

## Annual Review - Summary Sheet

<b>PROGRAMME TITLE: Middle East Peace Process (MEPP)</b>		
<b>Country/Region:</b>	Occupied Palestinian Territories and Israel	
<b>HMG Partners (LEAD in bold)</b>	<b>Foreign and Commonwealth Office</b> , Department for International Development, Ministry of Defence	
<b>Total Budget:</b>	ODA: £7.24m	Non-ODA: £0
<b>Start Date: April 2015</b>		<b>End Date: March 2017</b>
<b>Outputs</b>		<b>Score</b>
1. Advice, assistance for institutional development and training provided to Palestinian Authority Security Forces (PASF) and security sector.		A
2. Pro-peace interventions from key constituencies.		A
3. Legal assistance provided to Palestinians at risk of displacement.		A+
<b>Outcome 1:</b> The Palestinian Authority (PA) provides more capable, accountable and responsive PASF and justice services to its people; operating in support of the rule of law. <b>Outcome 2:</b> Support for peace process maintained in absence of negotiations. <b>Outcome 3:</b> Palestinians affected by or at risk of displacement within the OPTs are better able to uphold their housing, land, property and residency rights through provision of legal aid services and increased access to justice.		
<b>Outcome Score: N/A</b>		<b>Risk: Medium</b>

### Summary of Programme Performance

Year	2015/2016	2016/2017					
Programme Score	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>					
Risk Rating	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>					

### What support is the UK providing?

The UK provides support to build capability and capacity in the PA and the PASF, encourage pro-peace interventions from key constituencies in Israel and mitigate the impact of the occupation in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem.

### Summary of progress and lessons learnt/actions taken since last review

The programme team addressed the key recommendations from the last review. The National Security Council (NSC) strategy was updated and the scope of the strategy revised to focus on the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP). As a result of last year's review the Country Board is now solely chaired by the HM Consul General in Jerusalem and membership of the board has been streamlined to enable more strategic discussion and decision making. The Head of Programme role was upgraded which has suitably empowered the position and improved strategic oversight.

### Summary of recommendations for the next year

NSC discussion of the MEPP strategy at ministerial level would give the team the political direction required for future programme design.

The team should use over-programming as a tool to allow for more flexible programming, identifying activity that could be scaled up as necessary.

The team should look at how bilateral departmental funding could be used for scoping or pilot projects to complement the larger CSSF programme.

The team should seek advice from the Media Office and the Joint Programme Hub on how best to promote the work they do externally. A lack of advisory support across a number of specialist areas (gender, conflict, monitoring and evaluation) was identified.

The team should work with the Middle East North Africa Strategic Programme Team in London to explore options (and funding) for additional advisory support such as through the regional Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning contract or through the Stabilisation Unit.

Board members felt they would benefit from having more project level knowledge and programme managers would appreciate more insight into board discussions. Suitable options to bridge this gap might include: periodic project level deep dives during board meetings; site visits for board members; programme staff observation of sections of board discussions; and detailed back briefing to programme managers following board discussions. Consideration could also be given to increased London presence on the boards.

Programme strands and the individual projects delivered well but further linkages between these strands could be explored. Opportunities for synergy and coordination could be exploited. These include linking projects with the PASF to work under the Political Viability strand.

Lack of conflict analysis and conflict advisory support is an identified risk to the programme. With the changes in the political context the programme would benefit from up to date conflict analysis. This should include a consideration of the opportunities and risks to programming in Gaza.