



Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi tarafından finanse edilmektedir.  
This project is funded by the European Union.

# AFETTE KESİŐEN YOLLAR VE ROLLER ETKİNLİK RAPORU



**meşdan**



This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of YADA Foundation and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union, the Republic of Turkey and the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs Directorate for EU Affairs.

## INTRODUCTION

As the YADA Foundation, we held another online meeting within the scope of the “Strengthening Civil Dialogue” project, which is supported by the European Union, in our Meydan Meetings series, which we organize to implement a new dialogue and a negotiation model among non-governmental organizations. We came together online on December 23, 2020 to discuss the role of civil society in different phases of disaster situations, and the dialogue between NGO’s and stakeholders at the Meydan event. Since 2018, in order to talk, listen and discuss the issues of Turkey we come together in Meydan Meetings; which has been set up for seeing different issues from different perspectives and to allow stakeholders from different backgrounds to explore issues together. We thank everyone for coming together in the Meydan to share the experience and skills of civil society in owning, discovering, defining, bringing to the agenda, generating knowledge and solutions for social and environmental problems.

As YADA, since 2005, we have been producing information on different areas of social life and turning them into practice. We do research on how effective NGOs are on citizens and decision-makers; and try to increase their influence on the decisions and opinions of the public. With the research and studies, we do, we focus on improving the ability of NGOs to influence decisions and strengthen the dialogue between them. We aim to create common grounds where NGOs can discuss, exchange information and establish new collaborations. We aimed to create a space where these common grounds can be formed by organizing physical and online meetings with square activities. We also aimed to bring together non-governmental actors who are in different fields, views, and approaches to make these actors visible to each other. We wanted differences to be able to meet, encounter, talk and get to know each other. Thank you again for coming to Meydan Meeting with the aim of talking, listening, and discussing on Turkey’s issues.



# PROGRAM

- 13.30 - 14.00:** Opening
- 14.00 - 16.00:** Panel
- Panel moderatörü:** Emine Uçak - Civil Society and Media Studies Association, Civil Pages
- Panelistler:** Center for Spatial Justice-Bahar Bayhan  
Earthquake Reinforcement Association-Sinan Türkan  
Civil Society Disaster Platform - Serhan Süzer  
İHH - Emre Yerli  
The Turkish Red Crescent - Abdurrahman Yıldırım
- 16.00 - 17.30:** **Group Works**  
(Food Crisis, Earthquake, Flood, Pandemic, Drought)
- 17.30:** Closure



## OPENING

On December 23, 2020, at the Meydan meeting, which was held online to discuss the role of civil society in different phases of disasters, its dialogue within itself and with stakeholders, we came together with civil society representatives working in the fields of civil society, disaster, humanitarian aid, environment, planning, earthquake, education, sustainability, dialogue, city, research, law, mental health, disability, gender, refugee, children and youth, animal rights fields and experts working in local governments throughout Turkey, on the zoom platform and talked about the disaster theme.

The workshop started with a brief introduction after the participants stated their names and institutions. After the meeting, 'How prepared is the civil society for disasters?', 'Does the civil society have the necessary mechanisms to produce post-disaster response?' and 'Is there a dialogue ground between civil society - public and different stakeholders for disaster processes?' questions were answered anonymously by the participants via menti.com.

## PANEL

Following the main session, the panel session started with the moderation by Emine Uçak. Bahar Bayhan from Center for Spatial Justice, Sinan Türkan from the Earthquake Reinforcement Association,



Serhan Süzer from the Civil Society Disaster Platform, Emre Yerli from İHH and Abdurrahman Yıldırım from the Red Crescent discussed the general situation after the disaster, the relationship between disasters and civil society, the current state of cities, the relationship between central and local authorities, and the society's approach to disaster-induced trauma, and also the following questions.

- “What steps should civil society take before, during and after disasters?”
- “How is it possible to prepare in advance for possible scenarios as civil society, the public and different stakeholders?”
- “How should we coordinate in the work areas that intersect in disasters (animals, children, women, refugees, etc.), how should we make unique needs and solutions suggestions visible?”
- “What are our shortcomings in terms of dialogue, cooperation and capacity among stakeholders in disasters?”

**“Institutions working on disasters think they have mastered every subject concerning disasters.”**

It was determined that all institutions have issues that need to improve themselves, however the institutions in Turkey see themselves as sufficient. It has been said that there is no preparedness for the great Istanbul earthquake and there are many points that need improvement. It was pointed out that everyone was trying to do something on their own front, and it was emphasized to act together, saying “we must collaborate and develop together”.

**Every segment of the society should be made aware of disasters.**

It was discussed that psychologists, non-governmental organizations, educators, architects, etc. should produce disaster policies that all professional groups contribute to, and that all segments of the society should be trained on disasters in line with these policies.

**“Face your building!”**

It was said that citizens should learn whether the buildings they live in are earthquake-resistant; and then reinforcements, re-works and improvements should be made. After it was stated that all these procedures are serious costs, it was mentioned that bureaucracy prevents to overcome these problems and at this point, the state and citizens should join hands. Suggestions that financing models should be developed and zoning facilities should be provided.

**We must reach the level where we least need search and rescue.**

Experts who said that we should live in a more just, more ecological and more democratic country expressed their suggestions that participatory and secure

systems and mechanisms should be established. It was stated that the primary aim was to make the cities needing search and rescue at a minimum, and it was said that the countries where the search and rescue teams are very strong are 3rd world countries because the residences are not safe. It was informed that there were 7000 rescue teams, 17000 buildings in Istanbul which means almost 2 buildings to one search and rescue team. “Unsafe buildings are built for the sake of greed of money and rent, and therefore the need for search and rescue is increasing.” said the panelist.

**Studies on risk reduction should be done.**

It was suggested that the risks existing in every different region, city, and district should be identified and strategies should be developed to reduce them. Specific risk reduction methods were discussed such as not building on the stream bed in regions with floods before the disaster, returning to the traditional structure in the Black Sea and building on a base according to the risk.

**Psychosocial needs are ignored.**

It was said, “There should be a knowledge-based effort to do no harm and benefit; well-intentioned efforts are not enough.” It was mentioned that psychosocial support is a very important process after the disaster, but it is ignored.

**A legal process is required for safe houses with established infrastructure.**

It was mentioned that houses became uninhabitable after the Düzce earthquake and that a legal process was required for safe houses with infrastructure. It was an issued that the homeowners and tenants lived in prefabricated houses and that only the homeowners were brought to the houses built afterwards. “Due to the tenants being

forced to live in unsafe houses, the legal process could only reach a result.” was said.

### **It is necessary to keep the earthquake issue alive.**

It was emphasized that the earthquake fell immediately after it became the agenda, and it was mentioned that bad things tend to be very forgotten. It was expressed that the earthquake issue should be kept alive.

### **Pandemics caused by global epidemics are also called disasters.**

Although outbreaks are described as health-crises by definition, it was stated that there are also those who call global pandemics as disasters and that social sciences show that disasters occur when a natural or technological phenomenon occurs when a society is made vulnerable by political decisions, economic choices or social organization forms. “From this aspect, it is possible to consider epidemics as disasters,” was said.

### **Epidemics will increase with climate change.**

It was stated that the main reason underlying the epidemics is the problematic relationship between nature and humanity and that the number of epidemics that will be faced with the acceleration of climate change will increase. Looking at the history of epidemics affecting the world, it was informed that there was a spreading point caused by animal farms, and it was said that there were quite a number of viruses that passed from animals to humans and turned into a pandemic. Malaria and crimea congo being still on the rise were given as an example. It was stated that the irresponsible production-consumption of humanity was also effective in the emergence and spread of epidemics.

### **The epidemic has good and bad effects.**

Many negative economic, social and psychological effects of the epidemic, such as income and job loss, depletion of savings, borrowing to support consumption as a result of job loss, facing more burdens of vulnerable groups, discrimination of the elderly, inequality of opportunity in education, were addressed. In addition, it was stated that there are new skills and new methods taught by the epidemic, such as the need for digital literacy, preparation for potential crisis situations, the importance of being in communication and dialogue, access to information.

## **SECOND SESSION: GROUP WORKS**

The second session started with the evaluation of Murat Özçelebi, the EU Affairs Expert of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs. Özçelebi mentioned the European Union programs in the disaster theme such as ‘Rights and Values’, for the projects that might be conducted in Turkey. Afterwards, the participants were divided into groups with the theme “flood, epidemic, drought and earthquake” in line with their own choices, and answered to the following questions.

- What mission can civil society have on these themes? (Before, during and after the disaster)
- What kind of policy recommendations are needed?
- What kind of mechanisms / networks / collaborations are needed?

### **Disaster protection programs should be prepared on the basis of the child.**

It was stated that child-centered policies were not implemented, and the earthquake became more traumatic for children. It was pointed out that psychological resilience should be supported, and trainings should be organized based on this resilience. A proposal was made about how planning of temporary accommodation areas and disaster planning should be child-oriented before, during and after an earthquake.

### **Animal-oriented disaster approaches should also be made.**

It was pointed out that trainings should be given on questions such as “How to understand the traumatic animal”, “Who can we reach in case of an emergency regarding animals”, “What should we know to facilitate the escape of animals while preparing our bags during an earthquake”. It was said that what might be needed in containers to be used in case of disaster should be discussed and all lives should be considered.

### **Disasters makes the differences visible.**

It was pointed out that there was a serious ownership at the point of directing aid and a real abuse was experienced in stockpiling aid and delivering it to those in real need. “Earthquake victims are left alone about the demands for earthquake placements and municipal tents and the pre-existing anti-immigrant anti-immigration is getting higher during the disaster”, it was mentioned that registering and delivering aid through registration can also pose a problem.

### **There is a disconnection between ministry officials and local government representatives.**

The narrowing of the civilian area was

mentioned. It was said that the strength of solidarity was also high due to the high level of consciousness in the Izmir earthquake. It was mentioned that there is motivation for search and rescue, but it is a problem that all these are not gathered on one platform and there is no common plan. It was determined that the written document is much more functional for the public authority.

### **There is not an urban transformation in Turkey, there is a structural transformation instead.**

It was mentioned that the buildings were demolished for urban transformation, but the needs were ignored. It was said that there was a transformation per parcel instead of an urban transformation, and that the transformation was interrupted at the current point. It was mentioned that some districts have no land left, and their livability is destroyed, especially in metropolitan cities. It was suggested that population limitation and representation in this matter should be required.

### **Data about the earthquake should be kept under control with a mobile application.**

With an application similar to the HEPP application of the government, a proposal was made to act with data during and after the disaster. After saying that everyone should be kept under control with the mobile application; it was mentioned that it would be an important step for unity and solidarity that it is an application that includes all the data of earthquake victims, needs maps, building damage, traffic, and at the same time, showing which institutions and organizations are open to help.

### **Pedestrians and bicycles are required to reduce traffic.**

The importance of pedestrians and bicycles was mentioned after the earthquake. It was discussed that traffic and car-related problems should not be experienced, access to earthquake victims should be as fast as possible, and traffic should only be opened to ambulances and similar vehicles. An example was given of using bicycles and food distribution for street animals after the Izmir earthquake.

### **Volunteering stopped after AFAD came in Izmir earthquake.**

It was mentioned that many NGOs wanted to volunteer, and a proposal was made for a system where municipalities and NGOs are together. When AFAD arrived at the scene, it was discussed that volunteers and NGOs said, "your duty is over now". There have been views that the essential thing is to bring volunteers together.

### **Architectural regulations should change after the pandemic.**

It was said that there were people who did not want to sit in the high-rise building due to the earthquake, and that they did not want the living space to be crowded due to the pandemic. Considering the business centers, it was discussed that there is an air-conditioned environment, but now central systems are recommended. It was mentioned that there are now more criteria for urban transformation; so, the correct engineering should be done, and the right building system should be established on the right ground. It was agreed that the biggest problem in urban transformation is the property problem.

### **Food should be close to city centers.**

It was mentioned that with urbanization,

food is far away from food and that food is grown in places far from city centers. In terms of access to food, the proposal was made that production can be made in close areas in order to facilitate access. It was emphasized that the state and NGOs could not go beyond the "let's give food" approach in the food issue and that access became difficult. A proposal was made that roof gardening and production areas in the city could be developed by increasing smart home applications.

### **Sustainable food production should be supported.**

Suggestions were made to make sustainable life a focus, that is, a system where everyone produces their own food, seedlings, and a greenhouse system. "NGOs work where the funds point, so the funds should direct the civil society on this issue." criticism was made.

### **Campaigns that will make us feel the crisis and that we may find disturbing should be created.**

It was determined that there was a lack of establishing the link between consumption habits and the food crisis and that awareness should be raised in this sense. The emphasis was placed on suggestions that we should work with the needs and support of the field and create campaigns that will really make the crisis feel and perhaps disturbing, rather than using desk data.

### **Food: production, protection and market access, waste**

In the field of food, 3 main issues have been elaborated: production, protection and delivery, waste. In production, the issue of local ancestry seeds and fertilizers were emphasized, and it was mentioned that it is



a troublesome issue in terms of soil health. Solution areas such as soilless agriculture, renewable energies and permaculture were presented. The municipality conducted a study in Izmir for the issue of food processing, and it was mentioned that a tangerine processing center was established. It was pointed out that the irrigation issue should work together with the climate crisis. It was mentioned that the problem of shipping to the market is problematic and there may be broken packages while shipping. It was said that food communities could be a solution, that food transported to a single center was distributed from there, and emissions were prevented.

### **Syrian agricultural workers cannot access the products they produce.**

It was discussed that the producer could not reach the product he produced. Refugee agricultural workers and especially the Syrians living in Turkey, have no access to the products they produce. It was emphasized that in order to produce projects in this field, municipalities need resource support and the awareness of non-governmental organizations on this issue should be increased.

## **CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION**

As the YADA team organizing the square meetings, we would like to thank all our participants who came together with us at the Meydan meeting, where we talked about the role of civil society in different phases of disaster situations and its dialogue within itself and with stakeholders.

We agreed that the civil society should come together without excluding any segments and act together before, during and after the disaster. We talked about the

necessary policies and formations besides the mission of civil society; We focused on what is needed and what kind of ground should be prepared. It is seen that in the case of Turkey concerning disasters, the most prominent topic of discussion is earthquake, and events such as drought and floods are less common. In fact, we argued that such natural disasters can be less devastating before they turn into disasters when urban infrastructures are strengthened, cooperation between stakeholders is strengthened, and individuals are made aware of protection.

Along with these outputs, we continue to design different activities that will support the coexistence of civil society and the environment of dialogue and negotiation. In the upcoming days, we will continue to communicate with the institutions we met at the Meydan meetings whom we would like to see in our upcoming events we will talk around different topics and try different methods to encourage active participation. Let's meet at Meydan!

## \*APPENDIX: PARTICIPANT LIST (Names: A-Z)

INSTITUTION	NAME
IHH	Abdülkerim Erim
Van Çevre Environmental Protection Association, TÜRÇEV-Turkey Foundation for Environmental Education	Ali Kalçık
Teachers Academy Foundation	Anıl Derkuş
Mavi Kalem Association	Arzu Karacanlar
Sultanbeyli Municipality	Ayşe Atalay
İzmir Education Cooperative	Barış Özcan
The Four-Legged City	Başak Deniz Özdoğan
Right To Clean Air Platform	Buket Atlı
İzmir Education Cooperative	Burçak Temel
The Sustainability Steps Association	Doğa Tamer
Cevdet İnci Educational Foundation	Ecem Argüden
The Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (SGDD-ASAM)	Elif Atasal
The Sustainability Steps Association	Emrah Kurum
IHH	Emre Yerli
İzmir Metropolitan Municipality	Eray Alagözoğlu
Turkish Red Crescent Child Protection Center	Eray Yılmaz
Izmir City Council	Erdal Şimşek
The Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (SGDD-ASAM)	Esra Şimşir
	Fatih Çulhalık
City Detective - City and Child	Gizem Kıyıcı
Çanakkale Municipality	Gülşah Aktaşçı
Association for Children with Bionic Ears	Hatice Çankır
Goodness Association	Kanime Bektaş
Çanakkale Municipality	Metin Zengin
Directorate for EU Affairs	Murat Özçelebi
	Nevin Küçük
Social Disaster Association	Rezzak Elazat
Association for Children with Bionic Ears	Savaş Seyhan
Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG)	Seçil Özdemir
Save the Children	Selim Uysal
Istanbul Planning Agency	Semiha Turgut
TODAP	Siben Sabırlı

INSTITUTION	NAME
Barem	Sinan Egemen
Earthquake Reinforcement Association	Sinan Türkan
Directorate for EU Affairs	Sinem Bölükbaşı
Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning	Şeyda Toku
	Tuna Nurlu
Çanakkale Municipality	Utku Ersak
Quality in Social Responsibility Association	Ümit Yardım
Center for Spatial Justice	Yaşar Adnan Adanalı
Colorful Hopes Foundation	Yeter Erel Tuma
Anatolia Woman Association	Zübeyde Ozanözü
Civil Society Disaster Platform	Serhan Süzer
YADA Foundation	Aylin Ezgi Yılmaz
YADA Foundation	Ceylan Özünel
YADA Foundation	Elif Öztürk
YADA Foundation	Emine Uçak
YADA Foundation	İlknur Şahin
YADA Foundation	Rümeysa Çamdereli
YADA Foundation	Umut Erol