

Report on
“SAFE SCHOOL” DISASTER RISK REDUCTION DISCUSSION PLATFORM DPPI SEE-DMT
17-18 November 2016 Ankara, Turkey

“Safe School” Discussion Platform was held in Disaster and Emergency Management Authority in Ankara during the dates of 17-18 November 2016. 13 participants were in total and their distribution according to the countries were as follows;

Albania	Astrit Dautaj and Ruzhdi Baxhaku
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Miroslav TOPALOVIC and Sead VRANA
Croatia	Miljenka GALIC
Macedonia	Mitko DIMCHEV and Admir GORENCA
Montenegro	Marijana Papic and Biljana Čulafić
Serbia	Suzana Konjevic and Natasa Strahinjic
Turkey	Sultan BOĞAZPINAR GÜN and Habil KESLER

The purpose of the two-day discussion platform was to ensure Disaster Risks Reduction (DRR) activities the mutual sharing of information work to done or should be done under “Safe School”.

Together with visiting an educational institution (school), this event would allow participants to see if the objectives of Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) were achieved.

In the two-days discussion platform we tried to identify how to develop a better understanding under “Safe School” within the scope of disaster risk reduction. Therewithal the role and the interoperability of different stakeholders like education ministries and disaster and emergency management organizations was shown in DRR facilities in the scope of safe environment (the school). Participants had the chance to see what kind of facilities were taken in a non-safe school to make it safer.

On the 17th of February 2016 first AFAD shared his experiences about an ongoing project named “Disaster Prepared School Campaign”. This project owns activities taken within the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) in the scope of “Safe School”. Together with this presentation reason, objectives and goals of the project and the necessary solution partners in implementing of the project was explained. What kind of implementation models were taken of the Campaign was explained in deep details. In the end of the presentation what kind of a monitoring & evaluation was implemented in this project was also shown to the participants.

Within this project it was shown the whole picture of creating a safe environment and safe school.

After that, the role and interoperability of different governmental institutions were identified during the session. National Education Ministry of Turkey presented the measures taken for structural retrofitting in schools. Participants could see how schools were safer than before. Also it was shown that there was a need of cooperation between different organisations.

Then a presentation of the “Istanbul Seismic Risk Mitigation and Emergency Preparedness Project (ISMEP)” was shown to the participants. Aim of this work was to show what kind of measures had to be taken in according to building which was not earthquake proof enough.

Each participation country made their own presentation about the same topic safe school or safe environment where children (students) were involved. By making with 10-15 minutes national presentations participants gave the information and their experiences of ongoing works on DRR facilities done under the scope of “Safe School”.

After the presentation session, a discussion session was started and each participants made his/her input.

Inputs were as follow;

- The role in building a safe building (schools-universities and other building types for education) is very important and parts of different ministries and organisations has to be involved in this phase
- Managers of municipalities need to know the necessary disaster awareness information
- Parents has to be involved after contractual issues. That means they have to know the measures taken in schools for their children
- Parents have to be involved in School Disaster Plans
- Teacher need the necessary information to prepare their students against disasters
- Not only the school but also the environment has to be safe for students. Therefore majors must be involved in School Disaster Plans to take the necessary measures for safe school environment

Together with these fruitful inputs (Presentations) and outputs (participants opinion) the first day was finished. The first days important output was **“All individuals has to be prepared and involved to make schools safer”**.

On the second day (18 February 2016) together with the participants a local primary school in a village was visited in Ankara. At first the principle of the school gave information about the school. After that participants could see that the school was earthquake proof. The principle explained the participants that that is not enough to be a safe school only to be an earthquake proof school. All contractual measures were taken in the school because of obeying to the building regulation and other legislations. The principle explained the participants what kind of non-structural measures have been taken in the school. The measures were as follow;

- All bookshelves, wardrobes were fasten on the wall so that couldn't drop.
- Doors of classes were equipped with a secure mechanism on the wall so that couldn't hit students after they are opened during the break time. Teachers had the key for them.
- The necessary fire extinguishing system was installed in the school.
- Water reserve tanks were involved in the basement floor.
- Windows in each floor were secured with special equipment so that students couldn't fall out.
- The necessary Evacuation Plan was hanged on in each floor.
- Important signs and banners were on the walls.

- For disabled students the necessary special enter was established.
- Outside for students there was a meeting point established

After the explanation of the principle the second part of discussion started and participants were asked to give their opinion. Opinions were as follow;

Positive Feedbacks

- All necessary measures inside of the school was taken.
 - Windows were secured and student weren't able to open them without a special key. Of course in each floor there were a teacher as hall monitor in break times. This was again the second measure in case of an emergency situation.
 - Doors were secured so that student couldn't hit by the door and the risk of injuring was reduced.
- Fire extinguishers were in each floor and staff were able to use them.
- No big items were in classrooms which could drop and injure students.
- To rise up awareness of students and may be parents with banners, posters and signboards on the wall was a good idea.
- In case of fire the reserve with water tanks will be a good solution.
- The school has a disaster plan and an evacuation plan
- Students exercised the situation during an earthquake and they showed the right behaviour. Evacuation skills of students were perfect.
- Twice a year the school exercised together with students the disaster plan (fire extinguishing, evacuation skills).
- Although there weren't disabled students in the school but on the entering a special platform was established for disabled students.

Negative Feedbacks (Gaps)

- Outside of the school there was a line of electricity over the meeting point. It was forgotten that this will be a danger during a disaster. The principle took the necessary note for this to change this place.
- Not all parents were aware about the school disaster plan. But the principle did his best, this was because of the indifference of some parents.

At the end of the second day all participants were agreed that a safe school does have not only structural measure they also does have the necessary non-structural measures to reduce disaster risks. The second day's important output was **“Small measures makes big effects for a safe life and environment”**.

By visiting a local educational institution it was allowed participants to see what kind of measures were taken to make a school as a “Safe School”. And within this field study participants were able to identify the best practises in achieving if the objectives of Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) are taken well.

In the two-days safe school discussion platform we get very fruitful positive and negative feedbacks from the participants. Also participants gave their inputs with their national presentation. All these inputs will be taken in account in preparing the future safe school activities and school disaster plans.

