Participants:
- Sweden
- Norway
- Finland
- Austrian Development Agency
- EU
- Bank of Palestine
- Islamic Development Bank
- Italian Cooperation
- Belgium
- UN Resident Coordinator Office
- OCHA

Background

This co-creation exchange was organized by Sweden and UNDP as a first step in a wider consultation towards conceptualizing a new multisector and multi-stakeholder national program targeting Area C, East Jerusalem and Gaza. It aimed to build on the evolution of a previous effort entitled the Community Resilience and Development Programme (or CRDP) that has been on-going for the past decade. Key stakeholders attended with a vested interest in resilience programming and the humanitarian-development nexus (H-D).

Key messages and conclusions

- This was the first exchange with stakeholders in – what is anticipated as - a series of forthcoming consultations.
- It was agreed that not all relevant stakeholders were present or had been invited to the workshop. This is an early attempt at kickstarting the discussions on resilience and humanitarian-development nexus, aiming in the long run at changed programming and fund allocations. A challenge will be to find a relevant and viable format for future discussions where all relevant stakeholders take part.
- A collective view and application of a transformative resilience approach is required based on greater cooperation, collaboration, courage, and communication.
- This requires a multisector and a multi-stakeholder approach with stronger leadership from a cohesive UN and the government as well having the involvement of other constituents such as private sector and civil society.
- Focus on complementing interventions with strategic policy narratives (ref: operational activities with evidence-based advocacy) – not in isolation but in tandem – must be pursued and the latter requires a more courageous stance from the international community. While it was expressed and recognized that furthering the H-D dialogue can be seen as a donor-led bureaucratic initiative (ref: against earmarked funding windows), we agreed that within the framework of a policy dialogue, there is relevance in a context of protracted conflict like Palestine.
- There should be a space for horizontal coordination and strategic discussion convened between humanitarian and development actors, government, donors, civil society and private sector to think about strategies and actions, not just visions.
There is a collective need to create a shift in the current narrative regarding Area C, Gaza and East Jerusalem to highlight that investments can have real developmental impacts and to highlight the importance of these areas to the two-state solution

**Actions:**
- Plan follow up consultation workshops with civil society and community-based organizations, government institutions, private sector and UN agencies in Gaza, West Bank and Jerusalem to be completed by September
- Plan follow up meetings with the PMO and UNCT to deliver key messages of stakeholders and ensure government leadership and integrated UN in H-D policy dialogue
- Link programmatic discussions to ongoing actions for SDG acceleration, including the SDG taskforce and UNDP Accelerator Lab
Extended Minutes

1. Opening and Welcome

1.1 Welcome remarks from UNDP

- The goal of this workshop is to start the process of collectively designing a new program moving forward from UNDP’s experience from the Community Resilience and Development Program (CRDP) alongside partners’ experiences in resilience programming
- This workshop is the first step in a series of consultations towards conceptualizing a new national program targeting Area C, EJ and Gaza
- There is no prescriptive outcome; the outcomes will come out as a result of our consultation
- The macro political context is changing where future scenarios for East Jerusalem (EJ), Area C and Gaza look bleak as the fiscal insolvency of the Palestinian Authority continues
- Critical areas of concern are the effects of US policy on current and future development interventions in EJ and Area C, including alarming discussions of annexing the West Bank, and ongoing neglect of the concerning humanitarian and development conditions in Gaza
- The shrinkage of political space for the Palestinian Authority (PA) alongside the external environment are majorly undermining the ability of the government to deliver needed services to those left behind
- It is the collective duty of those that support Palestine to maintain and scale up funding to these areas to support policy discussions and the political vision of the two-state solution as per our respective mandates
- In doing so, the aid coordination architecture and funding mechanisms need to push forward the H-D nexus particularly as Palestine is in a context of a protracted conflict
- Development and humanitarian and political practitioners need to reflect on the policy-level dialogue of the H-D nexus between the national and international community and focus on the inclusion of those left behind in policy decisions in political and economic structures
- The UNCT has suggested a platform for policy dialogue at a multi-stakeholder level to strengthen our strategic messaging and action

1.2 Welcome remarks from Sweden

- Sweden is looking into the future post-CRDP in hopes of scaling up the breadth and engagement of different stakeholders, as the needs are multi-sectoral, so must the response and the partner set-up should be
- The driving force is to ensure that Sweden’s engagement aligns to the vision of a two-state solution and thus it necessitates a review of tools in our respective toolboxes in terms of how to sustain this vision
- Palestinians should be able to stay on their land to access services for their survival, so the questions that must be asked is what we need to do to meet this objective, and who are the duty bearers when the PA cannot access these people and places
- Sweden has limited resources to undertake humanitarian assistance and development work unilaterally, as most donors do, so the question is how we can make the best use of our resources, particularly in areas where humanitarian work should be complimented by development work
• Sweden and the West Bank Protection Consortium/NRC organized a visit to Birin, a village in Area C, to witness the work of the WBPC, where questions emerged regarding how we can work on the developmental needs of beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance. We need to consider the longer-term impact.

• Sweden wants to reiterate this is the first discussion of the process.

• Sweden envisions a future program engaging multiple agencies and humanitarian and development actors.

2. Plenary Discussion: Our experience so far with CRDP and other programs

2.1 Reflections from UNDP

• Being critically reflexive, CRDP has had some major strengths and weaknesses that are worth discussion.

• Strengths of the program have been putting Area C and East Jerusalem on the development map, alongside reorienting focus and investment in East Jerusalem at a critical juncture of the status quo.

• Yet with Gaza’s exclusion from the program, the ability to span as a national program focusing on integrating and connecting geographical areas at risk was limited.

• As the objective of the program was to strengthen the resilience of the population in Area C and support maintaining their presence, can the PA and the International Community state achieved success if the situation on the ground says otherwise.

• This brings to question if engagements in Area C should be limited to services and community resilience or should these engagements expand beyond communities to highlight the significance of Area C to the State of Palestine and look at opportunities to enhance linkages with and among Areas B and A.

• In EJ, UNDP has found that there is a repeated emphasis on the wrong challenges which have limited developmental impacts. For example, in urban planning and housing, the narrative and focus does not expand far beyond the zoning and planning regime where accessing permits is highlighted as the major setback to Palestinian development. Yet, through UNDP’s interventions in CRDP, it was identified that perhaps focus should be elsewhere. For instance, although 1,500 permits have been granted for construction, permit holders are unable to build owing to the lack of access to financial assistance or investment.

• In Gaza, certain development gains can be achieved. For example, rethinking cash for work interventions to link with longer term impacts as opposed to a quick fix cash injection.

• The international community is collectively confident that we all can do things better.

• UNDP asserts that the current mode of operation is that humanitarian and development work are engaging in the same types of interventions yet working in two separate lanes.

• The question is how H-D actors can create a dynamic to bank on shared strengths.

2.2 Comments and expectations from participants

• Clarification on the definition of resilience utilizing the H-D nexus to further resilience towards socioeconomic development – we as the H-D community need to transcend past the idea of communities and coping mechanisms.
• In principle humanitarian interventions cope with erosion while development interventions need to push towards transformation.
• The definition of resilience is not the major issue as names change but ideas stay the same – rather focus should be placed on communication and coordination. The problem is humanitarian actors and development actors do not talk or coordinate enough.
• This is a timely call for consultation and engagement. Expectations from this workshop are to engage with broader perspectives and support the state building process, yet the government and local stakeholders were not represented.
• From the perspective of the private sector, the vision of the new program focusing on Area C, EJ and Gaza focuses on three fundamental political and physical areas for the Palestinian state. As such this program should have its weight in sustaining hope and space.
• The private sector is keen on investing in these areas but lack the adequate tools to intervene.
• Humanitarian and development actors can support through suppressing the psychological risk entailed with investing in these areas through re-evaluating the types of narratives these actors push for.
• We as the H-D community need to make sure successes are celebrated, as there are successes, and highlight that it is doable, and that impact can be attained considering the challenging context. We all need to work together to ensure we have supporting narratives to achieve this.

2.3 UNDP response to comments

• UNDP is weighing the options between a larger event with more stakeholders or a smaller event where real discussions can take place. There are limitations with both approaches. Nonetheless this is not the first and last engagement. UNDP and Sweden envision future consultations with UN agencies, the government, civil society and private sector. Unfortunately, the Palestinian civil society representation was unable to attend owing to a scheduling conflict with the PNGO General Assembly
• The goal was to avoid discussion of definitions and jargon and focus on action. However, there appears to be consensus as to what transformative resilience encompasses and furthering the H-D nexus, where working together is a key aspect
• So, how can we as the H-D community be pragmatic in moving forward? How are we going to move together collectively?

2.4 Group Activity: Major areas of focus – the what and why

• Participants were divided into 3 groups – Area C, East Jerusalem and Gaza – where they were asked to discuss specific challenges based on institutional experience (such as the urban planning in EJ example presented earlier); priority sectors/interventions; and linkages with H-D nexus.
• It was noted by the audience that as some of our initial discussion has highlighted the importance of changing the narrative about these areas, rather than focus on challenges, we should focus on opportunities, which was agreed by all participants
• The below table is the key findings from each group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaza</th>
<th>East Jerusalem</th>
<th>Area C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recognising we should conceive resilience as beyond recovery towards transformation – what is the current framework that governs interventions in Gaza and what are we looking towards breaking the framework?</td>
<td>• Challenges in EJ include educational opportunities as well as brain drain, particularly talented youth; labour and capital flows towards Israeli markets; greater emphasis on Ramallah than Jerusalem in Palestinian narrative; PA lack of representation and engagement; attractiveness for investors; and psychological barriers and narratives of victimization.</td>
<td>• Challenges/opportunities include fragmentation and the need for linkages; current lack of control/use over land and natural resources, which is interlinked with the current narrative that divides the areas and hence the opportunities in Area C; migration of people away from Area C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priorities regarding economic development: Gaza market is very small and contained so we need to look at outside markets nationally or internationally focused on linking markets.</td>
<td>• Priority sectors: Master plan for Jerusalem – there have been many attempts but they have not been integrated in terms of representing multidimensional socioeconomic and urban needs While there have been attempts (Orient House, Norway, WB) the efforts haven’t coalesced into a multisectoral plan to be viewed as a viable capital as a Palestinian state – i.e. something to counter the Jerusalem 2020 vision.</td>
<td>• We have to ask ourselves what the biggest risk is if we do not invest in Area C. Area C is slowly being annexed, where we are constantly reacting to Israeli long-term plans, where things that previously used to be red lines are no longer red lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social services: should strive to ensure access to basic services are present through different approaches. The community level work is important for targeted interventions however larger scale interventions are important for reducing transaction costs.</td>
<td>• Balancing act between programmatic vs funding priorities.</td>
<td>• The current narrative around singling out Area C as a whole as a high-risk endeavor is frustrating and has led to a reduced risk appetite in investment, self-censoring and the ability to think outside of traditional modes of intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritization should be evidence-based. Clear market research should identify growth areas where investment should be made – e.g. IT or services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• But there are opportunities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focusing on lands on the fringes of Area A and B and utilizing surrounding lands (not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• We need to agree on programmatic priorities, so we can focus our efforts

• The same applies to funding priorities so that we do not all seek funding from the same donor and overwhelm donors to make sure we go to the right donor for the right items of support

• Sustainability remains a lingering question – how to link short-term interventions with longer term impacts (e.g. cash for work), and how do we ensure we are not replacing the PA in providing services but rather supporting

• Subsidies could be an initial support mechanism to invest in to facilitate transition towards more sustainable business models towards service delivery

• Actions to break the framework: advocacy and information awareness regarding the dual-use items, holding duty bearers accountable, not accepting the divide as a fact

• There is a disconnect between some donors – how do we bridge that together to look at the flow from short term to longer term

talented youth to work and invest in EJ

• Quality education is a need, however where there is strong support and investment in primary and secondary school, there is a serious gap in the early childhood educational system

• Economic revitalization – Tourism was a major point of discussion, but beyond tourism, particularly Islamic tourism, there should be more investments put into enabling business owners to have the appropriate titles and deeds alongside access to loans. Provision of retail services make for a relevant entry point.

• Increasing the risk appetite of financial institutions or developing financial solutions to enable more people to access financial services

• Interventions should be complemented with legal support to minimize the risk in terms of land deeds, permits for development and protection of individuals that are targeted

• Palestinian Jerusalem Data center

all lands in Area C have the same level of risk and this is important to recognize).

• There are CSOs and communities that have succeeded in making investments in Area C (construction or terracing of land) where communities have taken on the risk and their investments have remained – how can we learn from their experiences?

• The PA have to be more accountable to have a more holistic multisectoral approach to overcome fragmentation and link Area C to other areas (including coordination etc.)

• This approach has to be institutionalized at the governmental level which is not limited to the will of individuals

• Multisectoral interventions are needed that are flexible and that can adapt to the changing situation on the ground

• Incentives are needed to encourage investment and people to engage in economic activities in Area C

• Working in Area C requires a focused
- Our actions should ensure Gazans do not lose hope
- Another question is how to identify vulnerable groups in Gaza in a context where almost everyone is vulnerable. An example is the World Bank’s proxy means test formula for multidimensional poverty
- What are the key indicators for measuring our success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy conference in the region championing the status Jerusalem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem institutions need to be supported and better connected with the West Bank and Gaza (i.e. Hospitals network, chamber of commerce, education actors, etc.) and create forums for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the PA maintain a more active representation beyond the modest presence currently?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Political vision – i.e. the two-state solution. It is our role as humanitarian and development actors to ensure our development interventions and advocacy safeguard this vision
- As donors, particularly European donors, our actions in Palestine are based in European Council conclusions which govern the operations of member states in country. Each donor shall decide how much risk they are willing to take. It is up to those in the country offices to ensure that internal staff networks (at the consulate level, embassy, and ministerial level in home countries) are informed and share common messaging
- Intervening in Area C also extends beyond the communities as it is not only the people at risk but the land and hence the future viability of a Palestinian state

**Commonalities**

- Shifting the political narrative to instill hope and highlight that investments in certain areas can and do make a difference to counter the defeatist narrative (e.g. in Area C you can’t invest in any infrastructure otherwise it will be demolished or confiscated)
• Ground policy and programmatic priorities in evidence-based decision-making
• In light of ongoing and potential future scenarios flexibility in interventions and funding is key
• Multisector programmatic priorities: Economic stimulus and revitalization; investing in growth sectors; youth engagement and job creation; improving efficiency and sustainability of the provision of key services; supporting civil society and planning mechanisms.
2.5 Discussion

- There was agreement that thinking geographically should be avoided with risk of falling into the fragmentation trap and instead of focusing on the commonalities across each area – Area C, East Jerusalem and Gaza are victims of the political dynamics at play. As such a clear focus on human rights, anti-corruption and civil society is necessary, while also including a bigger role for communities into policy discussions.
- The future program that results from these consultations should be a national program to avoid a fragmenting narrative, yet being aware that the different geographical areas have their different challenges which means different approaches need to apply.
- The example of the Gaza 2050 vision exercise conducted in 2016 was cited as an assertive counter vision and a constructive exercise to think outside of current debilitating narrative.
- One of the biggest lessons learned throughout CRDP has been a result of the implementation mode where we’ve ended up working with, and to some extent relying on, the same types of NGOs, which have limited our engagement with community needs and to some extent resulted in the same types of interventions being implemented time and time again.
- The need in maintaining these NGOs is recognized, for the vital support to communities they deliver and the shrinking space for civil society, it should also be recognized that greater experimentation is needed with new styles of implementation to encourage nontraditional interventions. And this has been a major focus during this period of transition between CRDP and the new program that will result from these consultations.
- In finding alternative financial solutions for housing UNDP have linked with Bank of Palestine to discuss partnering in technical and legal support to support financing to construction and development.
- UNDP does not want to limit the discussion to CRDP as partners also have valuable lessons learned from other programmes, initiatives and experiences to contribute to a future program, this also includes linking European and Islamic/Arab donor engagement.
- 10% of the Arab socio-economic fund is allocated to Palestine which is around $50 million, which does not get much attention and is not coordinated with others. These activities are not visible as a means of reducing risk.
- On the H-D nexus some donors acknowledged and recognized that it is an artificial debate and bureaucratic requirement from donors, which donors are responsible for figuring out which funding instrument is necessary for which interventions. Each donor has different thresholds of how far humanitarian interventions can go, yet there needs to be a holistic multisectoral gender transformative approach in place, where donors are responsible for deciding themselves which instruments they will use to finance the different interventions. The government is also vital in leading this discussion.
- When considered beyond funding mechanisms, it was agreed that the H-D nexus does have relevance when framed within the policy dialogue in a place of protracted conflict, such as Palestine. The issue is what is the policy dialogue space that we have as actors to have a serious discussion and to develop strategies collectively. It’s not about putting resources on the table but more about how to

---

1 As the discussion included notions of the approach (“the how”) alongside envisioning the governance structure and financing we concluded the session following the discussion.

deploy the resources effectively and that benefits the Palestinian people in the best way. Creating a space where communities can also engage in the development planning process is also important to disrupt the ongoing narratives amongst traditional stakeholders

- In moving forward from today, it was highlighted that while we need to recognize there is a different context in Gaza, Area C and East Jerusalem we need to ensure that they are integrated in a national program for continuity

- Additionally, it was noted that in moving forward with creating a space for policy discussion on the resilience of Palestine in the future, who has the responsibility to collate the best practices and lessons learned from stakeholders and partners to ensure our investments and interventions are supporting the resilience of the Palestinian people and state – ‘we are all waiting for the bus to move, but there is no bus driver’

- It was agreed that UNDP is not the driver, the Prime Minister should be on the driving seat, while the RC/HC also has a key responsibility and role to play, at the helm, along the PM. In the oPt, the private sector and civil society are very well organized, hence their inclusion into the discussion is vital. This space is important also as LACS has vertical pillars. However, it lacks horizontal pillars and connectivity, and the nexus issue is very simple – it is just about dismantling silos and getting people together, coherently and productively. This space should be about action and strategies not just visions

- It was also noted there is an opportunity with the current government where the PM is active and keen to engage, and where the PM already informed UNDP and partners need to build on the H-D nexus for the government to engage in future discussions.

- The discussion concluded with agreement that there will be further consultation workshops to expand the discussion, including government, civil society and amongst the UNCT members, where a schedule will be prepared and shared. Follow-up meetings will be conducted with the PMO alongside the UNCT to ensure key messages from stakeholders are heard and that government and the UN are willing to take a stronger leading position in pushing forward the policy discourse and action on the H-D nexus.
Annex – Co Creation Agenda

Co-Creation Workshop

Location: Legacy, Jerusalem
Date: 9am-2:30pm Wednesday 19/6/2019

Context

Goal: To collectively design a new resilience program through building on our collective experiences in East Jerusalem, Area C and Gaza

Our goal is to scale up our support to resilience building and linking potential institutional changes and support mechanisms with community dynamics. The idea of this workshop is to convene different stakeholders and partners into discussion of how we can improve resilience-based programming, or even taking a step back to review what resilience building means in Area C, East Jerusalem, Gaza and Palestine as a whole. Questions include:

- How can we build on our experience to strengthen the connectivity of different marginalized areas while targeting specific needs in each locale?
- Which actors are key to rebuilding and transforming positive networks in ways that disrupt current cycles of de-development?
- How can we strengthen horizontal and vertical networks and support systems simultaneously?

In the absence of clearly identifiable resilience-based interventions, the approach is as important as the intervention. The specific contextual challenges and resilience networks across different sectors and levels of society necessitates different approaches depending on beneficiary needs. Therefore, how can we refine our approach?

Through 10 years of implementation, CRDP’s experience in institutionalizing different developmental needs and resilience-based programming into different levels of stakeholder engagement has been key to its success. Including highlighting the clear developmental needs of Area C and East Jerusalem, mainstreaming these target areas as integral to the Palestinian political process and institutional service delivery through engagement with different ministries such as the Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of National Economy, Prime Minister’s Office, amongst others, and the establishment of the Area C Coordination Office (ACCO). Moving forward the goal is to bring CRDP towards a national program, encompassing Gaza as an additional target area where there is a vital need for resilience-based programming. Yet two questions still remain highly relevant moving forward, particularly in the framing of a national program that aim to target specific areas with specific needs:

- Should the same broad objectives be maintained or reformulated into more selective and time-bound resilience elements?
- Is it realistic to envisage sustainable development activities, so long as progress towards the two-state solution is stalled?

As the modus operandi of UNDP and CRDP has largely focused on strengthening the government’s role in resilience-based interventions in Area C and East Jerusalem as a means to institutionalize the activities, services and impacts. Through working with different partners and approaches over the last 7 years we have found with each strategic approach limitations exist. Where the objective to support socioeconomic viability of communities and remaining present was a basic entry point to resilience, the intervention approach shifted
towards integrated clustering and a community-based approach in Area C where in EJ a greater focus on strategic interventions was adopted.
Building on this approach brings into discussion how the implementation approach can be further finetuned, particularly with the inclusion of Gaza into the target areas.

**Proposed Workshop outputs:**
- Agreed priorities and approaches for a holistic programme
- Action plan for moving forward with developing the full programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>9:00-9:20</td>
<td>Opening and welcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Plenary discussion        | 9:20-9:50    | **Our experience so far with CRDP and other programs**
  *This session aims to set the parameters of discussion and allow for reflexivity in evaluating ourselves as development actors in country.*
  Discussion includes:
  - What have we learned following 10 years of implementation?
  - What have been our shortcomings?
    - Limited direct community engagement
    - Not giving adequate recognition to ongoing development efforts in Gaza?
    - Varying capacity of partners and shrinking capacity and space
  Reflection:
  Based on our example and from your institutional experience what challenges have you faced in EJ, Area C and/or Gaza?
| 50 minutes                | 9:50-11:00   | **Major areas of focus – the what and why**
  *This session aims to collectively decide on priority areas for the new program to focus on including types of interventions.*
  Group work: Group discussion of institutional experience. What are your priorities in targeting these three areas? What does this mean in terms of interventions? How do your priorities relate to bridging the divide between humanitarian-development interventions? To what extent are you able to make significant progress in your priority areas? |
| 10 minutes break          |              |                                                                             |
| 15 minutes                | 11:00-11:15  |                                                                             |
| Reporting back            |              |                                                                             |
| 45 minutes                | 11:15-12:00  |                                                                             |
| discussion                |              |                                                                             |
| Break                     | 12:00-12:15  |                                                                             |
| Discussion                | 12:15-13:00  | **What should our approach be – the how**
  *This session aims to reflect on the different approaches we’ve tried in implementing different interventions in the target areas and*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:00-13:20</td>
<td><strong>Envisioning the governance structure and financing modality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*This session aims to encompass the different policy-level/strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussions of how we intend to address potential lingering questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated to our intended impact of strengthening connectivity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integration of these areas into a national program**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the reality is that the operational context alongside the humanitarian-development needs in East Jerusalem, Area C and Gaza vastly differ, how can we implement to meet these needs yet simultaneously conceive these areas under a unified objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20-1:30</td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>