

Sender

Non Governmental
Organizations



To the attention of

Member of the Parliament

Grand National Assembly of Turkey
Ankara

March 2010

Dear MP,

We, the undersigned non-governmental organizations, civil society groups and initiatives, have been monitoring public expenditures. During the parliamentary discussions at the Grand National Assembly, MPs examine the budgets of different public institutions. We noticed, however, that they lacked a coherent set of data through which they could keep track of expenditures made by different public institutions on social protection, those targeting children, the youth and the disabled.

We, as the civil society organizations dealing with these issues, believe that it is essential to monitor public expenditures in assessing the efficiency of the policies pursued as well as enhancing the possibility of discussing alternatives.

In this respect, we would like to take the opportunity to share with you the results of the budget monitoring exercise we carried out on public expenditures on social protection, expenditures targeting children, the youth and disabled as well as on military expenditures.

We hope to contribute to the policy debates all of you participate in at the parliament by transparency and traceability of public expenditures dispersed along different policy domains and institutions.

We ultimately intend to undertake regular public announcements for the results of our public expenditure monitoring exercises and our assessments each year.

Kind regards,

The list of the institutions contributing to the preparation of this letter and undersigning it, is annexed.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ON SOCIAL PROTECTION

Social protection expenditures in Turkey covering social security, health, social services and social assistance are estimated to constitute 11 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2009 according to the annual budget law approved by the parliament in January, before the economic crisis. This share has increased to 13 percent in the budget law ratified at the parliament in January 2010 (Table 1). Even though much of this increase stems from the contraction in GDP, we find it important to emphasize that social protection expenditures did not at all decrease in nominal terms after the crisis.

THE SHARE OF SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES IN TURKEY COVERING SOCIAL SECURITY HEALTH, SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOCIAL SERVICES IS 13 PERCENT IN 2009 AND SHOULD BE INCREASED

Indeed, this share remains substantially lower in comparative terms: as demonstrated by the latest EUROSTAT data, the share of social protection expenditures in GDP in EU27 is 25.2 percent in 2005. While Turkey spent only 11 percent of GDP on social protection expenditures in 2005, the expenditures constitute 29

THE AVERAGE SHARE OF SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES IN GDP FOR EU27 IS 26 PERCENT.

percent of GDP in France, 23.8 in Greece, 14.6 in Bulgaria, 18 percent in the Czech Republic, 12.3 percent in Estonia, 13.9 in Lithuania, 21.9 in Hungary, 17.8 in Poland and 12.6 percent in Romania.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ON SOCIAL SERVICES AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

The breakdown of social protection expenditures demonstrate that the share of pensions and health care services in GDP is estimated to constitute 7.8 percent and 5 percent respectively, while expenditures on social assistance and social services remain at only 0.72 percent. Adding the expenditures on Green Card¹, the share of expenditures on non-contributory social assistance and social services targeting the poor constitute only 1.3 percent of GDP.

Social protection expenditures in Turkey are significantly dominated by the public expenditures for those under formal social security coverage and for the unemployed with former social security contribution history. The non-contributory expenditures targeting the poor, on the other hand, not only remain significantly lower in relation to their share in GDP but also exhibit inadequate increases for expenditure estimates over time. We argue that in a country context with high rates of unemployment, prevalence of informal patterns of employment and in-work poverty, high incidence of at-risk-of poverty, and persistence of social exclusion based on gender, sexual orientation, gender identity and ethnicity, such composition of social protection expenditures with a contribution bias in favour of those under formal social security coverage aggravates the existing inequalities.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ON SOCIAL ASSISTANCE, SOCIAL SERVICES AND GREEN CARD TARGETING THE POOR CONSTITUTE 1.3 PERCENT OF GDP. WE FIND THIS CONSIDERABLY INADEQUATE

¹ Health care service provision in Turkey has been a part of the contributory social insurance system. Green Card is the means-tested social assistance mechanism that provides free health care services for those outside the formal social security coverage since 1992. The scheme is funded out of the budget of the Ministry of Health and is included in our calculation of health expenditures.

According to EUROSTAT, relative risk of poverty rates in Turkey fall from 28 percent to 25 percent as a result of social transfers while the corresponding rates for EU25 are 26 percent and 16 percent. The peculiarity of the case of Turkey is reflected in the high rates of relative poverty with significantly low levels of social expenditures – ranked lowest in EU. As the impact of social transfers on poverty remains modest, we argue that new policy interventions are necessary for eliminating poverty.

ACCORDING TO EUROSTAT, SOCIAL ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES IN TURKEY DO NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON ALLEVIATING THE RISK OF POVERTY.

In their regular annual screening reports, European Social Rights Committee, in charge of monitoring the implementation of European Social Charter, has identified several problems and challenges facing Turkey. These range from the lack of coherent statistical information to the inadequacy of the social assistance and social services provided, from a lack of a rights-based approach both in design and in implementation of

WE SIMPLY ARGUE FOR A CITIZENSHIP-BASED INCOME SUPPORT AS A NON-STIGMATIZING AND DIGNIFYING POLICY TOOL TO COMBAT POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION.

social assistance policies to the neglect of those in need of social services, from the problems of coordination between state institutions providing social assistance and social services to a need for devising a national strategy for combating poverty and social exclusion. We wholeheartedly agree with these statements.

We argue that the primary problem facing the social protection system in Turkey is the lack of citizenship-based regular income support programs to be financed out of general taxation—a common policy tool implemented all over the world. Indeed, we find no evidence of instituting such policies in the budgetary projections for 2010, 2011 and 2012. The method used in Turkey to provide aid to poor people is one which obliges them to prove that they are in need, and in doing so, stigmatises them. This is an offense against their human dignity and reaches a level tantamount to the violation of human rights.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ON UNEmployment INSURANCE

The Unemployment Insurance Fund² in Turkey is an important component of the contribution-biased social protection system. The recent trends in the global economy as well as the technological advances with new patterns of work indicate a considerable increase in rates of unemployment both in Turkey and in other countries all over the world. In this respect, we argue that the Unemployment Insurance Fund should be utilized in accordance with its primary aims while its coverage and eligibility criteria should be expanded. The resources accumulated in the Fund should only be used for maintaining social protection. Therefore, we claim that the transfers made from the Fund to the general budget for South Eastern Anatolian Project (GAP)

² Unemployment insurance scheme, put into force in 2002, envisages compulsory contributions by employers, employees and the state towards constituting 4 percent of the gross wage. The Fund has been institutionalized as the main body where these contributions are accumulated and benefits are paid out. The eligibility criteria surrounding the entitlement for unemployment benefits are very strict with respect to the formal contribution history while the duration for the payment of the benefits and amount of the benefit payment are restricted to a maximum of 10 months and to the official minimum wage, respectively. Thus, due to the rigidity of entitlement and payment conditions, the Fund accumulates a considerable amount of contributions which far more exceed the total expenditures.

should be transparent and utilized only for policies aiming to combat unemployment and social exclusion in the GAP region.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH

Composed of expenditures made by the Ministry of Health, public institutions with general and special budgets and the Social Security Institution (SGK)³ public expenditures on health exceeded 5 percent of GDP only in 2009 as a result of the economic crisis while remaining substantially lower in the expenditure estimates for 2010-2012. As shown in Table 2, only 10 percent of these are expenditures on Green Card. Indeed, General Health Insurance scheme, introduced with the recently enacted social security reform⁴, is primarily

WE OBSERVE A SUBSTANTIAL RISK OF ENCOUNTERING PROBLEMS OF ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE SERVICES, AS A BASIC HUMAN RIGHT, FOR A CONSIDERABLE SEGMENT OF SOCIETY WHO WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO AFFORD TO PAY THE CONTRIBUTIONS ENVISAGED.

based on contributions from those with incomes over the one-third of the minimum wage while the rest are covered by contributions to be made by the state. We observe that certain segments of society would not be able to pay for own contributions due to prevalence of temporary employment, low wages, seasonal and irregular income, and working on one's own account in agriculture. For those without any income, the ownership of non-valuable land or real estate would disqualify them for entitlement to state contribution. We claim that inaccessibility of health

care services for these groups due to non-contribution appears to be an essential social problem.

Women over the age of 15 constitute approximately one third of Turkey's population and the labour force participation rate for these women is only 25 percent. Women out of the labour force would either access health care services as a dependent of their spouse, children or father—provided that they in turn are formally covered—or remain totally outside the health care system.

Table 1 and 2 clearly demonstrate a diminishing trend in the public expenditures on health in general and the Ministry of Health in particular. The share of health ex-

THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR ANY POLICY PURPOSE OTHER THAN COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT AND MAINTAINING SOCIAL PROTECTION. WE ARGUE FOR THE TRANSPARENCY OF EXPENDITURES FINANCED BY TRANSFERS OUT OF THE FUND TO THE GENERAL BUDGET.

AS THE PER CAPITA PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES IN TURKEY RANK THE LOWEST AMONG OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, WE STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE CONTRACTION OF THE EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES

3 The social insurance system in Turkey was shaped along occupational lines. The Social Security Institution (SGK), as the primary actor in this system, shelters formerly separate Emekli Sandığı (ES) for government employees, Social Insurance Institution (SSK) for private employees and Bağ-Kur (BK) for employers and the self-employed. It is established under the auspices of Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLLS) by the recent social security reform enacted in 2008 to replace the administrations of the separate schemes of ES, SSK and BK. As health care service provision in Turkey has been a part of the contributory social insurance system, we take into account here the expenditures by SGK as well.

4 Social security reform in Turkey has been introduced successively since late 1990s, mostly driven by the international financial institutions. The reforms aimed to address both short-term measures for imbalances of the systems and longer-term administrative changes to reorganize the contributory pension and health insurance schemes. This reorganization, as partly indicated in the endnote iii, involved restructuring for the pensions schemes while introducing the health component under a separate scheme, i.e. General Health Insurance.

penditures in GDP of Turkey is 4.5 percent, on average. According to World Health Organization, per capita public health expenditures in 2006 are 2,833 USD in France, 406 USD in Iran, 443 USD in Bulgaria, 1,309 USD in the Czech Republic, 1,317 USD in Greece, 978 USD in Hungary, 636 USD in Poland, 433 USD in Romania and 416 USD in Turkey—indicating a significant problem pertaining to the level of public expenditures on health in Turkey in comparative terms.

We observe that the composition of the public expenditures on health is significantly problematic. As shown in

Table 2, share of public expenditures on health in GDP is 5 percent in 2009 where 3.35 and 1.65 percent are spent on pharmaceuticals and curative services by SGK and the Ministry of Health, respectively. When tracked from the budget allocation charts of the Ministry of Health among various Directorate Generals (DGs), 71 percent of the expenditures would be made by the DG of Curative Services and 29 percent by the

**HEALTH EXPENDITURES IN TURKEY
MUST BE INCREASED SUCH THAT THE
SHARE OF PREVENTIVE SERVICES IS
AUGMENTED.**

DG of Primary Health Care Services and other services. Therefore, we observe that only a third of the 1.65 percent, that is only 0.5 percent of GDP is allocated to the public expenditures on preventive health care services while 4.5 percent constitute expenditures on pharmaceuticals and curative services.

We are concerned that such contractions in preventive health care services potentially have much more expansionary impacts on curative services over time.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING CHILDREN

“The Committee recommends that the State party pay particular attention to the full implementation of article 4 of the Convention by prioritizing budgetary allocations so as to ensure implementation of the economic, social and cultural rights of children, in particular those belonging to marginalized and economically disadvantaged groups, “to the maximum extent of ... available resources”. The Committee further encourages the State party to state clearly every year its priorities with respect to child rights issues and to identify the amount and proportion of the budget spent on children, especially on marginalized groups, at the federal, provincial and territorial levels in order to be able to evaluate the impact of the expenditures on children and their effective utilization.”

United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, Report on the 34th Session (2003:17)

The public expenditures targeting children are undertaken by different institutions and thus separately recorded in their own budgets in Turkey. While monitoring the public expenditures and services targeting children aged 0-18, we considered a segregated approach differentiating between the components as social assistance and social services, health care services and judiciary services. For the year 2008, expenditures on social assistance and social services are 2,069,403,125 TL, and maximum estimation on health care expenditures are 7,948,265,779 and on judiciary services are 193,415,387 TL, all of which sum up to 10,211,084,291 TL constituting only 1.07 percent of GDP (Table 3). The public expenditures on preschool, primary and secondary education for 2008 are 19,855,766,000 TL.

WHILE CHILDREN CONSTITUTE 38 PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION IN TURKEY, THE GDP SHARE OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING CHILDREN AMOUNT TO MERELY 1.07 PERCENT EXCLUDING EXPENDITURES ON EDUCATION AND 3 PERCENT INCLUDING EXPENDITURES ON EDUCATION.

According to the 2000 Census, 38.34 percent of the total population in Turkey are under the age of 18. We argue that our analysis of the public expenditure (1.07 percent of GDP, excluding expenditure on education) targeting 38 percent of the population indicates considerable inadequacy with only 393 TL spent per child. Indeed, Turkey ranks top among OECD countries for child poverty rate with 24.6 percent of the children being at risk of poverty as opposed to the OECD average of 12.4 percent.

Budget allocation charts of Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SHÇEK)⁵ demonstrate significant decline in the resources for the Department of Child Services contrary to the increase envisaged for the Department of Social Assistance Services. In the 2010-2014 Strategic Plan of SHÇEK, through prioritizing protective-preventive services, the Agency sets out its intention to “protect the family” and provide support so that children under institutional care can return to their families/relatives. According to the Plan, the number of beneficiaries of child-rearing assistance for the returning children is estimated to increase from 22,000 in 2010 to 34,000 in 2014. Interestingly, the annual expenditures per child under this scheme is estimated to decrease from 5,278 TL in 2010 to 4,151 TL in 2014. Moreover, the annual expenditures per child on counselling services for this group of beneficiaries are estimated to increase only from 2.5 TL in 2010 to 3.30 TL in 2014.

WE SERIOUSLY OBJECT TO THE POSSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OUTLOOK TRANSFORMING FROM PROTECTIVE SOCIAL SERVICES TARGETING CHILDREN INTO SOCIAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THE FAMILY.

Social services, by definition, assume the primary role for provision of policy measures to maintain that individuals in need of care become self-sufficient primarily within their own living conditions. Especially, for the case of children, the role and importance of the family for the psycho-social development is quite well recognized. However, given the expenditure estimates, it seems particularly

unrealistic to pursue a full-fledged protective-preventive social services model. The expansionary expenditures envisaged seem to be related solely with the social assistance services. We would like to express our serious concern here: With implementation of this strategy, social services would be transformed to a simple provision of social assistance and the social problems necessitating deliberate policy interventions other than individual attempts or actions would be individualized and exported fully to the domain of the private.

⁵ SHÇEK is the primary institution in charge of social services in Turkey. It is involved in social services not only for the protection of the children and family but also for the elderly and the disabled. These services range from care services given at nursery homes or rehabilitation centers, running orphanages to providing cash transfers for home-based care, counselling services for family as well as children etc.

We also find the share of expenditures on judiciary services to be highly inadequate given the long duration of the trials of the children engaged in criminal activities as well as the lack of juvenile courts in each and every province in Turkey. This contradicts both with the Article 40 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (*States Parties shall seek to promote the establishment of laws, procedures, authorities and institutions specifically applicable to children alleged as, accused of, or recognized as having infringed the penal law*) and Article 25 of national Law on Child Protection (*Juvenile courts shall be established in each province*).

According to the statistics on judicial records, the average duration of trials at the juvenile courts has been ever increasing from 282 days in 2005 to 527 days in 2007. The average duration of 267 days at the higher crime juvenile courts and of 326 days at regular juvenile courts remain substantially high in comparison to the average trial duration for adults of 234 days.

IN 2008, THE EXPENDITURES TARGETING IMPRISONED AND CONVICTED CHILDREN CONSIST ONLY 1.04 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL EXPENDITURES OF THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, WHILE 0.74 PERCENT IS SPENT FOR THE JUVENILE COURTS.

2006 Labour Force data reveal that 6 percent of the children in the 6-17 age group do some form of work while 11.3 percent of the children in 12-14 age group are working according to 2008 Census. Indeed, Article 71 of Labour Law (No. 4857) clearly states that "*it is forbidden to employ children under the age of 15*". Moreover, ILO Minimum Age Convention, also ratified by Turkey, frames the national policy actions to be undertaken so as to ensure the effective elimination of child labour. Despite those laws and conventions, Department of Working Children under the auspices of the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) since 1991, has recently undergone an administrative transformation whereby the name of the

WE ARE DEEPLY CONCERNED THAT MoLLS DOES NOT ALLOCATE ANY PUBLIC RESOURCE FOR EXPENDITURES ON WORKING CHILDREN AND SERIOUSLY DEMAND FOR SUCH PUBLIC EXPENDITURES

department was changed to the DG for Disadvantaged Groups while the number of staff is decreased from 20 to 5 in 2009. In fact, all of the projects and programs undertaken for elimination of child labour in Turkey have been pursued by funds from international organizations or national NGOs. MoLSS reports that in 2008 no resource was allocated to this DG for expenditures on working children.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE YOUTH

The public expenditures targeting the youth include those made in the realms of sports, participation to social life, housing, support to education and support for entry into the labour market. All public expenditures carried out by different institutions in these realms sum up to 2,387,298,878 TL in 2008 and 3,143,090,232 TL in 2009 (Table 4). Thus, public expenditure per capita for youth turns out to be 137 TL in 2007, 172 TL in 2008 and 226 TL in 2009 (estimate).

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS SPENT 172 TL PER CAPITA FOR THE YOUTH IN 2008

The considerably low share of public expenditures targeting the youth in GDP at 0.2 percent for 2007 and 2008, and at 0.3 percent for 2009 demonstrates that the public expenditures as a whole practically neglect the youth. Indeed, 80 percent of the public expenditures targeting youth are undertaken by DG Youth and Sports⁶ and DG of Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Agency (YURTKUR)⁷ which, in both cases, is estimated to decrease in real terms for 2010 and 2011.

WE ARGUE THAT THE SHARE OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING YOUTH IN GDP IS ALREADY SIGNIFICANTLY LOW AT 0.3 PERCENT IN 2009 AND WE OBJECT TO ANY CONTRACTIONS ENVISAGED FOR THE FOLLOWING YEARS

We argue that public expenditures targeting youth should be increased contrary to the trend envisaged for the forthcoming three-year expenditure estimates. Not only those state institutions currently spending on different programs, but also all other public institutions should increase the public expenditures targeting the youth by introducing new policies and programs. Particularly for YURTKUR, we object to the foreseen contraction as presented in Table 4. Even before contraction, both the level of the monthly scholarships provided by YURTKUR (160 TL in 2008 and 180 TL in 2009), and the annual percentage increase implemented remain highly inadequate given the current economic crisis. One should also acknowledge the gap between the number of applications and the actual placements in YURTKUR dormitories.

DG of Youth and Sports appears to be the main institution with non-educational public expenditures targeting the youth. The budgetary allocation for this DG was 246,864,646 TL, 91 percent of which has been sports-

THE SHARE OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING YOUTH NOT IN EDUCATION IS AS LOW AS 0.05 PERCENT OF GDP. THE PUBLIC BUDGET IGNORES THE YOUTH, ESPECIALLY THOSE NOT IN EDUCATION

related. We object to the policy outlook that constructs the societal participation and development of the youth solely upon sports activities. Indeed, we strongly believe that the youth have to be acknowledged as autonomous and equal individual members of the society who should be supported in order to enhance their participation to social life.

The youth population aged between 15 and 24 in Turkey, namely 13,899,621 individuals, constitute 20 percent of the total population. Among those, approximately 30 percent is in education, 30 percent is in employment and the rest is neither in education nor in employment. Almost three quarters of the public expenditures targeting the youth between 2007 and 2009 are spent for those in education. Despite the considerable majority of those not in education among the young population, expenditures targeting them are quite limited - around one quarter of the total public expenditures targeting the youth. Even though we do not have access to the gender breakdown of expenditures, we argue that public expenditures targeting the youth should prioritize specific policy interventions to enhance participation of young women in social life as well as in education.

WE NOTE THAT THE SHARE OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE YOUTH, INCLUDING EXPENDITURES ON EDUCATION, CONSTITUTE ONLY 2 PERCENT OF GDP.

⁶ The DG Youth and Sports, under the auspices of Prime Ministry, SGM is the leading governmental organization that is directly providing services on the basis of sports and youth work (including youth centers, camps, etc.).

⁷ YURTKUR, under the auspices of the Ministry of National Education, is primarily involved in two types of services targeting university students: (1) provision of low-interest tuition loans and monthly scholarships and (2) construction and maintenance of dormitories to cater for the housing needs of university students

We observe that the share of public expenditures does not increase significantly even when the expenditures of higher education institutions (9,985,913,000 TL) are considered – for 2009, it reaches only 1.2 percent of GDP and 2 percent if public expenditures on secondary education (7,363,855,000 TL) are also included.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE DISABLED

Public expenditures targeting people with disabilities comprise of expenditures on social assistance and social services, support for employment, special education and sports. The sum of public expenditures in these realms amounts to 629,363,325 TL in 2006, 1,050,946,263 TL in 2007 and 2,211,213,705 TL in 2008. Despite the increase in nominal terms, the public expenditures targeting the disabled constitute only 0.22 percent of GDP (Table 5).

WE CONSIDER BOTH THE EXPANSION OF THE POLICIES AS WELL AS THE INCREASES IN THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE DISABLED AS POSITIVE DEVELOPMENTS.

The passing of the Law on the Disabled (No. 5378), ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and increases in public employment opportunities for people with disabilities have all been significant developments in the realm of policies targeting the disabled. Nevertheless, we argue that more efforts are necessary in the policy domain so as to enhance the participation of the people with disabilities to the economic, social and political life as equal citizens.

The social assistance provided by the Department of Care for the Disabled of SHÇEK accounts for the most significant increase of public expenditures targeting people with disabilities. This scheme primarily involves income-tested cash transfers amounting to the official minimum wage for the home-based care of the disabled. By the end of 2009, the number of beneficiaries of this scheme reached almost 200,000. This home-based care allowance signifies increasing state involvement in the realm of care for the disabled, mostly aimed at compensating for inadequate service provision. We claim that this policy has the potential of reinforcing the already existing gendered nature of the division of work against women. We strongly believe that these cash transfer policies should be complemented with expansions in the provision of institutional care for the disabled. In this regard, we also argue that public expenditures for the institutional care services for people with severe disabilities should be increased substantially.

The cash transfer scheme of the SGK (implemented under Law No. 2022) could be regarded as regular monthly income support provided to poor people with disabilities. While the risk of disability is significantly high among the poor, being disabled increases the risk of poverty not only by exclusion from social, economic and political life but also due to additional costs. For this reason, we consider increases in the amount of cash benefits to be absolutely important while the levels of the benefits remain highly insufficient for a decent living.

We believe that the conditionality attached to these benefits and the loss of entitlement by the beneficiary in

WE DEMAND FOR INCREASES IN THE LEVELS OF THE MONTHLY CASH BENEFITS UNDER THE 2022 SCHEME AT LEAST TO THE LEVEL OF OFFICIAL MINIMUM WAGE FOR ALLEVIATING THE RISK OF POVERTY FOR THE DISABLED.

case of being formally employed affects the incentives for the disabled. We argue that the monthly cash transfer program for people with disabilities should be regarded as a separate policy instrument catering for the additional expenditures burdening the household budget, and thus should not be treated as contingent upon non-employment.

We observe increases in the public expenditures targeting the disabled for training and job placement made by the Employment Agency (İŞKUR).⁸ In spite of this, we find no evidence of increased expenditures on re-designing of the workplaces or purchasing supportive technological equipment for workplaces to enhance access and usability for the disabled while expanding employment opportunities. We propose that, without any budgetary expansion, such expenditures could be made out of the resources of the Sanction Fund of İSKUR accumulates through penalties paid by employers who fail to comply with the existing employment quota system for the disabled.

The policy developments of the auspices of Ministry of National Education with the collaboration between DG for Special Education, Guidance and Counselling Services and DG for Private Education Institutions have expanded in 2008 to publicly finance special education services for disabled children. We would like to draw attention to the need for instituting a monitoring mechanism involving qualified staff to ensure quality service at the private special education centres catering to disabled children.

The provision of medical equipment for the disabled by the local foundations of DG of Social Assistance and Solidarity remain quite limited in terms of expenditure. Indeed, to overcome the problems the disabled face in their access to the medical equipment, we argue that all disabled people should be covered by formal social security system without any contribution requirement, as envisaged in the Law on the General Health Insurance, and all of their medical needs should be provided in good quality and free of charge by SGK.

WE CLAIM FOR ADDITIONAL BUDGETARY ALLOCATION FOR THE SUPPORTIVE TECHNOLOGICAL EQUIPMENT AND REDESIGN OF THE BUILDINGS TO ENSURE THE PARTICIPATION OF THE DISABLED IN EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT.

The disabled with less than 40 percent loss of their ability are excluded from all public programs and schemes targeting people with disabilities. We observe that this entails considerable inequalities among disabled citizens and argue for increasing public expenditures to cover this group as well.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

We claim for the transparency of the military expenditures in Turkey which would assume considerable amount of parliamentary or non-governmental scrutiny.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES IN TURKEY ARE NOT TRANSPARENT

Military expenditures are made by several public institutions and out of several public funds (Table 6). The defence industry in Turkey is dominated by the State Economic Enterprises and public equity participations.

⁸ İŞKUR deals with providing employability training programs and job placement while administrating the unemployment insurance scheme.

We observe that due to the lack of transparency surrounding the expenditures, military expenditures and expenditures on domestic security are not well defined and thus could not be easily monitored.

The expenditures made by the Turkish Armed Forces Foundation⁹ cannot be fully monitored. Even though there are no transfers from the public budget to the Foundation, we observe that the “project expenditures” item of the Foundation’s budget contains expenditures on production of armament other than its subsidiaries. In one of the press statements in 2009, general director of the Foundation stated that the “Foundation has contributed approximately 100 million TL from its own budget to the projects of the Armed Forces of Turkey”.¹⁰ In this respect, in order to be able to monitor the military expenditures as a whole, we argue for the transparency of the expenditures of the Foundation, which has not been made public since 2000.

THERE IS CONSIDERABLE LACK OF INFORMATION REGARDING THE EXPENDITURES OF THE TURKISH ARMED FORCES FOUNDATION, THE LEVEL OF THE MILITARY EXPENDITURES FINANCED BY THE SLUSH FUND OF THE GOVERNMENT AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE PURCHASE OF ARMAMENT FOR VILLAGE GUARDS, SOME OF WHOM VOLUNTEER OR THE SERVICE.

There is lack of clarity about the ownership of any slush funds¹¹ by the public institutions. Only the expenditures of slush fund of the Prime Ministry have been publicly announced in the annual activity reports but still no information has been made available about the share of military expenditures among those.

The expenditures on the monthly wages of village guards¹² exhibit a gradually but regularly increasing trend. This increase could not be properly explained because we cannot infer whether it is due to an increase in the number of village guards employed or in the amounts of the wages paid. In this respect, the total public expenditures on the village guard system could not be calculated fully also because we can trace neither the amount of the social security expenditures for these guards nor expenditures for the armaments used by the guards. Indeed, we would like to draw attention to the magnitude of the expenditures: 331,246,000 TL on the wages of the village guards in 2008, and compared to 942,341,000 TL on total personnel expenditures by the Ministry of Interior.

WE CLAIM FOR CIVIL AND PARLIAMENTARY SCRUTINY OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN FOR MILITARY EXPENDITURES.

9 Turkish Armed Forces Foundation was established in 1987 with the purpose of providing material support to the Turkish Armed Forces “by developing the national armaments industry of Turkey, establishing new branches of the armaments industry, and purchasing weapons, vehicles and equipment” (http://www.tskgv.org.tr/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=48&Itemid=56). The Foundation has affiliates, subsidiaries and indirect subsidiaries catering to the defense industry. Despite its status as an independent foundation, it is managed by a board of trustees chaired by the Ministry of Defense and commissioned by the Deputy Chief of General Staff, the Undersecretary of the Ministry of National Defense and the Minister of National Defense Undersecretary of Defence Industry.

10 <http://trmilitary.com>

11 Slush funds are official financial resources, established under the auspices of Prime Ministry, catering to non-specified and undisclosed expenditures especially concerning “national security and higher interests of the State.” The use of the fund resources are executed solely under the responsibility of the Prime Minister.

12 Village guards are official paramilitary forces set up in mid 1980s and funded by the State to act primarily as local militia during the conflict in the southeastern Turkey, which especially intensified in 1990s. Rather than being under the command of the armed forces, they are placed under the command of the local civil officers, thus Ministry of Interior provides both their salaries and their armament.

Currently part of the military structure, the gendarme forces are planned to become civilian. Yet, as far as we are able to monitor, the budget of the General Command of Gendarmerie does not seem to reflect any such change until 2012.

We would like also to draw attention to the lack of information about the total expenditures for compulsory military service undertaken by citizens.

Using available data, we calculate the total military expenditures undertaken by several institutions as 19.1 billion TL in 2008, 21.7 billion TL in 2009 and 23.4 billion TL in 2010 (estimate) (Table 6). The share of

WE OBSERVED A DECLINE IN THE SHARE OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES DOWN TO 2 PERCENT OF GDP BEFORE 2009 CRISIS. THIS SHARE IS INCREASED TO 2.3 PERCENT OF GDP IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE 2009 CRISIS. WE ARGUE THAT IT SHOULD RATHER BE DECREASED TO 1.8 PERCENT, WHICH IS THE AVERAGE LEVEL FOR THE NATO AFFILIATED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

military expenditures in GDP has been around 2 percent in 2009 but will increase to 2.2 percent on average for the 2010-2012 period due to the contractions in GDP. In comparative terms, this share is much higher than the average share of 1.8 percent for the European countries according to the data provided by NATO.

In a country context with 48 percent of total population in the age group of 6-29 as the target group of formal education, we object to the level and the amount of military expenditures as it has long been exceeding the

share of public expenditures on education for 17 years (Table 7). In this respect, we claim that this has had a cumulative impact on contemporary problems such as an ever-growing unskilled labour force, low levels of labour productivity and severe unemployment facing the youth.

We find it meaningful to discuss on the composition of the public expenditures. Rather than armaments, we certainly demand for public expenditures on good quality social services to maintain a decent living for all.

WE OBSERVE THAT DURING 1990s, THE SHARE OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES WAS SIGNIFICANTLY HIGH UP TO 5 PERCENT OF GDP AND EXCEEDED BY FAR THE SHARE OF EXPENDITURES ON EDUCATION BETWEEN 1988 AND 2004.

Institutions Implementing the Public Expenditure Monitoring and Writing the Text (in alphabetical order)

Amnesty International Turkey
Association for Health Officials
Association for Solidarity with Imprisoned Youth
Basak Culture and Arts Foundation
Boğaziçi University Social Policy Forum
Center for Research and Promotion of Community Health
Community Volunteers
Environmental Law Association
Helsinki Citizens' Assembly
Human Rights in Mental Health Initiative
Iris Equality Monitoring Group
Istanbul Bilgi University Children's Studies Unit
Istanbul Bilgi University NGO Training and Research Center
Kaos Gay and Lesbian Cultural Research and Solidarity Organization
Nilüfer City Council
Organization of Patients' and Patients' Relatives' Rights
Purple Roof Women's Shelter Foundation
Right to Health Movement Association
Six Dots Foundation for the Blinds
Social Development and Gender Equality Policy Center
Social Rights Association
Social Workers' Association Head Office
Social Workers' Association Istanbul Branch
Solidarity with Women Association
The Agenda is Children!
Youth Employment Association
Youth for Habitat
Youth Initiative Association for Art and Social Development
Youth Re-autonomy Foundation of Turkey, Ankara Branch
Youth Studies Unit

Other Institutions Signing the Text (in alphabetical order)

AECEE – (European Students' Forum) Ankara
All Colours – Former Volunteers of European Voluntary Service Youth Association
Alumni Association for Sociology
Amargi Women's Cooperative
Antalya Women's Association for Counselling and Solidarity
Association for Anew Health and Education
Association for Children Under the Same Roof (ÇAÇA)
Association for Civil Dialogue
Association for Civil Society in the Criminal Execution System
Association for Class of Workers in Health Services
Association for Experts on Forensic Medicine
Association for Experts on Judicial System
Association for Facilitation
Association for Nature
Association for Others
Association for Support to Tarlabasi Community
Association of Hangar Art
Association of Student Perspectives in Universities of Turkey
Association of Young Governance
Center for Research and Education in Health and Social Policy Association
Foundation for Orientation (Yön Derneği)
Foundation for Presentation of Guidance in Higher Education and Training of Guides
Foundation for Research on Society and Law
Foundation for the Disabled
Foundation for Women's Solidarity
Health Technicians and Operators Association
Initiative for PeaceNet
Mardin Association for Youth and Culture
Positive Living Association
Silopi Association for Subsistence of and Solidarity with the Disabled
Social Workers' Association, Ankara Branch
Social Workers' Association, Branch for Mediterranean Region
Social Workers' Association, Bursa Branch
Social Workers' Association, Denizli Branch
Social Workers' Association, Edirne Branch
Social Workers' Association, İzmir Branch
Social Workers' Association, Kocaeli Branch
Social Workers' Association, Konya Branch
Social Workers' Association, Mersin Branch
Social Workers' Association, Samsun Branch
Social Workers' Association, Şanlıurfa Branch
Social Workers' Association, Trabzon Branch
Social Workers' Association, Van Branch
Turkey Foundation for Europe
Women's Labour and Employment Initiative Platform

Table 1: 2006-2012, Social Protection Expenditures, Thousand TL.

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (BUDGETED) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| A: "SOCIAL SECURITY AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE" EXPENDITURES BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS | | | | | | | |
| UNDERSECRETARIAT OF TREASURY | 658,061 | 807,545 | 1,022,169 | 1,018,575 | 1,106,793 | 1,234,281 | 1,386,634 |
| ADMINISTRATION FOR DISABLED PEOPLE | 2,456 | 3,321 | 2,875 | 3,354 | 4,025 | 4,166 | 4,325 |
| DG OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOLIDARITY | 1,843 | 2,499 | 2,612 | 4,237 | 10,475 | 14,679 | 15,395 |
| SOCIAL SERVICES AND CHILD PROTECTION AGENCY | 426,912 | 603,200 | 1,056,174 | 1,783,640 | 2,345,696 | 2,761,163 | 3,094,328 |
| MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE | 11,033 | 10,442 | 11,096 | 12,124 | 15,038 | 15,775 | 16,422 |
| MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS | 4,327 | 5,245 | 4,341 | 4,068 | 11,340 | 11,789 | 11,872 |
| MINISTRY OF FINANCE | 11,902,882 | 7,267,901 | 9,315,255 | 19,950,446 | 22,023,320 | 24,036,841 | 26,320,493 |
| MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SETTLEMENT | 225,667 | 215,825 | 253,354 | 244,544 | 276,341 | 291,457 | 310,979 |
| MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | 45,911 | 88,332 | 26,244 | 29,438 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND SOCIAL SECURITY | 0 | 25,823,450 | 25,849,685 | 32,907,173 | 35,877,000 | 38,149,400 | 40,316,050 |
| Social Security Institution (transfer) | 12,856,272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUB-TOTAL: INSTITUTIONS WITH GENERAL BUDGETS | 26,135,364 | 34,827,760 | 37,543,805 | 55,957,599 | 61,680,028 | 66,529,551 | 71,486,498 |
| IN-KIND ASSISTANCE FOR THE POOR (COAL) | 250,000 | 265,000 | 332,000 | 252,200 | 462,400 | 509,250 | 535,833 |
| SUB-TOTAL: INSTITUTIONS WITH GENERAL BUDGETS (including in-kind coal assistance for the poor) | 26,385,364 | 35,092,760 | 37,875,805 | 56,209,799 | 62,142,428 | 67,038,801 | 72,022,330 |
| DG OF FOUNDATIONS | 75,141 | 120,784 | 119,885 | 108,610 | 118,154 | 123,187 | 128,753 |
| GAP Regional Development Administration | 2,510 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUB-TOTAL: INSTITUTIONS WITH SPECIAL BUDGETS | 77,651 | 120,784 | 119,885 | 108,610 | 118,154 | 123,187 | 128,753 |
| TOTAL CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ON "SOCIAL SECURITY AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE" | 26,463,015 | 35,213,544 | 37,995,690 | 56,318,409 | 62,260,582 | 67,161,988 | 72,151,083 |
| 1: TOTAL CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ON SOCIAL PROTECTION (excluding transfers to SGK and Unemployment Insurance Fund, including in-kind coal assistance) | 1,045,800 | 1,314,648 | 1,808,581 | 2,442,215 | 3,253,469 | 3,741,466 | 4,127,906 |
| B: HEALTH CARE SERVICES EXPENDITURES BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS | | | | | | | |
| GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF TURKEY | 271 | 327 | 383 | 602 | 743 | 784 | 823 |
| PRIME MINISTRY | 461 | 520 | 547 | 634 | 730 | 779 | 832 |
| TURKISH STATISTICAL INSTITUTE | 156 | 184 | 18 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 |
| PRESIDENCY OF RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS | 249 | 245 | 262 | 305 | 392 | 405 | 422 |
| DG OF SECURITY | 2,007 | 2,166 | 2,554 | 2,793 | 3,187 | 3,400 | 3,619 |
| MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS | 1,578 | 1,665 | 1,748 | 1,887 | 1,210 | 1,265 | 1,319 |
| MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SETTLEMENT | 76,884 | 117,430 | 78,253 | 49,174 | 598 | 612 | 630 |
| MINISTRY OF HEALTH | 8,475,066 | 10,358,358 | 11,962,380 | 14,560,289 | 13,908,737 | 15,196,953 | 16,152,458 |
| Expenditures on Green Card Scheme | 2,909,800 | 3,913,000 | 4,031,000 | 5,510,000 | 4,603,000 | 4,729,000 | 4,978,000 |
| UNDERSECRETARIAT OF MARITIME AFFAIRS | 102 | 108 | 120 | 90 | 116 | 130 | 144 |
| DG OF HIGHWAYS | 1,166 | 1,641 | 1,100 | 1,116 | 1,377 | 1,445 | 1,516 |
| MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE | 10,124 | 11,130 | 55,111 | 87,935 | 88,014 | 88,847 | 93,899 |
| MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TRADE | 13 | 37 | 36 | 31 | 67 | 69 | 73 |
| MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND TOURISM | 56 | 89 | 78 | 94 | 65 | 123 | 133 |
| DG OF METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES | 175 | 163 | 207 | 198 | 249 | 263 | 310 |
| DG OF STATE HYDRAULIC WORKS | 284 | 232 | 226 | 261 | 289 | 329 | 330 |
| SUB-TOTAL: INSTITUTIONS WITH GENERAL BUDGETS | 8,568,592 | 10,494,295 | 12,103,023 | 14,705,420 | 14,005,784 | 15,295,416 | 16,256,520 |
| SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF TURKEY (TÜBİTAK) | 277 | 288 | 289 | 310 | 375 | 403 | 432 |
| DG OF YOUTH AND SPORTS | 837 | 952 | 1,032 | 1,369 | 1,550 | 1,650 | 1,720 |
| DG OF STATE OPERA AND BALLET | 9 | 125 | 178 | 100 | 1,345 | 1,481 | 1,563 |
| DG OF FOUNDATIONS | 7,503 | 29,740 | 4,240 | 24,133 | 40,146 | 46,906 | 53,722 |
| DG OF HEALTH FOR BORDER AND COASTAL AREAS | 89,466 | 33,193 | 54,648 | 112,555 | 99,199 | 90,400 | 101,620 |
| INSTITUTE FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY | 111 | 82 | 57 | 48 | 179 | 187 | 199 |
| UNDERSECRETARIAT FOR DEFENCE INDUSTRIES | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Turkish Standards Institution | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GAP Regional Development Administration | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS | 606,660 | 717,702 | 788,533 | 836,848 | 811,682 | 883,304 | 879,459 |
| SUB-TOTAL: INSTITUTIONS WITH SPECIAL BUDGETS | 705,070 | 782,082 | 848,977 | 975,363 | 954,476 | 1,024,331 | 1,038,716 |
| 2: TOTAL CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES | 9,273,662 | 11,276,377 | 12,952,000 | 15,680,783 | 14,960,260 | 16,319,747 | 17,295,236 |
| C: EXPENDITURES OF SOCIAL SECURITY INSTITUTION (SGK) (formerly SSK, Emekli Sandığı, Bağkur) | | | | | | | |
| OTHER EXPENDITURES | 6,405,000 | 6,805,000 | 5,512,000 | 5,935,000 | 6,179,000 | 6,528,000 | 6,954,000 |
| Expenditures for the schemes under Law No. 2022 | 1,380,268 | 1,661,479 | 1,690,026 | 2,242,856 | 2,291,551 | 2,471,252 | 2,723,777 |
| INSURANCE EXPENDITURES | 44,786,000 | 52,736,000 | 59,647,000 | 68,229,000 | 76,203,000 | 83,980,000 | 92,323,000 |
| EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH | 17,676,000 | 20,045,000 | 25,404,000 | 28,990,000 | 32,842,000 | 34,256,000 | 36,202,000 |
| HEALTH EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS (included in SGK expenditures from 2010 onwards) | 2,440,000 | 2,711,000 | 2,732,000 | 2,730,976 | 198,000 | 208,415 | 219,798 |
| 3: SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES BY SGK | 71,307,000 | 82,297,000 | 93,295,000 | 105,884,976 | 115,422,000 | 124,972,415 | 135,698,798 |
| D: EXPENDITURES OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND | | | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND (excluding transfers to GAP Administration) | 376,000 | 404,000 | 640,000 | 2,248,000 | 1,613,000 | 1,184,036 | 1,377,417 |
| 4: SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES BY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND | 376,000 | 404,000 | 640,000 | 2,248,000 | 1,613,000 | 1,184,036 | 1,377,417 |
| E: EXPENDITURES OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOLIDARITY FUND | | | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOLIDARITY FUND | 1,389,548 | 1,413,757 | 1,797,053 | 2,157,000 | 2,344,120 | 2,547,589 | 2,795,342 |
| 5: SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES BY SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOLIDARITY FUND (SYDTF) | 1,389,548 | 1,413,757 | 1,797,053 | 2,157,000 | 2,344,120 | 2,547,589 | 2,795,342 |
| TOTAL SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES: (CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, SGK, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND, SYDTF 1+2+3+4+5) | 83,392,010 | 96,705,782 | 110,492,634 | 128,412,974 | 137,592,849 | 148,765,253 | 161,294,700 |
| GDP | 758,390,785 | 853,636,000 | 950,098,000 | 947,000,000 | 1,029,000,000 | 1,118,000,000 | 1,227,000,000 |
| TOTAL SOCIAL PROTECTION EXPENDITURES/GDP % | 11.00 | 11.33 | 11.63 | 13.56 | 13.37 | 13.31 | 13.15 |

Table 2: Public Expenditures on Social Security, Social Assistance and Health Care Services Percentage Shares in GDP, Summary Table

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (BUDGETED) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES | 3.88 | 3.99 | 4.32 | 5.01 | 4.66 | 4.54 | 4.38 |
| SGK EXPENDITURES ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES (including public officials) | 2.65 | 2.67 | 2.96 | 3.35 | 3.21 | 3.08 | 2.97 |
| CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES | 1.22 | 1.32 | 1.36 | 1.66 | 1.45 | 1.46 | 1.41 |
| EXPENDITURES ON GREEN CARD SCHEME | 0.38 | 0.46 | 0.42 | 0.58 | 0.45 | 0.42 | 0.41 |
| EXPENDITURES ON INSURANCE AND PENSIONS | 6.62 | 6.83 | 6.75 | 7.83 | 7.94 | 7.98 | 7.98 |
| SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOCIAL SERVICES | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.79 |
| TOTAL | 11.00 | 11.33 | 11.63 | 13.56 | 13.37 | 13.31 | 13.15 |

Table 3: Public Expenditures Targeting Children, 2008, TL (Excluding Education)

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 0-18 Age Group | 2008 |
| Social Services and Social Assistance | |
| Expenditures on Protection of the Child by SHCEK, direct | 302,690,330 |
| Expenditures on Protection of the Child by SHCEK, indirect | 119,599,541 |
| Expenditures on Protection of the Child by SYDTF, direct | 921,525,108 |
| Expenditures on Protection of the Child by SYDTF, indirect | 723,022,436 |
| Expenditures on Protection of the Child by Social Support Programme (SODES) of State Planning Organization, direct | 2,565,710 |
| Expenditures on Protection of the Child by Department of Working Children of MoLSS, direct | 0 |
| Total Expenditures on Social Services and Social Assistance | 2,069,403,125 |
| Health Care Services | |
| Budgetary Allocation for DG Mother-Child Health and Family Planning of Ministry of Health (MoH) | 102,361,000 |
| Expenditures of SGK for 0-18 age group on pharmaceuticals and curative services (excluding those with public official family members) | 2,584,633,272 |
| <i>Expenditures targeting children under Green Card Scheme of MoH, estimate</i> | <i>1,887,131,207</i> |
| <i>Expenditures targeting children under DG Primary Health Care Services of MoH, estimate</i> | <i>1,367,887,000</i> |
| <i>Expenditures targeting children under DG Curative Services of MoH, estimate</i> | <i>1,779,146,500</i> |
| <i>Expenditures for children of public personnel on pharmaceuticals and curative services, estimate</i> | <i>227,106,800</i> |
| Total Expenditures on Health Care Services | 7,948,265,779 |
| Judicial Services | |
| Expenditures on Juvenile Halls and Reformatories of Ministry of Justice (MoJ) | 29,624,013 |
| <i>Expenditures on juvenile courts of MoJ, estimate</i> | <i>21,375,374</i> |
| <i>Personnel Expenditures for Children's Police of DG of Security and Child Centers of Gendarmerie, estimate</i> | <i>142,416,000</i> |
| Total Expenditures on Judicial Services | 193,415,387 |
| PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING CHILDREN | 10,211,084,291 |
| GDP | 950,098,000,000 |
| PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING CHILDREN / GDP % | 1.075 |
| <i>The expenditure items written in italics are estimates.</i> | |

Table 4: 2006-2012, Public Expenditures Targeting the Youth, TL

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (BUDGETED) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| DG Youth and Sports | 298,464,000 | 389,024,000 | 470,447,000 | 635,656,000 | 480,840,000 | 467,767,000 | 446,312,000 |
| YURTÖKÜR (Transfers from Central Government Budget) | .. | 1,425,083,800 | 1,581,641,200 | 1,870,376,000 | 1,796,851,000 | 2,013,452,000 | 2,204,607,000 |
| EU Education and Youth Programs (Budgetary Contribution of Turkey) | .. | 41,230,000 | 48,909,800 | 61,622,000 | 66,796,400 | 72,248,000 | 77,704,000 |
| TÜBİTAK (Scholarships and Support Schemes) | 17,320,000 | 41,300,000 | 53,140,000 | 60,000,000 | 70,000,000 | 80,000,000 | 90,000,000 |
| SODES, Social Support Program (Expenditures targeting youth) | 0 | 0 | 12,620,720 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 |
| İŞKUR, Employment Agency (Expenditures targeting youth) | 0 | 0 | 20,596,747 | 228,995,506 | 400,000,000 | 400,000,000 | 400,000,000 |
| YÖK, Higher Education Council (Scholarships provided to the research assistants at the universities) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,620,000 | 14,480,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| MoNE, Ministry of National Education (Scholarships provided for Higher Education Abroad) | 7,781,552 | 15,262,930 | 22,744,632 | 61,647,000 | 64,680,000 | 64,680,000 | 64,680,000 |
| MoNE (Expenditures of Department of Dormitories and Scholarships for Secondary Education) | .. | .. | 177,198,779 | 208,173,726 | 230,000,000 | 260,000,000 | 290,000,000 |
| PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE YOUTH | .. | 1,911,900,730 | 2,387,298,878 | 3,143,090,232 | 3,136,647,400 | 3,386,147,000 | 3,601,303,000 |
| GDP | 758,390,785,000 | 853,636,000,000 | 950,098,000,000 | 947,000,000,000 | 1,029,000,000,000 | 1,118,000,000,000 | 1,227,000,000,000 |
| PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE YOUTH / GDP % | | 0.224 | 0.251 | 0.332 | 0.305 | 0.303 | 0.294 |
| <i>The expenditure items written in italics are estimates.</i> | | | | | | | |

Table 5: 2006-2008, Public Expenditures Targeting the Disabled, TL

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| DG for Non-Contributory Payments of SGK (Monthly cash transfers under Law No. 2022) | 537,471,498 | 816,663,949 | 978,346,048 |
| DG of Foundations (Social assistance for those in need - including the disabled) | .. | 1,076,937 | 1,207,904 |
| SHÇEK (Home-based care allowance and expenditures on care and rehabilitation services targeting the disabled) | 66,160,686 | 141,109,438 | 528,856,457 |
| DG for Social Assistance and Solidarity 1 (Expenditures on medical equipment for the disabled) | 1,994,745 | 1,673,976 | 1,754,075 |
| DG for Social Assistance and Solidarity 2 (Expenditures on transportation of disabled students benefiting from special education services) | 16,563,641 | 21,075,018 | 29,276,586 |
| Administration for Disabled People | 3,638,000 | 4,583,000 | 4,395,000 |
| İŞKUR, Employment Agency (Expenditures on job placement and training for the disabled) | 3,534,755 | 4,563,945 | 7,974,185 |
| MoNE, DG for Special Education, guidance and Counseling Services | .. | .. | 244,588,450 |
| MoNE, DG for Private Education (Expenditures on private special education) | .. | .. | 362,005,000 |
| DG Youth and Sports (Transfers to Sports Federations of Disabled People) | .. | 60,200,000 | 52,810,000 |
| PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE DISABLED | 629,363,325 | 1,050,946,263 | 2,211,213,705 |
| GDP | 758,390,785,000 | 853,636,000,000 | 994,315,000,000 |
| PUBLIC EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE DISABLED / GDP % | 0.083 | 0.123 | 0.222 |

Table 6: 2006-2012, Military Expenditures, Thousand TL

| A. MILITARY EXPENDITURES BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (BUDGETED) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEFENCE | 11,564,269 | 11,844,535 | 12,738,527 | 14,644,159 | 15,970,608 | 15,970,608 | 16,790,235 |
| GENERAL COMMAND OF GENDERMERIE | 2,629,821 | 2,771,471 | 3,233,138 | 3,771,997 | 3,898,531 | 4,136,959 | 4,387,069 |
| COAST GUARD COMMAND | 116,534 | 169,885 | 191,172 | 191,934 | 257,982 | 289,050 | 307,495 |
| UNDERSECRETARIAT OF DEFENCE INDUSTRY | 16,085 | 21,394 | 21,736 | 26,603 | 29,252 | 30,698 | 32,895 |
| B. MILITARY EXPENDITURES BY OTHER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (ESTIMATE) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
| MINISTRY OF INTERIOR - Wages of Village Guards (excluding SGK contributions) | 312,276 | 369,024 | 331,246 | 372,392 | 390,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| SLUSH FUND OF GOVERNMENT (approx. 3/4 consist of slush fund of Prime Ministry, the rest is unknown) | 292,939 | 354,149 | 399,196 | 464,955 | 500,000 | 550,000 | 600,000 |
| Slush Fund of Prime Ministry | 227,000 | 266,000 | 290,982 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 1. TOTAL MILITARY EXPENDITURES BY CENTRAL GOVERNMENT | 14,931,924 | 15,530,458 | 16,915,015 | 19,472,040 | 21,046,373 | 21,377,315 | 22,517,694 |
| B. EXPENDITURES OF DEFENSE INDUSTRY SUPPORT FUND (SSDF) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (BUDGETED) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
| 2. Expenditures of SSDF | 1,540,210 | 1,541,143 | 2,123,525 | 2,115,688 | 2,297,908 | 2,495,986 | 2,736,824 |
| C. BUDGETARY TRANSFERS TO MECHANICAL AND CHEMICAL INDUSTRY CORP. (MKEK) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 (BUDGETED) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
| 3. Budgetary Transfers to MKEK | 25,000 | 39,680 | 48,000 | 50,000 | 52,000 | 54,500 | 56,408 |
| D. TÜBİTAK EXPENDITURES FOR R&D TARGETING DEFENSE INDUSTRY | 2006 (ESTIMATE) | 2007 (ESTIMATE) | 2008 (ALLOCATION) | 2009 (ALLOCATION) | 2010 (ALLOCATION) | 2011 (ESTIMATE) | 2012 (ESTIMATE) |
| 4. TÜBİTAK (Scientific and Technological Research Council) | 44,656 | 50,264 | 60,194 | 63,605 | 64,807 | 72,670 | 79,755 |
| TOTAL | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| MILITARY EXPENDITURES (CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, SSDF, MKEK, TÜBİTAK 1+2+3+4) | 16,541,790 | 17,161,545 | 19,146,734 | 21,701,333 | 23,461,088 | 24,000,471 | 25,390,681 |
| GDP | 758,390,785 | 853,636,000 | 950,098,000 | 947,000,000 | 1,029,000,000 | 1,118,000,000 | 1,227,000,000 |
| MILITARY EXPENDITURES/GDP% | 2.181 | 2.010 | 2.015 | 2.292 | 2.280 | 2.147 | 2.069 |
| <i>Estimate of expenditures by Turkish Armed Forces Foundation (for comparative purposes)</i> | 43,194 | 48,619 | 54,113 | 53,937 | 58,607 | 63,676 | 69,884 |
| <i>The expenditure items written in italics are estimates.</i> | | | | | | | |

Table 7: Shares of Selected Public Expenditures in GDP (%)

| | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Military Expenditures (SIPRI) % GDP (old series) | 2.94 | 3.17 | 3.54 | 3.76 | 3.87 | 3.92 | 4.06 | 3.90 | 4.14 | 4.10 | 4.38 | 5.38 | 5.02 |
| Expenditures on Education (State Planning Office (SPO)) % GDP (old series) | 2.05 | 2.65 | 3.27 | 3.63 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.12 | 2.72 | 2.51 | 3.33 | 3.70 | 4.28 | 3.79 |
| Interest Payments (Ministry of Finance (MoF)) % GDP (old series) | 3.85 | 3.63 | 3.55 | 3.82 | 3.69 | 5.88 | 7.71 | 7.42 | 10.14 | 7.90 | 11.83 | 13.85 | 16.39 |
| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Military Expenditures (SIPRI) % GDP (new series) | 3.75 | 3.68 | 3.89 | 3.39 | 2.78 | 2.50 | 2.55 | 2.11 | 2.17 | | | | |
| Military Expenditures (Table 6) % GDP (new series) | | | | | | | 2.18 | 2.01 | 2.02 | 2.29 | 2.28 | 2.15 | 2.07 |
| Expenditures on Education (SPO, MoF) % GDP (new series) | 2.83 | 2.92 | 3.18 | 3.18 | 3.12 | 3.06 | 2.93 | 3.01 | 3.21 | 3.77 | 3.69 | 3.61 | 3.51 |
| Expenditures on Health (Table 2) % GDP (new series) | 2.62 | 3.19 | 3.72 | 3.80 | 3.93 | 3.90 | 3.88 | 3.99 | 4.32 | 5.01 | 4.66 | 4.54 | 4.38 |
| Expenditures on Green Card Scheme (Table 2) % GDP (new series) | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.19 | 0.28 | 0.38 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.45 | 0.42 | 0.41 |
| Expenditures on Insurance, Pensions and Other Items (Table 2) % GDP (new series) | 4.71 | 5.27 | 5.62 | 6.41 | 6.31 | 6.53 | 6.62 | 6.83 | 6.75 | 7.83 | 7.94 | 7.98 | 7.98 |
| Social Services and Social Assistance (Table 2) % GDP (new series) | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.32 | 0.23 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.79 |
| Interest Payments (Ministry of Finance) % GDP (new series) | 12.26 | 17.08 | 14.76 | 12.87 | 10.11 | 7.04 | 6.06 | 5.71 | 5.33 | 6.07 | 5.52 | 4.94 | 4.52 |

SOCIAL PROTECTION

The calculation of total social protection expenditures is based on the methodology of European Integrated System of Social Protection Statistics (ESSPROS). Detailed information on the methodology, data and data sources for **Tables 1 and 2** can be found in the “Guideline for Monitoring Social Protection Expenditures” (available at <http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/stkButce.asp>). The main sources of data are the DG of Budget and Fiscal Control and the DG for Public Accounts, both under Ministry of Finance, the State Planning Organization and the Undersecretariat of Treasury. Both actual and three-year estimate expenditures of institutions with general and special budgets are published online and could easily be accessed.

Social Assistance and Solidarity Fund (SYDTF) and the Unemployment Insurance Fund do not publish three-year estimates for revenues and expenditures. Unfortunately, EUROSTAT does not provide ESSPROS-compatible social protection expenditures for Turkey as the related public institutions in the country do not yet produce data in the same format.

There is no age group breakdown for the expenditures of the Department of Social Assistance Services or the Department of Family and Social Services of SHÇEK, all social transfers of SYDTF and the expenditures of the DG for Primary Health Care Services and the DG for Curative Services of the Ministry of Health. Also, no expenditure data is available on juvenile courts of the Ministry of Justice, child offices of DG for Security and projects and programs carried out under the DG Working Children of MoLSS.

EXPENDITURES TARGETING CHILDREN

Information provided in **Table 3** is based on the methodology and data described in detail in “Guideline for Monitoring Public Expenditures for the Protection of Children” (available at <http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/stkButce.asp>). The primary sources of data are the annual activity reports of related institutions and budgetary allocation sheets published on the website of the DG of Budget and Fiscal Control under the Ministry of Finance. The data on expenditures of SGK for 0-18 age group on pharmaceuticals and curative services and the data on expenditures on juvenile halls and reformatories of the Ministry of Justice were provided by the institutions upon demand.

EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE DISABLED

The data sources for the information provided in **Table 5** are SGK, İŞKUR, DG of Budget and Fiscal Control and DG Public Accounts under Ministry of Finance. The rest of the expenditures cited are taken from the annual activity reports of the related institutions. Detailed information on the methodology, data and data sources for the expenditures targeting the disabled in **Table 5** can be found in the “Guideline for Monitoring Public Expenditures for Disabled People” (available at <http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/stkButce.asp>).

There is no breakdown available with respect to different groups for the expenditures of social assistance for those in need provided by DG of Foundations.

EXPENDITURES TARGETING THE YOUTH

The actual expenditures of the institutions with private budgets as well as three year expenditure estimates cited in **Table 4** are available online. The rest of the expenditures cited are taken from the annual activity reports of the related institutions. Detailed information on the methodology, data and data sources for the expenditures targeting the disabled in **Table 5** can be found in the “Guidelines for Monitoring Public Expenditures for Empowering Young People” (available at <http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/stkButce.asp>).

With no breakdown for the expenditures on sports made by the local branches of the DG for Youth and Sports, it is not possible to single out the expenditures targeting youth from the total expenditures of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. There is no breakdown for age groups for the expenditure data of İŞKUR, while the total expenditure on scholarships provided Higher Education Council (YÖK) and the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) are not publicly announced and provided upon demand

Three year estimates for revenues and expenditures of Defence Industry Support Fund are not available. It is also not possible to identify either the breakdown of the expenditures of the slush funds or the amount of public expenditures on armament provided to village guards. Information on the R&D expenditures for the projects carried out at universities and expenditures of the Turkish Armed Forces Foundation is also not available.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The calculation of military expenditures presented in **Table 6** is mostly based on the methodology of Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Detailed information on the methodology, data and data sources for the expenditures targeting the disabled in **Tables 6 and 7** can be found in the “Guideline for Monitoring Military and Domestic Security Expenditures” (available at <http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/stkButce.asp>). The main sources of data are the DG of Budget and Fiscal Control and the DG for Public Accounts, both under Ministry of Finance, State Planning Organization and Undersecretariat of Treasury. Both actual and three-year estimate expenditures of institutions with general and special budgets are published online and could easily be accessed.

We demand for the provision of the publicly unavailable information mentioned above. Also, we claim for prioritizing gender budgeting so as to maintain gender equality and transparency in public expenditures.

This project is self-financed by the undersigned institutions.

PROJECT COORDINATION AND CONTACT PEOPLE

Nurhan Yentürk, Istanbul Bilgi University NGO Training and Research Center, yenturk@bilgi.edu.tr

Laden Yurttagüler, Istanbul Bilgi University NGO Training and Research Center, laden@bilgi.edu.tr

WORKING GROUPS AND CONTACT PEOPLE

Social Protection, Nurhan Yentürk, Istanbul Bilgi University, NGO Training and Research Center, yenturk@bilgi.edu.tr

Children, Ayşe Beyazova, Istanbul Bilgi University, Children's Studies Unit, abeyazova@bilgi.edu.tr

Military, Avi Haligua, Amnesty International, avi@amnesty.org.tr

Youth, Yörük Kurtaran, Youth Studies Unit, yoruk@bilgi.edu.tr

Disabled, Volkan Yılmaz, Social Policy Forum, volkan.yilmaz@boun.edu.tr