

# **Turkey**

## **Social Inclusion**

### **Global Thematic Report 2016**

**Period of reporting January 2016 – December 2016**



© UNICEF Turkey/2016/Feyzioglu

**Grant Ref No: SC149907**

**Prepared by: UNICEF Turkey**

**March 2017**



**Table of Contents**

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 4

II. STRATEGIC CONTEXT ..... 5

III. RESULTS IN THE OUTCOME AREA..... 6

IV. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS..... 11

V. FUTURE WORKPLAN ..... 13

VI. EXPRESSION OF THANKS..... 14

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<b>AFAD</b>	Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency
<b>CFC</b>	Child Friendly Cities
<b>CO</b>	Country Office
<b>CRM</b>	Child's rights monitoring
<b>CRPD</b>	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
<b>CWD</b>	Children with disabilities
<b>DPOs</b>	Disabled Peoples' Organizations
<b>GDP</b>	Gross Domestic Product
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organization
<b>MOFSP</b>	Ministry of Family and Social Policy
<b>PwDs</b>	People with disabilities
<b>NGOs</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>OECD</b>	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund

## **I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The social protection and resilience output of Turkey CO's programme is focusing on supporting the coverage of the Syrian and other refugee's inclusion in the social protection systems, supporting the Child Friendly Cities Initiative to build the capacity of local governments in contributing to the social inclusion needs of the various groups of children at local level and to combat against child labour, which is the most visible form of child poverty in Turkey. Due to the limited scope and coverage of the social protection mechanisms and increasing number of child workers, including its worst forms, in 2016, UNICEF Turkey office placed special emphasis on child workers within its social protection agenda.

Moreover, as described in last year's report, due to various shortcomings in services, environments and social attitudes, persons with disabilities are still observed to be excluded from some or many aspects of economic, social and cultural life in Turkey and are considered among the most vulnerable. Therefore, UNICEF Turkey has been working with the Government and various partners to fill the remaining institutional gaps by performing a NGO mapping of NGOs active in the area of children with disabilities and assessing their capacities.

To realize these strategic priorities, UNICEF cooperated with Government partners and NGOs to develop strategies and tools, to strengthen the social protection system at the local and national level, and to contribute to building the resilience of vulnerable Turkish and Syrian families to shocks, including responding to child labour and realizing the rights of children with disabilities.

The funding for the support of children with disabilities was received in 2015 and reported on at the beginning of 2016. UNICEF Turkey has received funding in 2016 for combatting child labour activities in the country. Overall, UNICEF Turkey has spent so far USD 3,084,759 for the social protection output of the Country Plan. Majority of the funding was utilized to support the Syrian children for their basic needs, including winter clothes and non-food items, through emergency funding (ORE).

Thematic funds helped the Turkey office to strengthen the systems, both at the national and local level, to support inclusion of child workers under social protection mechanisms and to address the supply side factors of labour market dynamics, contributing to the issue of child labour, which is often ignored or underfunded. Thematic funding was utilized to engage the private sector actors in the combat against child labour and promote child rights and business principles. Furthermore, the available thematic funds contributed addressing a critical bottleneck in the realization of the rights of vulnerable groups of children, in particular strengthening of the capacity of NGOs and DPOs to play their role of independent monitoring mechanism and to advocate for the child rights agenda, including the rights of children with disabilities. Specifically on the latter, out of the overall initial amount received in 2015, being

USD 15,037.59, there is approximately USD 5,000 left to be utilized for the final network meeting with the relevant partners.

## **II. STRATEGIC CONTEXT**

Turkey is an upper middle-income country with substantial capacities to uphold child rights. However, challenges related to disparities, inclusion, child poverty, child labour, child rights, gender discrimination and child marriage remain as well as gaps in access to quality inclusive education and protection from violence and abuse. Among the most vulnerable children are children with disabilities (CWDs), child workers, children in contact with the law, adolescent girls and boys and refugee children. Despite the economic growth, social spending in Turkey remains below 5% of the GDP, well below the OECD averages.

Needs of the children are often ignored or their best interests are not prioritized although children of Turkey composes one third of the overall population. According to the 2013 TURKSTAT data, over 30% of children are living in poverty (according to the 60% equalized median income) and do not have equitable access to services.

Turkey is hosting the largest number of refugees in the world today, with nearly 2.8 million Syrian refugees with temporary protection status – almost half of whom are children - and over 292,000 asylum-seekers and refugees from other countries.

As the Syrian conflict is now well into its 7th year, an increasing number of Syrian families revert to negative coping mechanisms such as child labour and child marriage among others. Unfortunately, there are no statistics available on children engaged in economic activities among the Syrians under temporary protection. However, field observations and other available information show that Syrian children do work in the same sectors and under similar conditions that Turkish children are working, including worst forms of child labour, i.e, in seasonal agriculture, in small-medium enterprises (such as textile workshops) and on the streets.

Combating child labour has been on the agenda of the Turkish Government since the beginning of the 1990s. Current figures portray a sharp decrease compared to the early 1990s. However, there are still approximately 850,000 children working in Turkey, in contrast to 3 million in the mid-1990s.

The most recent data available with regards to child labour in Turkey, Turkstat survey conducted in 2012, show that 44% of working children are engaged in seasonal agriculture, 24% in industry and 31% in services. The statistics also reveal that almost 50% of these children do not attend school and work more than 40 hours a week.

More than 45% of the working children cite “contributing to family income” as the main reason for their engagement in economic activity. This is followed by “contributing to the economic activity of the family” (28%) and “acquiring vocational skills” (15%). The values and rankings vary slightly when the data is disaggregated by urban and rural areas.

In the broader area of child rights and in particular the rights of children with disabilities, care and services are mostly provided in the family/community and not necessary directly to children. Institutionalization is comparatively limited and families are encouraged to take care in the home setting. Nevertheless, improved and significant efforts are made in ensuring access of people with disabilities to a wide ranged services. This may be particularly true for persons from low-income families or other disadvantaged or vulnerable population groups.

According to the Civil Society Development Centre (STGM) database, there are approximately 227 Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)/Disabled Peoples' Organizations (DPOs) working in the field of disability which are concentrated in three large provinces (Istanbul, Ankara and İzmir) of Turkey. However, there are very limited resources available on NGOs locations and areas of expertise except the database of Ministry of Interior or UNICEF database of NGOs in the field of violence against children (VAC). Therefore, the existing information about the organisational capacity of the NGOs is inadequate to inform targeted support aiming at strategic shifts in the area of children with disabilities. For these reasons UNICEF has undertaken the NGO mapping and survey which were conducted in 2016. The results are described in the following section.

### III. RESULTS IN THE OUTCOME AREA

The social protection and resilience output of Turkey CO's programme is focusing on supporting: 1) the coverage of the **Syrian and other refugee's inclusion in the social protection systems**; 2) the **Child Friendly Cities Initiative to build the capacity of local governments** in contributing to the social inclusion needs of the various groups of children at local level and 3) to combat against **child labour**, which is the most visible form of child poverty in Turkey. Furthermore, thematic funds contributed to achieving concrete results also in the area monitoring and strengthening the capacity of partners to work for realizing the **rights of people with disabilities**, specifically children.

#### 1. Syrian and other refugees' inclusion in the social protection systems

As a result of advocacy and the increased awareness on the need for resilience-building among Syrian and other refugees registered in Turkey, UNICEF and MoFSP discussed social protection measures for vulnerable refugees in Turkey. Along with other UN agencies and the Turkish Red Crescent, UNICEF participated in high-level and technical discussions on the strategy, design and operationalization of an Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) for refugees. The ESSN will be complemented by a conditional cash transfer programme for education developed by MoFSP, MoNE, TRC and UNICEF and targeting more than 200,000 children. This programme will be introduced in early 2017.

The latest thinking also informed a move away from supplies and clothing to predominantly cash-based assistance in winter support. Eligible families received vouchers or cash cards worth US\$100-300, depending on family size, for use in specified stores. During winter 2015-2016, UNICEF provided cash-based assistance to nearly 18,600 vulnerable Syrian families, benefitting

an estimated 58,000 children. In winter 2016-2017, over 31,200 families or approximately 96,000 children will be reached.

## **2. Child Friendly Cities**

Within the Child Friendly Cities framework, progress has been made in increasing the capacities of municipalities to uphold the rights of the most vulnerable children. A mapping exercise was conducted across the country to identify the strategic priorities of municipalities regarding children and understand their capacity needs for operationalizing these priorities. Special attention was paid to both Turkish and Syrians in South/Southeast Turkey and major urban areas, where many children are vulnerable. In partnership with the Ministry of Interior (MoI), a roadmap was prepared for local government capacity building, and support was provided to equip 40 municipalities for child-responsive policies and programmes, including child participation, child responsive budgeting, strategic planning and impact assessment. Additionally, municipalities were supported, in partnership with MoFSP, for the dissemination of good parenting skills programmes in the wider communities within the municipalities' rather than a project small-scale borders. The strategic decision to use the principles of CFC as an approach has proven to be successful with more ownership from the municipalities, more space to leverage resources and a much wider coverage.

## **3. Child Labour**

Due to the limited scope and coverage of the social protection mechanisms and increasing number of child workers, including its worst forms, in 2016, UNICEF Turkey office placed special emphasis on child workers within its social protection agenda. The desired impact of this work is to eliminate child labour and reduce child poverty, exploitation, and enhance social inclusion among child workers. Strategies are multiple and include a strong focus on engagement with private sector through various mechanisms such as joint platforms, i.e. global compact, occupational groups and chambers of industry and service to increase their awareness and advocate for the adoption of child rights and business principles throughout the supply chain.

Different forms of child labour require different interventions, while being part of an overall strategy. The principle behind interventions against child labour is that they should be carried out in an integrated manner and complement each other.

Based on available information and field visits, UNICEF Turkey proposes that an integrated approach, covering the pillars below, is required to combat child labour in Turkey.

- Strengthening social protection: main reason for child labour is poverty. As children work to contribute to the family income. This is an important reason why children are engaged in all of the economic activities mentioned above. Despite the fact that Turkey has a strong social protection system, the fragmented nature of it results in

non-coverage for a significant segment of vulnerable families. Additionally, Syrians living under temporary protection in Turkey have already depleted their resources and revert to negative coping mechanisms and child labour. Notwithstanding, some recent decisions to allow access for Syrian families to social protection mechanisms as well as work permit by law, the reality show that majority of the Syrians fall in between the cracks of the fragmented social protection system and remain in informal employment. Hence it is crucial to address poverty by building effective social safety nets for the most vulnerable families, complemented by additional education incentives, and by increasing opportunities for formal and decent work and other income generating activities.

- Revisiting business principles: Turkey is a party to all major international conventions targeting the elimination of child labour including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, ILO convention No. 138 on Minimum Wage and ILO Convention No. 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. National legal frameworks are in also in place banning child labour. However, there is a need to supplement the legislation with business principles by engaging with private sector. Business principles should be revisited to ensure child labour free production all along the supply chain.
- Addressing social norms: some social norms and discriminatory practices can constitute obstacles to the elimination of child labour. First of all, the negative effects of child labour are not well known. Even if some negative effects are recognized, it is often believed that the children will be better off in the future as they are acquiring vocational skills while working. Social norms also play an important part in terms of how child workers are perceived. Anecdotal evidence suggests that working children face discriminatory attitudes and practices from their peers and teachers, and that this is a significant factor which discourages them from attending school.
- Support to basic services and education: complementing the first three pillars that are targeting the root causes of child labour, this strategical pillar aims to reduce the harmful effects of child labour. Despite the fact that Turkey has high numbers of birth registration rates, children of the seasonal agricultural families are disproportionately represented among those who are not registered which is a major obstacle in front of the access to several government provided services such as health or financial aid. The issue becomes more critical among the Syrian population as they may face several obstacles to be under temporary protection allowing to benefit from several basic services. In terms of education, over 30% of the Syrian population are school-age children. Currently, 380.000 Syrian school-age children are still estimated to be out of school. Access and quality of education should be supported by accelerating formal schooling opportunities for all ages, as well as non-formal educational opportunities.



In partnership with a partner NGO, a child labour-focused case management toolkit was developed to guide the work of community centre managers and social workers, the toolkit was also disseminated to other NGOs in contact with child workers. A programme of awareness raising and ensuring that Turkish and Syrian child workers have access to available social protection measures and psychosocial support was expanded from one province to five. Collaboration with employers' organizations in relation with Good Business Principles will be accelerated in 2017. Evidence on child labour in seasonal agriculture generated through three studies will be available for programming and advocacy in 2017.

To realize these strategic priorities in a holistic fashion, UNICEF cooperated with Government partners and NGOs to develop strategies and tools, to strengthen the social protection system at the local and national level, and to contribute to building the resilience of vulnerable Turkish and Syrian families to shocks, including responding to child labour.

#### **4. Monitoring and providing quality data, knowledge and advocacy for child rights, with a focus on children with disabilities**

As reported in March 2016, thematic funds have contributed also to analyse the capacity of NGOs and DPOs through a mapping exercise, which also served as a baseline assessment for the below results framework. The study has been conducted in 2016 and revealed that the number of DPOs/NGOs which specifically target children with disabilities is low and services they provide are limited in scope (mainly treatment, care and habilitation services). It found out that majority of NGOs/DPOs participating in the survey have a clear understanding of the "social model" of disability; they carry out activities to raise awareness on the rights of PwDs; they have carried out effective and challenging advocacy for the development of legislation concerning the rights of the PwDs; and they have sought for ways to provide more qualified treatment, care and habilitation services. In short, both the survey and desk research revealed that civil society organisations have played a central role in the realisation of rights whether as service providers or as advocates challenging other key actors to fulfil their obligations. They can assume an even greater role in this respect.

However, the main problem expressed by DPOs working with PwDs is that social policies disregard PwDs as independent individuals but attach them to the family and the welfare of the family. This is in contrast to basic principles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and to the role of NGOs/DPOs in the realisation of all rights of the PwDs. The current policies mainly support charity-based approaches and weaken rights-based approaches and lead to a polarisation between DPOs platforms. DPOs/NGOs working for/with PwDs face serious capacity problems in terms of human resources, sustainable funding and knowledge of rights. Failing to receive support for their core activities, DPOs/NGOs supporting PwDs depend on service provision and projects for the sustainability of daily activities. Having a limited capacity and being dependent on public funds for services, for example treatment, care, training and habilitation services to a limited number of PwDs, including children, in isolated environments or to repetitive projects, DPOs/NGOs cannot carry out an effective advocacy for the realisation of all rights of PwDs as defined in CRPD. The context in which DPOs/NGOs operate

hinders effectiveness in transforming both the target groups and the government and thus fail to cause a change in the lives of PwDs.

Other human rights and child rights NGOs may also play a key role in promoting the rights of persons with disabilities, including the children, on the basis of core human rights conventions. However, currently there is no notable connection between these organisations and DPOs/NGOs working for PwDs. Incorporating these organizations into any kind of collaborative work will multiply knowledge and experience and lead to more effective results.

## **Lessons Learnt and Challenges**

Turkey has been influenced by the largest humanitarian crisis after Second World War and has been hosting the largest refugee population in the world. The extensive number of additional vulnerable population has resulted in a heavy burden on the services provided by the Government authorities not covering refugees and vulnerable Turkish children.

Turkey CO has continued strengthening systems of Turkey to support the social protection system in order to facilitate the inclusion of children in the existing mechanisms in a quality manner, including absorption of the refugee children. Other focuses included sensitizing the system to specific vulnerabilities, such as refugees, and strengthening the system's capacity to be shock responsive.

Additionally, partnering with civil society facilitated the process to share the burden with the government and to build the capacity of the civil society actors in contributing to the social inclusion of children as Turkey passes through a major refugee crisis.

Related to the child labour agenda, partnering with private sector has showed initial but promising results especially in targeting the demand side factors in tackling with child labour issue. Raising awareness of the private sector on the harms of work on children and engaging them in the combat against child labour will continue to be a major strategy for UNICEF Turkey CO in 2017.

In terms of supporting the rights of children with disabilities, it became evident that DPOs/NGOs need structured capacity development, including continuous and targeted training on legislations and rights, and on organisational capacity building (fundraising, media trainings, volunteer programmes, etc) in order to increase the effectiveness of their activities and reach out to the target groups. Secondly, mainly due to capacity problems, NGOs/DPOs working for different types of disabilities have not been able to establish a sustainable network of collaboration among themselves. Lack of an enabling environment for communication and sharing of information and experiences results in duplication of efforts, weak advocacy, failure to reach all target groups, in ineffective trainings and other activities. Although certain platforms are established under various projects or with the initiatives of rights-based organisations, past experiences show that the platforms might become inactive after the project ended, or when they are unable to find funding for activities, or their activities are limited to the contributions by a low number of organisations which have the capacity to carry out monitoring/ advocacy activities.

In 2016, progress was realised on several key issues, in spite of political developments and rapid turnover of public officials which caused delays in some programmes. The agreement between Turkey and EU has resulted in channeling additional resources to Turkey to support the social protection system in Turkey, however, the dependency on these funds, while the political environment, especially the relationship between Turkey and EU countries, is still very volatile, creates constant indeterminacy in terms of planning programmes. Additionally, considering the short lifespan of the emergency funding hinders longer-term, sustainable programmes in the areas in social protection and inclusion, which by nature require long-term investments that would bring results in long term results.

#### IV. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The estimated planned budget, RR/ORR for the Social protection and resilience output for 2016 was USD 250,000.

**Table 1: Planned budget by outcome area 7 Social Inclusion**

Intermediate Results	Funding type	Planned budget
Unknown	RR	-
	ORR	250,000

However, the final utilized amount, which includes ORE was USD 6,363,994 (see Table\*). The generous contribution of several funding partners and ORE donors, including UNICEF National Committees, individuals and traditional donors, enabled UNICEF to fully fund the requirements for 2016. The funding received directly from the Netherlands National Committee for UNICEF for the social inclusion outcome is USD 249,248.25, as per the table below.

**Table 2: Country-level thematic contributions to outcome area 7 received in 2016**

Donors	Grant Number	Contribution Amount	Programmable Amount
Netherlands Committee for UNICEF	SC1499070015	249,248.25	236,785.84
<b>Total</b>		<b>249,248.25</b>	<b>236,785.84</b>

**Table\* - Funding planned vs. Funding received in 2016 (including emergency funding)**

Organizational Target	Activity	Funding Type	Planned (USD)	Received (USD)
07-02 Social protection and child poverty	Social protection for refugees (including winterization and NFIs)	RR		
		ORR		
		ORE	5,441,368	5,441,368
	Addressing Child Labour	RR		
		ORR	533,079	195,945
		ORE	-	337,134
	Local Governance	RR	-	-

07-03 Public finance and local governance	ORR	389,547	202,349
	ORE	-	187,198

The humanitarian crisis in Syria, the Syrian refugees in Turkey and funds made available to Turkey office from humanitarian funding sources made it possible to fund programme activities which were originally planned in the 3RP from humanitarian funding.

**Table 3: Expenditure in the outcome area – social inclusion**

Organizational Targets	Type of Funding			
	Expenditure Amount			
	Other Resources - Emergency	Other Resources - Regular	Regular Resources	All Programme Accounts
07-02 Social protection and child poverty	2,176,711	409,393	-	2,586,104
07-03 Public finance and local governance	363,600	61,318	73,737	498,655
07-06 Economic and social policy general	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,540,311</b>	<b>470,711</b>	<b>73,737</b>	<b>3,084,759</b>

UNICEF Turkey has spent 3,084,759 USD for the social protection output of the Country Plan with a view to strengthen social protection and resilience of systems and populations.

Thematic funds helped the Turkey office to strengthen the social protection systems, both at the national and local level, to support inclusion of child workers under social protection mechanisms and to address the supply side factors of labour market dynamics, contributing to the issue of child labour, which is often ignored or underfunded. Thematic funding was utilized to engage the private sector actors in the combat against child labour and promote child rights and business principles. The following tables provide more information on the financial implementation.

**Table 4: Thematic expenses by programme area**

Organizational Targets	Expenditure amount	
	ORE	ORR
07-02 Social protection and child poverty	370,664	37,838
07-03 Public finance and local governance	13	300
07-06 Economic and social policy general	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>370,677</b>	<b>38,138</b>

**Table 5: Expenses by Specific Intervention Codes**

Specific Intervention Codes	Expenses
07-02-02 Social Protection # support to social protection programme and systems	65,144
07-02-04 Social Protection # accountability and participation mechanisms	80,897
07-02-10 Social Protection # General	1,802,914
07-02-15 Child Poverty # General	341,707
07-03-06 Support to local government budget planning and management	418,759
08-01-01 Country programme process	226
08-01-06 Planning # General	13,132
08-02-01 Situation Analysis or Update on women and children	248
08-02-08 Monitoring # General	871
08-03-01 Cross-sectoral Communication for Development	34,191
08-05-01 Supply # General	938
08-09-06 Other # non-classifiable cross sectoral activities	93,021
08-09-10 Brand building and visibility	124
08-09-11 Emergency preparedness and response (General)	12,763
09-03-02 Transparency of information and documentation	14,358
09-05-02 Humanitarian performance monitoring	732
10-07-12 Management and Operations support at CO	204,733
5902 Operating costs to support multiple OTs within FA5	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,084,759</b>

## V. FUTURE WORKPLAN

UNICEF Turkey will continue working in the area of social protection and resilience as per the Country Programme Document agreed between UNICEF and the Government of Turkey. The work will focus on the increased access to social protection mechanisms by the Syrians and other refugees in Turkey while strengthening vulnerable Turkish refugees. UNICEF will continue to step up its efforts to address child labour and to support local governance systems to be child responsive. Furthermore, UNICEF Turkey will utilize the USD 5,000 left from the 2015 contribution for organizing a preparatory meeting for the establishment of an NGO network on protection of child rights, with focus on children with disabilities, as a follow up of the survey and NGO mapping finalized at the end 2016.

As mentioned earlier, emergency funding against the 3RP broadens the Turkey office's fiscal space in terms of responding to the immediate social protection needs of the Syrian and other refugees residing in Turkey. However, emergency funding streams are required for specific interventions with short lifespans and are not flexible to be used for broader and more sustainable plans to strengthen the systems in the country. Therefore, such interventions will require longer term planning with the involvement of multiple parties and hence long term predictable funding that allows for innovative programming.

The estimated funding needs are USD 38,177,192 out of which USD 35,100,067 have already been received. 96% of the funding received comes from allocations to the emergency response in Syria.

**Table 6: Planned budget and available resources for 2017**

Organizational Target	Activity	Funding Type	Planned (USD)	Funded (USD)	Shortfall (USD)
07-02 Social protection and child poverty	Social protection for refugees (including winterization and NFIs)	RR	-	-	-
		ORR	80,000	-	80,000
		ORE	30,638,292	28,412,167	2,226,125
	Addressing Child Labour	RR	50,000	50,000	-
		ORR	1,121,000	430,000	691,000
		ORE	507,900	507,900	-
07-03 Public finance and local governance	Local Governance	RR	130,000	130,000	-
		ORR	150,000	70,000	80,000
		ORE	-	-	-
Sub-total Regular Resources			<b>180,000</b>	<b>180,000</b>	-
Sub-total Other Resources - Regular & Emergency			<b>32,497,192</b>	<b>29,420,067</b>	<b>3,077,125</b>
<b>Total for 2017</b>			<b>32,677,192</b>	<b>29,600,067</b>	<b>3,077,125</b>

## VI. EXPRESSION OF THANKS

UNICEF Turkey expresses its sincere appreciation to all the donors that have supported our work in the social inclusion focus area and have made possible the results described in this report. Such generous support contributed to the Social Inclusion Thematic Area through humanitarian funding. Thematic funding provides greater flexibility and allows longer term planning and sustainability of programmes in order to achieve our planned results. UNICEF also expresses its gratitude to all its partners including the Ministry of Family and Social Policy, Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Ministry of Interior, AFAD, civil society organizations, and employer associations which contributed to the successful results achieved in 2016.

### Report Feedback Form

UNICEF is working to improve the quality of our reports and would highly appreciate your feedback. Kindly answer the questions below for the above-mentioned report. Thank you!  
Please return the completed form back to UNICEF by email to:

Name: Lieke Van De Wiel, UNICEF Turkey Deputy Representative  
Email: [lvandewiel@unicef.org](mailto:lvandewiel@unicef.org)

\*\*\*

**SCORING:** 5 indicates “highest level of satisfaction” while  
0 indicates “complete dissatisfaction”

1. To what extent did the narrative content of the report conform to your reporting expectations? (For example, the overall analysis and identification of challenges and solutions)

5

4

3

2

1

0

If you have not been fully satisfied, could you please tell us what we missed or what we could do better next time?

2. To what extent did the fund utilization part of the report meet your reporting expectations?

5

4

3

2

1

0

If you have not been fully satisfied, could you please tell us what we missed or what we could do better next time?

3. To what extent does the report meet your expectations in regard to the analysis provided, including identification of difficulties and shortcomings as well as remedies to these?

5

4

3

2

1

0

If you have not been fully satisfied, could you please tell us what we could do better next time?

4. To what extent does the report meet your expectations with regard to reporting on results?

5

4

3

2

1

0

If you have not been fully satisfied, could you please tell us what we missed or what we could do better next time?

5. Please provide us with your suggestions on how this report could be improved to meet your expectations.

6. Are there any other comments that you would like to share with us?

**Thank you for filling this form.**