South Ayrshire Council
* CAAS Ltd. (2014): Strategic Environmental Assessment. Scoping Report for the Wild Atlantic Way Signature Tourism Experience. Fáilte Ireland, January 2014
* CAAS Ltd. (2015): Strategic Environmental Assessment. Environmental Report for the Wild Atlantic Way Signature Tourism Experience. Fáilte Ireland, August 2015
* CH2MHILL (2014) The City of Edinburgh Council Local Transport Strategy: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Post Adoption Statement Prepared for The City of Edinburgh Council. City of Edinburgh Council, April 2014
* City of Edinburgh Council (2015) City of Edinburgh’s Sustainable Energy Action Plan (SEAP) Strategic Environmental Assessment. Environmental Report, 09 March 2015
* COWI and RPS (2006) Pilot Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Replacement Midlands Waste Management Plan 2005-2010. Midlands Local Authorities (Offaly Co. Co., Laois Co. Co., Westmeath Co. Co., Longford Co. Co. and Tipperary North Co. Co.), February 2006
* Environmental Impact Services (2010) Environmental Report for the Grid25 Implementation Programme 2011-2016. Strategic Environmental Assessment. EirGrid, 2010
* ERM (2007) Strategic Environmental Assessment Study: Tourism Development in the Province of Guizhou, China. World Bank, 25 May 2007
* Fáilte Ireland (2015) Wild Atlantic Way Way Operational Programme 2015-2019. Fáilte Ireland, August 2015
* Glasgow City Plan 2 Strategic Environmental Assessment. Environmental Report.
* Halcrow Group Limited (2008) Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study. Strategic Environmental Assessment. Environmental Report. Portsmouth City Council, June 2008
* Levett, R., McNally, R. (2003) A Strategic Environmental Assessment of Fiji’s Tourism Development Plan
* LUC (2014) Ayrshire and Arran Tourism Strategy SEA Environmental Report. South Ayrshire Council, May 2014
* LUC (2014) Ex-ante Evaluation of England's ERDF Operational Programme. Strategic Environmental Assessment. Prepared by LUC for Regeneris Consulting, June 2014
* MCS, Aeoliki and CSA International (2008) Environmental Report. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Concerning Hydrocarbon Activities within the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Republic of Cyprus. Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism of the Republic of Cyprus, 15 November 2008
* Parsons Brinckerhoff (2014) Connecting Cornwall: Implementation Plan 2015-2019 SEA Environmental Report. Cornwall Council, Transport Planning and Strategy, November 2014
* Strategic Environmental Assessment of Cambodia’s Tourism Sector Baseline Assessment, Draft. August 2007
* URS (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Draft Rural Development Programme in England. Environmental Report. Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, June 2014

**SEA Manuals:**

* A basic introduction to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Scotland, October 2009
* and Redes Energéticas Nacionais (REN), SA, Lisbon, 2012
* ERM (2003) Environmental RTDI Programme 2000–2006. Development of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Methodologies for Plans and Programmes in Ireland. Synthesis Report. Environmental Protection Agency, 2003
* IUCN (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment for Spatial Planning. Guidance Document. National Impact Assessment Programme (NIAP). IUCN Pakistan, 2014
* OECD (2006) Applying Strategic Environmental Assessment. Good Practice Guidance for Development Co-Operation. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, OECD, 2006
* Rosário Partidário, M. (2012) Strategic Environmental Assessment Better Practice Guide. Methodological guidance for strategic thinking in SEA. Portuguese Environment Agency
* UNECE (2018) Application of the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment: Manual For Trainers. EaP GREEN Project, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) secretariat, May 2018

**Other materials:**

* Andrade F., Ferreira M.A., Gomes N., Joanaz De Melo J., Leitão P., Pinto M. J. (2005) Strategic Environmental Assessment In Tróia (Portugal)
* Antoniou E.: Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Greek Plans and Programmes
* Carvalho Lemos C., Fischer T. B., Pereira Souza M. (2012) Strategic environmental assessment in tourism planning — Extent of application and quality of documentation. Environmental Impact Assessment Review 35 (2012) 1–10
* Craglia M., Pavanello L., Smith R.S. (2010) The Use of Spatial Data for the Preparation of Environmental Reports in Europe. European Commission Joint Research Centre. Institute for Environment and Sustainability, Ispra, 2010
* Dusik, J., Xie, J. (2009) Strategic Environmental Assessment in East and Southeast Asia. A Progress Review and Comparison of Country Systems and Cases. Sustainable Development ─ East Asia And Pacific Region Discussion Papers. World Bank, June 2009
* Frey B., Olearius A., Palerm J. (2011) Strategic Environmental Assessment – a governance tool for sustainable development. Lessons learnt from applying Strategic Environmental Assessment within development cooperation focusing on aid effectiveness. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Project Rioplus - Environmental Policy and and Promotion of Strategies for Sustainable Development
* González Ubierna, S(1)( 2); Desdentado Gómez, L(1) ; Díaz Martín, M(1); Espluga González de la Peña, A.P; Martínez Orozco, J.M; Sobrini Sagaseta de Ilúrdoz, I.M; Casermeiro Martínez, M.A. Environmental Assessment in Spain. Totus et nihil.
* Milieu and Collingwood Environmental Planning (2019) Study to support the REFIT evaluation of Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (SEA Directive). Final report. European Commission, Directorate-General for Environment, June 2019
* Municipal planning and Strategic Environmental Assessment in Honduras: a case study on how to harmonise economic development and environmental protection. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Convention Project to Combat Desertification (CCD Project), Project Rioplus - Environmental Policy and Promotion of Strategies for Sustainable Development, May 2009
* Policy Process and SEA in parallel. Spatial Vision Overijssel. Views and Experiences: SEA Overijsel. Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment, March 2011
* Review of Effectiveness of SEA in Ireland. Key Findings & Recommendations. Environmental Protection Agency, 2012
* Ruiz L. (2016) Strategic Environmental Assessment of Towns in Ecuador with Tourism Potential. Journal of Building Construction and Planning Research, 2016, 4, 83-88
* SEA Scoping for a 5-Year Strategy for Fáilte Ireland to support the development of Tourism in Ireland from 2018 to 2022, response of Environment Protection Agency to Fáilte Ireland, December 2017
* Strategic Environmental Assessment for the structure vision Amsterdam 2040. Views and experiences: Structure vision Amsterdam 2040 and SEA. Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment
* Strategic Environmental Assessment in Morocco and an Approach to its Institutionalisation. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Project Rioplus - Environmental Policy and Promotion of Strategies for Sustainable Development. July 2011
* Strategic Environmental Assessment in Viet Nam. How to use SEA pilot experience for capacity development and broaden its impact via donor cooperation. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Project Rioplus - Environmental Policy and Promotion of Strategies for Sustainable Development. July 2011
* Terms of Reference: Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment. Cabo Verde Competitiveness for Tourism Project
* Terms of Reference: Strategic Environmental Assessment for Jordan Tourism Strategy 2015-2019. United Nations Development Program, March 2016
* Tulu F. D. (2014) Integration of strategic environmental assessment into regional planning. Herald Journal of Geography and Regional Planning Vol. 3 (1), pp. 001 – 015. February, 2014
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