



MOZAIK
TURKEY MOZAIK FOUNDATION

Kahramanmaraş Earthquake Emergency Relief Fund

NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT

February 2024

Turkey Mozaik Foundation

Introduction

It has been one year since devastating earthquakes struck Türkiye, affecting more than 15 million people across 11 provinces. Turkey Mozaik Foundation launched the Kahramanmaras Earthquake Emergency Relief Fund within the first few hours of the disaster.

Thanks to the generosity of our donors, we have so far supported 92 projects run by carefully selected civil society organisations (CSOs) to provide immediate relief and contribute to the long-term recovery of survivors. For an overview of our initiatives and results, please read our [**Kahramanmaras Earthquake Emergency Relief Fund 12-Month Impact Report**](#).

Our commitment to the affected regions goes beyond mere emergency relief. To truly facilitate the rebuilding process and the sustainable recovery of survivors, it's necessary to extend our support to local CSOs embedded in these communities for years to come.

As Turkey Mozaik Foundation, we have prioritised gathering real-time data on evolving needs directly from local CSOs and experts on the ground since earthquakes struck, in order to maximise our impact and make the best use of our donors' contributions.

Our intermediary local partner, the [Support Foundation for Civil Society](#) (Sivil Toplum için Destek Vakfı - STDV) **conducted a comprehensive survey** to gain invaluable insights into the pressing challenges and ongoing needs across the earthquake affected regions. The findings of this survey have been instrumental in aligning our strategies with the evolving needs of the CSOs and communities, and shaping our plans for 2024. This is a summary of the findings of the report.

Context and Methodology

In the aftermath of the earthquakes, with the financial support of Turkey Mozaik Foundation, STDV quickly engaged local CSOs in the affected regions, including past and present grantee organisations, experts, and other CSOs in the field. This strategic approach enabled us to gain crucial and reliable information about the reality on the ground. In the following months, alongside regular meetings, monitoring and evaluation methods and tools were utilised to assess the impact of the grants. The insights gathered via these tools have informed the structure and focus of our existing and consequent grants, tailoring them to the evolving needs of the region.

Using a similar approach, STDV conducted an online needs assessment survey in December 2023 to understand the problems faced in the field and the short- and long-term needs identified. Recognising the intense workload of the CSOs, the survey was kept as short as possible and consisted of two main sections: questions about the CSOs' activities in the earthquake-affected regions and questions about their plans, needs and suggestions for the future.

Survey Findings

The survey form was distributed by STDV on December 15, 2023, to 75 CSOs that received grants from the Kahramanmaraş Earthquake Emergency Relief Fund. The survey was open for 10 days and answered by 35 organisations.

Of the 35 CSOs that responded to the survey (26 associations, 8 foundations and 1 cooperative), **37.2% have their headquarters in the provinces directly affected by the earthquakes**. Among the other provinces where the headquarters of these CSOs are located, Istanbul ranks first with %42.9.

Table 1. Provinces where CSOs operate

Provinces	Frequency
Hatay	12
Adiyaman	9
Kahramanmaraş	8
Malatya	4
Gaziantep	4
Adana	4
Diyarbakır	4
Şanlıurfa	4
Mersin	3
İstanbul	2
Ankara	1
Bitlis	1
Elazığ	1
İzmir	1
Kilis	1
Osmaniye	1
Mardin	1
TOTAL	61

Most organisations were operating in multiple cities (mean 3.17), while the most frequently mentioned provinces were **Hatay, Adiyaman, and Kahramanmaraş, respectively**. The earthquake related work that are outside of the earthquake region targets earthquake survivors migrated to these cities.

According to the survey, **more than 80% of the CSOs have been working in the earthquake-affected regions for over 7 months**. Given the ongoing challenges of accessing services and meeting basic needs in temporary shelters and that most CSO headquarters are located in other cities, it is clear how difficult it is for CSO staff and volunteers to continue their work in the earthquake zone. The CSO staff and volunteers that lived together and engaged with affected communities since the early days of the earthquake, despite the challenges, have also acquired unique and valuable insight and expertise.

Table 2. Duration of CSOs' work in the earthquake-affected regions

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
9-10 months	25	71.4	71.4
7-8 months	5	14.3	85.7
5-6 months	2	5.7	91.4
3-4 months	2	5.7	97.1
1-2 months	1	2.9	100,0
Total	35	100	

CSOs working in the field often find themselves not only addressing needs related to their areas of expertise, but also responding to interrelated and different areas based on the needs that emerge on the spot on the ground. Through STDV's interviews with the grantee organisations, it was found that CSOs achieve more meaningful results when their work is in line with their expertise. It was also observed that trying to constantly adapt to suddenly emerging and changing needs can be a demanding process that negatively impacts CSOs' working models and human resources.

Table 3. Areas of focus of CSOs

Areas of focus	Frequency
Psychosocial support	22
Needs assessment	18
Humanitarian aid coordination / distribution	17
Educational support	13
Access to healthcare	11
Food assistance	10
Community building	9
Economic development	9
Improvement of shelter areas	8
Coordination of civil society efforts	5
Environment / Ecology related efforts	4
Rebuilding and reconstruction	4
Search & rescue	1
Legal support	1

CSOs are primarily engaged in activities related to psychosocial support, needs assessment, humanitarian aid coordination/distribution, educational support and access to healthcare, community building, economic development, and improvement of shelter areas. While search and rescue efforts were intense in the early days of the earthquakes, legal support activities, which gained importance later, are relatively less prominent.

Most of the CSOs reported having more than 2 target groups (mean 2.5), with the **primary target groups being children, women, youth, and CSOs/staff** (Table 4). The inclusion of youth, older people, and foster families (caregivers) in this list can be attributed to STDV's support for projects targeting these groups through thematic funds launched in collaboration with Turkey Mozaik Foundation and other donors. The responses also highlight the need support access to education with a holistic approach including all related target groups such as children, students, teachers, and caregivers.

One in four of the respondents identified CSOs / staff as a target group in their work shows that selected CSOs prioritised the well being of the people who work on the field.

Table 4. Target groups of CSOs

Target groups	Frequency
Children	22
Women	19
Youth	9
CSOs / staff	9
Foster families (caregivers)	7
Students	6
People living in poverty	5
Older people	4
Refugees	4
People with disabilities	4
Local governments / staff	3
Teachers	2
LGBTI+s	1

Nearly all participating CSOs **stated that they have developed various collaborations and partnerships**. Table 5 below shows that cooperation with CSOs and local organisations in the province where the fieldwork was carried out and with CSOs from other provinces is prominent. Collaboration with the private sector and public institutions was quite limited. This can be seen as a potential barrier to the sustainability of projects and to ensuring the necessary coordination on the ground.

Table 5. Collaborations and partnerships developed by CSOs

Types of institutions	Frequency
CSOs / local organisations in the province where fieldwork is carried out	28
CSOs from other provinces	15
Local governments	9
Public institutions	7
Private sector	5
Universities	1
Did not develop collaborations / partnerships	1

Table 6 shows that the most commonly encountered issue by the CSOs has been the **uncertainty related to the procedures required for obtaining official permits** for conducting work. Especially smaller CSOs and initiatives engaged in rights-based activities reported facing more problems in this regard compared to larger CSOs with recognised expertise and/or close relationships with the public institutions. The difficulty in finding a responsible counterpart in public institutions, which ranks relatively high, can also be considered a significant issue related to permit procedures.

Table 6. Problems encountered by CSOs

Problem areas	Frequency
Permit procedures for conducting work	14
Difficulty in securing funds / resources	10
Issues with data sharing	10
Rapidly changing needs / Lack of regular needs assessment	9
Transportation, logistics, and accommodation issues	9
Difficulty in finding a responsible counterpart in public institutions	8
Sustainability of volunteering	8
Lack of coordination with local governments	7
Lack of adequate support for maintaining the well-being of staff / volunteers	6
Lack of coordination in CSOs activities	5
Adverse conditions affecting participation in activities (problems with internet connection, lack of privacy in container homes, and language barriers / lack of interpreters)	3
Organisational problems	2
Security issues	2

Another significant challenge, ranking high on the list, is **the difficulty in securing funds/resources**. This issue may be associated with the insufficient capacity of CSOs in terms of time, expertise, and human resources dedicated to fundraising as they have been fully involved with ground work. Additionally, it could be explained by the decrease in resources allocated to earthquake relief over time and the lack of support for the sustainability of local initiatives.

The lack of efforts to identify rapidly changing needs and the problems regarding data sharing should be considered together. The absence of such efforts may be related to insufficient allocation of resources to these areas and/or limited competence of CSOs in using digital tools. Notably, when CSOs were asked to share field/needs assessment reports they contributed to and/or benefit from, about half of them shared nearly 50 documents, none of which were prepared by public institutions in this field.

Participating CSOs expressed **the need for more effective coordination with both local governments and other CSOs**. The sustainability of volunteering is also frequently cited as an area of concern. This may be explained by the difficulty for individuals who initially travelled from other provinces to provide support in the affected regions to sustain their efforts, and/or a loss of interest in the region over time. However, it is important not to overlook the continuing challenges related to transport, logistics, security, and accommodation, as well as the lack of adequate support for maintaining the well-being of volunteers/staff and insufficient support for strengthening the capacity of local institutions in this regard, all of which have a negative impact.

Finally, CSOs also highlighted issues affecting survivors, such as problems with internet connection, lack of privacy in container homes, and language barriers/lack of interpreters.

CSOs were also asked about **their intentions to continue working in the affected regions** if they could secure sufficient funding. As shown in Table 7 below, only one organisation indicated no intention to continue, while 75% expressed their desire to sustain their efforts for 5 years or even longer, as long as the needs persisted. During our Study Visit to Istanbul in July 2023, representatives of CSOs, particularly those working in humanitarian aid, emphasised that **at least a 10-year commitment is needed to repair the losses in the region**. This highlights the importance of providing long-term support in the earthquake-affected areas. This finding is also in parallel with previous natural disaster related work that we provided grants to such as the wildfires in 2021, and the Izmir and Elazığ Earthquakes in 2020.

Table 7. Estimated duration of CSOs' activities in the earthquake-affected regions

Duration	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
More than 5 years (as long as the needs persist)	24	68.6	68.6
5 years	1	2.9	71.5
3-4 years	3	8.6	80.1
1-2 years	6	17.1	97.2
Not intending to continue	1	2.9	100.0
Total	35	100.0	

Given the economic conditions in Türkiye and the shrinking civic space, **financial sustainability emerges as a priority area of need**, particularly in the context of the earthquakes. 91.4% of respondents stated that they would not be able to carry out their work, indicating that their activities would not be possible without our grant support. Grantees also noted that the flexibility to revise project activities and budget allocations according to the needs of the field enabled them to use resources more efficiently.

CSOs emphasised the vital role of our grants as a first step, pointing out that once they were up and running, **their chances of finding new resources also increased**. Some CSOs expressed difficulties in finding support for the continuation of their projects, and stated that the availability of our Kahramanmaraş Earthquake Emergency Relief Fund to provide additional grants for ongoing projects was beneficial to them.

Table 8. Organisational development needs of CSOs

Areas of need	Average
Financial sustainability	4.7
Networking and partnership building	4.4
Organisational management	4.3
Communications	4.2
Measurement and evaluation	4.1
Collaboration with volunteers	3.9
Project management	3.7

Table 8 shows that CSOs' main organisational needs are **financial sustainability, networking and partnership building, and organisational management**. CSOs also reported that they are more effective and sustainable when they are able to build cooperation and partnerships, showcasing that efforts to develop capacity in networking and partnership building in a holistic approach is critical.

It is important to note that in 2023, STDV's Institutional Fund, also supported by Turkey Mozaik Foundation, accepted applications from organisations newly established in the same year. Particularly in provinces where civil society activities were limited before the earthquakes, we observed that local groups were setting up new initiatives and associations. These associations indicated that they needed more support to develop their structures, areas of work, and approaches.

CSOs also highlighted their organisational development needs in the area of communications. The need to communicate the work being done on the ground was seen as a critical need interlinked with other areas such as financial sustainability, networking and partnership building, advocacy and lobbying.

Participants were also asked to identify their top 3 most urgent needs and which of these needs they believed would continue in the long term (beyond 2025).

Table 9. Urgent needs and problems identified by CSOs

Areas of need and problems	Frequency
Problems in temporary shelter areas	14
Regular data collection, sharing, reporting	11
Lack of coordination	11
Access to education	10
Continuation of psychosocial support activities	8
Lack of organisational / individual capacity	7
Uncertainty in rebuilding / reconstruction processes; lack of transparency / participation	5
Access to healthcare	5
Inclusivity	5
Infrastructure and transportation	4
Sustainability of activities	4
Ecological / environmental issues	4
Financial development / unemployment	4
Participation	2
Permit processes	2
Lack of advocacy efforts	2
Poverty	1
Migration	1

The most frequently raised issue was **the problems in temporary shelter areas**. CSOs highlighted both the unhealthy and unsafe conditions of container cities and problems related to access to basic rights such as education, health, and work. Issues such as access to clean water and hygiene problems were described as health-threatening factors, while vulnerability to natural events such as cold weather and flooding were also

used to describe the sites. Responses also indicated that there are still groups without access to even container cities and individuals who have not received assistance because their buildings have been assessed as “moderately damaged”. It was also highlighted that those working in the region were not exempt from shelter problems. Another risk associated with temporary shelters was living in containers of between 13-18 square metres, which violated individuals' right to privacy. They also stressed that the shared living spaces in container cities remain risky and unsafe for children and women.

In their responses about the challenges they face, CSOs highlighted two key issues: **the absence of efforts to identify rapidly changing and evolving needs, as well as issues related to data sharing**. Similarly, when discussing the primary needs in the affected regions, CSOs emphasised problems with data collection, sharing, and reporting. CSOs pointed out that even basic information about people in temporary shelters, like age, disabilities, gender, and other details, is often missing. They stressed the need for more participatory assessments, better coordination, and improved use of technology by organisations in the field, as the current limitations negatively impact data-related processes. Issues in data collection, sharing, and reporting not only hinder the ability to respond quickly to needs and lead to inconsistencies in service provision and distributions but also make it impossible to effectively monitor the impact of the efforts.

Takeaways of Turkey Mozaik Foundation from the Survey

Based on the findings of this report, we will:

1. Continue to provide financial support, including core support, as not only the people affected by the earthquakes but also the organisational capacity of CSOs needs to be supported.
2. Continue to pool our funds with other grant-giving organisations to support existing and new initiatives to mobilise more funding opportunities for CSOs working on the ground.
3. Finance human resources, enhance collaborative working across CSOs, and enable projects with data collection and sharing practices for multiplier effect.
4. Continue to fund a diverse portfolio of CSOs with different expertise as problems are interconnected.



MOZAIK

TURKEY MOZAIK FOUNDATION

Your contribution makes a real difference in the lives of those who need it most.

Please scan the QR code to make a donation.
Thank you for standing with us.



www.turkeymozaik.org.uk



[turkeymozaik](https://www.instagram.com/turkeymozaik)



[turkeymozaik](https://www.facebook.com/turkeymozaik)



[turkey-mozaik-foundation](https://www.linkedin.com/company/turkey-mozaik-foundation)



[Turkey Mozaik Foundation](https://www.youtube.com/Turkey Mozaik Foundation)