



Inter-Agency
Coordination
Turkey

Basic Needs Working Group

Meeting Minutes

Time & location:	11 April 2019, Watan Office, Gaziantep
Chaired by:	Ahmet Ünver (UNHCR) and Hiba Hanano (WFP)
Participants:	Emre Hakyemez (UNDP), Ahmed Ekzeyaz (FAO), Özgür Savaşcıoğlu (UNHCR), Gonca Savaş (WFP), Şura Ermistekin (WFP), Merve Ağcabay (WATAN), Hanifi Kinaci (TRC), Mohanad Ameen (IOM), Nader Alali (WATAN), Rafeef Oflazoglu (CARE), Mohamad Taher Kurdie (GIZ), Mohammad Bakkar (WATAN), Özlem İntizamoğlu (WHH), Dolunay Uğur (Yale University), Onur Özdemir (TRC)
Agenda:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Welcome & Introductions2. Action Points from the Previous Meeting3. Review: Basic Needs and Livelihoods Joint Meeting4. Environment and Basic Needs5. AOB<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Finalized BNWG Priority Plan 2019 and ToRb. Evaluation Survey Results of IM Training Sessionsc. Discussion on FGD compensation and harmonizationd. Discussions on access/barriers to language training



AGENDA POINT	DISCUSSION	ACTION POINTS
Welcome and introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ UNHCR & WFP chairs welcomed working group members▪ Members were informed that a resident WFP co-chair will start on duty in coming weeks and take over coordination in SE.▪ The meeting agenda was introduced and accepted without changes.	
Action Points from the Previous Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A BNWG ToR link will be shared with members – <i>ToRs are revised in February, 2019, endorsed to STF on March 2019 and shared with all members In April 2019</i>▪ A BNWG ToR in Turkish will be shared with members – <i>Turkish-English version of ToR is shared with members in April 2019</i>▪ Links for all relevant 2018 documents will be shared – <i>Done ✓</i>▪ Members prepare handouts for sharing with members – <i>Pending – Due June</i>▪ Request «information sharing spot» from coordinators – <i>Pending – Due June</i>▪ Members reminded to keep data up to date on Services Advisor – <i>Continuing</i>▪ Members to share capacity development and training needs – <i>A survey will be conducted to identify capacity development needs of members</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">→ Online capacity development needs survey to be conducted→ Members nominate their organisation for information sharing spot in June meeting
Review: Basic Needs and Livelihoods Joint Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Basic Needs and Livelihoods working groups held a joint meeting on transition on 20 March in Ankara, which aimed to take stock on the ongoing and joint sectoral activities that will support transition, and referrals on the way forward.▪ Main point of the meeting was presentation from MoFLSS on the “Exit Strategy from the ESSN Program”. It can accessed from here.▪ Coordinators set the scene by giving a quick recap of sector priorities and figures, which followed by outlaying purpose of transition, and challenges associated with it.	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Lead agencies present their work that they have undertaken to support the process of transition. Meeting provided in-depth understanding of the exit strategy of MoFLSS and a platform for members to raise issues, and address questions to relevant actors of transition.▪ MoFLSS presentation brought out that clear timeline is not set, social assistance will not be stopped rapidly, process should be regarded as a graduation rather than transition, and that FRIT II will bring more clarity to future planning.	
Environment & Basic Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>FSA colleague</i> made a presentation regarding integrating environment into the basic needs refugee response. Presentation aimed to respond to questions such as “what is environmental mainstreaming?” and “why mainstream environment?”▪ Environmental mainstreaming is to manage/mitigate negative environmental impacts, to identify/maximise positive environmental impacts as well as consume natural resources sustainably.▪ Goal of the integration of environmental into the program is to increase the accountability, effectiveness and sustainability of the activities of the project.▪ Negative environmental impacts have long term outcomes and irreversible. There are several examples in the world that humanitarian crisis and population influx resulted in deterioration of the environment.▪ Refugees can also bring positive environmental effect to the hosting community by engaging various activities. Environment is one of the main pillar to enhancing social cohesion.▪ Currently in Turkey, strategy and program development does not consider environment. There is also no environmental impact nor risk assessment. Relevant actors of environment are not engaged in the response.▪ Deterioration of the environment, increased competition for natural resources, stretched services or drop in quality of service etc can lead to social tension and result in loss of social cohesion.	



- There are several key environmental issues that concern BN sector such as
 - Increase in **solid and liquid waste generation** due to increased population or distribution activities
 - Water and soil pollution associated with **poor wastewater and sewage management**
 - **Pressures** on water resources associated with water provisioning
 - **Public health risks** associated with poor environmental sanitation
 - Poor shelter conditions increasing energy consumption for heating/cooling.
- Humanitarian activities that can minimize negative environmental impact are shared and discussed with members that included: cash-based interventions where applicable to avoid negative impact of distributions, awareness raising for refugees, host communities and response actors, leaning towards sustainability in procurement, facilitation of platforms and channels through which community can address their concerns to relevant actors regarding environment.
- Municipalities have been undertaking large responsibility in the response from the beginning of the crisis. There were several challenges for the municipalities; service delivery was stretched beyond its capacity, funding was not suited to host additional population with the crisis, legal framework did not bring clarity for use of municipal resources for refugees, municipalities had limited resources to increase access to services in order to ensure inclusiveness, and supporting social cohesion in several dimensions was also responsibility of municipalities.
- 3RP in an increasing trend, has been aiming to support municipal services through projects and activities. These activities target to support municipal service delivery infrastructures and also strengthen response mechanisms.
- **UNDP colleague** presented that UNDP had been putting projects in place to support municipalities of Eastern Turkey cities with management of environmental impact of the crises.



- UNDP has an approach of Coping, Recovering and Transforming. Coping is the immediate response which includes provision of equipment/infrastructure support. Recovering involves introduction of new service delivery methods and technology. Transforming helps increase efficiency and also access to resources and external funding by Optimization of Project Management Systems.
- Currently UNDP implements in 4 cities; Şanlıurfa, Gaziantep, Kilis and Hatay.
- Completed project have supported waste management, waste water management and also with vehicles such fire trucks and backhoe loaders
- Ongoing project again targets supporting waste management, waste water management and technical capacity improvement.

- Highlights of the discussions by members following the presentation were:
 - Cash-based interventions can be defined as more environmental friendly compared to distributions
 - Environment should be mainstreamed to planning/programming
 - Many environmental friendly solutions that would reduce negative impact can be integrated into current shelter/wash projects such as renewable energy, reuse of waste water, use of sustainable materials etc
 - Partners of response are rather “shy” in environment, not openly discussing the impacts nor integrating feasible solutions to their implementations
 - In order to establish and maintain social cohesion, environment is a key variable. Environment can contribute to or hinder social cohesion
 - Awareness raising for all relevant actors and beneficiaries on zero waste or waste reduction can be provided
 - Municipalities can be supported with infrastructure and also technical capacity in order to prevent actions during emergency responses (such as wild dumping, contamination of water resources etc)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Environment Workshop from last year brought out that implementing actors in the response do not have budget and technical capacity to mainstream environment into their implementation. Also it brought out that environment is not a concern for donors. 	
Inter-sector Consultation Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sector coordinators briefed the inter-sector consultation process and introduced the five consultation questions. Members expressed their preference to discuss the questions and populate the answers internally, back at their organisations, following the meeting, 	→ Members to respond consultation questions, which will be sent via email following April cycle.
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sector coordinators briefed members on purpose of revision and finalisation of ToR, and introduced Turkish-English ToR. ▪ Sector coordinators briefed members on finalised BNWG Priority Plan 2019 ▪ IM presented findings of IM Training Sessions Evaluation Survey. 53% of the participants responded to the evaluation. Overall evaluation was positive, feedbacks were noted by IM. 	
AOB - FGD Compensation and Harmonization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Members commented that money should not be provided to FGD beneficiaries since it is expected to be a voluntary process. It is an acceptable and common practice to provide snacks, and depending on the situation, compensate cost of transportation (preferably in-kind). ▪ Making daily payments to refugees for FGDs would make management of these consultations difficult, such as inflated demand for FGDs etc. 	
AOB - Access/Barriers to Language Trainings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Members agreed that there still are barriers against acquiring Turkish language for refugees and there are several different reasons. ▪ There are several actors that provide Turkish courses; however, there is high drop-out rates. 	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Flexible course hours are not provided to refugees. Working refugees have very limited option to follow a Turkish course regularly. Turkish training with allowance might be a solution, so that refugees can attend full-time.▪ The problem might be that learning Turkish is not mandatory unlike European countries. Uncertainty and lack of medium or long term plans result in refugees not engaging and investing in language learning.▪ TRC survey brought out that in SE Turkey, Arabic speakers can manage without learning Turkish since there are locals speak Arabic.▪ Collecting feedback to establish a deeper understanding on why refugees drop out or do not benefit from language courses.▪ Lack of practice on teaching Turkish to foreigners and lack of materials hindered success of language courses.	
	Next meeting: 13 June 2019, TBD, Gaziantep	