

# Pakistan and turkey relationship essay sample



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

1. Situated in a disaster-prone geography, Turkey has a strong tradition of responding to those in need, not only in times of natural disaster, but also on a periodical basis. Learning from its own painful experiences, Turkey is an ardent advocate of international solidarity and partnership with a view to building a safer world, saving human lives and protecting the environment. Turkey further believes that a comprehensive development can only be achieved through a sustainable and collective strategy.

1. o With this understanding, Turkey, indiscriminate of race, religion, language and gender, strives to rapidly channel humanitarian assistance to those countries in dire straits and supports the international efforts to this end. Especially in recent years, humanitarian assistance by Turkey has been diversified and significantly increased. Its participation in various humanitarian assistance operations has steered certain international organizations to name Turkey as an “ emerging donor country”.

1. o Turkish humanitarian assistance to Southeast Asia in the aftermath of the tsunami disaster in late 2004, its immediate response to Pakistan’s call for assistance following the October 2005 earthquake and the helping hand extended to Lebanon after the crisis in July 2006 are remarkable examples in this regard. Within this framework, the value of Turkish in-cash and in-kind humanitarian assistance have exceeded 250 million US Dollars in 2005 and 2006.

1. o Furthermore, the Turkish Red Crescent Society and numerous Turkish NGOs are also very active worldwide, so much so that their contributions are estimated to surpass those made by the government.

1. o On the other hand, Turkey's humanitarian contributions are not solely confined to bilateral assistance projects. Turkey aims to further increase its donations to various international organizations. UN World Food Programme (WFP) has already named Turkey as one of the major donors to alleviate the acute food crisis in Africa.

1. o In 2007, almost 11 million USD worth of humanitarian assistance has been made to various countries.

1. o Moreover, Turkey's voluntary contributions to the United Nations have amounted to almost 12 million US Dollars in 2005 and 2006, including a donation worth 600. 000 USD to the newly-founded " Central Emergency Response Fund".

1. o We share the view that further improvements to the humanitarian system are needed in order to have a more effective response to the increasingly complex humanitarian environment. To this end, Turkey is ready and willing to make every effort and contribution. Role of Turkey with the help of Unicef

UNICEF Pakistan Support to Recovery and Rehabilitation of Basic Social Services for the Earthquake-Affected Population 2007-2008

#### SUMMARY

Pakistan suffered its worst ever natural disaster on the morning of 8 October, 2005 when an earthquake measuring 7. 6 on the Richter scale struck a mountainous area of 28, 000 square kilometres of Pakistan's North West Frontier Province (NWFP) and Pakistan-administered Kashmir (PAK). The death toll was estimated at 73, 000 of which around 17, 000 were school

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

students. Around 3.5 million persons were left homeless, of which at least 60 per cent were women and children. Approximately 42,000 children were orphaned, 23,000 children were disabled and an estimated 17,300 women were widowed. Health facilities, water and sanitation schemes, schools, roads, communication systems and public offices were destroyed and agricultural land, livestock and forests were partially or fully lost. The disaster hit children and women particularly hard as many schools had just started morning classes and women were inside their homes when buildings collapsed.

1. Government, Civil Society and International Response The immediate response from the Government, the Army and civil society was swift and exemplary. Within days of the disaster the Government established a Federal Relief Commission (FRC) based in the Prime Minister's Office which mounted a coordinated rescue and relief plan. Residential camps were quickly setup for the displaced and immediate medical relief services were provided for the thousands of injured. Given the heightened risk of child abduction, the adoption of children was banned and security measures were tightened in hospitals, camps and on roads leading out of the affected areas.

Furthermore, the Government created the Earthquake Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Authority (ERRA) to support medium to long term rebuilding efforts. A massive response was mounted by civil society organizations, the population at large and affected people. They all played a commendable and substantial supporting role with huge amounts of cash, in-kind donations and voluntary contributions of time and expertise. The international support for rescue, relief and early recovery was organized initially in 12 sectoral

cluster groups<sup>2</sup> bringing together the Government and a broad range of UN and other humanitarian organisations.

## 2. UNICEF Response

UNICEF was part of the UN consolidated response and was tasked 'to ensure the survival of children in the affected areas through health and nutritional care, provision of safe drinking water and sanitation, while restoring normalcy to their lives through education, recreation, rehabilitation, reunification and psycho-social support.' It acted swiftly to join Government and other partner efforts and led the Water and Sanitation, Protection and Education Clusters and the sub-cluster on Nutrition.

key results of UNICEF's emergency response were the following: UNICEF

Response from October 2005 to September 2007

1. Health and Nutrition • Distributed 150 New Emergency Health Kits to restart health services catering to the needs of 1.5 million people • Supported vaccination of 1.1 million children aged 6 months to 15 years against measles • Re-equipped 99 health facilities with medicine, equipment, supplies and personnel benefiting 1.5 million people • Established services for the identification and management of malnourished children and mothers with the result that 275 severely malnourished and about 21,000 moderately malnourished children and mothers were treated. • Assisted Departments of Health to reach communities that were previously unserved, by establishing a network of more than 2,100 Community Health Workers (CHWs) 2. Primary Education • Established 4,020 tented schools serving about 420,000 girls and boys, including more than 21,000 children - mostly girls - who had never attended school before. • Distributed 9,500 School-in-

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

a-Box Kits and other educational supplies (books, school bags, etc.), serving about 420, 000 students • Trained 14, 500 teachers in psychosocial skills and teaching in challenging environments • Built 125 transitional shelters (for 52 schools) in high-altitude, harsh weather locations where tents are not a long-term solution • Hired 82 para-teachers where either no teacher was available or there was a shortage of teachers

### Water, Environment and Sanitation

- Provided safe water and sanitation to some 350, 000 people in IDP camps, schools and hospitals • Repaired 322 rural water supplies serving over 310, 000 people. More than 500 water supply schemes that will serve approximately an additional 750, 000 people are in progress and will be completed by the end of 2007 • Supplied safe drinking water and latrines to over 190, 000 students in 2, 000 schools • Provided water and sanitation facilities to 29 temporary Basic Health Units • Helped build 38, 400 latrines serving around 700, 000 people • Distributed 160, 000 hygiene kits serving about 1. 1 million people

- Trained nearly 4, 000 primary school teachers on school sanitation and hygiene education, with the result that almost 270, 000 students received sanitation and hygiene education sessions

### 3. Child Protection

- Distributed 687, 000 winter clothing kits, one million blankets and quilts, assisting an estimated 1. 5 million people • Registered and monitored 13, 400 separated, unaccompanied and orphaned children • Provided psycho-social and safe play environments to nearly 18, 300 children through 122 child-friendly spaces • Supported birth registration for more than 21, 000 children under the age of five • Established three District Child Protection Monitoring Units

in Muzaffarabad, Bagh and Mansehra • Set up two child protection centres for earthquake-affected street and working children 3. ERRA-UN Coordinated Recovery Efforts

Government leadership, donor assistance and the efforts of many humanitarian workers on the ground led to an effective and largely successful relief operation. The lives of thousands of children and women were saved by the prevention of a potential second wave of deaths from epidemics, disease and exposure to harsh winter conditions. As the official relief phase ended in April 2006, the FRC's functions were merged with ERRA. In the interest of decentralized operations, ERRA's agencies were set up: PERRA at provincial level in NWFP and SERRA at State level in PAK. Currently ERRA has the overall coordination, planning, financing and monitoring role while PERRA and SERRA act as the Secretariats to the respective Provincial and State Governments.

ERRA's District Reconstruction Units work closely with the district line departments and NGOs to coordinate the implementation of plans. After extensive consultations between ERRA, Inter-Agency Standing Committee members and other stakeholders, the ERRA-UN Early Recovery Plan from May 2006 to April 2007 was established at an estimated cost of \$295 million dollars. The plan presents the concrete actions required in the critical period of transition from relief to rehabilitation and reconstruction to support affected people. Under the banner "Rebuild and Revive with Dignity and Hope", it marks the shift from saving lives to restoring livelihoods in the earthquake-affected areas. 4. UNICEF Support to the ERRA-UN Early Recovery and Rehabilitation Plan (May 2006 to April 2007)

UNICEF directly supports the ERRA-UN Early Recovery Plan efforts in Education, Water and Sanitation, Health and Support to Vulnerable Children through its Primary Education, Water, Environment and Sanitation, Health and Child Protection projects. UNICEF's assistance focuses on the integrated delivery of improved basic social services in the affected areas; institutional and community capacity building; humanitarian support for the remaining IDP caseload and the most vulnerable population; and advocacy and facilitation for policy and legislative reform in six of the nine affected districts - Abbotabad, Battagram and Mansehra in NWFP, and Bagh, Muzaffarabad and Neelum in PAK. The sectors of the Emergency Support Programme established as a response to the earthquake are aligned with those in the ongoing 2004-2008 Government of Pakistan-UNICEF Country Programme Plan of Action. The 2005 earthquake was Pakistan's biggest ever natural disaster but there have been others of varying degrees during UNICEF's almost sixty years of work in the country.

In order to better meet future challenges and ensure equity of response in all locations, the Emergency Support Programme seeks to further strengthen the emergency preparedness and response capacity with regard to children in the Country Programme of the Government and its partners. Similarly, as post-earthquake requirements change from emergency to recovery and reconstruction, UNICEF is ensuring that the rehabilitation and reconstruction activities restore basic social services for children which were aligned with social service provision in other parts of Pakistan. To guide implementation, UNICEF Pakistan's Emergency Support Programme has prepared this strategic recovery plan outlining proposed programmatic and financial



contributions to the overall earthquake recovery effort. This reflects strategies and interventions based upon lessons learned from the relief and rescue phase and planned jointly with the various levels of ERRA, line departments and district governments in NWFP and PAK, UN and (I)NGO partners. The proposed interventions are in line with national sector strategies, the UN System in Pakistan's Guiding Principles for Early Recovery and Reconstruction and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). Major Donors for UNICEF Pakistan Support for Recovery

UNICEF Pakistan would like to express its gratitude to the following governments and UNICEF National Committees for their contribution to its interventions in the recovery phase: Australia, Canada, Denmark, the European Commission, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. National Committees for UNICEF in Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Kuwait, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and United States Fund for UNICEF (US Fund).

Support World bank for the development in damaged area of Pakistan  
Compared to the famine-inducing disasters of earlier periods, South Asia has progressed in its ability to cope with disaster. Although several major natural disasters have hit the region in recent years - the tsunami, the Kashmir earthquake, floods and cyclones in Bangladesh - it has not experienced a

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

famine for decades. Thanks to better disaster responses in the region, large natural disasters no longer trigger massive food insecurity and high post-disaster mortality. This article looks at the role of cash support in the wake of natural disasters, drawing out lessons from the World Bank's use of large-scale cash support in South Asia and Turkey.

In the past, the World Bank often focused on reconstruction and long-term development, leaving humanitarian relief to others. But starting with the earthquake in Turkey in 1999 and continuing through the South Asian disasters of 2004 and 2005, cash support to affected households has played a growing role in the Bank's disaster response. This article reviews some of the lessons from Bank-supported large-scale cash support. Cash support has performed well. Large-scale cash income support directly to affected households complements other relief and reconstruction efforts and seems to have had positive impacts on short-term food security and long-term recovery. To perform even better in future disasters, donors should consider building up their own capacity and that of implementing agencies to deliver timely and high-quality cash support. Why income support?

The purpose of cash transfers and other social protection instruments, when used in disasters, is to protect the basic consumption of the affected population and to help preserve and recover assets and human capital. They are a basic safety net in times of critical need, when community support mechanisms are exhausted. The support aims to prevent famines and food insecurity, speed up the recovery of assets and livelihoods and protect a population's schooling and health status after a disaster. All of this will prevent poverty from deepening. Income support complements other types

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

of post-disaster efforts, such as housing and infrastructure reconstruction. This complementarity became clear to the Bank in Gujarat: ' earthquake victims' need for cash assistance became apparent to the Bank in an indirect way following the 2001 earthquake. Families were using the first installment of house construction funding to purchase food and other necessities to survive, rather than using it toward the construction. As a result, when it became time to issue the second installment, many of the families did not have the first phase of the house to show in order to receive the second installment'. Cash or food?

Cash remains underutilised in humanitarian relief, although there is growing evidence of its efficacy. The World Food Programme, for example, has embraced cash and voucher-based safety nets in its Strategic Plan for 2008-2011. Cash confers dignity and choice and tends to have lower transaction costs and higher value to beneficiaries than in-kind support. Cash is best delivered through cash transfers or workfare. Cash support must be timely, temporary, not too large and distributed in communities of regular residence, and it must end as livelihoods bounce back. Cash support is inappropriate where food markets are weak or non-existent. Success requires careful attention to the details of design and implementation: how will support be targeted and distributed, to whom, how much and for how long? Success also requires speedy deployment. Therefore, there are clear advantages on speed and efficiency grounds of drawing up plans for disaster response and helping to build implementation capacity before disaster strikes. Income support in South Asia and Turkey

Many agencies help countries respond to large disasters. The role of the World Bank in disasters has often been as lead donor, trusted advisor and coordinator of reconstruction and long-term development, but not relief. Since 1984, the Bank has financed natural disaster activities in 528 projects, worth \$26 billion, constituting some 10% of total global Bank lending in the last two decades. India and Bangladesh alone had 71 disaster projects from 1984 to 2005. Government agencies implement most of these projects and fund them through a combination of new loans and grants and reallocations from existing loans. Bank support in major disasters generally comprises a multi-sectoral mix of interventions, such as budget support, emergency preparedness and rehabilitation and reconstruction of schools, housing, infrastructure, agriculture, forestry and health facilities. The World Bank assisted in the deployment of income support as part of its response to disasters in Turkey (1999), Sri Lanka (2004), the Maldives (2004) and Pakistan (2005).

While many different agencies have experience with post-disaster cash transfers, the uniqueness of the World Bank's recent experience is the scale of the transfers. The marriage of government implementation channels and Bank support (mostly financial, but also some technical assistance) allowed cash grants to be offered on an unprecedented scale. In the Maldives, all affected households (one-fifth of the population) received tsunami cash assistance, most of them within one month. In Sri Lanka, cash grants were given to some 250, 000 households (in the first round), covering all of the affected households and even some that were not directly affected (later tranches were therefore targeted more narrowly). In Pakistan, Bank-

supported cash grants were given to 250, 000 households, approximately 30% of all those affected. Key design details are summarised in Table 1.

The variation in the basic design of post-disaster cash support across countries shown in Table 1 is remarkable. It is particularly surprising that the amounts offered to affected households varied widely. Pakistan, after the Kashmir earthquake, provided the most generous support, especially when compared to GDP. In Pakistan, affected households received between \$300 and \$2, 000, the equivalent of 7–48% of per capita GDP per member. It seems unlikely that Pakistan would be able or willing to finance transfers of this magnitude in future disasters. The comparable amounts per person are 3–9% of per capita GDP in Turkey, 3% in Sri Lanka and 1. 5–4. 5% in the Maldives. These amounts are in all cases substantially higher than the benefits provided to regular social assistance beneficiaries in these countries (typically the chronically poor).

There is limited evidence of the impact of this income support. The most detailed is from the Maldives, where a survey carried out six months after the tsunami showed that the support was adequate, well-targeted and helped people to cope and recover. Targeting appears to have been good and few eligible households, if any, were missed. The cash grants infused purchasing power into affected islands and helped to revive retail trade. Incidences of food shortage fell rapidly after peaking one week after the tsunami. Six months afterwards, household income was higher than it had been before the disaster. From Pakistan, there are anecdotal reports that the government's decision to pay compensation for death may have led to inflated casualty figures: verification of claims for death compensation

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

proved difficult as the dead had often been buried without vital registration. There is little solid evidence on the extent of corruption. In Sri Lanka, reports found mistargeting (inclusion of unaffected households) but not corruption. Nevertheless, risks are large. Many studies of South Asia's safety nets – albeit from non-disaster settings – have pointed to leakages.

Most reported problems arise with workfare and in-kind transfers, such as India's subsidised food grain programme. There are fewer reports of mistargeting and leakages of cash transfers, probably because they are simpler to implement. Implementation arrangements are critical and a particular challenge is to combine speed and quality in the delivery of assistance. It proved difficult to align technical assistance for design and implementation with the desire to roll out cash transfers swiftly. Some governments went ahead with disbursing cash transfers without waiting for technical assistance: Pakistan (death/disability grants), Sri Lanka (cash grants) and the Maldives (cash transfers) all started without external technical assistance, while Pakistan's livelihood grants benefited from technical assistance but were paid out somewhat later. As a consequence, monitoring arrangements were often simple, with little or no data collection, sometimes hampering ex-post verification and audits. Lessons learned

The main lesson that emerges from these experiences is that speed is of the essence: if donors are slow, governments will design and implement programmes on their own. Some further tentative lessons are listed below.

Cash preference: Income support should be in cash unless there is evidence that food markets are disrupted. In rapid-onset disasters, food and other in-kind support can be useful if the disaster has disrupted markets. However,

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

in-kind support should subsequently be converted into cash support except where food markets remain interrupted. In slow-onset disasters (with the possible exception of conflicts) food markets are more likely to function and the case for cash is therefore stronger. Duration and target group: Cash support should be provided only for a limited period for most households, but could be stretched into the medium term for the most vulnerable. In small-to-medium emergencies, the best approach may be to provide an initial fairly large transfer to all those affected, followed by a second, smaller transfer (perhaps after three months).

Later transfers should be targeted to vulnerable households. In very large emergencies, household targeting within affected areas may be required for all transfers. For the most vulnerable groups (such as orphans and disabled people), additional social services are also required. Benefit levels: The amount of support should be adequate for subsistence but not so high as to jeopardise work incentives or cause inflation. Larger amounts should be given only as one-off compensation, for example triggered by the loss of a house. Eligibility: Eligibility criteria would ideally be predefined, transparent, easy to explain and simple to administer. Criteria could emphasise loss of house or other assets for immediate support (but without discriminating against renters), shifting to poverty criteria and possibly even a proxy means test for medium-term support.

Delivery agency: Income support would ideally be coordinated and delivered by one or more of the regular safety net or social security programmes with experience in handling cash transfers. Given the logistical challenges in large emergencies, support from others such as army staff or local governments

will probably be needed. Delivery channel: For rapid support to people who do not have bank accounts, cash-in-hand may be used to avoid the delays of opening bank accounts. Cash is also often the best way to pay workfare participants. For medium-term support, bank or post office accounts should be used. In the future, transfers via mobile phones may become more common. Systems are needed: Systems for targeting, implementation and monitoring and evaluation should be prepared in advance. Conclusions

Large-scale cash support has been an important and effective part of the response in several recent major disasters. As cash transfers will continue to be needed, it makes sense to improve their design and seek to make them swifter, more equitable and more consistent. Affected countries and donors should work this into their disaster preparedness plans. Ex-ante planning should answer the core design questions: in what form, amount and duration should income support be offered? which households should be eligible for support and how can they be targeted? which agency is responsible for delivery? Implementing agencies should start building the necessary response capacity. These steps would help the international humanitarian community to respond better and faster to the next emergency. Role of Turkey in 2005 earth quake

With regard to purchase and procurement of relief goods, a President's Relief Fund was established soon after the earthquake to provide a central target point for donations and resource mobilization efforts. All financial transactions and procurement were handled by the Emergency Relief Cell of the Cabinet Division, on the direction of the FRC which was responsible for identifying what goods were needed and in what quantities, arranging

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>



transport for supply of these, and ensuring their judicious distribution. The ERC took the lead in procuring additional items needed for the relief effort. It helped build up the seven days' reserve rations stipulated in the relief supplies' policy. Thousands of tons of relief goods were provided by the people of Pakistan. The Government and people of Punjab were especially generous and active in mobilizing supply. Local and national NGOs, individuals, schools and colleges and m sent supplies to help the quake survivors. Also notable was the contribution of the Utility Stores Corporation (USC) of Pakistan.

USC opened 33 containerized outlets in the affected areas and distributed over 15, 000 tons of rations. Its contribution included supply of 73, 610 bags of composite rations between 9 October and 14 November 2005, provision and transport of 7 days' reserve stocks for 1. 5 million people (10, 354 tons), distribution of 1, 500 tons of rations to people short of food, and provision of CGI sheets to people in the affected areas at subsidized rates. 10Th international community also responded generously to the plight of the earthquake survivors, particularly as the massive scale of the disaster became apparent. A total of 68 countriesent supplies to help the quake affectees. Particularly notable, and useful, were the contributions of Turkey (including 55, 000 tons of rations, over 1 million blankets); Sri Lanka (3, 000 tons of rations), China (210, 880 blankets, 14, 000 tents, 64 tons medicines); Saudi Arabia, Japan and the US (incl. 189, 827 blankets). The international community also gave support in other forms. Japan sent 120 rescue workers; China sent a 50-member rescue team with sniffer dogs to rescue survivors; and Germany sent a search-and-rescue team.

Cuba sent 2, 575 medical personnel who set up 30 field hospitals in the affected areas. Iran provided two helicopters to support the relief effort and 22 vehicles (15 ambulances, 4 buses, 2 vans, 1 jeep). It also set up two 50-bed field hospitals and gave 4 tons of medicines. The US set up 2 MASH hospitals and provided 159 tons of medicines. Japan set up a field hospital and provided heavy machinery to clear rubble (10 excavators and 10 bulldozer cranes details of donations from individual . The ICRC carried out its own needs assessment and launched its independent, self-contained relief operation. It chartered helicopters which flew 8, 000 sorties and distributed 12, 791 tons of food and 1, 275 tons of non-food items. The relief contributions by Turkey proved extremely useful in meeting the food requirements of the earthquake survivors. Turkey sent 100 containers of rations by road. It provided 55, 000 tons of food, over 1 million blankets and 9, 000 tents. The combined food stuff donated by Turkey and Sri Lanka was divided between AJK and NWFP as follows:

AJK - 20, 000 tons

flour, 300 tons soybean oil, 200 tons rice, 100 tons sugar; NWFP - 20, 000 tons flour, 300 tons oil, 100 tons rice, 100 tons sugar; Reserve - 10, 000 tons flour, 150 tons oil, 194. 7 tons rice, 50 tons sugar. Turkey also set up 9 field hospitals and provided 114 tons of medicines. And it made cash donations of \$3. 5 million and \$3 million respectively to the President's Relief Fund and UN agencies, and pledged a further \$150 million in assistance at the Donors' Conference held in November 2005.

The Turkish Red Crescent Society was very active in supporting Pakistan deal with the quake disaster. It launched three campaigns in Turkey to raise funds

<https://assignbuster.com/pakistan-and-turkey-relationship-essay-sample/>

for the survivors: ' They were always with us, now it is our turn', a ' Qurbani campaign' and ' Lets have a house in Pakistan', which together raised over \$60 million. Its activities in Pakistan included setting up two tent villages catering for 5, 000 people, running bakeries in Muzaffarabad and Bagh, setting up a field hospital (delivered within 24 hours of the quake) in Muzaffarabad, distributing relief goods to nearly 1 million people through a military relief team. The Turkish Red Crescent is continuing its support with projects for reconstruction and rehabilitation.