

## ACTION FICHE FOR OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORY

### 1. IDENTIFICATION

Title	PEGASE: Support to Community Services in East-Jerusalem		
Total cost	€2,000,000		
Aid method / Management mode	Project approach – <i>centralised (direct)</i> management		
DAC-code	16010	Sector	Social Sector

### 2. RATIONALE

#### 2.1. Sector context

After the 1967 occupation of East Jerusalem and its annexation in 1980 by the Israeli government, inhabitants of East Jerusalem have to rely ever since on the Israeli municipality for governance and public services. East Jerusalem's status has contributed to an increasing separation from the rest of the West Bank which severely affects the economy and weakening the social fabric. Because of Israeli under-investment in the East and a lower level of public service provision, East Jerusalem falls below West Jerusalem in a number of development indicators such as employment rate and income level. East Jerusalem has also higher rates of illiteracy, dependency, early marriage and early child birth. It has far fewer libraries, parks, clinics, social workers and social centers for aged and disabled, road infrastructure, and emergency facilities. East Jerusalem is also confronted with over crowdedness and the unanswered pressure of the demand for housing have risen deeply in the past years due to the Wall construction around Jerusalem, which forces thousands inside the municipal boundaries. Significantly, East Jerusalem also fares worse than many other Palestinian areas in the West Bank and Gaza, especially in school enrolment, completion and literacy levels. In the face of such high levels of need, assistance provided by the international community is particularly important.

However, donors find it more difficult to work in East Jerusalem even than in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, as partnership with the municipality would imply de facto recognition of the Israeli annexation. The Commission has taken a leading role in finding ways of delivering assistance to the East Jerusalem population, and the Member States rely heavily on the Commission to continue in this role.

#### 2.2. Lessons learnt

The absence of a legitimate public authority in East Jerusalem has posed particular challenges, not only for the Commission but for all donors, in terms of pursuing a rational strategy for local development. To remedy this, the Commission funded the development of a strategy in the form of a Multi-Sector Review (MSR), and established a local Monitoring and Co-ordination Unit (MCU) for East Jerusalem in charge of its implementation.

Within this framework, a number of projects have been implemented successfully, such as support for East Jerusalem hospital co-ordination (which recently received an extremely high ROM score) and the establishment of a cultural heritage institute in the Old City.

Other donors also rely on MSR and the MCU as a framework for planning their activities. Experience shows that the MCU significantly helps increase the quality and scope of public service provision in East Jerusalem. For that reason, the Commission continues to support the MCU following its recent relocation within the Office of the President.

In the absence of governmental partners the selection of partners for project implementation is extremely important for project success. European or International organisations with local experience are the favoured implementing partners, with local partnership to ensure sustainability and ownership.

### **2.3. Complementary actions**

A number of donors, including several EU Member States, Norway and the World Bank are supporting projects in East Jerusalem. It is important that the current support to East Jerusalem is fully coordinated with actions undertaken by other donors.

### **2.4. Donor coordination**

For East Jerusalem in particular, the MCU plays the local co-ordinating role. The MCU's recent attachment to the Office of the President should strengthen and reinforce the effectiveness of this role. Amongst EU Member States, a Task Force on Jerusalem has been created with the aim of co-ordinating policy and project-related issues between the donors.

## **3. DESCRIPTION**

### **3.1. Objectives**

The overall objective of the action, in line with the PRDP chapter on East Jerusalem, is to enhance the quality of life related to social sectors through support to the better provision and improved quality of community services to East Jerusalem residents in the key sectors of education, housing and land use, health, social services, women and youth, and culture and heritage.

### **3.2. Expected results and main activities**

The principal outcome expected from the activities is the sustained and improved delivery of essential community services to the Palestinian population of East Jerusalem.

The main activities under this action will be decided to ensure complementarity and coherence between donor actions and the overall development strategy, thus building on the work of the MCU. Assistance is foreseen in the specific areas of vocational training; women, children and youth, including support to institutions providing

health and education services. The social care sector is also expected to be covered, and through support to institutions participating in rights awareness raising campaigns, providing legal consultations and influencing policies. Projects which support national prosperity and culture will also be considered.

Other possible areas of intervention include support to highly visible projects to support the re-opening of Orient House and other Palestinian institutions.

### **3.3. Stakeholders**

The stakeholders are the Palestinian population with a focus on the wider community of East Jerusalem. Health and education professionals are particularly involved, and A number of Member States are active in the areas of proposed support including Italy, UK, France, Denmark and Germany.

### **3.4. Risks and assumptions**

The projects may encounter operational difficulties if Israeli restrictions on activities undertaken by different institutions and NGOs increase or if the political situation in general sharply deteriorates. Support to Orient House or other formal Palestinian institutions is highly dependent on Israel.

### **3.5. Crosscutting Issues**

Attention will be paid that the projects incorporate the promotion of co-education, gender equality and empowerment of vulnerable groups in its activities.

## **4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

### **4.1. Implementation method**

The project will be implemented under a centralised management structure with direct payments by the Commission to service and equipment providers. A financing agreement following standard models in force will be concluded between the Commission and the Office of the President of the Palestinian Authority. Grant agreements will be signed with European or International organisations with local experience. Partnership by them with local organisations will be strongly encouraged.

### **4.2. Procurement and grant award procedures**

All contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the Commission for the implementation of external operations, in force at the time of the launch of the procedure in question.

The essential selection and award criteria for the award of grants are laid down in the Practical Guide to contract procedures for EC external actions. Full financing can be applied in the cases provided for in Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation where financing in full is essential to carry out the action in question.

Should it prove necessary to implement all or part of the activities through an international organisation, all contracts implementing the action must be awarded and implemented in accordance with the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the international organisation concerned.

The West Bank and Gaza are territories facing a crisis, as defined in Article 168(2) of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation. As a result negotiated contracting procedures may be used in accordance with applicable provisions.

#### **4.3. Budget and calendar**

The budget of the operation amounts to €2,000,000 and the duration of the activities is set expected to be 36 months.

Project Activities	€1,940,000
Visibility	€10,000
Monitoring, Evaluation and Audit	€50,000

#### **4.4. Performance monitoring**

The project will be monitored according to relevant indicators of performance and provision will be made for day-to-day project monitoring.

#### **4.5. Evaluation and audit**

Evaluations and audits of each project will be undertaken following the standard rules.

#### **4.6. Communication and visibility**

The projects will follow the visibility guidelines of the Commission, and will be integrated into the communications strategy for PEGASE.