



INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM AT THE RESPONSE TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN TURKEY IN 2003

Nihan Erdoğan, M.A. (presenter)

Hikmet İskender, PhD

Assoc. Prof. Levent Trabzon

Istanbul Technical University

Center of Excellence for Disaster Management

- 1st group (15 November 2003)
 - Targeted two synagogues
- 2nd group (20 November 2003)
 - Targeted a bank and a consulate general
- 53 people lost their lives and 718 people were injured,
- Building damages
 - 9 heavily damaged
 - 18 moderately damaged
 - 43 slightly damaged
 - 259 with window damages



ATTACKS IN ISTANBUL




ATTACKS IN ISTANBUL




ATTACKS IN ISTANBUL



ATTACKS IN ISTANBUL






Beyoğlu

Neve Şalom Synagogue

Incident Place

15.11.2003





Şişli

Beth Israel Synagogue

Incident Place

15.11.2003





Beyoğlu

UK Consulate General Buildings

Incident Place

20.11.2003




- Police
- Crime scene investigations directorate
- State head court of republic
- Fire department
- Medical teams
- Civil Defense
- Metropolitan municipality
- Provincial municipalities
- Directorate of public works and settlement
- Search and rescue NGOs





INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM



- Within few minutes, hospitals nearby were shifted to plan "A",
- Medical teams were first on-site,
- No reported problems of lack of sufficient number of ambulance (26 out of total 54 ambulances reached to the scenes in the first 15 minutes),
- No triage areas.



SEARCH AND RESCUE OPERATIONS

- Being performed by Fire department, Civil Defense and search and rescue NGOs,
- High number of volunteers,
- No staging area during all attacks,
- Not well enough arranged shift and working hours,
- No additional precaution for health of staff,
- No decontamination process was applied.



- Attacked areas were announced as crime scene,
- Unauthorized people were not accepted to the scene,
- Casualties were not moved by teams without the official permission of the Prosecutor,
- Authorization problems at the beginning,
- Potential problems of losing some evidences.



- High attention from both national and international media,
- Showing casualties pictures ,
- Incorrect news given by the media,
- Panic wave being created among the community,
- Some media staff entering the zero point with no permission,
- Lack of proper information flow to the media,
- Ethical rules of media being criticized.



Successes:

- Quick deployment of responders,
- No communication problems among the responders,
- Rapidly securing the affected area (at the second group of attacks),
- Quick identification of casualties,
- Support from NGOs.



Challenges:

- No proper conduction of Incident Command System,
- Some group of officials walking on possible evidence areas,
- Some unrelated and authorized people on site at the beginning,



Challenges:

- Lack of triage area,
- Lack of joint information center or a similar structure,
- No specific public information officer to relay information.



Suggestions:

- Triage area, decontamination corridor, personnel safety, evidence safety to be provided better,
- Follow up of where the casualties are sent to,
- Involvement of NGOs into the mechanism,
- Better consideration of secondary devices,



Suggestions:

- Better precautions if there are visits of high level officials,
- Press spokesman to be assigned,
- Better information flow,
- Better media management,
- Integrated emergency management instead of a more technical perspective.





THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION

Nihan Erdoğan, M.A. (Presenter)
nihanerdgn@yahoo.com
erdogannihan@itu.edu.tr

Hikmet İskender, PhD
iskender@itu.edu.tr

Assoc. Prof. Levent Trabzon
levent.trabzon@itu.edu.tr