

Annex 5

of the Commission Implementing Decision on the ENPI Regional South Annual Action Programme 2013 –Part I

Action Fiche for Middle East Peace Projects (MEPP) – EU Partnership for Peace programme 2013 (PfPP)

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Middle East Peace Projects (MEPP) – EU Partnership for Peace programme 2013 (PfPP) CRIS No. ENPI/2013/024-686		
Total cost	Total estimated cost: EUR 5,000,000 Total amount of EU contribution: EUR 5,000,000		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project approach – Direct Centralised management		
DAC-code	15050	Sector	Civil Society

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Summary of the action and its objectives

The overall objective of the EU Partnership for Peace Programme is to help support the conditions for re-launching the peace process and provide a solid foundation at the societal level for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East by strengthening and increasing direct civil society relationships and co-operation based on equality and reciprocity between Palestinians and Israelis, including the Arab minority in Israel.

The specific objective is to strengthen civil society peace building actions and conflict transformation, focusing on initiatives which are likely to have an impact on people's everyday lives. In particular, the programme intends to support practical actions aiming at rebuilding mutual trust through reconciliation, building capacity for non-violent approaches to conflict resolution, empowering marginalized parties and launching joint development policies and strategies.

2.2. Sector context

A central objective of the EU in the Middle East is the achievement of lasting peace by means of a just and lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with the State of Israel and an independent, democratic, contiguous, sovereign and viable State of Palestine, within 1967 border and with East Jerusalem as its capital, living side by side in peace and security and mutual recognition. This includes a fair solution to the complex issue of Jerusalem, notably through negotiations to resolve the status of Jerusalem as the future capital of two states, and an agreed, just, fair and

realistic solution to the problem of Palestinian refugees. It also includes a solution in the Israeli-Syrian and Israeli-Lebanese tracks.

Notwithstanding the stalemate of the Middle East Peace Process, the Council reiterated in May 2012 its pledge toward the solution of the conflict: "The Council took stock of developments in the Middle East peace process. It reaffirmed its commitment to a two-state solution to the conflict and urged that the viability of such a solution be maintained. Reiterating its fundamental commitment to the security of Israel, it expressed at the same time deep concern about developments on the ground which threaten to make a two-state solution impossible, including in Area C of the West Bank and in East Jerusalem".

Meanwhile, Palestine has obtained the status of non-member state at the UN, following a vote in the General Assembly in November 2012.

Jordan, as a close neighbour to Israel and host to a large Palestinian refugee population, tries to keep and reinforce its role as peace broker between the parties.

The prospects for the renewal of the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP) remain unclear, despite hopes that current political developments in Israel may lead to a new dynamic.

At the regional level, the Arab Peace Initiative (API) remains the principal option for a comprehensive settlement of the conflict and normalisation of relations between Israel and the Arab neighbours. However, though the Initiative has been welcomed anew by the international community including the EU and the US, Israel's response has been lukewarm. The regional approach to the resolution of the Israeli-Arab conflict will have to take into account the fundamental changes across the Arab world.

Notwithstanding the endorsement of the API at official level both in Palestine and Jordan, at social level the anti-normalisation movement, advocating for freezing all joint activities with Israelis until the final settlement of the conflict, is becoming increasingly vocal and active.

Since 1998, after the 1997 Luxembourg European Council recommended that the EU actively support civil society initiatives in the Middle East as an essential means of reinforcing dialogue and restoring mutual confidence, the EU has constantly supported a great number of initiatives through the European Union's People to People (P2P) Programme (1998 - 2001) first and then through its successor, the EU Partnership for Peace Programme (PfP), from 2002 to the present.

2.3. Lessons learnt

In the absence of a reinvigorated peace process and in view of the deepening internal divides on both sides, peace-building activities are confronted with increased scepticism in the whole region. In order to adapt to the deterioration of the situation, the programme will continue to support "national" projects in addition to the cross-community projects, in order to target those segments of the population who support peace but are losing hope. In this context, political leaders and opinion-formers need

to be targeted in order to renew and keep alive the ideas and visionary leadership which could result in a peace deal. Activities aiming at revitalising the dialogue, exposing them to studies and international experiences will also be supported by the programme.

The external evaluation of the programme, conducted in 2009, and the consultation workshop with civil society in 2012 confirmed the relevance of the regional nature of the programme as well as its demand-driven approach. Through its flexibility and diversity, the programme has made possible a large variety of projects, approaches and methodologies, which have built up a valuable richness in experiences and practices. The programme has successfully enhanced the capacity to introduce and defend the role of third parties as a substantial component of the conflict resolution.

Meanwhile, it was recommended to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the effort by improving the image of the programme, promoting networking and coordination, and building capacities of the grant recipient organisations. These recommendations are met through the implementation of a specific EU PfP communication strategy and through a package of trainings (Monitoring & Evaluation, Reporting, Gender mainstreaming, greening development) offered to EU PfP grant beneficiaries.

The Call for Proposals will reinforce, in continuity with the 2012 Call, the following approaches:

1. Connect peace-building and education for peace with tangible results likely to impact on people's everyday's life;
2. Promoting conflict transformation and capacity building for nonviolent resistance among marginalised groups and new constituencies as alternatives to passive acceptance of the conflict or of armed struggle against it.
3. Opening the political space for political discussion among conflicting parties and support national and intergovernmental leadership to foster the peace process.

2.4. Complementary actions

The involvement of the European Union in the Middle East peace process is driven by the basic principles and objectives of the ENP Southern Partnership. The relationship between the European Union and its Mediterranean Partner Countries aims at “turning the Mediterranean basin into an area of dialogue, exchange and co-operation guaranteeing peace, stability and prosperity” through “strengthening of democracy and respect for human rights, sustainable and balanced economic and social development, measures to combat poverty and promotion of greater understanding between cultures, which are all essential aspects of partnership (...).” Such a partnership in the Mediterranean area is implemented in practise through the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and the relevant Action Plans, offering the countries covered an increasingly close relationship with the EU, and aiming to prevent the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and its neighbours. The EU Partnership for Peace is therefore situated in the context of the

ENPI Regional Strategy 2007-2013 and ENPI Regional Indicative Programme 2011-2013.

Complementarities will be sought with the Instrument for Stability (IfS), if necessary, which provides for rapid responses in contexts of crisis and emerging crisis.

The PfP programme will also take into account, and seek complementarities and avoid of duplication with bilateral and regional actions under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

Finally, the PfP programme will be coherent with the Comprehensive Approach to the EU implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on Women, Peace and Security encouraging applicants to mainstream gender in their proposals thus ensuring full involvement of women in the search for peace.

2.5. Donor co-ordination

In the past, although attempts were made for launching donor co-ordination in peace building, there were no tangible results. It appears then that so far there is no real interest for donor coordination in the area, most probably to avoid an additional coordination setting, at least among donors in Palestine, and also because donors strategies and funding mechanisms in this sector are quite uneven. The results of an EU commissioned mapping of donors' support to civil society in the peace building area, launched in 2012, confirm the above mentioned fragmentation and lack of interest. The objective of the mapping was twofold: on the one hand, it intended to establish first contacts with the donors involved in peace-building in the region with a view to creating a platform for coordination; on the other hand, it aimed at providing civil society organisations with useful information enabling them to increase their capacities to leverage funds. The first aim will be most probably dropped. The draft mapping has been shared with concerned EU donors for final check and will be finalised and disseminated soon.

3. DETAILED DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The **overall objective** of the EU Partnership for Peace Programme is to help support the conditions for re-launching the peace process and provide a solid foundation at the societal level for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East by strengthening and increasing direct civil society relationships and co-operation based on equality and reciprocity between Palestinians and Israelis, including the Arab minority in Israel. To this end, initiatives under this programme can be undertaken by organisations in each country or jointly between Mediterranean Partner Countries and/or EU Member States and/or countries that are beneficiaries of Pre-Accession Assistance and/or Member States of the EEA.

The **specific objective** is to strengthen civil society peace building actions and conflict transformation, focusing on initiatives which are likely to have an impact on people's everyday lives. In particular, the programme intends to support practical

actions aiming at rebuilding mutual trust through reconciliation, building capacity for non-violent approaches to conflict resolution, empowering marginalised parties and launching joint development policies and strategies.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

Expected results would include:

1. Confidence in the peace process and the two state solution is restored amongst key constituencies.
2. Marginalised parties are empowered and new constituencies persuaded to adopt non-violent approaches to conflict resolution.
3. Joint development of policies and strategies is renewed, and awareness about and advocacy for existing peace solutions is raised.
4. Commitment to the peace process is strengthened by leaders/decision makers through broadening support for particular initiatives.
5. The outcomes of the PfP projects are disseminated widely and the image of the programme is reinforced.
6. Networking among PfP grant beneficiaries is ensured and their capacity strengthened.

Results 1 to 4 will be achieved through support for projects under a Call for Proposals.

Result 5 and 6 will be achieved by continuing the implementation of the PfP communication strategy as well as of capacity building activities launched in 2012 with the support of an external communication company. It is expected that EU staff will continue to communicate widely on the programme as a whole and on the various individual projects. With regard to the latter, EU press and communication services in all involved Delegations have been and will always be supportive through delivery of training on EU communication and visibility requirements and assistance on any communication related activities. Finally, EU staff will ensure dissemination of projects' outputs among all PfP grant beneficiaries.

Even though the previous Call for Proposals, launched in December 2012, is still on-going, and it is thus premature to draw conclusions, it is recommended that next Call for Proposals priorities will be in line with previous ones. Those priorities have been identified in consultation with civil society; hence they are expected to meet the need of the targeted communities. In addition, by encouraging different projects under the same priorities the impact prospects of those specific actions and of the programme in general are enhanced.

1. "Peace as viability of the two state solution": joint concrete actions for socio-economic development of communities directly affected by the conflict.

The programme will maintain its support to practical actions responding to local concrete needs (such as environment, health, business development, municipality issues, community development, technical disputes or the like) likely to produce tangible results in terms of development, quality of life and cooperation between conflicting communities, particularly for the benefit of those communities directly exposed to the conflict.

2. "Peace as a value": education for peace

The actions under this priority could include conflict management work such as capacity-building for non-violent approaches to conflict resolution, expose the target groups to both their own and other narratives as well as increase the understanding of their respective rights; peace building educational activities; educational programmes designed to introduce long term changes in attitudes, stereotypes, prejudices and to increase tolerance and understanding both within each of the societies and of the other side; lessons learnt from other conflicts in the world.

3. "Peace as negotiated political solution"

Actions under this priority will promote the implementation of existing visions of a future peaceful relationship between Israel and its Arab neighbours, through increasing knowledge and awareness of possible solutions to the conflict based on justice and rights. These actions are intended to support leaders and opinion formers to work toward the resolution of the conflict and promotion of the two state solution.

All actions, regardless of the priority, must be implemented mainly in Palestine and/or Israel and/or Jordan. Specific activities, within the scope of the action and for its benefit, can be implemented also abroad.

Institutionalisation of good results and best practices as well as dissemination of outcomes at public level should be sought within each action.

Target groups: Pioneer projects, targeting 'veto' and 'blocking' groups (those communities considered hostile to the peace process such as religious or radical parties, settlers, etc.) will be welcomed. Projects aiming at expanding the constituencies through the involvement of marginalised groups such as youth, women and children and/or targeting sceptical or not committed groups are encouraged. Projects involving local communities as a whole, thus producing a multilevel and long term impact, will be particularly encouraged.

3.3. Risks and assumptions

As previous experience has shown, there is a high risk of disruption of activities linked to the instability of the political situation. Increased political tensions could jeopardise the willingness/ability of the stakeholders to carry on the project, or even to apply in the first place. In addition, the anti-normalisation movement has attempted to hinder a number of joint activities.

Outbreak of violence, similar to that of November 2012 due to the war on Gaza, is likely to provoke a freezing of the activities and a temporary suspension of the peace NGOs engagement. In this case, and depending on the prevailing conditions during

the CFP/implementation process, the following options will be considered: to stand-by the launch of the call for proposals; to delay the evaluation process; freeze implementation and/or grant a time extension to the contracts. These measures should allow civil society to return to regular activities once the situation has calmed down.

Visibility could also be affected due to security reasons. In these cases, as learned previously, it is suitable to delay some activities and/or adopt a low profile approach. Each proposal will need anyway to thoroughly assess the risks and propose mitigation measures.

Lack of freedom of movement, especially for Palestinians and Jordanians, is an issue likely to hamper the smooth operation of activities and therefore it could lead to delays in the implementation of the projects. It could also affect the monitoring of the activities.

3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Cross-cutting issues, such as environmental sustainability and gender equality will be taken into due consideration in the context of the programme by respectively encouraging applicants to adopt a gender-sensitive approach and raising their awareness on environmentally friendly operations.

3.5. Stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the programme are civil society organisations, including Community Based Organisations (CBOs), and leaders and opinion-formers in the region as well as their European partners and international organisations.

In the last years, several consultation seminars with stakeholders have been undertaken, the last one being in July 2012 for the identification of the Call's priorities. The work of civil society is extremely important in contributing to building sustainable peace. Working on common interests can maximize prospects for sustainability, and objectives need to be gradual and realistically achievable. In addition, given the political and cultural divisions within the societies which create barriers to the peace process, a broad range of communities and actors need to be targeted, and sometimes uni-national actions will be more sustainable. For this reason, PfP, notwithstanding its specific peace-building overall objective, is not restricted to peace NGOs, but is open to all kind of civil society organisations which are able, through their actions, to connect peace-building with tangible results that change lives and create long-term impact and consolidation of results. In this regard, the involvement of the communities as a whole is key to ensure that the civil society organisations agenda is relevant to the targeted communities.

Local Authorities have a significant task in socio-economic development and community representation. They have an important role in ensuring social cohesion among their constituents and are therefore among the potential stakeholders of the programme.

The final beneficiaries are the people of the Middle East and the Mediterranean Partner Countries.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country, referred to in Article 184(2)(b) of the Financial Regulation.

4.2. Indicative operational implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in sections 3.2. and 4.3. will be carried out, is 60 months, subject to modifications to be agreed by the responsible authorising officer in the relevant agreements.

4.3. Implementation components and modules

Direct centralised management devolved to EUREP in East Jerusalem and EU Delegations in Tel Aviv and Amman.

EUREP in West Bank, Gaza Strip launches the call for proposals after agreement on guidelines with EU Delegations in Israel and Jordan and provides the administrative support for the selection process. Once the selection made, each Delegation manages the respective grants falling under its responsibility.

Delegation services will work jointly for the preparation of the Call for Proposals and for the evaluation process as well for the organisation of joint events, if any. They will also attend events, meetings and monitoring visits together when relevant and keep each other regularly informed on the projects progress.

As a general principle, the distribution between the different delegations in terms of contract/project management is made on the grounds of the nationality of the applicant: Palestinian and European applicants are processed by the Jerusalem office whereas Israeli ones are processed by Tel Aviv. Projects which have mainly activities in Jordan or Jordanian applicants are managed by Amman Delegation.

4.3.1. Grants: call for proposals - The EU Partnership for Peace programme (direct centralised management)

- a) Objectives of the grants, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

Each action grant has its own objectives and expected results deriving from the problems the action intends to address. As per the type of actions eligible for financing, they must be in line with the priorities described in point 3.3. In addition, All actions, regardless of the priority, must be implemented in Palestine and/or Israel

(within its internationally recognised borders) and/or Jordan. Specific activities, within the scope of the action and if duly justified, can be implemented abroad.

b) Eligibility conditions

- be legal persons and
- be non-profit making and
- be specific types of organisations such as: non-governmental organisations (for example, but not exclusively, organisations representing national and/or ethnic minorities, local citizens' group and traders' associations, cooperatives, trade unions, organisations representing economic and social interest, consumer organisations, women's and youth organisations, teaching, cultural research and scientific organisations, universities, cross border associations, independent political foundations, community based organisations, and private sector agencies, institutions and organisations, such as chambers of commerce, federations, etc.), local authorities, international (inter-governmental) organisations as defined by Article 43 of the Implementing Rules to the EU Financial Regulation and
- be established in a Member State of the European Union or one of the ENPI South Countries or a country that is beneficiary of Pre-Accession Assistance or a Member State of the EEA (this obligation does not apply to international organisations)

c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are financial and operational capacity of the applicant and the relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

They are established in accordance with the principles set out in Title VI 'Grants' of the Financial Regulation applicable to the General Budget.

d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants under this call is 80% of total eligible costs

The maximum possible rate of co-financing may be up to 100 % in accordance with Articles 192 of the Financial Regulation if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the responsible authorising officer in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

e) Indicative trimester to launch the call

The call for proposals is expected to be launched in the third trimester of 2013.

f) Exception to the non-retroactivity of costs

The Commission authorises the eligibility of costs prior to the submission of the grant application as of 01/01/2014.

4.3.2. *Procurement (direct centralised management)*

Subject in generic terms, if possible	Type (works, supplies, services)	Indicative number of contracts	Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure
Information, communication, networking and capacity building activities	Service	1	Last trimester 2013
External evaluation of the programme	Service	1	Second trimester 2014

4.4. Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement in direct centralised and decentralised management

Subject to the following, the geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement procedures and in terms of origin of supplies and materials purchased as established in the basic act shall apply.

The responsible authorising officer may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 21(7) of the basic act on the basis of the unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, for reasons of extreme urgency, or if the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

4.5. Indicative budget

Module	Amount in EUR thousands	Third party contribution (indicative, where known)
Call for proposals EU Partnership for Peace (direct centralised)	4,700	600
Procurement (direct centralised)	120	N.A.
Evaluation and audit	180	N.A.
Totals	5,000	N.A.

4.6. Performance monitoring

Performance monitoring, in order to measure progress of projects implementation, will be ensured by the Commission services (EU Representative Office in East Jerusalem, EU Delegations in Israel and Jordan, as well as EU Delegations of ENPI

countries, if applicable). A number of actions under PfP will be included also in the annual ROM monitoring exercise. Applicants are encouraged to allocate human and financial resources for monitoring their actions. This point will be duly highlighted in the Guidelines for Applicants in order for them to include it in the proposed budget.

4.7. Evaluation and audit

Final external evaluations of each project are encouraged and the relevant cost must be included in the project's budget. The project evaluation should mainly assess the project impact in terms of change of attitude of the target groups toward the peace process. This point will be duly highlighted in the Guidelines for Applicants in order for them to include it in the proposed budget. EU staff will facilitate the dissemination of these reports, upon authorisation of the grant Beneficiaries, so as to favour exchange of best practises.

An external evaluation of the whole programme is envisaged to be launched in 2014, which will focus on the impact of the programme in terms of long term change of attitudes.

Although not mandatory, Beneficiaries will be encouraged to submit expenditure verification in support of every request for payment. The relevant cost must be included in the project's budget. This point will be duly highlighted in the Guidelines for Applicants in order for them to include it in the proposed budget.

Some PfP projects will be included in the EU Annual Audit exercise, if deemed necessary.

4.8. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the whole programme is expected to be ensured by EU staff on the basis of the communication strategy developed in 2012. A dedicated link to PfP was also created in the websites of each of the three delegations in charge of the programme where a brief presentation of the programme, including the list of the awarded grant, is uploaded. The three delegations will take due care to always communicate identical messages and provide identical information.

EU visibility guidelines are to be respected by all grant beneficiaries. Upon signature of the grant contracts, grant beneficiaries will be informed about the EU visibility requirements either through a dedicated workshop delivered by EU press staff or on bilateral meetings. Services on the ground will check the visibility component of the actions through field visits and will increase public visibility of the actions when possible.

However, in view of the sensitive nature of this programme, grant beneficiaries may have valid reasons for not disclosing information on their activities and on participants. Visibility issues will be then treated with the utmost care and requests for derogations will be treated on their merits and on case-by-case basis.