



National Preparatory Workshop for Global Refugee Forum

11 November 2019 - Ankara

TOBB University, Ankara, Turkey
Meeting Report

Introduction

The first Global Refugee Forum (GRF) will take place on 17-18 December 2019 in Geneva. As per the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), affirmed by members of the United Nations General Assembly in December 2018, the GRF aims to provide an opportunity for UN member states and other stakeholders to collaborate to achieve a more equitable distribution of responsibility for international refugee protection. It seeks to do this by encouraging stakeholders to make pledges and contributions towards achieving the objectives of the GCR, and to exchange good practices and experiences in relation to refugee protection.¹ Hosted by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Swiss government, the event will be co-convened by the governments of Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Germany and Turkey.

Ahead of the GRF, a National Preparatory Workshop was convened by the Research Center on Asylum and Migration (IGAM), Oxfam and Support to Life. The **workshop brought together 54 representatives from national civil society, municipalities, government ministries, universities and think tanks** to jointly reflect on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the response in Turkey, and to develop a series of joint pledges to improve the refugee response to be made during the GRF in December 2019.

Meeting report

The meeting began with reflections on the GCR and GRF from representatives of key stakeholders, including Giulia Ricciarelli Ranawat, UNHCR Assistant Representative in Turkey; Mehmet Akarca, Chief Advisor to the President, and Burak Yaşar, Migration Expert, Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM). The objectives of the GCR, the process that led to the GRF, its format, the expectations of member states including Turkey from the forum, and the stages that Turkey has passed through in terms of refugee management were covered through short presentations and exchanges with the wider participants.

It was acknowledged that with over 4 million refugees Turkey hosts the largest refugee population in the world, including 3.7m Syrians under temporary protection and over 400,000 asylum seekers from Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq and other countries. The fact that Turkey also hosts migrants who came here in search of a better life was also noted. Accordingly, it was emphasized that 1 in 10 people in Turkey is of foreign origin and 1 in 20 people is a refugee.

¹ <https://www.unhcr.org/5c700a654>

Turkey's approach to refugee response was summarized as a 'whole of society' approach, in that everyone, from the highest echelons of the state to society in general has approached the refugee issue with common sense, and as such have set an example to the world. It was noted that Turkey has historically welcomed displaced people and will continue to do so. Although it has received some financial support from the international community, this has not been enough to meet the extensive needs.

Turkey's response to refugee situation was characterized as having had three stages, from reception to crisis management to social cohesion. Institutional capacities were quickly adapted and developed in response to the arrival of Syrian refugees, in collaboration with government institutions, civil society and municipalities. Through this process, the legal framework in Turkey has been amended to provide refugees with access to public services, supports social cohesion and strengthens refugees' capacities for self-sufficiency. Municipalities also support this process. Despite a lack of prior experience of refugee hosting on such a large scale, solutions to the challenges faced by refugees – such as recognition of academic qualifications, access to health care and school enrollment of children – have been developed through the collaboration of these diverse stakeholders. In this way, widespread registration of the Syrian refugee population was ensured.

Public support has been both a strength and a weakness in this context. Public support is critical, given that hosting such large numbers of refugees requires co-habitation and thus is not an issue that can be simply solved through bureaucratic processes. While the public has been generally supportive, due to Turkey's geopolitical location and social structures there have been some problems as well. In terms of weaknesses, the need to engage the private sector further in the process was highlighted. The ongoing instabilities in the region were highlighted and it was said that future waves of refugees can be expected – including from Iran. The possibility of some refugees' voluntary return to the areas cleared through Operation Peace Spring was also noted. The failure of the international community to adequately share in the responsibility of hosting countries was also mentioned. It was said that as a result Turkey has been forced to participate in the creation of a buffer zone, rather than engage in efforts to find an equitable distribution of responsibility.

It was noted that Turkey has actively participated in the development of the GCR, and is also a co-convenor of the GRF. The objectives of the GCR were referred to as follows: (i) ease the pressure on hosting countries; (ii) enhance refugee self-reliance; (iii) expand access to third-country solutions; and (iv) support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity. Turkey's expectations from the GRF were summarized as wanting to draw attention to the successes achieved and achieving a more balanced distribution of responsibility.

Following these interventions, the floor was opened to all participants, resulting in a vibrant discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the refugee response, and what could be expected from the GRF. The following **key themes** emerged from this discussion:

The role of civil society and localization of humanitarian aid:

- One of the key reasons for the success of the refugee response in Turkey has been the capacity of civil society, and its flexibility of action in fields which require fast solutions such as employment, housing and subsistence. The interventions of national actors in these areas need to be acknowledged, rendered visible and shared internationally;
- The informality in Turkey has been one factor that enabled refugees to establish a certain level of self-sufficiency; the state however, has focused primarily on formal spaces, to address exploitation and mistreatment;
- The participation of refugees, host communities, and their civil society organizations in policy- and program-development processes that affect their lives is limited. This is well

reflected in the tiny proportion of international humanitarian funding that is directly available to national actors. This point was also underlined by participants in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Summit of Refugees, which took place on 8-9 November 2019 and brought together 33 refugee-led organizations from across the region. Despite the wealth of experience and expertise amongst civil society in Turkey, international organizations tend to dominate the discussions. The process of developing the GCR, for instance, was largely dominated by northern actors. As a result, the valuable national experience from Turkey and other major refugee-hosting countries, and lessons learned are not considered adequately;

- The need for ongoing multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination was underlined by all participants, as an essential strategy for maximizing the efficiency of the refugee response;

Expectations from the GRF

- Some participants noted their low expectations from the GRF, in terms of achieving concrete outcomes and improvements to the lives of refugees and host communities;
- The UNHCR representatives noted that although the GCR is not binding, its significance is that it has brought renewed energy and attention to the issues and has emphasized the importance of the multi-stakeholder approach. The importance of data management, experience sharing and the establishment of a global network of academics was noted;
- A question was raised about the lack of clarity around organizational arrangements for the GRF, including the coordination between government and civil society representatives.

Turkey's migration management strategy

- Participants noted that there is a certain degree of ambivalence in national strategies for dealing with the refugee issue. Two tracks appear to be on the table currently: one is supporting the development of social cohesion; the second is the possibility of voluntary repatriation. Some participants disputed the degree of ambivalence, arguing that policies and programs designed to support social cohesion may also contribute to longer-term voluntary repatriation, for example by equipping refugees with skills they can use both in Turkey and in their countries of origin upon return. Although the importance of having a clear migration management strategy was underlined in order to ensure efficient use of limited resources, some stakeholders noted the challenges associated with developing a clear strategy, given the constantly changing dynamics and the need to remain responsive and flexible;
- The impact of the economic crisis on Turkey's migration policies was noted. It was noted that this has been a factor in turning the refugee issue into a political polemic and reducing the initially high levels of social acceptance of refugees;
- Others noted that national actors should place more emphasis on developing and implementing their own strategies, rather than simply following international funding;

Access to migration-related data

- Some participants noted that there are challenges around access to data on the refugee population in Turkey, which donors do not consider when providing funding. Access to up to date and accurate data is critical for the development of effective programs. Others noted that no single institution has comprehensive data on all refugees, and that some data that is held by certain institutions cannot be freely shared due to the need to protect personal data;

Equal burden- and responsibility- sharing

- The need for new arrangements for more equitable responsibility-sharing was emphasized by participants, recognizing that the world has changed significantly since 1951 and the obligations taken on by states then are no longer enough;
- It was emphasized that conventional solutions such as third country resettlement do not work and innovative/alternative solutions such as residence permits for refugees should be explored. It was stated that what really matters is refugees' access to rights and services and that does not necessarily require being categorized as refugees;
- Participants highlighted that the responsibility of refugee-hosting is not only financial but is also related to various issues such as the legal framework and alternative methods for accessing third country solutions. As such, participants noted the need for alternative approaches and solutions to be explored, including in countries of origin. More emphasis needs to be placed on peace and stability and addressing root causes of displacement.

The refugee response in Turkey: strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement

In the second part of the meeting, participants formed small groups and reflected on areas of strength, weakness and improvement in the refugee response in Turkey. Each small group consisted of multiple stakeholders, including civil society, academia, government institutions and municipalities. The key themes emerging from these discussions can be summarized as follows:

Strengths	
Migration policies and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong bureaucracy/economy/state structure has enabled a strong response to the mass influx of refugees; • The speed and efficiency of legal and institutional adaptation has been key, including taking key regulatory and policymaking steps and establishment of new units (e.g. DGMM). This has been facilitated by the flexibility of the state system; • Tolerance of a certain degree of informality has been critical to Turkey's capacity to absorb the refugee population; • Shift from humanitarian to development-focused response happened relatively quickly; • Response has gone far beyond humanitarian aid, to include steps towards social cohesion, including access to education, health, employment.
Access services, including education and health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The granting of access to public services for refugees within the national system has been a critical area of success. At the municipal level, the provision of the same municipal services to refugees as the local population is also a strength; • The initial decision to establish Temporary Education Centers (2015) was a positive step to quickly increase access to education for refugee children, while the ongoing integration of refugee children into the national education system (completed 2019) is evidence of an adaptive long-term, developmental approach (rather than a purely humanitarian approach).
Social cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High importance attached to social cohesion by all stakeholders, and willingness to take steps to support and promote this;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-existing relations between Turkey and Syria, particularly commercial ties have helped to strengthen social tolerance and acceptance of refugees. This has been supported by the philanthropic nature of Turkish society and importance attached to solidarity. The historical experience of hosting refugees and asylum seekers was also an important factor in the success of the response.
Labor force participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory changes to enable Syrian refugees to access work permits have been critical to enabling refugees' access to labor markets, and thus to achieve economic inclusion to a certain extent;
Multi-stakeholder collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many kinds of actors have been active in the response, bringing their distinctive experience and expertise to the response. Collaboration and cooperation amongst stakeholders (CSOs-government-academia-municipalities) has been key to meeting needs; • CSOs' role in generating funding for the municipalities; • Cooperation between international organizations and state institutions has been important to facilitate a strong response; • Presence of INGOs / international organizations has provided much-needed funding for critical activities, despite shortcomings (see below).
Role of civil society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSOs have been able to transfer their experiences from internal migration in Turkey to their work with refugees; • CSOs' flexible and responsive approach has enabled them to take action promptly; • Government has given space to CSOs to respond; • CSOs have played a particularly key role in raising awareness about refugees; • CSOs have managed to deploy resources and at certain circumstances helped the refugees to overcome the language barrier.
Institutional capacities of municipalities	<p>Municipalities have displayed enormous flexibility and willingness to adapt their existing infrastructure to meet the needs of refugees, despite the absence of dedicated financial resources for their refugee populations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The willingness of individual local administrators to work on migration, and their capacities to direct initiatives;
Weaknesses	
Coordination and collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although multi-stakeholder cooperation and collaboration has been key to the response's success, there is still a lack of coordination amongst relevant actors at all levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National CSOs do not collaborate as much as they could. Competition for resources is sometimes a disincentive to collaborate; ○ Coordination amongst government line ministries and municipalities could be strengthened; • There is a lack of coordination between national institutions and civil society; As a result, there is a lot of repetition,

	<p>duplication and overlap amongst projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel turnover, especially in government institutions, makes cooperation more difficult; • Difficulties in information flow and sharing; • Lack of engagement with the private sector seen as a big gap (e.g. absence of collaboration framework except for textile and agriculture);
Institutional capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of financial and human resources or inability to benefit from them effectively; • Pressure on public infrastructure and the relatively slow pace of investment in expanding public infrastructure; • Municipalities' insufficient financial resources; • Project-based approach limits effectiveness of interventions; • Local actors face challenges in conducting impact assessments, to understand where and how their interventions are effective and can be strengthened.
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of database results in lack of reliable and shareable information. As a result, it's difficult to have an overview on the current situation, profile, needs, and capacity; • There are constraints in data sharing.
Migration policies and legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the policies adopted have been short-term in nature; • There is still an absence of a clear strategic plan; • Municipalities' authority to develop and implement services for refugees is legally constrained, which results in initiative-based projects. While these can be very effective, they also rely on the political will and capacities of individuals; • Legal and regulatory constraints limit access of refugees to services and rights,
Inclusivity of the response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain population groups are neglected by the response, including: host communities; women; people with disabilities; non-Syrian refugees; • The interventions are designed without accurate knowledge about the profile of refugees and their needs; • Low level of refugee participation in decision-making mechanisms at all levels; • Rising xenophobia in recent years is a big cause for concern. The media plays a critical role here.
Access to resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources are overwhelmingly in the control of international actors, who are not experts on Turkey and do not have connections to communities. This results in priorities that do not reflect the realities on the ground; • The sub-contractor model that is part of the traditional international humanitarian system (e.g. funds are made available by donors to northern INGOs, who then work with national actors as sub-contractors) limits the effective use of resources; • Available resources are primarily short-term, which limits

	<p>sustainability of interventions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are constraints on what can be spent on core costs / administrative costs, which may undermine the institutional sustainability of national actors; • Municipalities' budgets are based on the number of Turkish citizens reside in their area, rather than the total number of residents.
Social cohesion and integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although social acceptance has been high, it is increasingly fragile; • There are also several barriers to integration, such as the need for refugees to apply for work permits through their employer, restrictions in travel (the need to get travel permits for moving from one city to another) etc.; •

Based on these discussions, the following were identified as key steps that could improve the refugee response in Turkey:

How can the refugee response in Turkey be improved?	
Social cohesion/awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing misinformation and the perpetuation of myths, to tackle prejudices and stereotypes about refugees in Turkey; • Establishing broad-based collaboration amongst civil society, media, academia, municipalities and government in order to tackle misinformation; • Creating a shared narrative that can leverage social cohesion and use of such narrative across media, CSOs as well as in the political discourse, • Investing in measures to address language barriers; enhancing language education;
Coordination and collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved coordination amongst CSO, municipal and government actors through more inclusive coordination mechanisms; • Strengthening relations with international actors;
Knowledge/experience sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced sharing of lessons learned and best practices amongst different actors; • Building on the knowledge and experience developed so far, and further developing response and its impact.
Migration policies and legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a strategic plan with the participation of all actors; • Amending legislation to increase the power and financial resources of municipalities to take necessary measures to respond to the needs of refugees in their areas;
Participatory approach and representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing refugees' participation at all levels of policy and program design, implementation and evaluation. One way to do this may be through refugee councils / assemblies

	<p>that already exist in some areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring participation of particularly under-represented groups, such as women, non-Syrian refugees in policy processes;
Access to resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring improved access to long-term funding is informed by an accurate understanding of the situation on the ground; • Increasing national actors' direct access to national and international funding, including core / administrative funding; • Taking measures to facilitate national level responsibility and burden sharing amongst different district municipalities by increasing their access to central, regional and local funding possibilities; • Adapting the system to ensure that municipalities have access to funds based on total population in their municipal area, including refugees. The potential high cost of hosting refugees should be taken into account.
Access to data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collecting and verifying data through a centralized system via which data can be shared in line with data protection legislation.

Meeting participants also briefly reflected on potential **criteria that can be used to define good practices**. According to the discussions, good practices should:

- **Be based on needs identified in a participatory way:** good practices should be based on the collection, analysis and sharing of accurate, verified data about needs. Needs analysis should be conducted in a participatory way, and should consider the differing needs of different social groups;
- **involve the direct participation and self-representation of refugees and host communities,** from the design to evaluation stages of programs and projects. Policy-making should also build in mechanisms for such direct engagement. Specific interventions such as efforts to support refugee / host community self-representation and direct participation were identified as examples of good practice;
- **be gender sensitive,** considering the specific needs of women, men, boys and girls from design to evaluation stages;
- **be sustainable,** taking a long-term approach that is not dependent on short-term funding;
- **be well-coordinated,** to avoid duplication / replication, and to maximize the contributions of diverse actors based on their unique expertise and experience;
- **be sensitive to their impact.** Impact assessments must be undertaken to better understand what works and what does not work, to maximize the efficient use of resources;
- **adopt rights-based** approaches;
- **be scalable,** to enable effective interventions to reach wider population groups and thus achieve greater impact.

Joint pledges to strengthen the refugee response

Informed by the preceding discussions on the strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement of the national refugee response in Turkey, stakeholder working groups reconvened to identify joint pledges they are willing to make in order to strengthen the response. The following section summarizes the key areas in which joint pledges were proposed:

DRAFT: Civil society organisations

We, the civil society participants in the National Preparatory Workshop, pledge to:

- Ensure that **refugees and host communities benefit equally** from our interventions. This will involve advocacy with donors to ensure resources are available for host communities, and incorporating activities designed to strengthen and promote social cohesion into ongoing interventions;
- Take steps to ensure that **refugees are meaningfully engaged** in all stages of our programs, from design to implementation to evaluation;
- Ensure **more comprehensive information sharing** between refugees and service providers;
- **Systematically document and share good practices** from our work so that other actors (either in Turkey or in other contexts) can benefit from the lessons we have learned;
- Ensure that our projects and programs are inclusive and respectful of diversity. We will make sure that our work is developed to **address the needs of diverse groups** with respect to countries origin, age, gender, ability, class etc. In particular, we will **ensure that non-Syrian refugees** are also included in our interventions. We will also work in the informal sector in order to ensure we are reaching **the most vulnerable groups**;
- Work together with media, academics and other stakeholders to develop strategies for **countering hate speech** through awareness raising and advocacy;
- Proactively explore **collaboration with the private sector**;
- Take the lead in promoting **coordination and solidarity** amongst different stakeholders. This may include convening a coordination mechanism that helps stakeholders to understand in detail the realities on the ground; prevents duplication of efforts; supports different actors to reach target groups more easily; and facilitates joint advocacy work;
- Engage in **public mobilization activities** and encourage a spirit of volunteerism to involve more actors in the response;
- **Monitor the progress of 500,000 in-school refugee children** for the next 4 years.

DRAFT: Municipalities

We, the municipality representatives at the National Preparatory Workshop, pledge to:

- Provide services to all who need them;
- Play an active role in fostering and strengthening social cohesion amongst refugees and host communities;
- Take the lead in institutionalising migration work through for example: establishment of a migration commission in every municipal council; a migration unit in all municipalities; and encouraging all city councils to convene refugee assemblies;
- Support coordination amongst various stakeholders;
- Adopt a rights-based language and eliminate hate speech;
- Ensure that host communities are included in projects alongside refugees;
- Facilitate the access of school age children to education;
- Foster collaboration with the private sector;

- Share our experiences and good practices from our work with other stakeholders in Turkey and in other countries hosting refugees.

Sharing pledges with international stakeholders

In the final session of the workshop, a variety of international stakeholders were invited to hear the outcomes of the preparatory workshop and to share their own reflections on these. This session began with a brief summary of the day's discussions, and the proposed pledges developed by the participants (as outlined above).

The key reflections from the session can be summarized as follows:

- **The importance of inclusivity and diversity** was underlined. The necessity of including non-Syrian refugees and host communities in interventions was also noted by the international stakeholders, while the need to ensure that gender is also taken into consideration throughout intervention design, implementation and evaluation was also underlined;
- It was suggested that **including media representatives** as participants in future workshops would be beneficial, given the media's central role in shaping public discourse;
- On the need for enhanced **coordination amongst stakeholders**, a question was raised about the necessity of additional coordination mechanisms when there is a UN-led coordination structures and a high volume of coordination meetings already taking place. However, it was noted that the existing coordination architecture is not necessarily inclusive, with municipalities, national CSOs, government institutions and refugee-led organizations all having noted feeling excluded to varying degrees and at various times. Thus, the need for an inclusive coordination mechanism which can prevent repetition and overlap, facilitate the identification of needs, and enable access to refugees and host communities was underlined;
- **Durable solutions**: the need to find creative and alternative solutions was noted, given the difficulties in accessing the three traditional durable solutions, particularly when it comes to resettlement. It was further noted that responsibility sharing does not only mean financial support. It was noted that In Turkey, there is a holistic approach to sustainable solutions, with a primary focus on social cohesion, while other solutions such as voluntary repatriation are also explored.

Next steps

The meeting conveners, IGAM, Oxfam and STL, made a commitment to share a draft workshop report, along with the draft pledges, for review and input from the participants, prior to the finalization of these joint pledges.

Participants agreed that the pledges developed during the workshop should be monitored until the second GRF, which will take place in December 2023.

It was agreed that the national actors which participated in this workshop should come together with refugee-led organizations as soon as possible.

Oxfam made a commitment to work with partners to convey the joint pledges which will be prepared at the end of this process to relevant actors, including UN, governments and donors, and to support the participation of national civil society actors in Global Refugee Forum as far as possible.

Annex: Workshop participants

Name - Surname	Name of the organisation
Adil Murat Vural	Seyhan Belediyesi
Alev Örsel Karaca	BMMYK
Aylin Yıldız	YTB - Yurtdışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı
Basak Kale	ODTÜ
Başak Yavçan	TOBB Üniversitesi
Begüm Başaran	İGAM
Burak Yasar	Göç İDaresi Genel Müdürlüğü
Burcuhan Şener	Marmara Belediyeler Birliği
Cem Uluyuce	BMMYK
Ceren Topgül Samur	Oxfam
Dilşad Turan	Sevgi ve Kardeşlik Vakfı
Duygu Fendal	IBC- Uluslararası Mavi Hilal İnsani Yardım ve Kalkınma Vakfı
Ece Akçay	Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı-Piktes
Eda Albayrak	Zeytinburnu Belediyesi
Elif Bilge Erdölek	Habitat Derneği
Elif Gogus	BMMYK
Esra Yurt	IGAM
Giulio Ricciarelli Ranawat	BMMYK
Hasan Maden	Hatay Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Hayri Volkan Korkmaz	Küçükçekmece Belediyesi
Hayriye Kara	Kaos GL Derneği
Hilal Büke	Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı
Hülya Elçi	Kilis Belediyesi
Ihsan Resat	BMMYK
İbrahim Karatüme	Şanlıurfa Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Jülide Ergin	MAYA Vakfı
Josephine Whitaker Yılmaz	Oxfam
Lara Özügergin	BMMYK
Doç. Dr. Mahmut Kaya	Harran Üniversitesi
Mehmet Akarca	Cumhurbaşkanlığı
Mehmet Aktaş	Sultanbeyli Belediyesi
Mehmet Ercan Birbilen	Gaziantep Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Meryem Aslan	Oxfam
Metin Çorabatır	IGAM
Muhtar Çokar	İKGV
Murat Erdoğan	Türk - Alman Üniversitesi
Mustafa Talha Keskin	IHH İnsani Yardım Vakfı
Nihal Eminoğlu	Çanakkale Üniversitesi
Omar Kadkoy	TEPAV - Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey
Ömer Ataş	Gaziantep Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Pelin FEYMİ	Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Pelin Özcan	BMMYK

Pınar Özel	Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı - Piktes Projesi
Rabia Bihter Dazkır Erdendođdu	Zeytinburnu Belediyesi
Rumeysa Terziođlu	KEDV
Sema Genel Karaosmanođlu	Hayata Destek
Serkan Denli	Hayata Destek
Sevim Özdemir	Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneđi
Sibel YAVUZ	Adana Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Süleyman Soyhanođlu	Göç Araştırmaları Vakfı
Şebnem Koser Akçapar	Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi
Sümeyra Akgül	Göç/Şanlıurfa
Sümeyye Gedikođlu	Türkiye Belediyeler Birliđi
Turker Saliji	IGAM

Participants of the final session of the workshop

Name - Surname	Name of the organisation
Reza Kasrai	ECHO
Philippe Schneider	ECHO
Tobias Schlaepfer	Embassy of Switzerland
Banur Özaydın	EU Delegation
Nazlı Yıldırım Shierkolk	EU Delegation
Dagmar Bkickwede	GIZ, SHRC- QUDRA Program
Alev Yıldırım	GIZ, SHRC- PEP
Kemal Pehlivanlı	IOM
Anastasia Pazer	Konrad Adenauer Stiftung
Daniell Rosell	Swedish Embassy
Iris Kristjansdottir	UN Women
Elif Özkaya Aydın	U.S. Embassy