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ABOUT TUSEV

Third Sector Foundation of Turkey (TUSEV) was established in 1993 with the objective of strengthening the legal, fiscal and operational infrastructure of civil society organizations. For over two decades, TUSEV has been working to create a more enabling environment for civil society and providing solutions to common and emerging problems of CSOs with the support of its members.

With the vision of a stronger, participatory and credible civil society in Turkey, TUSEV works under four main program areas and undertakes activities that aim to:

- Establish an enabling and supportive legal and fiscal framework for CSOs,
- Encourage strategic and effective philanthropy and giving,
- Facilitate dialogue and cooperation between the public sector, private sector, and civil society
- Promote the credibility of Turkish civil society,
- Encourage collaborations at the international level,
- Create resources and raise awareness through research on civil society.
COVID-19 (Coronavirus), which was classified as a pandemic on March 11, 2020 by WHO (the World Health Organization), have an adverse impact on the activities of civil society organizations like many other sectors. TUSEV came together with stakeholders from civil society at certain stages of the process; created platforms for sharing knowledge and experience related to the ongoing situation. As an output of these discussions - and to use the results in the planning of advocacy activities to be tailored for different stakeholders; TUSEV created the Survey on The Impact of COVID-19 Outbreak on Civil Society Organizations Operating in Turkey, to determine the common problems experienced by CSOs during this period in a more participatory manner. In total, 170 CSOs participated in the survey, the first phase of which was conducted between April 10 and 15, 2020. The results of the survey were evaluated by stakeholders from different parts of civil society under the coordination of TUSEV.

The ongoing epidemic has created the necessity of monitoring the current status of civil society organizations and determining their changing needs. In this context, the second phase of the survey has been designed. The survey consisted of 39 questions under six topics (General Questions, Current Resources, Impact of COVID-19 on Your Organization, Grants and Funds, Aids and Donations and Employment and Sustainability), which were answered by 141 CSO representatives, between August 11 and 19, 2020. This report provides a comparative evaluation of both surveys.
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1. GENERAL QUESTIONS

In the General Questions section of the report, data regarding the types of CSOs, their fields of activity, and the regions where their headquarters are located are presented.

TYPES OF CSOs

Within the 141 CSOs that responded to the survey, there were 83 associations, 47 foundations, 2 cooperatives, and 2 umbrella organizations. Among the respondent organizations, there are 1 initiative, 1 platform, 1 social initiative, 1 non-profit corporation, 1 professional union, 1 professional organization, and 1 think tank operating under a private university.

FIGURE 1. TYPES OF CSOs

- Association: 83
- Foundation: 47
- Cooperative: 2
- Umbrella Organization (federation, confederation etc.): 2
- Initiative (Groups, networks etc.): 1
- Platform: 1
- Social Initiative: 1
- Think Tank Operating Under a Private University: 1
- Non-Profit Corporation: 1
- Professional Union: 1
- Professional Organization: 1

August
April
FIELDS OF ACTIVITY OF CSOs

When the primary fields of activity of the respondent CSOs were evaluated; number one was education with 50%, followed by youth (29%), culture and arts (22%), women (19%), human rights (18%), children’s rights (18%), and information (research and publication) (18%).

FIGURE 2. FIELDS OF ACTIVITY OF CSOs

- Education: 50% (August), 57% (April)
- Youth: 29% (August), 27% (April)
- Culture and Arts: 22% (August), 21% (April)
- Women: 19% (August), 23% (April)
- Human Rights: 18% (August), 27% (April)
- Children’s Rights: 18% (August), 22% (April)
- Information (Research and Publication): 18% (August), 15% (April)
- Enhancing the Capacity of Civil Society: 17% (August), 16% (April)
- Social Services: 16% (August), 18% (April)
- Healthcare: 16% (August), 17% (April)
- Other: 16% (August), 16% (April)
- Conservation of Environment and Wildlife: 13% (August), 14% (April)
- Disability Rights: 10% (August), 14% (April)
- Business World: 10% (August), 9% (April)
- Migration and Refugees: 9% (August), 14% (April)
- International Cooperation: 9% (August), 12% (April)
- Development: 9% (August), 11% (April)
- Communication and Media: 6% (August), 9% (April)
- Elderly Rights: 5% (August), 4% (April)
- Good Governance (Democracy, transparency, fighting against corruption): 4% (August), 8% (April)
- Animal Rights: 4% (August), 4% (April)
- Consumer Rights: 1% (August), 4% (April)
- LGBTİ+: 3% (August), 5% (April)

Multiple options were selected.
LOCATIONS OF THE CSOs' HEADQUARTERS

In terms of geographical distribution, the majority of the CSO headquarters are located primarily in 3 regions. More than half (60%) are located in the Marmara Region, 19% in Central Anatolia, 12% in the Aegean Region. No CSO from the Eastern Anatolia Region responded to the survey. When these findings are evaluated according to the type of organization, 57% of the associations are located in the Marmara Region and 43% are located in other parts of Turkey. A different distribution is observed in foundations: 65% of the foundations that responded to the survey are in the Marmara Region.

It was determined that almost half of the CSOs in the Marmara Region, where most of the organizations participating in the survey are located, have an annual income of 1.5 million TL and one-third of them over 3 million TL. More than half of the CSOs participating from other regions have an annual income below 150 thousand TL.

**FIGURE 3. LOCATIONS OF THE CSOs' HEADQUARTERS**

- **Marmara Region**: 60%
- **Central Anatolia**: 19%
- **Aegean Region**: 12%
- **Mediterranean Region**: 4%
- **Southeastern Anatolia Region**: 3%
- **Blacksea Region**: 2%
- **Eastern Anatolia Region**: 0%
- **August**: 0%
- **April**: 2%
2. CURRENT RESOURCES

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME PAID EMPLOYEES WORKING IN CSOs

The CSOs were asked about the number of their paid employees. The results show that 38% of the CSOs who responded to the second phase of the survey have 1-5 full-time paid employees. While 24% of the participating CSOs stated that they had no paid employees, 14% had 6-10 paid employees, 9% had 11-25, 6% had 26-50 paid employees, 4% had 51-100 and 5% had above 100 paid employees.
TOTAL INCOME IN 2019

When the responses of the 141 CSOs, that participated in the second phase of the survey, were evaluated, it was determined that 11% of the organizations had less than 10,000 TL of annual income in 2019. 6% had an annual income of 10,001-30,000 TL, 17% had 30,001-150,000 TL and 9% had 150,001-300,000 TL. 22% of the CSOs stated they had an annual income of 300,001-1,500,000 TL. 11% of the respondents indicated that they had an annual income of 1,500,001-3,000,000 TL and 24% reported having an annual income of >3,000,000 TL.

CSOs’ MAIN SOURCES OF INCOME

According to the respondents, individual donations (56%), project revenues (55%), and membership fees (33%) are the top three sources of income. 11% stated that income from interest is among their main source of income while 8% indicated that income from leased assets is among their main sources of income. In addition, 13% of the organizations cited income from economic enterprises among their main sources of income while corporate giving made up 11% of the responses.
When the income distributions are analyzed according to the types of organizations participating in the survey, we see that project revenues are among the main sources of income for 60% of the associations, followed by individual giving with a rate of 50%. Income from membership fees is among the main sources of income for 46% of the associations that participated in the survey.

71% of the 46 foundations participating in the survey stated that individual giving is among their income sources. According to survey results, which show project revenues as the second-highest source of income for 46% of the foundations, 24% of the foundations ranked income from interest as one of the main sources.

For initiatives, cooperatives, umbrella organizations, and similar organizations the main source of income is project revenues. These percentages were calculated based on the number of selected choices, not based on the size of income.

**FIGURE 6. CSOs’ MAIN SOURCES OF INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual giving</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project revenues</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Economic Enterprises</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest revenues</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Giving</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased assets</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple options were selected.

“What are your organization’s main sources of income?”
3. IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON YOUR ORGANIZATION

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON ACTIVITIES

As in the first phase of the survey conducted in April, within the scope of the second phase in August, CSO representatives were asked questions about the impact of the pandemic on the activities of their organizations. The organizations participating in the second phase of the survey were asked to make the said assessment for the last three months. 78% of the 141 organizations participating in the survey stated that the pandemic affected activities such as seminars, conferences, and performances, while 60% highlighted the effect on training. Also, 39% of the participants stated that fundraising activities were affected, 38% reported their services were affected due to closure of centers and stopping fieldwork, and 16% stated that the pandemic had an impact on advocacy activities. 16% of the CSOs reported that all of their activities have completely stopped.

Compared to the results of the survey in April 2020, a decreasing trend is observed in the impact of the pandemic on some activities of civil society organizations. For the provision of services, the rate was 43% in the previous survey whereas it is 38% in this phase. In addition, the rate of the CSOs that reported the complete suspension of their activities decreased from 29% to 16%.
“How did the measures taken against the COVID-19 pandemic affect the activities of your organization?”

- **Events (seminars, conferences, performances etc.)**
  - August: 78%
  - April: 75%
- **Training**
  - August: 60%
  - April: 59%
- **Fundraising activities**
  - August: 39%
  - April: 43%
- **Provision of services (cessation of field work and service centers being closed down)**
  - August: 38%
  - April: 43%
- **All activities completely suspended**
  - August: 16%
  - April: 29%
- **Advocacy (postponing campaigns and activities)**
  - August: 16%
  - April: 20%
- **Other**
  - August: 9%
  - April: 8%

Multiple options were selected.
CHALLENGES IN CARRYING OUT ACTIVITIES

In the first phase of the survey in April, the CSOs were asked how easily they could adapt their activities to new ways of working in the context of measures taken against COVID-19; considering the start of the process and adaptation. In the second phase, the respondents were asked to evaluate, taking into consideration the time elapsed, how difficult it was for them to perform their activities in the last three months (1- great difficulty, 5- no difficulty at all). 19% of respondents had great difficulty, 22% had some difficulty, 39% found it neither difficult nor not difficult, 14% had no difficulty and 6% had no difficulty at all.

“*How difficult were the last three months in terms of performing your activities within the context of the measures taken against the COVID-19 pandemic?*”
NEW METHODS

The 141 organizations surveyed were asked if they did any of the items on the list in response to the challenges posed by the COVID-19 outbreak. 73% of the participating organizations noted that they developed new methods to reach their beneficiaries, 45% stated that they were looking for new grants/funds, and 36% stated that they established cooperation with different stakeholders. 7% of the respondents stated that they have not done anything new during this period. 9% of the organizations that marked the “other” option in this question stated that they tried methods such as improving their digital infrastructure and diversifying their fundraising methods.

When analyzed in conjunction with the answers given to the previous question, it is seen that almost half of the organizations that reported difficulties while implementing their activities, started to seek alternative grants and funds, and another 50% developed new methods to reach the beneficiaries. According to survey results, “developing new methods to reach beneficiaries” has been popular among the organizations that gave different responses to the previous question. 83% of the organizations that stated having difficulties while implementing their activities, 75% of the organizations that stated not having any difficulties, and 55% that stated not having any difficulties at all, stated that they tried new methods to reach their beneficiaries in the process.

**FIGURE 9. NEW METHODS**

- Developed new methods to reach our beneficiaries: 73%
- Looked for new grants/funds: 45%
- Established cooperation with different stakeholders: 36%
- Other: 9%
- Could not do anything: 7%

*Have you done any of the following in the past three months due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on your organization and activities?*
INCREASE IN DEMAND

Within the scope of the survey, the CSOs were asked to rank how the pandemic affected the demand for their services, on a scale of 1 (not increased at all) to 5 (increased dramatically). 33% of 141 respondents reported a dramatic increase, while %32 stated some increase and %25 said there was no change in demand. While 5% of the respondents stated that the need for their activities did not increase, another 5% answered this question as "not increased at all."

A closer look shows that, out of the 141 CSOs, 90% of those working in healthcare, 84% in children’s rights, 80% in animal rights, about %80 in social services, 75% in human rights and women’s studies, and 71% in elderly rights reported an increase in the need for their activities. About half and a little over half of the organizations working in fields such as education, rights of persons with disabilities, information and research, good governance, culture and arts, consumer rights, reported that the need for activities showed an increase.

FIGURE 10. INCREASE IN DEMAND

“How has the demand for your activities increased during the COVID-19 pandemic?”
DIRECT WORK WITH THE DISADVANTAGED GROUPS

In the second phase of the questionnaire, it was asked whether civil society organizations have been directly working with the communities affected by the pandemic. More than half of the 141 CSOs (52%) stated that they are working directly for the empowerment of the disadvantaged communities, while 48% stated that they do not carry out such an activity.

At a closer look, during this period, it was observed that the activities of organizations that carried out direct efforts to empower the disadvantaged communities were more affected than the activities of the organizations that did not carry out such activities. Among the CSOs that were doing direct work for the empowerment of the disadvantaged groups, 60% had their trainings affected, 80% had their events affected, 21% reported an impact on their advocacy work, and 42% had their fundraising activities affected. For the organizations that did not carry out such activities, 58% had their trainings affected, 75% had their events affected, 25% reported an impact on their services, 10% on their advocacy work and 35% reported an impact on fundraising activities. Another important fact is that while only 10% of the CSOs working to empower the disadvantaged groups during this period stated that they had to stop their activities due to COVID-19, 22% of the remaining organizations had to stop their activities.

In terms of the number of volunteers in the organizations that reported working directly to empower the disadvantaged groups in the last three months during the COVID-19 outbreak, 60% of these organizations have between 11 to 500 volunteers. Only 38% of CSOs that are outside this category have their volunteer number within this range while 25% have no volunteers. During the pandemic, 21% of the organizations working to empower the disadvantaged groups had an increase in the number of volunteers, whereas for the remaining CSOs this rate was 10%.

46% of the organizations that work directly for the empowerment of disadvantaged communities stated that there was a decrease in the donations they received during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although this rate is not very different from other organizations, when the increase in donations is examined, it is seen that 20% of the organizations carrying out such activities noted that the donations they received increased in this period, while the rate of the other organizations who stated that their donations increased in this period remained at 3%.

Another interesting finding is that, in this period, 43% of organizations working directly with the disadvantaged groups applied for emergency funding, while only 7% of the organizations that do not work directly with these groups used this opportunity. In addition, the former group’s rate of receiving grants is higher than the latter; while 60% of CSOs working to empower vulnerable groups stated that they received grants, 42% of other CSOs reported doing so.
INCREASE IN DEMAND WITHIN A DIFFERENT AREA

CSO representatives were asked whether the pandemic created an additional demand for activities/advocacy in other areas. 68% of the respondents stated that they are not planning to perform activities in other areas, while 32% reported that activities in other areas were brought to their agenda. Of the 43 organizations stating they would operate in other areas, 7 said they would focus on digital transformation, 7 on healthcare, 10 on disadvantaged communities, 2 on education, 7 on social assistance, 1 on rights-based activities, 3 on advocacy, and 6 other niche areas. The rate of organizations that stated they would operate in other areas was 43% in the first phase in April and 32% in the survey conducted in August.

FIGURE 12. INCREASE IN DEMAND WITHIN A DIFFERENT AREA

“In addition to your current areas of activity, has the COVID-19 pandemic created an additional demand for activities/advocacy in other areas?”

No [68%]
Yes [32%]

August [57%]
April [43%]
NUMBER OF ACTIVE VOLUNTEERS IN CSOs

The CSOs were asked about the number of their active volunteers. The results indicated that 14% of the organizations have 1-5, 14% have 11-25, 13% have 26-50, 12% have 51-100 and 10% have 101-500 active volunteers. In addition, 5% of the CSOs stated that they have more than 1000 volunteers, while 20% noted that they have no active volunteers.

**FIGURE 13. NUMBER OF ACTIVE VOLUNTEERS IN CSOs**

- **1000+**: 8% (August), 5% (April)
- **501-1000**: 1% (August), 3% (April)
- **101-500**: 10% (August), 10% (April)
- **51-100**: 14% (August), 12% (April)
- **26-50**: 14% (August), 13% (April)
- **11-25**: 20% (August), 14% (April)
- **6-10**: 9% (August), 9% (April)
- **1-5**: 15% (August), 14% (April)
- **None**: 20% (August), 11% (April)
THE IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS

In the second phase of the survey, the impact of the pandemic on the number of volunteers working for the organizations was analyzed. Of 113 organizations stating that they have volunteers, 16% said the number of volunteers increased while 27% highlighted a decrease in the number of volunteers. 57% of the respondents reported that there was no change in the number of volunteers.

![Figure 14. The Impact of COVID-19 on the Number of Volunteers](#)

**Has the COVID-19 pandemic caused a change in the number of volunteers in your organization?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Graph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW METHODS OF WORKING WITH VOLUNTEERS

Within the scope of the survey, 113 organizations who reported working with volunteers were also asked whether they used new methods in their volunteer-based activities during the pandemic. While 72% of the respondents stated that they did not try any new methods in this period, 28% stated that they tried new methods to carry out volunteer-based activities.

50% of the organizations that reported an increase in the number of volunteers, 25% of those that reported a decrease, and 25% of the CSOs who stated that the number of volunteers remained the same highlighted that they developed new methods for volunteer-based activities during the pandemic.

![Figure 15. New Methods of Working with Volunteers](#)

**Have you used any new methods (e-volunteering, etc.) for your volunteer-based activities during the COVID-19 pandemic?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Used</th>
<th>Graph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW METHODS TO INCREASE MOTIVATION IN VOLUNTEERS

In the survey, the organizations that reported working with volunteers were asked about the motivation of their volunteers, and they were asked whether they used any new methods to maintain and increase the motivation of their volunteers in the process. While 59% of 113 organizations reported that they did not do any work in this regard, 41% of the organizations stated that they tried new methods to maintain and increase the motivation of their volunteers.

65% of the CSOs that reported a decrease in the number of volunteers, stated that they did not develop any new methods to maintain their volunteers’ motivation, while 35% stated that they tried new methods.

**FIGURE 16. NEW METHODS TO INCREASE MOTIVATION IN VOLUNTEERS**

Have you used any new methods to maintain and increase volunteer motivation during the COVID-19 pandemic?

- 41% Yes
- 59% No
4. GRANTS AND FUNDS

GRANTS/FUNDS

52% of respondents stated they received grants/funds while 48% reported they did not.

FIGURE 17. GRANTS/FUNDS

Has your organization received grants/funds in the past year?”

Yes

52%

60%

No

48%

40%

August

April

Has your organization received grants/funds in the past year?”
For the CSOs that received grant/funds, the European Union was the primary source for such grants/funds with 30%. The rate of those who reported receiving grants/funds from international organizations such as consulates and international grantmaking organizations ranked second with 27%. 15% reported receiving grants/funds from a foundation in Turkey while 14% reported receiving grants/funds from the private sector. 7% reported receiving funds from the United Nations. The respondents who chose “Others” (7%) specified development agencies among their responses.

**Figure 18. Sources of Grants/Funds**

- United Nations: 7%
- European Union: 30%
- Supranational organization (EU, UN): 30%
- International organizations (Consulates, international grantmaking organizations): 27%
- Foundations operating in Turkey: 15%
- Private sector: 14%
- Other: 7%

*If you receive grants/funds, can you state their source?*
Among the CSOs participating in the survey, 72% of those who declared that they received grants/funds in the last year stated that they used the grant/fund they received for project implementation and 28% as core funding.

Half of the organizations that reported having received grants/funds had an annual income of 1.5 million TL or more. In terms of field of work, 75% of the organizations doing LGBTi work received grants while this rate was about 70% for the CSOs operating in the field of media and communications, children’s rights, migration and refugees, international cooperation; and 60% for the CSOs working in the field of women, human rights, animal rights, and capacity building for civil society.

**FIGURE 19. PURPOSE OF GRANT/FUND**

- **Project implementation:**
  - 72%
  - Multiple options were selected.

- **Core funding:**
  - 28%

“*What is the purpose of the grants/funds you received?”*
RELATIONS WITH THE GRANT/FUND PROVIDERS

The CSOs that reported receiving grants/funds were asked whether they discussed specific topics with their grant/fund providers during the period between the beginning of the pandemic and the second phase of the survey. 38% of the 73 grant recipients stated that they discussed the current situation and changes in project activities, 30% reported having discussed an extension in completion dates. 18% of the CSOs stated that they discussed details regarding the use of the core funding they received from the provider. In addition, 8% of the respondents reported that they discussed the cancellation of project activities with their grant/fund provider. During this period, 6% did not discuss any topics with their grant/fund providers.

**FIGURE 20. RELATIONS WITH THE GRANT/FUND PROVIDERS**

- **Current situation and changes in project activities**: 38% discussed, 45% did not.
- **Extension of completion date**: 30% discussed, 34% did not.
- **Details regarding the use of the core funding**: 18% discussed, 19% did not.
- **Cancellation of project activities**: 8% discussed, 7% did not.
- **No, we have not**: 6% discussed, 7% did not.

“*If you receive grants/funds, have you discussed any of the following topics with your grant/fund provider?*”
THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE GRANT/FUND PROVIDERS TOWARDS REQUESTS

The respondents who stated having received grants/funds in the past year were asked to rank the flexibility of their grant/fund providers towards their needs on a scale of 1 (not flexible at all) to 5 (extremely flexible). 38% of the respondents stated that they were very flexible, while 32% responded as flexible. 19% of the representatives responded as neither flexible nor not flexible; another 11% in total chose the options of either “not flexible” or “not flexible at all.” When the responses in the first and second phases of the survey were compared, no significant difference could be found in terms of the flexibility of the grant/fund providers towards the demands and expectations of CSOs.

FIGURE 21. THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE GRANT/FUND PROVIDERS TOWARDS REQUESTS

“If you receive grants/funds, can you rank the flexibility of your provider with regards to the needs of your organization in this period on a scale of 1-5?”
SUPPORT OTHER THAN CASH GRANTS/FUNDS

In the second phase of the survey, the respondents who reported having received grants/funds in the past year were asked whether they received any other support from their grant/fund provider outside of cash grants/funds. Of the organizations that reported having received grants/funds, 24% received mentorship, 16% received networking/communication support, and 7% received infrastructure support. 53% of the respondents stated they did not receive any other support from their grant/fund provider outside of cash grants/funds.

**FIGURE 22. SUPPORT OTHER THAN CASH GRANTS/FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking/communication</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure support</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do you receive any other support from your grant/fund provider outside of grants/funds?*
EMERGENCY GRANT/FUND APPLICATION

In the second phase of the survey, the respondents were asked whether they applied to any of the emergency funds/grants provided by various civil society actors following the COVID-19 outbreak. 74% of the respondents reported not having applied to such grants/funds while 26% stated that they had.

At a closer look, it was seen that 45% of the CSOs that previously reported having difficulty or great difficulty in performing their activities, applied for emergency grants/funds. In terms of fields of activity, 20% of the CSOs from almost all fields of activity applied for emergency funds. However, CSOs operating in the fields of migration and refugees, healthcare, media and communication, and children’s rights were outside of this trend, with an average application rate of 43%.

“Have you applied for any emergency grants/funds after the COVID-19 outbreak?”
PURPOSE OF EMERGENCY GRANT/FUND

The respondents who reported having applied for emergency grants/funds in the previous question were asked about the purpose of their application. 68% stated that the purpose of the grant/fund application was project implementation, while 32% said it was for core funding.

FIGURE 24. PURPOSE OF EMERGENCY GRANT/FUND

- Project implementation: 68%
- Core funding: 32%

What was the purpose of your grant/fund application that you made following the COVID-19 outbreak?

EMERGENCY GRANT/FUND APPLICATION RESULTS

The organizations that reported having applied to emergency grants/funds also answered a question regarding the result of their application. Based on the responses, 58% of the organizations had their application approved. However, 22% stated that their application was rejected. Meanwhile, 20% of the respondents reported that they have not received a response yet.

FIGURE 25. EMERGENCY GRANT/FUND APPLICATION RESULTS

- Yes, approved: 58%
- Yes, rejected: 22%
- No, not yet: 20%

Have you received a response for your emergency grant/fund application?
The CSOs responded to a question on how the COVID-19 pandemic affected the aids and donations their organizations received. 49% of the organizations stated a decrease in the aids and donations they received. 43% of the organizations reported no change in the aids and donations they received while 12% reported an increase. In April, the rate of organizations that reported an increase in the aids and donations was 4%.

**FIGURE 26. IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON AIDS AND DONATIONS**

- Aids and donations decreased: 45% (49% in August)
- Aids and donations stayed the same: 43% (47% in August)
- Aids and donations increased: 12% (4% in April)

“How has COVID-19 impacted the aids and donations you receive?”
CHANGES IN FUNDRAISING STRATEGIES

The organizations were asked whether they plan to make any changes in their 2020 fundraising strategies. 70% of the CSOs stated they have changed/are changing their strategies while 30% indicated that they will not make any changes. In April, the rate of the organizations that disclosed their inclination to change their fundraising strategies was 54%.

“Have you made/do you consider making any changes in your fundraising plans for 2020?”

FIGURE 27. CHANGES IN FUNDRAISING STRATEGIES

- Yes: 70% (August) 54% (April)
- No: 30% (August) 46% (April)
NATURE OF THE ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN FUNDRAISING EFFORTS

Within the scope of the survey, organizations that reported plans to change their fundraising strategies in 2020 were asked about the nature of these changes. Developing relationships with different stakeholders and using digital fundraising campaigns and tools effectively are the most popular responses with 52%. 50% of these CSOs stated that they will look for new grants/funds, and 35% reported that they will strengthen their existing relationship with donors and work on gaining regular individual donors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Fundraising Efforts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look for new grants/funds</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use digital fundraising campaigns and tools effectively</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop cooperation with different stakeholders</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on gaining regular individual donors</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen existing relationship with donors</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 28. NATURE OF THE ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN FUNDRAISING EFFORTS
EMPLOYMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

EMPLOYEE LEAVES

The CSOs were asked about their practices regarding employee leaves during the pandemic. 76% stated they did not have to enforce employee leaves, 15% stated that they are enforcing paid leaves for employees while 4% reported enforcing unpaid leaves. CSOs that implement both paid and unpaid leaves make up 5% of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Leave</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We did not have to enforce leaves</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid leave</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both paid and unpaid leave</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid leave</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*What type of employee leaves are you enforcing, if any, within the framework of measures against COVID-19?”*
SHORT-TIME WORK ALLOWANCE APPLICATION

72% of the CSOs stated that they have not applied for short-time work allowance while 28% stated that they have applied for the allowance. In April, the rate of respondents who applied for short-time work allowance was 18%.

**FIGURE 30. SHORT-TIME WORK ALLOWANCE APPLICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>August</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Have you applied for short-time work allowance for your employees?”

DISMISSAL

5% of the respondents stated that they had to dismiss employees due to the impact of the pandemic on their financial position while 95% reported they did not have to. This result is similar to the results of the survey conducted in April.

**FIGURE 31. DISMISSAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>August</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Have you had to dismiss any employees from your organization until now, due to the impact of COVID-19 on your financial position?”
FORECASTS FOR DISMISSAL

36% of the CSOs said they might have to dismiss employees if the pandemic continues while 64% stated that they do not believe they will have to decide this direction. In April, the rate of those who stated that they might have to dismiss employees if the pandemic continued was 37% and those who did not believe they would have to take such a decision was 63%.

***FIGURE 32. FORECASTS FOR DISMISSAL***

“Do you think that if the effect of COVID-19 continues, you will have to dismiss employees from your organization?”

- **No**
  - August: 64%
  - April: 63%

- **Yes**
  - August: 36%
  - April: 37%
FORECASTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

In the second phase, the CSOs were asked about their forecasts regarding sustainability. 11% of the CSOs replied the question of "how long do you foresee that you can sustain your current working structure and number of staff with your existing resources without carrying out new fundraising activities?" with 1-3 months. While the rate of the CSOs that believe they can sustain their current working structure and number of staff for 3-6 months is 23%, 13% replied the same question with 6-9 months. 18% of the CSOs responded to the same question with 1-2 years and 16% with more than 2 years.

Compared to the first phase of the survey conducted in April 2020, the rate of the CSOs that foresee that they can sustain their current working structure and number of staff for 1-3 months without carrying out new fundraising activities, dropped from 24% to 11%. Meanwhile, the ratio of the CSOs that responded to the same question with 1-2 years increased from 11% to 18%.

**FIGURE 33. FORECASTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 months</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 months</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer than 2 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 months</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“How long do you foresee that you can sustain your current working structure and number of staff with your existing resources without carrying out new fundraising activities?”
The CSOs were asked to evaluate a list of elements that would prevent their employees and activities from being affected. The elements selected by the CSOs are as follows: 67% of the CSOs stated that it would be “grant/fund providers increasing their core funding for 65% it was “arrangements to be made to cover CSOs HQ expenditures (rent, etc.), for 57% it was “flexibility of grant/fund providers”, 50% stated that it would be CSOs to be taken out of scope of aid collection law, CSOs participating more in decision-making processes; for 40% it was postponing tax and social security payments and for 17% it was an extension of the duration of short-term work allowance permit.

**“Which of the following would make it easier for your organization to sustain its employees and activities?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing core funding</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements to be made to cover the organization’s headquarter expenditures (lease etc.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of grant/fund providers</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs participating more in decision-making processes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs being taken out of scope of aid collection law</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postponing tax and social security payments</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of short-time work allowance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating opportunities for an effective public-civil society cooperation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs being regarded as priority for short-term work allowance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple options were selected.