



EU TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
TO CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS
IN THE WESTERN BALKANS AND TURKEY

COUNTRY CONSULTATION

TURKEY

25 FEBRUARY, 2021

Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in the Enlargement region, 2021-2027





SHORT REPORT

BACKGROUND

For the needs of the European Commission, the Director General Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations (DG NEAR) and in cooperation with the Delegation of the EU to Turkey, EU TACSO 3 organized an on-line consultation meeting on *Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in the Enlargement Region for the period 2021-2027* on Thursday, 25 February, 2021, between 15:30-18:00hrs (Turkey time).

The aim of the consultation meeting was to present the latest draft of the Guidelines and hold a discussion session, with the participation of civil society organizations and other stakeholders, for updating the existing Guidelines that have been used throughout the period 2014 – 2020.

The call for applications for CSOs to take part in the consultation meeting on *Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in the Enlargement Region for the period 2021-2027* was launched on Monday, 15 February and the deadline for application was set as Thursday, 18 February. In addition to the open call for applications for CSOs, direct invitations for participation were sent to the related public institutions and donor organisations simultaneously. Within the scope of the call for applications for CSOs, sixty-five (65) representatives of CSOs applied to participate in the event. During the evaluation of the applications priority was given to CSOs who have been conducting any monitoring, advocacy and/or capacity development activity in one of the result areas mentioned in the EU Civil Society Guidelines and the ones who have implemented/still implementing any EU funded project. 36 CSOs and individuals were shortlisted to attend the meeting. In total 46 representatives, 26 from CSOs, 6 from donor organisations, 9 public institution representatives and 5 from other stakeholders, attended the event fully or in part. (Annex 2: List of participants).

INTRODUCTION SESSION

Introduction, objectives, opening speeches

Tanja Hafner Ademi, EU TACSO 3 Team Leader, as the facilitator of the introduction session, provided information around the purpose of the event, language translation and other technical details for smooth conduct of the event. The event was held in English, but participants could also use Turkish language translation. Furthermore, the agenda of the event was presented (See Annex 1: Agenda).

André Lys, Delegation of the EU to Turkey opened the event reminding the EU support to civil society organisations in the IPA Beneficiaries countries and the Guidelines introduced in the IPA II period. The Guidelines provide guiding principles on how to support CSOs for the Commission and Delegations and for all government counterparts during policy planning and support. He underlined that the Guidelines have been an important reference for all actors and are a useful instrument to measure progress and to set target for the IPA Beneficiaries. He also explained that in Turkey, the EU has coherently directed the use of EU financial resources in accordance with the objectives defined in the Guidelines and in particular invested to support the third objective of the Guidelines, which is the strengthening of CSOs capacities. In addition to that, he underlined how a number of innovative interventions such as those based on “financial support to third parties” also helped reach out to a wider number of beneficiaries, who previously had difficulties in accessing the EU supports because of language barriers and complexity of procedures.



Furthermore, he mentioned the role of the National Resource Centre (NRC) which - being the outcome of previous phases of the TACSO project - provided a very solid base for supporting civil society in the country. Lastly, he emphasized that it is really timely to discuss the Guidelines again to see what has worked well, what needs to be improved. Based on the consultations already undertaken, the overall structure of the Guidelines is confirmed as being very valid, as not so many changes are being proposed and now what needs to be done is fine-tuning for the future.

Liselotte Isaksson, Head of Section, Western Balkans Regional Cooperation and Programmes Civil Society and Social Inclusion (D.5), DG NEAR, emphasized the importance of the Guidelines and the development and prospect of civil society as a key priority for the EU. Civil society is considered an important actor that actively promotes and supports the fundamental rights that are at the heart of the EU, such as freedom of expression, rule of law, democracy and respect for human rights including the minority rights. Active civil society represents the views and aspirations of citizens and holds institutions accountable. In addition, she talked about the important role civil society plays in service provision to communities and recently the very specific role of supporting the communities in emergencies. CSOs are also important partners in proposing a vision for society and in testing and promoting innovative solutions to sustainable development challenges. With regard to the Enlargement process, she emphasized the importance of civil society in deepening the understanding of citizens about the reforms that are needed to qualify for membership. The EU needs CSOs that are capable, professional and resilient, but also public institutions that will put in place an enabling environment for the work of civil society. In addition, there should also be good systems to facilitate the cooperation and exchange between civil society and government. She explained that the Civil Society Facility (CSF) established since 2009 with the role to channel both bilateral support such as that to Turkey as well as support at regional level. In the previous period, approximately 3% of the budget of IPA I and II have been allocated for civil society whereas the average annual amount is around 80 million EUR. This orientation of EU to support civil society will remain at the same level in the future period through IPA III. She reflected on the importance of the Guidelines in this new financing period 2021 – 2027 and the need to revise them in a participatory manner and with active participation and understanding of all stakeholders such as public institutions and civil society. She emphasized the three-fold purpose of the Guidelines. Firstly, for the EU to plan, monitor and analyze the support provided to civil society, secondly, to policy makers and public officials to understand the standards and expectations that the EU has in terms of an enabling environment for civil society and the involvement of civil society in public policy making. In addition, the Guidelines are seen as assisting in the development of strategies for cooperation between governments and civil society. The third purpose of the Guidelines is for CSOs to know the standards towards which they should work in terms of their own capacities. She shortly reflected on the structure and the results framework that also includes indicators to measure the progress and that are anchored in the international standards and legal framework.

Lastly, she underlined that the overall objective of the Guidelines and the three focus areas (conducive environment, the relationship between CSOs and public institutions and CSO resilience and capacities) are the same from the beginning and have not changed since the previous version. The second part of the Guidelines includes the “Results Framework”, that provides the details of specific objectives and outcomes and also presents the indicators that are being used to measure the progress. She informed participants that objectives and indicators are not newly invented by the Commission, but are anchored in international and regional standards and a human rights framework. What the EU is trying to do, is to make a clear link between the work proposed by the EU and already existing obligations stemming from the mentioned international and regional human rights covenants. The novelty proposed in the recent version of the Guidelines is that the focus is put on monitoring. The EU put



quite a lot of efforts into this part which refers to monitoring and picking indicators. This is where comments are especially welcomed.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Session 1: Presentation of the EU Civil Society Guidelines for the Enlargement region, 2021-2027

Tanja Hafner Ademi and Emina Nuredinoska, EU TACSO 3 P2P Manager presented the Guidelines Result Framework. The presentation included information about the review process of the Guidelines, which were originally developed in 2013, with an inclusive approach and participation of CSOs, public authorities and other stakeholders. It was underlined that the presentation was about the second component of the Guidelines, that is the “Result and monitoring framework” for assessing the progress in the civil society-related policies. This is conceived also for providing inputs to the EC Annual Reports and for directing EU financial assistance, mainly through CSF. The presentation included detailed information on the changes in the structure (e.g. added column with regional benchmarks) and overview of specific objectives and indicators under each of the three Areas: conducive environment; dialogue between civil society and IPA beneficiary institutions/authorities; and CSO resilience and capacities.

After the presentation, **Bülent Özcan from Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs** added his reflection on the civil society support and the Guidelines in Turkey. The guidance prepared by the Commission, especially at the beginning of each new fiscal year, has always guided candidate countries in the field of civil society and helped public institutions on which issues to prioritize. The Guidelines is also important in terms of developing a common language and developing a common network, in which both public institutions and civil society organizations can work together. In Turkey, since 2014, civil society was identified as a priority area and as a sector in consultation with the Commission and the Guidelines guided the Directorate for EU Affairs (former Ministry of European Union) while preparing a civil society strategy in this process. However, not only while preparing the sector document, but also in the preparation of the 11th Development Plan, the elements specified in the Guidelines were to be integrated and reflected upon in the preparations. He underlined that the Directorate for EU Affairs has worked in cooperation with the Commission in the previous periods, particularly in terms of participation of public institutions in the process, and this cooperation mainly took place within the framework of the previous TACSO project. While there was a more participatory approach with the inclusion of all institutions in the previous periods, in the new period, in the implementation of the EU TACSO 3 project, there is a slightly more difficult structure in terms of participation or inclusiveness. Additionally, he stated that the Directorate for EU Affairs is always ready to host studies as continuation of this consultation work with the participation of other candidate countries and stakeholders. Lastly, he underlined that with regards to consultations with public institutions and the contribution of the public to this process, in the upcoming period, the Directorate for EU Affairs would be glad to work more closely with the EU TACSO 3 project and the Delegation.

Session 2: Discussion

Özge Konuralp, EU TACSO 3 Country Coordinator for Turkey, as the facilitator of the discussion session, gave instructions about the main objective of the session and presented the ground rules to be followed during the discussion session. Mrs Konuralp asked the participants to present their questions regarding the presented draft, in writing in the chat or orally by raising their hand. All questions and comments made by different participants are presented below in consecutive order:

Murat Özçelebi, Directorate for EU Affairs discussed the legal status of the Guidelines that was discussed since 2014. After 2018, we have seen its integration in country reports and progress reports, albeit partially. He asked if this trend will continue and about the approach to its dissemination at the



policy level and mainstreaming. He also asked about the missing reference to the Guidelines in the programming framework that they received. The second question was about the one-stop shop regarding monitoring processes and what details are available. The monitoring of capacity issues, especially in Turkey, for example, requires a remarkable effort. There was also a comment in the presentation regarding the fact that public institutions produce more data, which is an area we have had difficulties for 4-5 years, in the sense of public sharing or facilitating data. Finally, he asked if the EU make an effort to strengthen public institutions' role in this.

Mrs Isaksson responded that in terms of formality, the Guidelines is not a formal document and they won't be binding in the sense of adding some additional formality to what is already in place. They are a guidance document. But regardless of whether this is formally adopted or not, it is important to underline that the standards which are included here in most cases are already legally binding. DG NEAR will use these indicators that are specified in the Results Framework when assessing how effective its support is and as a tool in helping the assessment on the situation in relation to the Copenhagen Criteria. How these issues are addressed will be elaborated upon in the context of the annual Enlargement Package of reports and our intention with these Guidelines is to have more transparency and more coherence.

Mrs Hafner Ademi added that, in terms of methodology, this has been improved and now includes more focus on qualitative indicators. Basically, a comprehensive methodological guide has been prepared, with which indicators are transformed into concrete questions, which are then put into a survey to civil society to detect the practice. This is very much focused on Area 3, but also in terms of the practice for Area 1 and 2. Additionally, the data is gathered in focus groups and interviews with a unified methodological approach. Interviews in all cases are mixed, meaning that all stakeholders are included. The report now composes both county briefs and a regional overview and assessment. In terms of the question about public institutions gathering data concerning public funding, consultations and other aspects that related to the monitoring, cooperation and exchange in this field would be greatly appreciated and useful.

Seda Akço, Humanist Bureau talked about the issue of resource allocation for the humanitarian aid field especially in Turkey being quite problematic. First of all, CSOs fill an important gap in service delivery where these services cannot be provided by the public institutions. On the other hand, organisations are not subject to the same laws and rules in service delivery where private sector and public institutions are binded with certain laws and regulations. Therefore, if these activities are to be carried out by organisations, how is the effectiveness, inclusiveness and equality of these organisations going to be monitored? In addition, there is a remarkable amount of resources allocated in this field and there is a considerable amount of globalizing civil society activities which dominates the field and creates an unfair competition between the local CSOs and international organisations. This situation also jeopardises the resilience of local CSOs. These multi-dimensioned facts should also be taken into consideration in the design of the supports for CSOs and strengthening capacities of CSOs, particularly working in the field of humanitarian aid.

Feray Salman, Human Rights Joint Platform does not see civil society as a "sector", but it is an integral part of everything and each sector. In this respect, the result framework provides a holistic approach in terms of monitoring the freedom of association and well describes free acts of CSOs within this frame. On the other hand, the new law adopted in Turkey at the end of December 2020 (Law on Preventing Financing of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction) concerning fight against terrorism has a structure that is extremely restrictive and jeopardises rights and freedoms. In the first section of the Guidelines related to conducive environment, within the result indicators, there is, of course, a reference on not restricting the legitimate activities of civil society through alleged issues



such as combating terrorism and money laundering. However, in the following chapters, there is no reference to the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights related to anti-terrorism and the protection of human rights and freedoms. The indicators that are initially considered under “conducive environment” section are not reflected in the following sections of the Guidelines related to the CSO resilience and CSO capacities. This is actually a considerable risk for CSOs. She was interested to know whether the result framework will be used as only guiding principles or will be considered a binding document.

Feridun Ekmekçi, Energy Efficiency and Environmental Protection Association discussed that in terms of strengthening economic and operational capacity of associations, some local municipalities in Turkey offers campuses, which provide space for offices and meetings/activities of CSOs. I believe that this type of campus services and public funding for CSOs are quite important particularly for the small organisations with low capacity to develop projects and lack space for office and/or meeting. Municipalities’ investment in such spaces is also crucial in terms of strengthening cooperation among public institutions and civil society. This kind of needs can also be reflected in the Guidelines result framework.

Tezcan Eralp Abay, Association for Civil Society Development Centre (STGM)/ National Resource Center (NRC) stated that the Guidelines offer a rich reference for civil society and for EU-Turkey relations in Turkey and have a great potential for CSOs. In order for these Guidelines to make sense and realize their potential, the norms and standards mentioned in the Guidelines must be followed by a wider segment of civil society and integrated into their own sectoral work. In terms of the norms-standards-goals, the Guidelines offer a tripartite structure: a tool for the Commission, a tool for civil society and a tool for public administration. Here, this triple structure, namely, the objectives set by the Commission in terms of integration with EU; legal improvements that should be undertaken by the public institutions and CSOs capacities as well as the benchmarks mentioned in the Guidelines should be taken into consideration by the public institutions while determining national targets. Therefore, in order for these national targets to be determined and be guiding for the public administration, they should be adopted and integrated into sectoral policies. Secondly, when it comes to the methodology of monitoring of civil society capacities, it becomes difficult to monitor the progress due to the complicated nature of chain of results, which is related with the development of civil society as well as legal framework and legislations that CSOs are subject to. For instance, according to the Competition Law, a non-for-profit organisation is closed down since it does not make “profit” based on the fact that in Turkey only associations, foundations, federations, confederations, unions, associations and cooperatives are regarded as non-for-profit organisations while non-profit companies, social enterprises and networks were excluded from this definition. This is one of the challenges CSOs face and these challenges needs to be addressed in the Guidelines result framework.

Sinem Sefa Akay, Flying Broom Women Communication and Research Association reported that in terms of CSO resilience and capacities, monitoring and evaluation activities, these are usually not considered as an integral part of the projects by the funding for organisations. CSOs usually cannot ask the costs of a monitoring and evaluation expert and/or legal consultants, lawyers and psycho-social support, which is quite crucial where there are multiple vulnerable groups, there are violations of rights, there are risks of violations during the implementation of the projects. These needs might better be reflected under CSO resilience and capacities section of the Guidelines Result Framework.

Burcu Miraç Diraor Aydın, Directorate of Strategy and Budget of the Presidency emphasized that the involvement of public institutions into the consultation processes for the updating of the Guidelines is quite crucial in terms of setting the priorities, goals and monitoring tools, as none of the actors (neither CSOs nor public institutions) are alone in this field. She believes that the envisaged goals in the

Guidelines will be realized in cooperation and interaction with public institutions. Setting up more exchanges with public institutions and sharing more information with the public institutions would be useful. In addition, some of the priority areas reflected in the Guidelines, such as improvement of the legal framework regarding the participation of civil society into the decision-making and legislative processes, tax regulations and volunteering, are also considered among the national priorities within the scope of our 11th National Development Plan in Turkey. There were plenty of projects, those developed by Ministry of National Education; Ministry of Interior, General Directorate of Relations with Civil Society; General Directorate of Foundations, Directorate of EU Affairs and Turkish Grand National Assembly and submitted to EC within the scope of 2021 Action Documents for Turkey that included all the topics mentioned in the Guidelines. The responses of the Commission to the Action Documents came in January, and we saw that all the related projects under the headings you have identified as priority areas have been eliminated. Civil society area is a priority within IPA and there have been good gains on behalf of the country in this area and they want it to continue. Therefore, they expect that such valuable projects to be emphasize and mentioned in the annual Guidelines assessments prepared by EU TACSO 3.

A short reflection session followed to offer response to questions and comments presented by participants.

Mrs Hafner Ademi: The issue of methodology is refined as with each annual monitoring and for the new result framework is going to be reflected once this is complete. There is also always the issue of availability of data and different perceptions of stakeholders in terms of experiences in practice under the specific objectives and can also differ from one to another contexts. The whole aim of the exercise in the Guidelines and assessment report is to be able to bring all stakeholders together, to sit at the same table, to seek, to identify any bottlenecks through this assessment. This is then the basis for all stakeholders to discuss what they can do about it, what can public institutions do about it, what can civil society do about it, how can the Commission and the Delegations help. The whole exercise and preparation of the report is about bring all stakeholders together, especially civil society and public institution.

In terms of non-financial support or space support to organizations, this is very important issue to civil society, especially small organizations, which don't have a lot financing resources, but might have an office or space to meet. This is may be an area which was not reflected in details yet in the Guidelines. There is a mention on financial support in one of the specific objectives under Area 2, 1.4 and 1.5., but refinement of indicators on this aspect could be useful.

In reference to new anti-terrorism legislation and regulation, this was not in place during previous Guidelines and is something newly introduced. The standards that these Guidelines bring forward is that it requests the institutions applying such legislation to be proportional. There was a case of not anti-terrorism but money laundering in Serbia, where an institution conducted an investigation without concrete proof. In the context of Council of Europe's Greco and MONEYVAL mechanisms, it was found that this was not duly justified. Yes, there are cases where public institutions would willingly or knowingly or unknowingly use those mechanisms, but then organizations were in a position to take protective measures at the international or regional level. The Guidelines transpose the Greco and MONEYVAL mechanisms and standards in this area.

In terms of comments on civil society capacity and indicators under Area 3: The specific objectives in this area might sound very demanding as their aim is to lead the way forward. It might be really hard to achieve that situation by an organization in a particular given time, but this is the direction that one should work towards.



EU TACSO 3 has provided information and a written response to Directorate of Strategy and Budget of the Presidency after the Validation Meeting (that was held on 9 July 2020 in Turkey, on-line) in response to the additional information provided by the Directorate of Strategy and Budget regarding the specific projects planned for civil society by the Directorate within the scope of multi-annual budgeting. While information provided was noted, specific projects were not mentioned in the EU TACSO 3 Assessment Report for 2018-2019, because the report does not list activities or implemented projects in Turkey or other IPA Beneficiaries. Its aim is to illustrate the given situation and the given state of affairs in an area. Since the projects per se are not an improvement on the legal or practical situation, therefore this is the reason why they were not directly mentioned in our report. But of course, if these projects are helping to improve the situation in a given area, this is noted. In the future, when projects are being implemented in a given specific objective and contribute to the improvement of the situation, this will be noted in the assessment report.

Stefano Calabretta, Delegation of the EU to Turkey: There was a good mix of comments on the monitoring framework itself, and on the other side, comments on the situation in Turkey and what should be in the center of the attention. The monitoring framework as such is just an instrument to look at the reality, is not in itself an instrument to change the reality. It is a knowledge base, to see where we are. With this more detailed and defined set of indicators, this should work better in the future. From this perspective, the comments raised confirm the areas of the Guidelines are well focused and are touching upon what is relevant for civil society. As for the question raised by the Humanist Bureau about the standards for humanitarian aid, we cannot provide a thorough feedback here, also because the Guidelines are more oriented to long term development better than to emergency situations. However, let me recall that other sets of standards specifically designed for emergency situations are existing, such those of the SPHERE Project.

He underlined that STGM, in the frame of the NRC project, and other projects dealing with financial support to third parties, are under constant effort to elaborate on all the areas of capacity building that is related to the third Area of specific objectives. And also, to better define and measure the result of Delegation's funding to their activities in making CSOs more capable. This is exactly what Mr Lys mentioned at the beginning as the focus of the third Area of specific objective of the Guidelines that is still fully and even more relevant now. If there is anything that cannot be answered today, there is still the possibility to provide additional written comments to the Result Framework in the coming days.

Mrs Isaksson: This discussion is taking place as we think that civil society is an essential component of democracy. Therefore, the Commission is putting very substantial resources in supporting civil society in doing their work, but it also seeks to work with public institutions to enable civil society to put in place the right framework so that civil society can operate. That is the background. Now we have something in place with the existing Guidelines that has been quite effective and efficient. What we are doing now is to fine-tune this further. There are new challenges facing civil society in the region and the Commission wants to make sure that these Guidelines capture these challenges. She underlined that these Guidelines are not invented by one single player, but they are drawn from existing international and regional commitments. She reiterated that this guideline will continue to be a tool for the Commission, to target its support and a tool for the Commission to assess how effective it is. Then it is also a tool to ensure that the Commission can get information that it can use in more overarching assessments, including in the preparations of annual country reports, where these elements are always taken into account. In sum, it is a two-way street, the Commission is trying to be clearer on what is expected and what it wants to support and also have the necessary feedback from all partners on the framework being used.



Mr Lys: He thanked all participants for staying until the end of the meeting and added that they should have more time to go in detail since there was a lot of interesting questions, comments and dialogue on these Guidelines that should continue in the format that has been mentioned. He underlined that this dialogue has to continue, and they need to find a proper way to continue empowering civil society to make sure that the government and the authorities give a proper and conducive environment for civil society. He also stressed that a set of standards for coordination should be set between the government and entities which was also pretty much reflected in the interventions of Mrs Miraç Diraor Aydın from Directorate of Strategy and Budget of the Presidency and colleagues from Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We should all be clear in the context of the assessment that Commission is doing on the environment for civil society which still definitely needs to be improved and the Guidelines provide a framework on how to go about that. In terms of the projects and programmes mentioned by the public institutions, he underlined that there are different channels in programming actions. The Commission is trying to make sure that, on the one hand, the framework, the Guidelines and the objectives are jointly discussed while, in different instances, it is also considered how to support the Guidelines through projects and programmes. Debates on this issue should continue. He concluded that the Guidelines are not only important for the IPA beneficiary countries but also EU itself to do better.

CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS

It was concluded that the consultation event was useful in exchanging constructive feedback from different actors. After the consultation launch event, participants were invited to submit written contributions to EU TACSO 3 at consultation@tacso.eu. Organizations were informed that contributions can be in form of a comment, suggestion, useful study or report etc. to draft EU CS Guidelines 2021-2027 and additional follow-up meetings can be held with the participation of CSOs if needed. Written contributions can be submitted both in English and Turkish language by Friday, 12 March 2021. The latest version of EU CS Guidelines 2021-2027 is available on EU TACSO 3 website www.tacso.eu.

An additional Consultation Meeting that was held on Wednesday, 10 March, 2021 with the participation of Humanist Bureau and Yuva Association

There were several participants that asked to provide comments during the consultation meeting, but due to time constraints, this was not possible. EU TACSO 3 organized an additional meeting to collect their comments:

Seda Akço, Humanist Bureau and Erdem Vardar, Yuva Association

Four important points were highlighted by the Humanist Bureau and Yuva Association regarding the allocation and the disbursement of the funds in the field of humanitarian aid. First, while the international organisations as well as particular national organisations have a certain level of economic and political advantage, this situation creates an unfair competition between the local CSOs and international/national organisations. Together with the huge number of resources allocated to the humanitarian aid field, in the case of Turkey this is particularly for refugees, the humanitarian aid field has become a sector in which urban, educated people largely employed participate. However, no strategic approach has been adopted in terms of the results and impacts of projects developed within this new sector. Second, the ratio and amount disbursed annually through public funding should be taken into consideration together with the shrinking space for CSOs in Turkey, where local and grassroots organisations can hardly benefit from the public funding and where there is an apparent monopoly of international and national organisations that qualify as public institutions working in the field of refugees. Third, activities undertaken by organisations who are active in the humanitarian aid field should be monitored in terms of the relation between the resources allocated into this field and



the outcome and impact of the disbursed funds. It was underlined that there is a considerable ambiguity in terms of the transparency and accountability of CSOs active in the field and the majority of them can hardly be defined as organizations that adopt a rights-based approach in their activities. Last but not least, it was emphasized that in terms of the final impact of the projects conducted especially for increasing the quality of life and/or employment level of the refugees, there is a considerable imbalance between the resources used to this end and the improvement of the life quality and employment level.



Annex 1. Agenda

GUIDELINES EU SUPPORT TO CIVIL SOCIETY IN ENLARGEMENT REGION (EUCSG) FOR THE PERIOD 2021-2027 TURKEY COUNTRY CONSULTATION

TURKEY
25 FEBRUARY, 2021

On-line public consultation
15:30hrs Turkish time (13:30hrs CET)
AGENDA

15:30 – 15:45	Introduction, objectives of the process <ul style="list-style-type: none">• André Lys, Head of Cooperation Unit – European Union Delegation to Turkey• Liselotte Isaksson, Head of Section, Western Balkans Regional Cooperation and Programmes - Civil Society and Social Inclusion (D.5), DG NEAR• Tanja Hafner Ademi, Team Leader, EU TACSO 3
15:45 – 16:15	EU Civil Society Guidelines for the Enlargement region, 2021-2027 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation of the 1st draft framework• Bülent Özcan, Director-General for Financial Cooperation and Project Implementation, Directorate for EU Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs• Q&A (Session led by EU TACSO 3 experts for the EUCSG – Tanja Hafner Ademi/ Emina Nuredinoska)
16:15 – 17:45	Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderated by Özge Konuralp, Country Coordinator for Turkey, EU TACSO 3
17:45 – 18:00	Conclusions & next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EU and TACSO

Annex 2: List of participants

No.	First Name	Last Name	Organization Name
1	Nazlı	Türker	Third Sector Foundation of Turkey
2	Feray	Salman	Human Rights Joint Platform
3	Hayriye	Atas	Checks and Balances Network
4	Murat	Köylü	KAOS GL
5	Özge	Gökpınar	17 May Association
6	Ezgi	Yılmaz	İstanbul Culture and Art Foundation
7	Tezcan Eralp	Abay	Association of Civil Society Development Centre (STGM)
8	Ezgi Can	Koçak	Association of Civil Society Development Centre (STGM)
9	Seda	Akço	Humanist Bureau
10	Sinem Sefa	Akay	Flying Broom Association
11	Erdem	Vardar	Yuva Association
12	Serhat	Kaçan	Civil Society Association in the Penal System
13	Feridun	Ekmekci	Energy Efficiency and Environmental Protection Association
14	Melisa	Demirkıran	Pi Youth Association
15	Cana	Türk	İstanbul Policy Center
16	Murat	Kenanoğlu	The Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey
17	Cem	Arslan	Empathy Association
18	Petek	Shehrin	Monitoring and Evaluation Senior Expert
19	Behrooz	Motamed-Afshari	Monitoring and Evaluation Senior Expert
20	Olçay	Özer	Truth, Justice and Memory Center
21	Serpil	Sancar	Association for Monitoring of Gender Equality
22	Yusuf	Kanlı	Association of Journalists, Media for Democracy (M4D)
23	Merve	Nebioğlu	Hrant Dink Foundation
24	Bülent	Özcan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs
25	Mustafa Murat	Özçelebi	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs
26	Hakan	Atik	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs
27	Bilge	Özer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs
28	Dina	Erad	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs
29	Burcu	Miraç Diraor	Directorate of Strategy and Budget
30	Melda	Melleş	Directorate of Strategy and Budget
31	Sercan	Yavuz	Ministry of Interior
32	İsmail	Yaman	Central Finance and Contract Unit
33	Burçin	Kahveci	Union of Municipalities
34	Tuğba	Ereken	Union of Municipalities
35	Gokmen	Argun	UNDP - Small Grants Programme
36	Malin	Malin	SIDA
37	Irmak İnan	Çınar	UN Women
38	Miresi	Busana	German GIZ
39	Büşra	Karakuş	EU Monitoring Network - Türkiye Avrupa Vakfı
40	Çiğdem Nas	Nas	Economic Development Foundation İKV



**EU TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
TO CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS
IN THE WESTERN BALKANS AND TURKEY**

41	Cafer	Yazıcıođlu	Türkiye Emekliler Derneđi
42	İsmail	Avcı	Laz Enstitüsü
43	Çisel	İleri	Economic Development Foundation IKV
44	Eser	Canaliogly	EUD Turkey
45	Friewderika	Wuenschman	EUD Turkey
46	Nurhan	Yentürk	İstanbul Bilgi University