



SEISMIC RESILIENCE AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECT

(Ref : WB/CS-DESSUP-04)

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SURGERY HOSPITAL BUILDING IN ÇAPA CAMPUS OF İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF MEDICINE

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MEETING SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS REPORT



SEPTEMBER 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6
1. METHODOLOGY.....	7
1.1. Data Collection and Analysis Process	7
2. FINDINGS.....	8
2.1. Findings Related to Frequency Data	8
2.2. Findings Related to Gender Dependent Variable.....	11
CONCLUSION	21
Annex 1: Survey Form.....	22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Gender Distribution of the Participants	8
Table 2: Adequacy of the Information Provided at the Meeting on Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Performed in the Building	8
Table 3: Adequacy of Information Shared on Measures for Potential Environmental, Social, and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Impacts of the Project	9
Table 4: Timely Notification of the Meeting’s Location, Time, and Content	9
Table 5: Adequacy of Responses to the Questions Raised During the Meeting.....	10
Table 6: Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenters.....	10
Table 7: Relationship Between Gender and the Sufficiency of the Information Provided at the Meeting Regarding Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Carried Out in the Building	11
Table 8: Relationship between Gender and the Assessment of the Sufficiency of Information Shared at the Meeting on Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Impacts of the Project and Measures to be Taken	13
Table 9: Relationship between Gender and the Evaluation of Timely Information Regarding the Location, Time, and Content of the Meeting	15
Table 10: Relationship between Gender and the Assessment of the Adequacy of Responses to Questions Raised during the Meeting.....	17
Table 11: Relationship between Gender and Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenter(s)	19

ABBREVIATIONS	
GDCA	General Directorate of Construction Affairs
MoEUCC	Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
SREEPB	Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings
WB	World Bank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The General Directorate of Construction Affairs (GDCA) under the Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Environment, Urbanization, and Climate Change (MoEUCC) has secured a loan from the World Bank (WB) for the Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Project. This loan has been used to achieve seismic resilience and energy efficiency targets in public buildings. Stakeholder engagement meetings have been organized for the sub-projects under the SREEPB Project, following the WB's environmental and social requirements, including its stakeholder engagement standards.

The building to be constructed under the Construction of the Surgery Hospital Building in Çapa Campus of İstanbul University Faculty of Medicine, reference number WB/CS-DESSUP-04, as part of the SREEPB Project, is designed to be earthquake-resistant, utilizing a seismic isolator system. Aligned with sustainability principles, the hospital will be an environmentally friendly public facility with near-zero energy consumption. This modern hospital, offering both high earthquake safety and energy efficiency, will significantly enhance İstanbul's healthcare infrastructure.

This report presents an analysis of the satisfaction survey conducted following the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting held on September 3, 2024, at the İstanbul University Faculty of Medicine Çapa Campus, organized as part of the DESSUP-04 Sub-project. The survey reflects the opinions/feedback of 63 participants who attended the meeting. The data were analyzed using the SPSS Statistics 25, and the key findings are summarized in this report.

According to the results of the DESSUP-04 Subproject Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Satisfaction Survey, the stakeholders who attended the meeting expressed their satisfaction in general (78.4%), while this ratio was 64.4% for women. 84% of participants found the information provided on structural repair and energy efficiency works to be sufficient, while 90% were satisfied with the information on environmental and social risks. Additionally, 92% of participants reported receiving timely information regarding the meeting's location, time, and content, and 69% expressed satisfaction with the presentation's quality. Among female participants, 87% found the information on environmental and social risks was adequate.

Overall, the stakeholders who attended the meeting were satisfied with the project's progress and the information provided, though some participants suggested improvements in the presentation's length and performance.

Önder YURDAKUL

Project Coordinator

INTRODUCTION

A survey was conducted to assess the satisfaction of the stakeholders who attended the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting held on September 3, 2024, regarding the Environmental and Social Management Plan prepared under DESSUP-04.

The survey responses are tabulated both separately and by gender in this report. The first section covers the survey methodology, including data collection and analysis processes. The second section provides insights based on frequency and cross-tabulation analysis of the responses.

1. METHODOLOGY

The analysis stages of the survey conducted to measure the satisfaction of the participants at the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting detailed above are outlined below.

1.1.Data Collection and Analysis Process

A total of 95 people attended the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting on September 3, 2024, with 91 participating in person (52 female and 39 male) and four attending online (two female and two male). The survey for this meeting was administered in-person to the invited stakeholders, and 63 participants completed the questionnaire. The responses from these 63 participants were analyzed using SPSS Statistics 25 software. The survey gathered feedback on various topics, including participants' knowledge of the meeting content, information provided on environmental and social risks, and the quality of the presentations (see Annex 1 for the survey questions).

During the data analysis, frequency distribution tables were created for each question. Gender was used as a dependent variable to analyze its relationship with each closed-ended question, and the results were presented in tabular form.

2. FINDINGS

In the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Satisfaction Survey Report, frequency tables were generated for all questions, and the results were analyzed. Additionally, cross-tabulations were created using gender as the dependent variable, and these findings were included in the report.

2.1. Findings Related to Frequency Data

Table 1: Gender Distribution of the Participants

Question 1: Please indicate your gender.			
Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Question not answered	2	3,2%	3,2%
Female	32	50,8%	54,0%
Male	22	34,9%	88,9%
Prefer not to specify	7	11,1%	100,0%
TOTAL	63	100,00%	

Table 1 shows the gender distribution of the survey participants. Among the 63 respondents, 3.2% did not answer this question. Female participants accounted for 50.8% of the total, while 34.9% were male. Additionally, 11.1% of the participants chose not to disclose their gender.

Table 2: Adequacy of the Information Provided at the Meeting on Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Performed in the Building

Question 2: Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?			
Answer	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Question not answered	2	3,2%	3,2%
Yes	53	84,1%	87,3%
No	8	12,7%	100,0%
TOTAL	63	100%	

While 84.1% of the participants found the information provided at the meeting regarding the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be sufficient, 12.7% stated that the information was inadequate, and 3.2% did not respond to the question.

Table 3: Adequacy of Information Shared on Measures for Potential Environmental, Social, and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Impacts of the Project

Question 3: Was sufficient information provided on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social, and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?			
Answer	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Question not answered	2	3,2%	3,2%
Yes	57	90,5%	93,7%
No	4	6,3%	100,0%
TOTAL	63	100,0%	

90.5% of the participants stated that they received sufficient information about the measures to be taken regarding environmental, social, and occupational health and safety risks within the scope of the project. While 6.3% of the participants did not find the information shared on this subject sufficient, 3.2% did not respond to this question.

Table 4: Timely Notification of the Meeting’s Location, Time, and Content

Question 4: Was information about the location, time, and content of the meeting provided on time?			
Answer	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Question not answered	2	3,2%	3,2%
Yes	58	92,1%	95,2%
No	3	4,8%	100,0%
TOTAL	63	100,0%	

92.1% of the participants stated that they received timely information about the meeting’s location, time, and content, while 4.8% reported that they did not. Additionally, 3.2% of the participants did not respond to this question.

Table 5: Adequacy of Responses to the Questions Raised During the Meeting

Question 5: Were the answers to the questions raised during the meeting adequate?			
Answer	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Question not answered	18	28,6%	28,6%
Invalid response	2	3,2%	31,7%
Yes	35	55,6%	87,3%
No	1	1,6%	88,9%
Participants did not ask questions	7	11,1%	100,0%
TOTAL	63	100,0%	

55.6% of the participants thought that the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting were sufficient. However, 28.6% did not answer the question. While 1.6% found the answers insufficient, 11.1% stated that the participants did not ask any questions during the meeting. Additionally, 3.2% of the participants provided invalid responses. This corresponds to two individuals who wrote comments on the questionnaire form as the following: “There was very little time left for questions. The presentations took too long.” and “Partially”.

Table 6: Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenters

Question 6: Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?			
Answer	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Question not answered	4	6,3%	6,3%
Invalid response	5	7,9%	14,3%
Yes	44	69,8%	84,1%
No	10	15,9%	100,0%
TOTAL	63	100,0%	

69.8% of the participants were satisfied with the performance of the presenters, while 15.9% were not. The non-response rate was 6.3%. Additionally, 7.9% of the participants provided invalid responses, expressing themselves manually in the following ways on the survey form:

- “Partially” (3 people)
- “Medium” (1 person)
- “Some of the presenters did not have a good command of the room, which led to a loss of interest, and certain topics were not understood.” (1 person)

2.2. Findings Related to Gender Dependent Variable

In this section, the relationship between the dependent variable of gender and each question asked to the participants in the questionnaire is analyzed with cross-tabulations.¹

Table 7: Relationship Between Gender and the Sufficiency of the Information Provided at the Meeting Regarding Structural Repairs and Energy Efficiency Works to be Carried Out in the Building

Q2. Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient? * Gender Crosstabulation							
			Gender				TOTAL
			Female	Male	Prefer not to specify	Question not answered	
Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?	Question not answered	Count	1	1	0	0	2
		% within the question “Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?”	50,0%	50,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,1%	4,5%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
		of Total %	1,6%	1,6%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
	Yes	Count	27	19	6	1	53
		% within the question “Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?”	50,9%	35,8%	11,3%	1,9%	100,0%
		% within Gender	84,4%	86,4%	85,7%	50,0%	84,1%

¹ The “% in Gender” row data in the tables was calculated using the gender distribution of all participants who completed the questionnaire. The “of Total %” row data was calculated based on the total number of participants.

		of Total %	42,9%	30,2%	9,5%	1,6%	84,1%
	No	Count	4	2	1	1	8
		% within the question “Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?”	50,0%	25,0%	12,5%	12,5%	100,0%
		% within Gender	12,5%	9,1%	14,3%	50,0%	12,7%
		of Total %	6,3%	3,2%	1,6%	1,6%	12,7%
TOTAL		Count	32	22	7	2	63
		% within the question “Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?”	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Total %	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%

According to Table 7, of those who found “the information provided at the meeting about the repair and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building adequate,” 50.9% were women, 35.8% were men, and 11.3% preferred not to disclose their gender. Based on gender, 84.4% of women, 86.4% of men, and 85.7% of those who did not specify their gender considered the information sufficient. Among those who responded “No” to the question, indicating that the information provided was insufficient, women made up 50% of this group, men 25%, and participants who did not specify their gender 12.5%. This corresponds to 12.5% of women, 9.1% of men, and 14.3% of those who did not specify their gender. Additionally, 3.2% of respondents did not answer the question, and this group was evenly split between women and men, with each gender representing 50%.

Table 8: Relationship between Gender and the Assessment of the Sufficiency of Information Shared at the Meeting on Potential Environmental, Social and Occupational Health and Safety Risks/Impacts of the Project and Measures to be Taken

Q3. Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social, and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project? *Gender Crosstabulation							
			Gender				
			Female	Male	Prefer not to specify	Question not answered	TOTAL
Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?	Question not answered	Count	1	1	0	0	2
		% within the question “Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?”	50,0%	50,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,1%	4,5%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
		of Total %	1,6%	1,6%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
	Yes	Count	28	21	6	2	57
		% within the question “Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?”	49,1%	36,8%	10,5%	3,5%	100,0%
		% within Gender	87,5%	95,5%	85,7%	100,0%	90,5%
		of Total %	44,4%	33,3%	9,5%	3,2%	90,5%
	No	Count	3	0	1	0	4
		% within the question “Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?”	75,0%	0,0%	25,0%	0,0%	100,0%

		occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?"					
		% within Gender	9,4%	0,0%	14,3%	0,0%	6,3%
		of Total %	4,8%	0,0%	1,6%	0,0%	6,3%
TOTAL		Count	32	22	7	2	63
		% within the question "Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?"	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Total %	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%

According to Table 8, of the respondents who stated that “sufficient information was shared about the measures to be taken regarding the potential environmental, social, and occupational health and safety risks of the project,” 49.1% were women and 36.8% were men. A breakdown by gender shows that 87.5% of women, 95.5% of men, and 85.7% of those who preferred not to specify their gender found the information sharing to be sufficient. While no male respondents answered “No” to this question, 75% of those who did were women. Specifically, 9.4% of women and 14.3% of participants who did not specify their gender found the information provided to be insufficient.

Table 9: Relationship between Gender and the Evaluation of Timely Information Regarding the Location, Time, and Content of the Meeting

Q4. Was timely information about the location, time, and content of the meeting provided? * Gender Crosstabulation							
			Gender				TOTAL
			Female	Male	Prefer not to specify	Question not answered	
Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?	Question not answered	Count	1	1	0	0	2
		% within the question “Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?”	50,0%	50,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,1%	4,5%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
		of Total %	1,6%	1,6%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
	Yes	Count	30	19	7	2	58
		% within the question “Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?”	51,7%	32,8%	12,1%	3,4%	100,0%
		% within Gender	93,8%	86,4%	100,0%	100,0%	92,1%
		of Total %	47,6%	30,2%	11,1%	3,2%	92,1%
	No	Count	1	2	0	0	3
		% within the question “Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?”	33,3%	66,7%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,1%	9,1%	0,0%	0,0%	4,8%
		of Total %	1,6%	3,2%	0,0%	0,0%	4,8%
TOTAL		Count	32	22	7	2	63

	% within the question “Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?”	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%
	% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	Total %	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%

92.1% of participants answered “Yes” to the question, indicating that they were "informed about the place, time, and content of the meeting on time." Among them, 93.8% of female participants, 86.4% of male participants, and 100% of those who preferred not to specify their gender found the information sufficient. The overall rate of participants who answered "No" was 4.8%, with 3.1% of female participants and 9.1% of male participants finding the information insufficient. Of those who responded "No," men were the most represented group at 66.7%. The non-response rate was 3.2%.

Table 10: Relationship between Gender and the Assessment of the Adequacy of Responses to Questions Raised during the Meeting

Q5. Were the answers to the questions raised during the meeting adequate? * Gender Crosstabulation							
			Gender				TOTAL
			Female	Male	Prefer not to specify	Question not answered	
Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?	Question not answered	Count	9	7	2	0	18
		% within the question “Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?”	50,0%	38,9%	11,1%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	28,1%	31,8%	28,6%	0,0%	28,6%
		of Total %	14,3%	11,1%	3,2%	0,0%	28,6%
	Invalid response	Count	0	2	0	0	2
		% within the question “Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?”	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	0,0%	9,1%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
		of Total %	0,0%	3,2%	0,0%	0,0%	3,2%
	Yes	Count	18	12	4	1	35
		% within the question “Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?”	51,4%	34,3%	11,4%	2,9%	100,0%
		% within Gender	56,3%	54,5%	57,1%	50,0%	55,6%
		of Total %	28,6%	19,0%	6,3%	1,6%	55,6%
	No	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		% within the question “Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?”	100,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%

		% within Gender	3,1%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	1,6%
		of Total %	1,6%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	1,6%
	Meeting participants did not ask questions	Count	4	1	1	1	7
		% within the question “Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?”	57,1%	14,3%	14,3%	14,3%	100,0%
		% within Gender	12,5%	4,5%	14,3%	50,0%	11,1%
		of Total %	6,3%	1,6%	1,6%	1,6%	11,1%
TOTAL	Count	32	22	7	2	63	
	% within the question “Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?”	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%	
	% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	Total %	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%	

55.6% of respondents answered "Yes" to the question, indicating that they found "the answers given to the questions asked during the meeting adequate." Among those who responded "Yes," women were the majority, representing 51.4%. Specifically, 56.3% of women, 54.5% of men, and 57.1% of those who preferred not to specify their gender found the answers sufficient. Only one respondent (1.6%), who was female, found the answers insufficient. Additionally, 28.6% of participants did not answer the question, including 28.1% of women, 31.8% of men, and 28.6% of those who did not specify their gender. Furthermore, 3.2% of participants provided invalid responses, all of whom were men. Participants who provided invalid responses did not select the options listed in the questionnaire. Instead, they wrote the following comments by hand on the form: “There was very little time left for questions. The presentations took too long.” and “Partially”. Lastly, 11.1% of respondents reported that no questions were asked during the meeting, with women making up the majority (57.1%) of this group.

Table 11: Relationship between Gender and Satisfaction with the Performance of the Presenter(s)

Q6. Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)? * Gender Crosstabulation							
			Gender				TOTAL
			Female	Male	Prefer not to specify	Question not answered	
Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?	Question not answered	Count	1	2	1	0	4
		% within the question “Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?”	25,0%	50,0%	25,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,1%	9,1%	14,3%	0,0%	6,3%
		of Total %	1,6%	3,2%	1,6%	0,0%	6,3%
	Invalid response	Count	1	3	1	0	5
		% within the question “Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?”	20,0%	60,0%	20,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	3,1%	13,6%	14,3%	0,0%	7,9%
		of Total %	1,6%	4,8%	1,6%	0,0%	7,9%
	Yes	Count	22	16	5	1	44
		% within the question “Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?”	50,0%	36,4%	11,4%	2,3%	100,0%
		% within Gender	68,8%	72,7%	71,4%	50,0%	69,8%
		of Total %	34,9%	25,4%	7,9%	1,6%	69,8%
	No	Count	8	1	0	1	10

		% within the question “Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?”	80,0%	10,0%	0,0%	10,0%	100,0%
		% within Gender	25,0%	4,5%	0,0%	50,0%	15,9%
		Total %	12,7%	1,6%	0,0%	1,6%	15,9%
TOTAL		Count	32	22	7	2	63
		% within the question “Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?”	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Total %	50,8%	34,9%	11,1%	3,2%	100,0%

Of the participants who completed the questionnaire, 69.8% stated that they were “satisfied with the presenter's performance.” Specifically, 68.8% of female respondents, 72.7% of male respondents, and 71.4% of those who preferred not to specify their gender answered “Yes.” Among the 6.3% of respondents who did not answer the question, 25% were women, 50% were men, and 25% did not want to specify their gender. Additionally, 15.9% of respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the performance, with the majority of this group being women (25.0%), while the dissatisfaction rate among men was 4.5%. Notably, none of the respondents who did not specify their gender answered “No.” Invalid responses accounted for 7.9%. The participants who provided invalid responses did not check any of the provided options on the questionnaire form. Instead, they expressed themselves by writing “Partially” (3 people), “Medium” (1 person), and “Some of the presenters did not have a good command of the room, which led to a loss of interest, and certain topics were not understood.” (1 person). Overall, most respondents rated the presentation performance positively, though dissatisfaction was higher among women than men.

CONCLUSION

The results of the DESSUP-04 Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Satisfaction Survey indicate that 78.4% of the stakeholders who attended the meeting expressed overall satisfaction, with this figure being 64.4% among women. Additionally, 84% of participants found the information provided at the meeting regarding the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be sufficient. Furthermore, 90% of participants were satisfied with the information on the measures to address environmental, social, and occupational health and safety risks associated with the project.

Regarding the meeting's location, time, and content, 92% of participants stated that they were informed on time, and 56% found the responses to questions during the meeting to be adequate. Satisfaction with the presenters' performance was positively rated by 69% of respondents.

A high level of satisfaction was also reflected among female respondents, with 87% finding the information on environmental and social risks to be adequate. However, some participants suggested improvements in the duration of the meeting and the quality of the presentation, as indicated by the responses to an open-ended survey question (Question No: 7), which have been categorized below:

Participants were asked to share their concerns, requests, opinions, and suggestions in one open-ended question, with responses categorized as follows:

- Presentation and communication
 - Length of the presentation
 - Language and content of the presentation not suitable for the target audience
 - Positive feedback, including satisfaction, thanks, and congratulations
- Construction process
 - Questions and stakeholder input to be considered in the building design
 - Emphasis on the importance of independent preventive audit systems
 - Request for the use of heat pumps in the hospital
 - Concerns about structural and patient safety risks in nearby Internal Medicine and Orthopedics buildings

All opinions, requests, complaints, and suggestions submitted to the PIU through the open-ended question in the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Satisfaction Survey have been recorded in the grievance log.

Annex 1: Survey Form

Seismic Resilience and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings (SREEPB) Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Evaluation Survey

This survey aims to measure satisfaction with stakeholder information meetings organized within the scope of SREEPB Project. **Please do not share any information about your identity (name, surname, ID number, etc.) in the survey.** The data collected through the survey will only be used to measure the performance of the engagement meetings and will not be shared with any third party.

In order for the survey results to contribute effectively to project implementation, it will be critical that you answer all the questions.

Your answers to the questions in this survey will be analyzed, reported and disclosed anonymously on the project's official website (<https://kamuguclendirme.csb.gov.tr/>).

Thank you.

1. Please indicate your gender
 - Female
 - Male
 - I do not want to specify
2. Was the information provided at the meeting about the structural repairs and energy efficiency works to be carried out in the building sufficient?
 - Yes
 - No
3. Was sufficient information shared on the measures to be taken regarding potential environmental, social and occupational health and safety risks/impacts of the Project?
 - Yes
 - No
4. Was timely information about the place, time and content of the meeting provided?
 - Yes
 - No
5. Were the answers to the questions asked during the meeting adequate?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Participants did not ask questions
6. Were you satisfied with the presentation performance of the presenter(s)?
 - Yes
 - No

7. Please indicate if there is anything you would like to convey to the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change **regarding the project subject to the meeting**.....

.....

.....