

Arne Tesli

# Physical Planning and Institution Building

Lessons learned and documentation  
of PPIB project in Palestine



**NIBR**

Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research

# Physical Planning and Institution Building

## Other reports from NIBR:

NIBR Report 2008:6

**Municipal International  
Co-operation**  
Kristiansand (Norway) and  
Walvis Bay (Namibia)

NIBR Report 2008:3

**The 'Critical Urban  
Areas' Programme in  
Portugal**  
- First assessment

NIBR Report 2005:16

**The Transferability of  
Policy Instruments**  
How new environmental  
policy instruments strike  
roots in Russia and Latvia

You can order the  
publications from NIBR at  
the cost of NOK 250,-  
pluss postage.

Gaustadalléen 21  
N-0349 Oslo  
Phone: +47 22 95 88 00  
Fax +47 22 60 77 74  
E-mail  
[nibr@nibr.no](mailto:nibr@nibr.no)

[www.nibr.no](http://www.nibr.no)

Arne Tesli

# Physical Planning and Institution Building

Lessons learned and documentation of  
PPIB project in Palestine

NIBR-Report 2008:26

**Title:** **Physical Planning and Institution Building**  
Lessons learned and Documentation of PPIB project in Palestine

**Author:** Arne Tesli  
**NIBR Report:** 2008:26  
**ISSN:** 1502-9794  
**ISBN:** 978-82-7071-753-8

**Project number:** O-2697  
**Project name:** Lessons learned and Documentation of PPIB project in Palestine

**Financial supporter:** Ministry of Planning, Palestine  
**Head of project:** Arne Tesli

**Abstract:** This report documents lessons learned of the project *Physical Planning and Institution Building* (PPIB) in Palestine, which was carried out with Norwegian support during the period January 1995 - March 2008. The primary objectives of the PPIB project were linked to: Physical planning; Institution building (development of human resources and organisations involved in planning); and training and education.

**Summary:** English  
**Date:** November 2008

**Pages:** 80  
**Price:** NOK 250,-

**Publisher::** Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research  
Gaustadalléen 21  
N-0349 OSLO

Telephone (+47) 22 95 88 00  
Telefax (+47) 22 60 77 74  
E-mail: [nibr@nibr.no](mailto:nibr@nibr.no)  
<http://www.nibr.no>

Printed: Nordberg A.S.  
Org. no. NO 970205284 MVA  
© NIBR 2008

---

# Preface

In August 2008 the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR) was commissioned by the Ministry of Planning (MOP) in Palestine to carry out a study with the purpose of documenting lessons learned of the project *Physical Planning and Institution Building* (PPIB) in Palestine, which was carried out with Norwegian support during the period January 1995 - March 2008.

The primary targets of the PPIB project have been linked to:

- Physical planning;
- Institution building (human resource development, organisation development, and institutional building);
- Training and education.

The current report is *not* an evaluation, as MOP is planning to have a separate external evaluation of the PPIB. This project should enlighten the experiences of the PPIB project; possible impacts of the project on its prime targets; as well as possible impacts outside the project stemming from the project. The lessons learned should also focus on the relevance of the objectives and the design of the PPIB project relative to the experienced reality. The aim is to gain more knowledge and experience that can benefit further endeavours in this kind of support and cooperation.

Senior Researcher, Dr. Arne Tesli, has been NIBR's project manager. He visited Palestine in the period 10-21 August 2008, and had meetings and interviews with current and former MOP and PPIB staff, as well as with representatives of other institutions in Palestine. Dr. Tesli and NIBR want to express their thanks to the MOP staff for the hospitality and great support extended during the visit in Palestine, and especially to Bashar Juma'a, Sana

Birawi, Fadwa Azem as well as Lara Eways, for the great hospitality and support rendered during Tesli's visit in Palestine.

The project has been planned and carried out in close cooperation with Rolf Jensen and Ulf Tellefsen, who were also attached to the PPIB project as project managers. Their input and comments to this report have been of utmost value. The cooperation with them is greatly appreciated.

Oslo, November 2008

Olaf Foss  
Research Director

# Table of Contents

Preface.....	1
Tables .....	5
List of Acronyms.....	6
Executive Summary.....	7
1 Introduction .....	15
1.1 Background.....	15
1.2 Project goal and objectives .....	16
1.2.1 The development of the project goals and objectives.....	17
1.2.2 Main activities of the PPIB project .....	19
1.2.3 The main phases of the project.....	19
2 The PPIB project.....	22
2.1 Institution building .....	22
2.1.1 Establishing new units for physical planning in Palestine.....	22
2.1.2 The political context – carrying out physical planning in Palestine in the period 1995-2007.....	23
2.1.3 Establishing a legal framework for physical planning in Palestine.....	25
2.1.4 The transfer of staff from PPIB project to ministry payroll.....	25
2.1.5 The Norwegian consultant .....	27
2.2 Training .....	28
2.2.1 On the job training .....	28
2.2.2 Formal training and education .....	32
2.2.3 The Palestinian universities and training institutions.....	35
2.3 Results and outputs.....	36
2.3.1 The Production of Plans.....	36
2.3.2 Planning after 2000.....	39
2.3.3 Other activities and outputs .....	40



2.4	Planning responsibilities in different ministries.....	41
2.4.1	Responsibility for local and regional planning – The relationship between MOP and MOLG.....	43
2.4.2	Cooperation between MOP and MOLG – an example .....	45
2.4.3	Physical planning in Gaza and the West Bank .....	48
3	Discussion – Lessons learned.....	50
3.1	The institution building.....	50
3.2	Responsibility for local and regional planning.....	52
3.2.1	The Planning and Building Act (PBA).....	54
3.2.2	The Higher Planning Council .....	55
3.2.3	Practical challenges linked to planning at regional and national level .....	55
3.3	The political situation and the different stages of the PPIB project.....	56
3.4	The Training .....	57
3.5	The transfer from project staff to government payroll .....	59
3.6	The integration of environmental considerations in the planning.....	60
3.7	Sustainability .....	61
4	Conclusions .....	64
	References.....	68
	Appendix 1 Major PPIB Plans and Publications .....	69
	Appendix 2 Persons with completed Master’s degree as part of the PPIB project.....	75
	Appendix 3 Persons interviewed.....	77
	Appendix 4 Documents examined.....	78
	Appendix 5 Norwegian and International Advisors involved in PPIB.....	79

# Tables

Table 1.1	The Phases of the PPIB project.....	20
-----------	-------------------------------------	----

## List of Acronyms

Acronym	Institution
ARIJ	Applied Research Institute of Jerusalem
DURP	Directorate for Urban and Rural Planning (later renamed GDPP)
GDPP	General Directorate for Physical Planning (Previously DURP)
HPC	Higher Planning Council
IPCRI	Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information
MOLG	Ministry of Local Government
MOP	Ministry of Planning, Palestine (Before 2001: MOPIC)
MOPIC	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Palestine (Later renamed MOP)
NAD	Negotiations Affairs Department
NMOE	Norwegian Ministry of Environment
Norad	Norwegian Agency for International Cooperation and Development
PACS	Palestinian Aid Coordination System
PALGRIC	Palestinian Geographic Center
PCBS	Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics
PECTAR	Palestinian Economic Development Agency
PIEFZA	Palestinian Industrial Estates and Free Zones Authority
PNA	Palestinian National Authority
PPIB	Physical Planning and Institutional Building, Palestine
STU	Special Technical Unit (for supporting the final status negotiations)

---

# Executive Summary

*Arne Tesli*

## **Physical Planning and Institution Building**

Lessons learned and documentation of PPIB project in Palestine  
NIBR Report: 2008:26

In the period January 1995 - March 2008 Norway supported the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIIC) in Palestine in work to establish and build up capacity and expertise in physical planning. A team of Norwegian consultants was engaged to cooperate with the Palestinian staff for this purpose. The project had the official name *Physical Planning and Institution Building* (PPIB).

### **Institution building**

The PPIB project initially had two main objectives:

- To carry out institution building that could establish professional physical planning in Palestine; and
- To produce plans that would be of relevance and value for the development of Palestine.

To achieve these objectives, the project focused on three main areas: i) establishing and shaping a sound professional basis for physical planning, by collecting relevant data and information, creating maps, establishing databases, GIS-work, etc.; ii) organising the PPIB's planning activities, and enhancing its integration into the existing institutional structures; and iii) securing financial and technical support for its operations. That is, the intention was to establish and institutionalise appropriate and sustainable physical planning procedures and structures, through the introduction of

modern and high quality planning methods and models, and to produce concrete and relevant physical plans and other outputs.

PPIB has been a relatively large project of its kind in Palestine. The total cost being more than US\$ 17 million. The results and output have also been very comprehensive and wide-reaching:

- A large number of concrete plans, studies and reports have been produced (see Appendix 1), and these have been of great relevance and importance for the development of Palestine.
- More than 80 persons have obtained professional, high-level training and education in physical planning and related topics – both as informal on-the-job training, and as formal education and university studies. These persons have been able to utilise the expertise and experience gained through the PPIB project in the work they later have been engaged in, whether this work is still within the MOP, or in other ministries or institutions.

### **Training and Education**

The PPIB project had a relatively large and comprehensive training and education component, and it constituted more than twelve years of training and capacity building in the field of physical planning.

The professionals that originally were recruited to the project were architects, engineers and social scientists “in the pure sense”. That is, they did not have any previous education as planners, and they thus had to go through a training process to become operative planners.

During the initial years of the project, the focus of the PPIB training activities was two-fold: On the one hand, the training aimed at enhancing the planning competence and expertise of the PPIB staff; but at the same time, emphasis was put on developing a long-term education program for physical planning in Palestine.

The PPIB project has to a considerable degree raised the planning expertise and competence of the Palestinian staff. Through high level and very professional on-the-job training and academic education, the project established a good understanding and

---

awareness of concrete and professional planning methods and models. The training was carried out partly as intensive on-the-job training, internal seminars and courses in Palestine and internationally. Many of the staff also became linked up in formal education, and a relatively large number of the PPIB staff received education abroad – taking master's degrees or PhDs in Palestine, in Norway or elsewhere internationally.

The project managed to establish top-level expertise, competence and capacity in physical planning among a large number of Palestinians, and these persons have later – and are currently – working in various institutions in Palestine. They have become high level experts with several years of experience from carrying out concrete plans, and today they are involved in work as physical planners, engineers, financial planners, educators, etc. The establishing of a very professional staff of planners with high skills in carrying out and making plans – as well as a strong awareness about the role and importance of physical planning, policy making and decision making, must be considered a major achievement of the PPIB.

The persons that were attached to the PPIB project consider themselves to have been very privileged: they received high level and professional training and expertise in very concrete planning work; got a chance to learn and use GIS; could make use of all kinds of modern and advanced technical equipment and facilities; got early access to internet; etc.

### **The Norwegian consultants**

The Norwegian consultancy team was composed of experts with very long and top level expertise and experience from work with physical planning in Norway and internationally. The selection of these experts was based on their experience both as top-level managers and administrators of public and private planning institutions; as planners of concrete projects, as well as from their work in academia and research. Their role in Palestine was to function primarily as *advisors* in the setting up of the planning authorities at central level.

The Norwegian consultants introduced something that was relatively new in Palestine; using high level academic and administrative knowledge and expertise in the practical work of

formulating a large number of very concrete and relevant plans. This was done as part of, and at the same time as, institution building for physical planning in Palestine was taking place.

### **Production of concrete plans**

The PPIB project was designed to link the institution-building to the actual production of concrete plans, and the PPIB project has produced a very large number of concrete plans, studies, reports and articles (See Appendix 1 for a more detailed overview of all plans and reports). The plans that were produced had to offer practical and applicable solutions for the urgently arising needs, as well as cater for participatory and democratic planning processes in the Palestinian setting. At the outset of the project, these needs and demands had as a result that the project had to work with almost all relevant aspects of planning: national, regional, local – and across sectors and topics. Gradually, however, the work became more focused on regional and national planning.

A lot of modern and very good models and methods were introduced and used to formulate, structure and organise the planning work. This also included the training and awareness-raising on issues such as environment and natural resource management, as well as integration of wider aspects of planning methods and approaches into the data-collection and analysis.

The plans that have been made by PPIB contain a lot of information regarding the local conditions and situations, and have been widely used by different ministries and institutions in Palestine. MOP has also developed and provided guidelines and directions regarding local level planning.

During the last few years, work has been carried out in which closer linkages and cooperation have been established between the local, regional and national level planning. The planning work that has been done in Ramallah, Al Bireh and Beituniya, as well as in Jenin are examples of fruitful cooperation that MOP and the PPIB staff have been involved in.

### **Institutional challenges**

There has been a number of challenges linked to the institutional framework and development of the PPIB project. Central in this respect, has been that it has taken long time to define, and agree

upon, the organizational division of responsibilities for planning at different levels in Palestine. There has been some clear overlap in the planning responsibilities assigned to the different ministries and agencies, and one of the big challenges in terms of institutional building, has been to find a good way and good procedures for the cooperation between the different ministries.

It is thus necessary to clarify the mandate of the individual ministry, as well as the relationships between the different ministries and departments: the linkages to other institutions; the regulatory framework; legal acts, guidelines; etc. These issues need to be settled, both in the long term, as well as in the short term. To a certain extent, some of this has been sorted out by 2008. However, there is still a need to clarify which ministry and administrative level that should be responsible for various parts and aspects of physical planning in Palestine. In connection with this, there is a particular need to finalise the Planning and Building Act (PBA).

There have also been challenges linked to the career opportunities of the personnel that were employed and trained in the PPIB. A large number of persons received very professional training and expertise through the project. However, many of these individuals later had to seek employment in other institutions. This problem occurred especially after 2000. One can ask whether sufficient emphasis initially was put on the question of transforming PPIB from a project to becoming an integral part of the Ministry of Planning. The plans regarding the long term employment of staff should have been more clearly discussed from the initiation of the project.

## **Lessons learned**

### *Institutional development and cooperation*

The MOP staff as well as the planners in other ministries and departments are praising the cooperation they have had with the Norwegian PPIB experts and consultants. All the interviewed persons say that, the PPIB project has been very successful in terms of managing to introduce high level expertise and models for concrete physical planning.

### *Training of local level planners*

The PPIB project had a relatively strong focus on training of



personnel for the central and national planning authorities. This was linked to the fact that there was a very strong need to develop this kind of national level planning, and also that there had not been established a tradition for local level planning in Palestine – the Israelis had not allowed this to happen. As a consequence of this, the persons from the municipalities and local level institutions were not included in the initial years of the physical planning training. The training could perhaps, also at the initial stage, have included more representatives from the regional and local level authorities. However, this was, of course, also a question of resources available as well as PPIB capacity.

*Institution building vs. consultancy work*

In spite of the impressive results and outputs of the project, some of the representatives of the Norwegian donor were at different intervals raising questions regarding the results or outputs of the concrete planning activity: “What are the concrete results of the project; where are the plans you have been making?” The donor representatives were in this way looking upon the project, much in terms of being a traditional consultancy job, where the consultant was expected to produce some concrete physical plans, rather than looking upon the consultant’s role primarily as advisors, that were supposed to provide input to the Palestinian authorities’ institution building for physical planning. In this way, the donor representatives under-emphasised the very crucial principle regarding the *ownership* of plans, which implies that it is crucial that the concrete plans are made by the ones who are going to implement them. Experience has demonstrated, that this is a very fundamental principle that one ought to stick to – if one is going to have plans that are sustainable, and which can be implemented successfully. This indicates that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between: Institution building that should be carried out as a long term process, involving capacity building, training, cooperation, dialogue, etc., on the one side, vs. more short term consultancy work aimed at producing concrete plans and results, on the other. This distinction should have been stated and communicated more clearly and explicitly at the initiation of the PPIB project – as well as later in the process. The leaders of the project should therefore have made it more explicitly clear, that *the main goals of the project* only could be expected to be accomplished in the long run.

### *Time frame of the project*

The time-frame that initially was stipulated for the project was way too short. The PPIB was a very ambitious, large and complex project, and the involved actors should right from the beginning have seen that the implementation and carrying out of all the planned project activities would require considerably more time than the three years initially indicated. Subsequently, the time frame was also expanded and extended several times.

### **Sustainability**

The PPIB project established a very strong forward drive and momentum for the development of planning in Palestine. Much of this momentum is still present. All the PPIB persons obtained a very professional, high-level expertise and training, and they became very competent and qualified planners. Even though, many of the ones who received their training in physical planning are not working in MOP any longer, most of the persons who have been attached to the PPIB project are still working as planners or educators in Palestine, and they have very good relations and connections with the people in MOP.

### **Some continuing challenges**

#### *Geo-political situation*

Very many aspects linked to the development of physical planning in Palestine, are, and have been, clearly related to the political situation. One were, after all, dealing with issues relating to land, water and natural resources, mapping, etc. At the start of the project, it was, for instance, difficult to obtain maps, and the physical planning was, of course, totally dependent upon having maps. The political situation and framework has thus influenced the PPIB project to be quite different during different periods and stages. In the first years after 1995, the PPIB work was closely related to the establishing of the new Palestinian State. This was the main and fundamental framework for the PPIB work from 1995 to 1999, and the project played a central role in providing background information in the negotiations between Palestine and Israel. A lot of essential inputs, data, maps etc. was produced and constituted crucial background information to the negotiations. In many respects, 1995-99 can be considered to have been the “golden period” of the PPIB project.

*The division of the Palestinian territory into areas A, B and C*

One major concern, has been that the infrastructure planning becomes extremely difficult when you cannot relate to, and work with, the whole geographical area that is of relevance for, and influences the various sectors of planning. In Palestine, this has been the case throughout the PPIB project period.

This is also demonstrated to the extreme in Palestine, by the zoning/classification of the Palestinian territory into areas A, B and C, and where the Israelis control area C (the national) area. This makes it practically impossible for the Palestinians to prepare plans at this level.

---

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

In October 1994, the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIIC) in Palestine signed an agreement on behalf of the Palestinian national Authority (PNA) with the Government of Norway. The aim of the agreement was to provide technical and financial assistance towards developing capacity in physical planning to achieve a better control and coordination of the development process on the West Bank and Gaza. A three years project for Physical Planning and Institutional Building (PPIB) was defined for the period 1995-98. At the outset, the Project implementation was divided into two phases (Phase I – a pilot phase; and Phase II – the main phase). However, the Pilot Phase, which was intended to last six months, was extended to the full first year (1995). In this phase, the Work Plan for Phase II was formulated.

A central assumption and background for the PPIB project, was that the new Palestinian state would be formally established within 3-4 years – that is, before 1999. The institutional building of the state was to run parallel to the development of the PPIB project. This must be seen as a fundamental background and context for the institutional development that has been taking place as part of the project.

Institution building is usually long-term in nature. It requires time, patience and resources to establish new institutions with clear mandates, authority, and with competent staff, expertise and capacity to prepare plans, carry out decisions and to implement the activities according to the plans. In this sense, the initial three-year period that was intended for the project was over-optimistic. It

was way too short, relative to the challenges faced in Palestine in terms of establishing and making operational institutions for physical planning. The initial 3-year project period was thus extended several times. First by the so-called extension phase, then by the “bridging period”<sup>1</sup> and thirdly by the so called consolidation phase, which, by and large, lasted until March 2008, when the PPIB was finalised as a project.

The focus on institution building and the development of competence and capacity in physical planning was chosen, because both the representatives of the Palestinian authorities as well as the Norwegian donor meant that improved and strengthened physical planning was of crucial importance for the Palestinian state and for the general development of Palestine.

A total of NOK 177,5 million have been allocated to and used in this project, including NOK 45 million to the consolidation phase.<sup>2</sup>

The central actor at the Palestinian side has been the Ministry of Planning (MOP(IC)).<sup>3</sup> On the Norwegian side, the consultant was composed of a joint team. (Some of the key personnel taking part in the project is indicated in Appendix 5).

## 1.2 Project goal and objectives

One of the major objectives of the project was to develop a modern, well-functioning and sustainable planning capacity and planning process in Palestine. The main goal was to establish a framework and system for physical planning for national, regional

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “Bridging” period was used, because the project had reached the time, that initially had been set for the finalisation of the project. However, at that time, most actors realised – also the donor – that the finalisation of very many of the objectives and goals linked to the institution building lay some time in the future.

<sup>2</sup> The initial period (1995-1998) had an allocation of NOK 75 million, with an addendum in June 1998 of NOK 27,7 million, and further NOK 12,25 million in a second addition in July 1999. The third addendum amounted to NOK 17,5 million for the year 2000.

<sup>3</sup> In this report the term MOPIC (Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation) and MOP (Ministry of Planning) is used interchangeably. MOPIC was the name of the Ministry until 2001, after that the name has been MOP.

and local level planning in Palestine. Initially, one was talking about developing physical planning at all three administrative-political levels (national, regional and local). In practice, however, the main focus gradually became more centred around developing physical planning at national and regional level.

The PPIB work was carried out within a framework of considerable uncertainty inherent in the political situation – as related to the long standing occupation, on the one hand, and the many efforts to provide a constructive solution for the Palestinian-Israeli conflict on the other.

When the project was started in 1995 there was no tradition for this kind of planning activity in Palestine, or in the Palestinian institutions. Until then, the physical planning had been carried out by the Israelis, based on military laws and orders.

### 1.2.1 The development of the project goals and objectives<sup>4</sup>

The PPIB's overall goal was revised a couple of times during the initial years of the project. When the Work Plan for Phase II (the main phase of the project 1996-1998) was drafted, the goal statement given in the original agreement had to be revised in order to conform with MOPIC's mandate at the time. This was, to function as the coordinator for the development in Palestine.<sup>5</sup> The second revision of the goal statement was made while drafting the project document for the consolidation phase. At this stage the term "to develop capacity in physical planning" was dropped, and this phrase was not included in the goal statement for the next period, due to the following reasons:

- Within the project it was felt that the physical planning capacity in MOPIC at this stage had been developed to a satisfactory level, and that there was a need to consolidate this capacity rather than to expand it;

---

<sup>4</sup> The changes in the objectives of the different phases of the project are described in the Final Progress Report (for the period 1 January 1995-30 April 2001) Table 2 (October 2001).

<sup>5</sup> This specification of the mandate was also necessary in order not to confuse MOPIC's role with that of the Higher Planning Council (HPC).

- MOPIC was not supposed to be a training institution, and PPIB should thus cease to be looked upon as a ‘training project’. Instead, efforts should be made to institutionalise the project’s training activities within existing Palestinian educational institutions;
- The scope and direction of the training inside the project should be shifted to take into account the need for planning proficiency and capacity in other parts of the Palestinian planning system;
- At the same time, a lot of emphasis was put on ‘*on-the-job training*’, all through the different activities and phases of the PPIB;
- There were also other projects that supported capacity building in physical planning in related government institutions (MOLG, HPC as well as in local authorities). Thus, the capacity building activity of the PPIB project should focus on complementing these efforts.

The PPIB project as a whole can be considered to have been an ongoing training and learning process, where the project design was continuously adapted to the existing situation and needs, and to the newly acquired experiences. Work plans were revised as the project progressed, adding or dropping some of the activities along the way, according to the felt needs, and in order to accomplish the goals and objectives. Similar to the revision of the goal statement, the objectives of the project were assessed and revised to accommodate for and adapt to the internal as well as external changing conditions. The reasons for these changes can be attributed to one or more of the following factors:

- Changes in the institutional set up or in the mandates of the relevant institutions;
- The specific objectives were refined in order to reduce overlap with the work of other ministries or entities;
- Some of the objectives were reformulated to reflect the progress or status of a certain activity or activities<sup>6</sup>;

---

<sup>6</sup> Some of the objectives were also refined in order to operationalize or clarify the ambiguity in previously stated objectives.

- New objectives were introduced to respond to arising political or planning needs and priorities.

However, in general it can be said, that even though the wording of the objectives changed, the content remained very much the same.

### 1.2.2 Main activities of the PPIB project

The original agreement between PNA and Norway did not specify in detail the different activities that were to be carried out as part of the PPIB project. However, in the Work Plan for Phase II (the main phase 1996-1999) and in later documents related to the planning and implementation of the PPIB project, three sets of interconnected activities were identified and specified.

One set of activities was to carry out **institution building**. This encompassed activities related to organizational structuring and design; developing a legal framework for physical planning; drafting policies, guidelines, norms and standards for planning; defining cooperation and coordination linkages between different ministries and entities; institutionalizing mechanisms and procedures for handling physical planning processes at various administrative and political levels; etc.

The second type of activity was to carry out **actual (physical) planning work**, and to couple this to the activities related to institution building.

The third type of activity was to provide relevant and adequate **training** to upgrade skills and competence in the field of planning, and to closely relate this to the other two sets of activities. The scope and content of the training was defined by, and adapted to, the arising needs for concrete physical planning, as well as for institution building in this field in Palestine.

### 1.2.3 The main phases of the project

The PPIB can be described as having been carried out and implemented in quite different stages and phases. The development of the project's phases, and the characteristics of these phases are summarised in the table below:



Table 1.1 *The Phases of the PPIB project*

Year	Name of Project Phase	Activities	Characteristics / Comments
1994	Agreement	Planning and signing of Agreement	
1995	Phase I	Pilot studies	Establishing the necessary base for planning, including recruiting personnel, creating maps, basic data collection, and initial training. Practical arrangements for offices, working environment, equipment, etc.
1996-98	Phase II	<b>The main phase of PPIB</b>	Due to different obstacles – mainly related to the ongoing political development and political situation - and in order to achieve the project's objectives, it was early decided to extend the project for one year, that is, until 31.12.98.
	Extension Period (1998)		
1999	Bridging Period (July-December 1999)		The PPIB project was initially planned as a 3-year project. However, from 1998 a “bridging” period was introduced, intended to last for the period 1998-2001.
2000	Extended Bridging Period (2000)		- A project document discussing the consolidation of the project was submitted to Norad in November 1998. - The agreement for the “Bridging Period” was signed in July 1999. This period was gradually extended to 30 April 2001. - The Second Intifada occurred in September 2000.
2001-2003	<b>Consolidation Phase<sup>7</sup></b>	The PPIB/MOP staff became engaged in emergency plans, Strategic development planning.	After 2001, the project activities were carried out as part of the Consolidation Phase. This work was continued, and extended a couple of times, <sup>8</sup> and the project was finalised in March 2008.
2004-2005			
2006-2008			

<sup>7</sup> In June 2001 an agreement was signed between Norway and the Palestinian National Authority (PNA), in which Norad agreed to finance the Consolidation Phase of the Physical Planning and Institutional Development Project (PPIB-CP) to be implemented by MOP(IC).

<sup>8</sup> Due to the difficult political and social situation during this period, a Revised Activity Plan (RAP) covering the period 1 September 2003 – 30 June 2005 was drafted in 2003. The RAP was approved by Norad, and an “Addendum” to the original Agreement was signed in November 2003. Due to the prevailing political situation and conditions, it took longer time to carry out the planned activities, and the project was finally completed in March 2008.

In the extension phase of the project, the focus was primarily on the institution building component, whereas, the Bridging and the Extended Bridging periods (1998-1999) centered more around establishing and strengthening the activity of the Special Technical Unit in order to provide background information and support to the ongoing negotiations with Israel.

The PPIB project has been reviewed and assessed a couple of times. In general, the comments and assessments have been quite positive (Fors et.al. 1997; Kleven et.al. 1998; Kleven et.al. 1999; Endresen et.al.2003).

## 2 The PPIB project

### 2.1 Institution building

#### 2.1.1 Establishing new units for physical planning in Palestine

Initially the intention was that the physical planning at national level should be established as an integral part of the planning ministry.<sup>9</sup> At a relatively early stage in the PPIB project, a core unit for planning – the technical support unit – was established, and this still continues to be the core unit for technical support in physical planning in MOP.

In the original agreement, the idea had been to establish a ‘central’ planning administration in addition to two ‘regional’ offices, one in West Bank and another in Gaza. As the management of the project was transferred to MOPIC, this meant the establishment of a physical planning directorate within MOPIC with two offices; one in West Bank and another in Gaza.

At the start of the project, one of the objectives had been to develop a ‘central planning institution (Palestinian Planning Bureau). However, as the implementation of the PPIB project was transferred to MOPIC instead of to PECTAR, this objective was changed; to focus on establishing a directorate responsible for physical planning within MOPIC. This unit was given the name the Directorate for Urban and Rural Planning (DURP), and this

---

<sup>9</sup> In the mid 1990s, technical committees, that were responsible for preparing the technical design and framework for development of roads, water, and other infrastructure facilities, had been established in Palestine. These technical committees were the forrunner of *PECTAR*.

---

was later renamed General Directorate for Physical Planning (GDPP).

As DURP/GDPP was established, some new organizational and managerial challenges regarding PPIB's integration into MOPIC were encountered, and from 1998, the objectives were modified to focus more on integrating PPIB/DURP/GDPP into MOPIC; defining its functions, and eventually, upgrading its institutional linkages and managerial capacity.

### 2.1.2 The political context – carrying out physical planning in Palestine in the period 1995-2007

At the initiation of the project, the formal setting and the legal basis for carrying out physical planning in Palestine was very difficult, and with very complex conditions existing both in the Gaza Strip and in the West Bank. In 1995 there was a general lack of updated and accurate data; lack of appropriate planning institutions and systems; lack of planning policies; procedures and expertise. There was almost a total lack of basic data and information in all fields relevant to physical planning. In many ways, one had to start the work of establishing the physical planning institutions relatively much from scratch. Initially, the PPIB project did not even have specially assigned office space – this had to be arranged for during the initial year of the project.

There was a series of constraints linked to establishing and developing new institutions and authorities for physical planning in Palestine. The constraints were of many different kinds; political, physical, economic, cultural, social – in many respects, the constraints are also quite obvious.

At the initiation of the project, there were no maps, as maps were considered to be military secrets by the Israelis. Never-the-less, the team in various ways managed to produce maps.

The professionals that were recruited to the project were architects, engineers and social scientists “in the pure sense”. That is, they did not have education as planners, and they thus had to go through a training process to become operative planners.

The project managers thus had to be very flexible and pragmatic when addressing and solving the tasks and challenges they met.

For instance, when preparing the transportation plans, they initially did not have any data on the origin and destination of the individual travel, and the project, therefore, had to be very innovative in order to obtain the necessary data for the planning, map making, etc.

On the individual side, the professionals that were recruited had backgrounds as architects, engineers and social scientists in the pure sense. None of them had any previous planning education, since planning under the Israelis had been regarded as military secrets.

New recruits were assigned jobs of gathering the necessary data and information, and they were taught to carry out basic analysis as part of the job. The PPIB team in this manner managed to establish a basis for producing maps and making plans.

The PPIB project was in this way designed to link the institution-building to the actual development of concrete plans. The plans that were developed had to offer practical solutions for the urgently arising needs, as well as cater for participatory and democratic planning processes in the Palestinian setting. Based on the experience generated along the way, the project design was continuously assessed and revised.

The PPIB work and the implementation of the plans have been strongly affected by the political situation and framework, and by the changes in the political situation during the last 15 years. In the beginning, the assumption was that the declaration of the Palestinian State would be made within the time frame of the main phase of the project – that is, before 1999.

After the Second Intifada in September 2000, Palestine experienced a period of political turmoil and instability, and during the last 6-7 years the situation has also been quite turbulent and difficult. This is, for instance, illustrated by the difficulties regarding the contact and communication between the West Bank and Gaza, etc.

### 2.1.3 Establishing a legal framework for physical planning in Palestine

Since the start of the project, one of the objectives has been to contribute to the development of a Planning and Building Act (PBA) for Palestine. The work linked to this has been going throughout the project period, and the PBA has been drafted and revised several times. So far, the Palestinian authorities have not managed to agree upon, and decide on, a joint and overarching PBA, and in 2008 the PBA has still not been finalised. Part of the problem of finalising the PBA is linked to the competition between different ministries regarding the responsibility for specific parts of the planning. To a large extent, questions regarding the responsibilities for planning have been approached and decided upon in each individual case. That is, the mandates, responsibilities, tasks and roles for the different parts of the physical planning have not been sufficiently clarified and defined. This is something that one is still struggling with, and one is trying to find ways of finalising the PBA.<sup>10</sup>

### 2.1.4 The transfer of staff from PPIB project to ministry payroll

The original intention had been that most of the persons employed and trained in the PPIB project should be offered positions and end up as part of the MOP/PNA payroll. The MOP leadership tried to obtain approval for better positions (and wages) for the persons that had been trained and working in the PPIB project, in order for them not to leave the ministry. However, when the time came when this had to be effectuated, it was difficult to find the necessary funding to employ all the trained staff as part of the government payroll. One of the limitations has been that the Ministry of Finance did not have the funds necessary for MOP to employ the persons trained and employed in the PPIB project. This must, also be related to the very difficult financial situation of the Palestinian state, which, during certain periods, resulted in the state not even managing to pay the wages to some of the employees.

---

<sup>10</sup> Several donors have been supporting work with the aim of revising and finalising the PBA

## **The situation after 2000**

These developments must also be seen against the background that there was a relatively more stable situation in Palestine before 2000 than after. It was especially after the Intifada in 2000, that the problems linked to the transfer of the personnel from the PPIB project to the MOP payroll occurred. During this period, there was a lot of confusion and lack of clarity regarding what would happen, and many persons left the PPIB project and MOP after 2000. There were also a number of changes of ministers.<sup>11</sup>

In many ways, the planning activity in MOP did not have the same dynamic drive, momentum and atmosphere after 2000, as it had had during the first years of the PPIB project. In some respects, the situation appears to have been somewhat stagnant after 2003. “I have not learned anything new after I became a government employee.” This also contributed to making the work in MOP/PPIB not as attractive as it had been before 2000, and led to many of the staff seeking opportunities and jobs in other ministries or institutions.

It can therefore be said, that MOP has not had a policy regarding how to keep the ones that had received training and formal education, and thus had improved their expertise and skills.

Many of the persons that received training and education through the PPIB project, are today working in other ministries, in municipalities, at the universities or in other institutions. The ones who obtained PhDs are mainly attached to one of the Palestinian universities.

## **The transfer from PPIB project staff to government payroll in Gaza**

In Gaza it took about six years before the transfer from PPIB staff to MOP government payroll started, and there are still (August 2008) some PPIB staff members who have not obtained job-contracts in the ministry. The transfers were started at the top; giving positions to the directors first, while the ordinary staff had to wait and come later.

---

<sup>11</sup> For instance, during the last one year leading up to August 2008, there have been three ministers in MOP, and each of them has wanted to “change the vision and the focus of the ministry”.

Many of the ones who received their training through PPIB in Gaza are now employed in other ministries, such as MOLG, Ministry of Housing, etc. Even though MOP has lost much of its expertise in this way, these transfers make it easier to cooperate with the representatives of the other ministries – because a common understanding regarding planning has been established between these persons.

### 2.1.5 The Norwegian consultant

The Norwegian consultancy team was composed of experts with very long and top level expertise and experience from Norwegian physical planning, as well as from international planning. The selection of these experts was based on their experience both as top-level administrative managers of public and private planning institutions; as planners of concrete projects, as well as from their work in academia and research. Very much of the individuals' background and experience had been generated as consultants to concrete physical planning projects and activities in Norway and internationally. Their role in Palestine was primarily to function as *advisors* in the setting up of the planning authorities at central level.

The Norwegian consultants introduced something that in many ways was relatively new in Palestine; using high level academic and administrative knowledge and expertise in the practical work of formulating a large number of very concrete and relevant plans. This was done as part of, and at the same time as, institution building for physical planning and formulating of a framework for the planning in Palestine was carried out.

A summary of the experience regarding the cooperation with the Norwegian consultants, and which is shared by most of the PPIB staff, can be expressed by a statement made by one of them: “The PPIB staff learned a lot from the Norwegian consultants, in terms of practical, concrete planning; theoretical and methodological approaches to planning; as well as regarding human and personal relationships.”



## 2.2 Training

Right from the very beginning, after having hired professionals to the project, the training and teaching was introduced as an essential part of the project. The PPIB staff thus very early became enrolled in training to become professional planners

A large number of persons – approximately 85 – has been trained directly in the activities that were carried out under the PPIB's training component (See Appendix 2 for an overview of the persons that obtained master's degrees). These persons got a very good chance of receiving professional training and education in planning. The training had a wide scope, and the staff learned to produce concrete plans, make maps, write proposals, reports, land-use planning, etc. There were also teams that were working specifically on development studies. This was carried out partly as on-the-job training, through concrete and well-organised practical planning work, covering many topics and levels. A large part of the training was also carried out by the Norwegian consultants giving lectures and courses in planning theory, models, methods, procedures, practice, etc.

During the period 1996-99, the focus of the PPIB training activities was two-fold: On the one hand, the training aimed at enhancing the planning competence and expertise of the PPIB staff; while at the same time emphasis was put on developing a long-term education program for physical planning in Palestine.

The PPIB project can, as a whole, be considered to have been a continuous training and learning process, where the project design was continuously adapted to the existing situation and needs, and to the newly acquired experiences.

### 2.2.1 On the job training

Before the PPIB project was initiated, most of the staff had a very limited background in planning, and at the outset, very many of the Palestinians had a practical, very rationalistic approach to planning.

---

It was therefore necessary to introduce alternative and appropriate planning processes as well as a lot of on-the-job training in the various aspects of planning.

The staff through their work and training learned very much about the various aspects of planning. They learned to make local plans, regional plans, structural plans, etc., and they were involved in making a number of studies, analyses, policy documents and plans. In this way they obtained concrete advice in the form of on the job training.

PPIB tried to incorporate the planning into improved organizational structures and set-ups. Likewise, the suggested policies and procedures intended to guide the physical planning processes, could be tested and refined through the direct implementation of planning activities in the specific field.

Most of the Norwegian consultants were involved in the teaching and training courses that were offered.

### **Hiring of personnel**

The vacant positions for working within the PPIB project were in general, advertised in Palestinian newspapers. This kind of open advertisements was something completely new in Palestine. These job-offers were very popular, and there was a very strong demand and a long list of applicants for these jobs. For some more limited activities of the PPIB work, students and volunteers were engaged to take part in the detailed data collection and information gathering. Some of the ones who got their training through the project was first linked to it as students and volunteers, and later they became more formally attached, and got their training and work experience through it. In this way the PPIB opened opportunities of training and education for a large number of persons who learned data collection; analysis; formulation of proposals and plans; management; archiving, etc. This was a very good career start for most of the ones who decided to join PPIB and go for work within the field of planning.

### **Local level planning**

At an early stage of the PPIB project Ramallah and Jericho were selected for pilot projects on local level planning. At that time, there were no local level planners or planning institutions in these

two cities. The reason for this, was that under the Israeli regime, the Palestinians had not been allowed to develop their own local planning institutions. The local planning in Ramallah and Jericho had been carried out by MOLG with assistance of consultants that operated with relatively old-fashioned planning models and methods. Initially, there were thus no local level planners in Ramallah or Jericho – or in other cities in Palestine – that the PPIB project could relate to, and build upon, in order to strengthen local level planning capacity.

It should be emphasised that these local level planning initiatives of PPIB in Jericho and Ramallah were *pilot projects*. They were not considered to be the main activity of the PPIB, and were prioritised accordingly.

PPIB's pilot project in local level planning in Ramallah and Jericho caused some friction between the MOP staff and MOLG. This was partly due to the opposition that at that time existed between MOP and MOLG, and MOP was not willing to give away or allocate resources to MOLG before clearer mandates and responsibilities had been established between the two ministries.

### **Regional plans and Land-use plans**

In practice, planning at regional level was not present in Palestine before the PPIB project carried out and introduced the regional plans for the West Bank and Gaza.

The PPIB staff learned how to make concrete regional plans and land-use plans (LUP). A few of these plans, such as the Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates (1997/2002), and the Regional Transportation Plan for the West Bank (1996), have also been approved by the Higher Council. These plans also served to channel donor funding into areas of great importance and benefit for the Palestinians.

On the basis of the LUP-work that was carried out during the first years of the PPIB project, and which has been carried out later, MOP has made recommendations regarding carrying out more detailed data-collection in order to make the LUPs more detailed and operational for use at local level. However, after the Intifada and the political instability in 2000, it has been very difficult to carry out more detailed LUPs. The LUP in different areas and at

---

local level is thus somewhat superficial, and not up to the standards MOP would like to have them.

The PPIB project was in many respects very innovative. A lot of modern models and methods were tried out and implemented for general planning, institution building and organisational development.

The planning work that the teams was carrying out, often had a bottom-up approach. This was particularly the case for land-use planning, landscaping and environmental issues.<sup>12</sup>

The PPIB teams organised a series of hearings and workshops in a large number of communities in the West Bank and Gaza. In these meetings they discussed with the local people the local situation regarding: agriculture, water, cultural heritage, etc. “The local people helped us a great deal with obtaining data and information about the local situation.”

### **Team spirit and trust**

In a project like this, good relations and *trust* between the persons who are involved in the cooperation and work, is of crucial importance. The leaders of the PPIB project managed to establish very good and friendly relationships and trust between the Norwegians and the Palestinians that were involved. This resulted in a very good team spirit, and good cooperation throughout the project. One of the great outputs of the PPIB, was that all the ones involved learned to work efficiently in teams.

The Palestinians who have been interviewed, say that the experienced Norwegian consultants “opened up” something among the PPIB staff members – not only in terms of planning science and experience, but also regarding attitude and *behaviour* between the cooperating partners. Some of the Palestinians taking part in the project has described the behaviour and work of the Norwegian team-leaders as: “being built on a perspective of equality. This is different from the relationship we often experience with other international cooperating partners”. It was,

---

<sup>12</sup> In Palestine much of the planning had traditionally been very top-down oriented. In Norway, however, much of the planning has been bottom-up oriented.

“something in between the German culture, on the one side, and the oriental, on the other.” At the same time as being very professional and hard working, oriented towards obtaining concrete, relevant and usable results, the team-work and cooperation was also characterised by very friendly and easy-going relationships. This made it easier and more encouraging to be a part of the team – and to be at work. The Palestinian staff members considered the relationships within the team to be very inspiring and encouraging, and they all enjoyed the cooperation and the work. This resulted in people putting in a lot of effort, and also producing very good results. In many respects, PPIB had a very modern approach and philosophy on how to *build teams* and organisations.

### **Information Bank**

As a result of the PPIB activity and work, a considerable amount of data and *information* has been generated and collected by MOP. Initially, there was an ambition of developing ‘a database (for mapping, statistics, etc.) for practical planning’. However, this was later revised to focus primarily on ‘coordination of efforts in order to develop national information systems for planning’. This was in order not to duplicate the work carried out by other specialized institutions and agencies which had been established, such as the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) and Palestinian Geographic Center (PALGRIC). Today much of the relevant data is collected by the Sector Ministries, and gathered in PCBS.<sup>13</sup>

MOP’s data and information are widely used by other ministries and institutions, and thus serve the purposes of many sectors and ministries. Earlier there was an intention of developing this to a wide reaching database, but this has not been realised.

### **2.2.2 Formal training and education**

The PPIB project provided a lot of capacity building and training opportunities for its staff, and many of the staff entered into formal education and studies in Palestine, in Norway or

---

<sup>13</sup> PCBS also has observatories in Jericho and Jerusalem, and they are talking about expanding the observatory activities in cooperation with some of the universities.

---

elsewhere,<sup>14</sup> which led to master's degrees or PhDs in the field of planning. This capacity building has been of great value and benefit for Palestine.

## **GIS**

From the start of the PPIB project the focus was on establishing top level GIS competence and capacity. The development of this GIS competence in Palestine has been a very important output of the PPIB project. The GIS expertise and capacity also proved to be of crucial importance in the negotiations with Israel.

Considerable work has also been laid down in linking the GIS data and development together with the descriptive information and data that PPIB has generated and collected regarding land, water resources, cultural heritage, etc.

In 2002 the STU unit in MOP started work to establish maps with Spot-based source data.<sup>15</sup> A number of new maps have been produced and compared with the previously produced area-based maps. In connection with this work, there has been a number of challenges, such as for instance, the classification of roads. The MOP staff has had to discuss with other ministries and agencies how to define and classify the various types of roads; similarly with housing: there have been problems regarding the identification of different types of buildings; and there has also been a lot of challenges linked to the definition of municipal borders.

There is currently some duplication and overlap in the GIS work and the making of maps in Palestine. Some ministries produce their own maps, and some private companies also operate with their own map-making. It is thus necessary to establish a stronger coordination and a common basis for data-collection, databases, as well as clear specifications for the GIS work. To a certain extent, the basis for this has already been made.

---

<sup>14</sup> One, of the staff members, for instance, took his PhD on land degradation in Palestine. This was clearly linked to the work he had been doing in the PPIB project.

<sup>15</sup> This work was carried out in cooperation with the Palestinian Geographic Center (PALGRIC). However, in 2004 PALGRIC was transferred and became an integrated part of the Geographic Center and Technical Support Unit in MOP.

MOP wants to be responsible for the national Base-Map. That is, the intention is to establish one reference map for Palestine. In 2004 MOP cooperated with Norwegian experts to formulate a Documentation Programme for establishing a Mapping Agency for Palestine (MAP). MAP is supposed to be a national unit responsible for the core data and information necessary to make (official) maps – a central data-source for mapping that can be used by different agencies and companies. MOP is currently waiting for the approval of the funding of this activity.

### **Training in environmental management and EIA**

PPIB also introduced training in EIA, with teachers from Norway and Canada. There was, for instance, a six-months intensive training course on EIA.

The environmental awareness among the planners who received this training as part of the PPIB became very strong.

### **Management procedures and archiving**

The PPIB project introduced clear administrative and managerial procedures and routines: reporting systems; financial mechanisms and procedures for monitoring and auditing; etc. These procedures and systems have been adopted, not only by other units in MOP, but also by other ministries. For instance, the archiving routines and procedures that have been introduced as part of the PPIB project, and which were used in the cooperation projects between MOP and MOLG, are now being applied and used by eight departments in MOLG.<sup>16</sup>

The persons that were attached to the PPIB project in many ways consider themselves to have been very privileged: they received high level and professional training and competence in very concrete planning work; got a chance to learn and use top quality GIS in their work; could make use of all kinds of modern and advanced technical equipment and facilities; got early access to internet; etc.

---

<sup>16</sup> The development of the archiving routines was carried out also with assistance and input from local private companies and consultants.

According to one of the former PPIB staff members who was interviewed: “Most of the planning I have learned, I learned during the period 1995-1999.”

### 2.2.3 The Palestinian universities and training institutions

Most of the ones who went abroad to take a master’s degree or a PhD came back to Palestine after having completed their studies. Some returned to MOP, some went to other ministries, while most of the ones that obtained PhDs are now working at one of the universities in Palestine, and the PPIB has contributed significantly in the building up of the universities’ competence and capacity to carry out education and training in the field of planning. The PPIB has in this way significantly contributed to build up and provide capacity to meet future planning needs in Palestine.

The former PPIB persons who are now working at one of the universities in Palestine are also using the work, data and experience from the PPIB work in their teaching. As stated by one of the former PPIB-staff, now teaching at a university: “I have used the methods, approaches and behavioural attitudes I learned in the PPIB project in my teaching at the university, and it is also clearly reflected in the work we are carrying out at the university.”

The former PPIB staff are teaching in i.a. the following master’s or under-graduate courses at one of the universities in Palestine:

- Natural Resources and Planning.
- Regional Planning and Environmental Management.
- Urban Planning in Palestine through history.

During recent years close cooperation has also been established between some municipalities and some universities in connection with the formulation of local plans. Al Najah University is for instance cooperating with MOP, MOLG and the local administration in formulating a new Master Plan and development plan for Jenin.

Through these courses, and the direct involvement in concrete planning, the students learn to see the clear and strong linkages to



– and relevance of – their education in the physical planning and development of Palestine. This also contributes to improve and strengthen the pedagogical quality of the education.

Long term cooperation has been established and developed between MOP on the one side, and Birzeit University; An-Najah University; and other universities in Palestine, on the other. Institutional and long term cooperation has also been established between Norwegian and Palestinian universities involved in teaching related to planning; PPIB has facilitated and been operational in establishing contacts between Oslo School of Architecture (AHO) and An-Najah University – as well as between other universities in Palestine and Norway and elsewhere internationally – with the aim of establishing joint training programs for physical planning in Palestine.

## 2.3 Results and outputs

### 2.3.1 The Production of Plans

At a very early stage, the PPIB project had to produce *regional plans*, and for this purpose it was necessary to establish teams that were specifically assigned and composed for the task. For instance, the project established one team that had to carry out a study of the agricultural land in the West Bank, and to make a classification of the land: agriculture, housing, water resources, cultural heritage, etc. In this work, the PPIB staff had close cooperation with representatives of the Dept of Agriculture in a number of areas in the West Bank. In this way, strong ties and good cooperation were established with the persons working in these other ministries and offices. This was to be used as input to the formulation of the regional plan.

During the first years of the project (1996-1998), emphasis was put on finalizing the Regional Plan for the West Bank Governorates (1997), the Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates (1997), and developing the White Paper “National Policies for Physical Development” (NPPD) (1998), as well as working with the process of integrating PPIB in MOPIC.

The persons that had been involved in making the regional plans were later assigned to the urban and rural development unit, and here they had to find methods of linking the experience and knowledge that they had obtained by working on the regional plans with the concrete work PPIB was doing on urban and rural development.

In 1999 the PPIB's objectives were again redefined to cater for new political priorities, namely, to provide input to the preparations that was going on for the Declaration of the State, by developing a National Physical Plan. That is, the objective of the PPIB work was reformulated and specified, and the accumulated data, information and expertise were geared towards 'providing technical assistance to the Negotiations Affairs Department (NAD)' in support of the ongoing negotiations.

From the inception of the project and until today (2008) a large number of concrete plans, studies, reports and articles have been produced as part of the PPIB project (See Appendix 1 for a more detailed overview of all plans and reports produced). Below we present selected examples of some of the concrete plans and reports that have been made:

- Emergency Natural Resources Protection Plan for Gaza Governorates (1995)
- Emergency Natural Resource Protection Plan for the West Bank (1996). The plan covered topics such as:
  - Landscape Assessment
  - Endangered Cultural Heritage Sites, etc.<sup>17</sup>
- Regional Transportation Plan for the West Bank, covering land use, traffic zones, travel demand estimates, traffic surveys and other data collection. (1996). This was a pioneer work; for the first time, one could cover the whole of Palestine.
- Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates (1997/2002)
- Regional Plan for the West Bank Governorates (1997)
- National Policies for Physical Development (1998).<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> This plan was also expanded to include a separate Study of Jerusalem.

- Framework for a Palestinian Strategic Development Plan (1999)
- Endangered Cultural Heritage Sites in the West Bank Governorates (1999).
- Metropolitan Plan for Ramallah-Al Bireh-Beitunia (2004)

The development of the Regional Transportation Plan for the West Bank deserves particular attention and merit. This was a very comprehensive plan, covering land use, traffic zones, travel demand estimates, traffic surveys and other data collection. This was a pioneer work, covering the whole of Palestine. It was a very successful exercise. It verified the quality and importance of the PPIB team's work, at the same time as it provided maps, data and analysis that were of major importance and value for the Palestinian society in general.

In cooperation with the Palestinian Land Research Centre and the Israelis PPIB/MOP has also carried out a study about the land area within a 10 km border zone on each side of the border line. In this work they were trying to estimate the value of the land on both sides of the border. The study was confidential, and was intended to be used as background information and data in potential land-swapping cases.<sup>19</sup>

The formulation of most of the plans was based on fieldwork, data collection and mapping carried out by specifically designated teams.

All the plans that have been made by PPIB/MOP have been very professional, and have also been taken very seriously by other ministries and departments. Only a few regional plans have so far been formally approved by the Higher Council. These include: the Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates and the Regional Transportation Plan for the West Bank. However, even though many of the plans have still not been formally approved by the

---

<sup>18</sup> The National Policies for Physical Development (NPPD) identified new national level planning tasks, and particularly the Physical Planning Initiatives (PPIs). These tasks and initiatives were strongly linked to issues related to the *Final Status Negotiations*, and were introduced in the summer of 1999.

<sup>19</sup> If an area was going to be swapped, it was supposed to be of equal value as the one it was swapped with.

Palestinian higher authorities – much due to bureaucracy – these plans are being widely applied and used by sector ministries, such as: the Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Water; Culture, etc., as well as by the municipalities.<sup>20</sup> These plans contain a lot of relevant data and information, and they have, to a large extent, been the only plans of its kind that are available in Palestine.

### 2.3.2 Planning after 2000

The planning that has been carried out by PPIB/MOP after 2000, is, in many respects, a result of the institution building and infrastructure that had been developed during the first years of the project.

#### **The Emergency plans**

After the Second Intifada (in September 2000), the work of the PPIB/MOP staff have centered more on emergency planning, as well as on short term projects and plans.

In 2002, a team of five-six persons of the PPIB/MOP staff participated in making the Palestinian Development Plan (PDP). This was strongly needed as an emergency plan, and was a response to the destruction caused by the conflict with Israel. Much of the emergency planning work was linked to the evacuation of colonies and the situation of the refugees. The PDP stipulated and gave priorities regarding what the government needed to do in a number of sectors, such as housing, transport, electricity supply, water and other development areas and needs – as well as the funding needs linked to this. In similar ways, the MOP staff was providing input to a number of ministries, agencies and institutions.<sup>21</sup>

#### **Strategic development planning**

The formulation of the Strategic Development Plan started in 2005. This is a mid-term development plan (MTDP) with more strategic thinking and elements than the former emergency plans. In the Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) (2005-2007)

---

<sup>20</sup> MOP has been, and is, producing plans that to a large extent are to be carried out and implemented by other ministries and departments.

<sup>21</sup> Among these also the World Bank.

MOP has been trying to integrate the competence, data and qualifications of its staff with the needs and requirements of other ministries and departments. The main questions that have been addressed and focused upon are: What are the worst/most needy regions, in what sectors and services, and what can be done about this? There are, for instance, strategic plans that deal with the situation of refugees, and some of the MOP staff has been involved in making these plans. However, the authorities have not yet managed to address all the issues related to this. There are so many challenges and difficulties linked to these issues in the current political situation.

In 2005 a MOP team made a Gap analysis for the MTDP. This work was very thorough, and is very important in terms of providing assistance, first to the communities that need it most. The MTDP plans are supposed to be updated every year, and this is meant to be one of the core activities of the involved ministries. In the first year the MTDP was quite successful. However, after that, the results or the effects of these plans have been much more limited.

The MOP staff feels that they, in many respects, have not managed to incorporate all of their competence and skills in formulating the MTDP, or rather; all of their skills and qualifications has not been sufficiently utilised when making these plans. They have been met with the argument that the input they have been providing has been *too spatial* (that is; too much oriented towards physical planning), while the development plans, currently are expected to be made much more according to the *sectoral* needs and requirements. This change in planning focus is, in many respects, also linked to the priorities and visions at the top in the ministry. As a result of this, some of the local authorities are also losing some of their confidence regarding what MOP can contribute with – and regarding how the expertise and experience that lie in MOP can be utilised in their own planning.

### 2.3.3 Other activities and outputs

The drafting of a new Planning and Building Act (PBA) was the first activity that was initiated under the PPIB project in 1995. A Norwegian expert was engaged to introduce the Norwegian experience linked to the development of the PBA. The work with

the Palestinian PBA has been very complex and difficult, and it has taken a very long time. In 2008, it is still not finalised. In retrospect, it can be said that the drafting and introduction of new legislation require a very strong comprehension of local culture, tradition and history, and that this should have been given more emphasis in the formulation of the new PBA in Palestine.

As it was not possible to establish a separate ‘mapping authority’, and PALGRIC was not able to provide the data needed for physical planning, a new activity was introduced in the PPIB activity plan in 1998, which emphasized the importance of maintaining a *database* for physical planning within the project. During the subsequent years, the work linked to this database was oriented towards providing technical support to the ongoing negotiations between PNA/PLO and Israel, as well as providing the necessary data for the physical planning activities in the PPIB.

When a new municipal council has been elected, many municipalities are asking for an expansion of their municipal border. In Jenin, for instance, there has been some quarrels between neighbouring communities regarding the border lines. MOP has been carrying out a study together with the Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Local Government and the Governorate to make a clear and unambiguous map regarding the municipal borders. The Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) is now using the borders defined through this mapping-work as a basis for their statistical work. For this particular purpose, MOP has also produced a report regarding how to accurately translate local names from Arabic to English.

## 2.4 Planning responsibilities in different ministries

When the different ministries were established in Palestine, it was to a certain extent up to the individual minister to decide what his/her ministry should focus upon, and how the ministry should be organised. This resulted in considerable overlap between the ministries in terms of mandates, functions and responsibilities. At that time, which was running parallel to the initial years of the PPIB project, there was thus considerable competition between politicians – and ministries. One of the questions that soon was

encountered, was whether the Ministry of Planning MOP(IC) should be involved in all kinds of planning, or whether the ministry should just provide input to and coordinate the work of other ministries. For instance, a discussion emerged between MOP and the Ministry of Local Government regarding which ministry was supposed to have the main responsibility for the planning at decentralised and local level.

In similar manner, there has been a lot of discussions regarding the questions of the responsibilities of the various ministries and the different planning institutions.<sup>22</sup> Within this context, it has, in many respects, been a challenge to get the cooperation to function efficiently and well.

In 2003 the Ministry of Local Government was assigned the responsibility for planning at local and regional level, and after this, the PPIB planning work was gradually oriented more towards national and regional planning.

In connection with the cooperation that MOP needs to have with other ministries and sectors, such as health and education, Memos of Understanding have been signed between the ministries for cooperation in making the necessary plans. When concrete plans are being made that involve more than one ministry, steering committees are set up to coordinate and monitor the planning activities. For instance, in connection with the formulation of the plan “Framework for Palestinian Strategic Development” (1999), a steering committee was established, involving persons from MOP, Ministry of Transport and Ministry of Finance. The steering committee coordinated the activity and the procedures for everybody involved. In this work, the tasks and roles of the different ministries and contributors to the plan were relatively well clarified and defined, and this contributed to establishing very good and efficient work and results. For instance, the Ministry of Transport oversaw that the plans were feasible, and classified them according to: long term; medium term; short term plans, etc.

---

<sup>22</sup> The need to specify and formalize the relationships with institutions outside MOPIC was clearly identified in the PPIB activity plan from 1996 and in the following years.

#### 2.4.1 Responsibility for local and regional planning – The relationship between MOP and MOLG

As mentioned, there has been considerable overlap and competition between the different ministries involved in planning, and in this respect, the relationship between MOP and the Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) is of particular interest. There have been a number of constraints and challenges linked to the competition between MOLG and MOP. The mandates regarding the work and responsibilities of these ministries were more clearly defined in 2003: MOLG should be responsible for the planning at local and regional level, while MOP should be responsible for the physical planning at national and regional level. MOP can be involved in the production of provincial and regional level plans – but only for the elements of the plans that can be said to be of national relevance and importance. As a consequence of this, MOP and MOLG made an agreement to cooperate in producing some plans, and a MoU was signed regarding this. Since then, the two ministries have been cooperating to jointly produce some plans.

The differentiation of the work of MOP and MOLG, implied that MOP eventually had to focus more on the national and regional level of physical planning, while MOLG was to focus on district (governorate) and local level physical planning. This was also in accordance with the division of labour and the mandates that were proposed for the two ministries in the Draft Planning and Building Act.

In connection with the formulation of a number of plans, like transportation, water supply, energy, metropolitan planning, etc. the Palestinian planners need to relate to the regional level, and the regional information and data provided for this kind of infrastructural projects. However, the updated data at the regional level is often missing and difficult to get access to. In fact, there are some very strong constraints regarding regional planning in Palestine today: The West Bank is divided into areas A, B and C, and where Israel controls Area C. This means that it is very difficult for the Palestinian planners to carry out physical planning at regional level for topics such as: transportation; water and sanitation; solid waste, etc., and it has therefore been very hard for the Palestinian authorities to make important infrastructure maps



and plans at regional level. This has strongly constrained the Palestinians planners, and this has led to increased focus on local level planning, that is, for areas A and B – and particularly the area A.

### **Relationships to governorates and municipalities<sup>23</sup>**

There are a very large number of local communities in Palestine.<sup>24</sup> The municipalities are of very different size and types, and the kinds of tasks and responsibilities that can be handled by the individual municipality are, therefore, in practice also very different. This means that there is not a common basis for the local communities to operate in a uniform way when it comes to planning.

It is considered to be very important that planning is organised and carried out at local level. The Master Plans are covering the situation at local level, and these plans should therefore be made with strong participation and involvement of the people in the municipality and the Local Council. That is, a bottom-up approach should be applied when making the plans at local level.

A statement made by a person who worked in the PPIB project for several years, and who is now working as a planner in a municipality can illustrate the importance of carrying out planning work at local level: “The experiences gained through my PPIB work has been maximized at local level, because it all relates to the work I am now doing at municipal level. That is, at the municipal level, we both have to do the planning as well as the implementation of the plan”.

Many of the municipalities and local level administrations in Palestine have matured a great deal during recent years. However, the municipalities are, in general, very small, and it is relatively clear that the individual municipality will have difficulties producing plans on their own. Many of the municipalities often do not have sufficient financial basis for carrying out the plans.<sup>25</sup> The

---

<sup>23</sup> In Palestine, one can talk about the following administrative levels: 1. State/nation; 2 Regions (West Bank and Gaza); 3. Governorates; 4. municipalities; (and 5. communities).

<sup>24</sup> Altogether there are about 666 local communities in Palestine.

<sup>25</sup> This is linked to the fact that there is not established a good or adequate system for generating or obtaining income at local/municipal level in Palestine.

municipalities thus need to cooperate when making local plans, and MOP and MOLG are assisting the municipalities in producing Master Plans.<sup>26</sup>

MOLG has established close linkages to the governorates and municipalities, and has Directorate offices and representatives in all governorates.<sup>27</sup> Previously, the work of these offices was focusing mainly on the issuing of permits. Now MOLG is trying to organise the work so that these units can play a larger role in the planning, and MOLG has invested more resources and is giving particular emphasis to the activities in three of these directorate offices: Nablus, Hebron and Ramallah.<sup>28</sup> By having planners distributed geographically in this way, MOLG tries to strengthen the physical planning in these governorates. They want the three directorate offices to function as a kind of model areas.

The District Governor has the authority to coordinate the work of all the public institutions operating in his/her governorate, and District Level Committees have been established for this purpose, and they have been given the authority to approve the local physical plans.

#### 2.4.2 Cooperation between MOP and MOLG – an example

At the operational level, the planners in MOP and MOLG during the last 4-5 years have been cooperating quite fruitfully in producing several plans.

In 2002 MOP and MOLG started cooperating in carrying out the following planning activities:

1. Development of the Metropolitan Plan for Ramallah, Al-Bireh and Beituniya (RBB).

---

This is also related to the weak financial situation of the Palestinian state. That is, the state is also in strong need of the revenue it manages to generate.

<sup>26</sup> When MOP and MOLG is assisting a municipality in formulating a Master Plan, the municipality has to host the planning team, and provide input and data. The mayor and the city engineers are always very important persons and contributors to the making of these plans.

<sup>27</sup> There are 11 governorates in the West Bank.

<sup>28</sup> There are at least two engineers in each of these Directorate offices.

2. Development of 22 Master Plans for municipalities in the West Bank and Gaza (six of these Master plans are in Gaza).<sup>29</sup> Many of these plans are now being implemented.
3. Development of a new archive system to be used by MOLG, as well as by the other institutions involved<sup>30</sup>.
4. Work to update the Planning and Building Act (PBA).

The organisation and financial aspects of this particular cooperation between MOLG and MOP have been very fruitful and good both at the top as well as at the operational level. The cooperation has been flexible and sound, and the MOLG-MOP team has thus managed to carry out the work in a very efficient manner.

A steering committee was overlooking the work, and it was trying to ensure that there was a good coordination of the staff and the resources utilised by both ministries. This activity constituted a good start for a cooperation that is continuing and used as a model also in other planning assignments.<sup>31</sup>

In this project MOP and MOLG managed to establish good cooperation between the three municipalities Ramallah, Al-Bireh and Beituniya (RBB) for the planning of the RBB Metropolitan Plan. In this plan they have utilised the comparative advantages of each of the municipalities. Ramallah is, for instant, relatively good regarding: health; sports; tourism; and water management, while Al Bireh and Beituniya have their strengths in land area and other fields. The local planning administration has been trying to utilise these strengths in the cooperation between the municipalities, at the same time as they want to maintain the individual characteristics of each of the municipalities. This is linked to cultural and historical uniqueness, as well as the identity of the individual municipality. In this way, the planners have been trying

---

<sup>29</sup> Several of these 22 Master Plans have later been formally approved and are binding.

<sup>30</sup> The archiving system developed, has later been adopted by several departments in MOLG, and is also used by the Higher Planning Council.

<sup>31</sup> For instance, MOLG and MOP are also cooperating in providing input to activities supported by UNDP.

---

to establish sustainable solutions and cooperation between the municipalities.

This project was carried out at a time when most other projects in Palestine had to stop due to financial constraints.

There was a lot of on-the-job training and education linked to this project. Special training in planning was conducted for the MOLG and MOP staff, and some of them also went on training abroad. This was in particular training in metropolitan planning, GIS, etc. The Norwegian consultants and advisors were central in carrying out and providing input to these training and planning courses.

Two of the main universities in Palestine had members in the project's steering committee, and a lot of students could utilise the work linked to the formulation of these plans in their studies.

The MOLG-MOP cooperation to produce the Metropolitan plan for RBB was very successful in a number of ways, and it functioned as a kind of Model Project. MOLG wants to utilise the approach and methods, as well as the experiences from the Metropolitan Plan for RBB in similar planning work that they are intending to carry out in Jerusalem and Bethlehem.<sup>32</sup>

The MOLG and MOP staff that have been involved in the cooperation between the two ministries look upon the cooperation as very positive, and the involved persons hope that they can continue this cooperation and work together as a team also in the future. MOLG has produced a nice pamphlet that describes the approach, the various aspects, objectives and results of the planning cooperation between MOLG and MOP. MOLG is arguing very strongly for this kind of dissemination of information of the planning activities. This dissemination was not, however, included as a part of the budget for this particular project, so the MOLG staff carried out this work on their own initiative, and with relatively low costs for the ministry. More of the plans could have been presented in this way.

---

<sup>32</sup> There have been several challenges linked to the strong turnover of the staff in the three RBB municipalities. Much of the change of staff has come after the elections, when the newly elected politicians bring along their own people. In this way, the *local ownership* and knowledge of the prepared plan among the local bureaucrats is not as good and strong as it was with the ones who had been part of the team that produced the plan.

MOLG has also established close cooperation with the private sector in making local plans, and is encouraging and trying to get more involvement of the private sector in the development and formulation of the Master Plans. This is particularly the case for planning linked to environmental and transportation issues.

### **The use of GIS in MOLG**

MOLG has purchased three ArkView licenses – one to be utilized in Gaza and two in the West Bank. The one in Gaza is being used, but in the West Bank they have not managed to make full use of this tool. MOLG did not have sufficient funds to obtain the necessary training to use this tool. MOLG is therefore cooperating with MOP, regarding the utilisation of GIS expertise and technology for map-making, etc.

#### **2.4.3 Physical planning in Gaza and the West Bank**

When the PPIB project was first initiated in Gaza, the staff did not have access to any planning data. All plans had previously been made by the Israelis, who had all the maps and information. The PPIB people thus needed all kinds of data and information in order to be able to make maps and carry out the physical planning.

Some of the PPIB staff in Gaza has been involved in local planning and urban planning since the initiation of the project in 1995. They have learned a lot about professional, high-quality planning from the very intensive and long term cooperation with the Norwegian partners, and the PPIB staff in Gaza has produced a large number of plans: The Regional plan for Gaza; local and structural plans, etc. PPIB made the plan for Gaza port, as well as for housing, and they have also made plans for other areas. The staff was also involved in the work to make the Structural Plan for Gaza city. Very many of these plans have been used, and are still being used today. The political situation in Gaza has resulted in the regional plan being frozen. However, the data and information in the plan is being widely used by the municipalities and by different ministries and agencies.

PPIB has been more successful in making local level plans in Gaza than in the West Bank. This is linked to the situation in Gaza, where more of the planning has been confined to the local area, and the collection of detailed data and information, map-making,

---

etc. linked to this. When making these plans The PPIB staff in Gaza has applied a bottom-up approach, and the content of the plans has always been discussed with the local people.

In a similar way as in the PPIB/MOP headquarters in Ramallah, the GIS section was established as a central part of the PPIB project in Gaza, and the staff received comprehensive training in GIS. The GIS units have been very operational and important for the development of physical planning in the West Bank and Gaza. These units have been providing a lot of input and support to many other Palestinian ministries and agencies. The GIS units and personnel have also provided GIS training to a number of persons in other institutions in the West Bank and Gaza. Many of the other institutions have thus gained the ability to use and utilise GIS themselves.

The biggest challenge in Gaza is the implementation of the plans. This is linked to the political instability and difficult situation in the area, but it is also related to the financial constraints. The city of Gaza also has problems in executing the plans, partly due to the limitations linked to land. This is particularly a problem in connection with the development of housing.

In general, there has been relatively good cooperation on planning issues between the different ministries in Gaza. However, also in Gaza there have been some conflicts between MOP and other ministries, especially with the Ministry of Housing, which has its own standards and requirements regarding the plans it is producing – even when these requirements are in conflict with the Regional and structural Plan. A committee has been set up to try to resolve these issues.

## 3 Discussion – Lessons learned

The PPIB project was initiated at the same time as PNA was established, and it was supposed to develop capacity building and institution building in the field of physical planning. At that time, in 1995, everything had to start from scratch, and a large number of issues and topics needed to be dealt with. One had to cover: regional planning; land-use planning; the questions of sensitive areas, transport planning, demographic development, water and energy supply, etc. In the beginning the PPIB team had to address all these issues, including how to formally manage, monitor and archive/file and document the various project activities. Very many studies and sub-projects were started at the same time, and a large number of persons became involved in the PPIB work. One simultaneously had to have a bottom-up, as well as a top-down approach. This was named “The Bifocal Approach” by the team managers and staff.

Some persons have been arguing that: “Almost all the plans that have been made in the PPIB project, were practically made during the first 4-5 years (1995-99) of the project. After this, much of the work has been to update these or to make more peripheral plans.” However, when we look upon all the plans and work that has been carried out after 2000 (see for instance paragraph 2.3.2 and Appendix 1), we see that this is not true.

### 3.1 The institution building

The institution Building and capacity development contained a lot of different activities and elements and was carried out over a 12-years period, as needs arose, and in a step by step process. The institution building took place in different units and entities; and at different levels. However, the main institution building

achievements of the PPIB project can be summarised as having been:

1. The establishing of the MOP planning unit and its infrastructure.<sup>33</sup>
2. Development of human resources – the training.
3. The GIS expertise and competency; the database, the information, etc.
4. The organisational set up and structure, the cooperating relationships, team work, etc.

The establishing of the planning institutions and capacity was a great and important achievement. For the first time in more than 40 years it became possible to carry out physical planning in Palestine, for and by Palestinians. Even though many of the plans have not yet been formally approved, they have been of great relevance and importance, and have been widely used and utilised by a large number of ministries and institutions. This has been the case with plans such as: NDCP, Jordan Valley Development Plan, the Regional plans for Gaza and West Bank; plans for landfill sites, etc. The PPIB GIS units in Gaza and Ramallah have developed a very high level GIS expertise and proficiency. These units have been making a lot of maps for the general development of Gaza and the West Bank.

To illustrate the scope of the PPIB work, we quote a statement made by one of the interviewed PPIB staff members: “In 1999/2000 we went to Egypt and presented for Egyptian planners what we had managed to do during the first five years of PPIB work. The Egyptian Planning Authorities were very impressed, and said that PPIB had managed to do more planning in five years, than they had done in a hundred years in Egypt.”

---

<sup>33</sup> In the Ministry of Planning two Directorates were established: i) The Geographic Center and Technical Support Unit (The GIS department and section); and ii) The Spatial Planning Unit.



## 3.2 Responsibility for local and regional planning

The talks regarding establishing PNA were initiated in 1994, and at that time there was almost a complete vacuum in terms of government administrative framework and structures. The mandates of the various ministries and government institutions were not clear, and for the ones who were involved in the planning and development in Palestine, there was a need “to find and make the way, as we went along”. The mandates of the different ministries have later been clarified and specified, but there are still some overlap and competition, and some responsibilities that need to be more clearly specified and defined. Very much was – and still is – depending upon the person in charge at the top, the minister.

A large number of institutions have been involved in the planning work and planning cooperation of the PPIB project, and there has also been a strong variety of different *types of actors*:

- Ministry of Planning, MOLG, and other ministries
- Local authorities
- Universities,
- The private sector. One has been focusing very much on how to engage and involve the private sector in the planning.

It is a very positive achievement that planning has become integrated and mainstreamed into the work and activities of the various ministries. However, there has been considerable competition between MOP and the other ministries (such as the Ministry of Local Government) about who should have the responsibility for the different aspects of the planning. This has been a challenge throughout the PPIB project.

The PPIB project was initially intended to develop physical planning at national, regional and local level. During the last few years, one has managed to identify which ministry should have the responsibility for planning at local and regional level. MOLG has been assigned the responsibility for making and handling plans at local and regional level, while these plans are supposed to be implemented by the local authorities.

---

In this set-up, it has been difficult to find ways of how the PPIB project could relate to the carrying out of physical planning at regional and local level.

In 2004 the two ministries reached an agreement to share the responsibility for regional planning, and during recent years there have been several projects where the two ministries have cooperated in producing plans.

There are, however, still difficulties and challenges linked to the individual ministry's mandates regarding the planning. This is, perhaps, particularly the case in the housing sector and regarding housing needs. There have been some discussions between MOP and the Ministry of Housing regarding these issues.

There is thus still a need to differentiate more clearly between the different tasks and functions that need to be solved at different levels. It is necessary to specify the responsibilities for certain tasks and issue, such as:

- National level
  - Policies
  - Legal framework and structure
  - Defining social, economic, environmental standards, etc.
  - National requirements for plans and planning
- Regional
  - Regions: West Bank and Gaza
  - The Governorate level
- Local Municipal planning
  - Responding to the needs of individual households and persons
  - Implementation of plans

The regional plans that have been made by PPIB contain a lot of information regarding the local conditions and situations, and MOP has also developed and provided guidelines and directions regarding local level planning. However, some planners at local level are arguing that the guidelines that MOP has developed are, in some respects, too broad to function good and satisfactorily for

the formulation of the Master Plans. One of the challenges, is that more details are needed for the formulation of the plans at local level. The ambition of MOP has been to start work to make more detailed plans. So far, however, they have not had the funds or capacity to do this.

During the last few years, work has been carried out in which closer linkages and cooperation have been established between the local, regional and national level planning. The planning work that has been done in Ramallah, Al Bireh and Beituniya, as well as in Jenin are examples of how this can be done.

There is a need to clarify the roles, functions, responsibilities, etc. of the different ministries and actors, both in terms of long term issues, as well as short term issues. To apply the *principle of subsidiarity*,<sup>34</sup> is widely considered and acknowledged to be a good practice and approach, when addressing the issue of how to allocate different tasks and responsibilities to different administrative levels. This principle and approach could, to a larger extent, be looked upon and considered in Palestine.

### 3.2.1 The Planning and Building Act (PBA)

The present legal framework differs between Gaza and the West Bank. In Gaza the legal framework for planning is based on laws from the English Mandate Period as well as from Egyptian legislation from the period after 1948. In the West Bank, planning is based on the same legislation from the English Mandate Period, but also on Jordanian laws from 1948 until 1967. During the Israeli occupation, in the period from 1967, the planning was based on Israeli military orders.

The legal framework regarding the responsibilities for the various aspects of planning in Palestine needs to be clarified and strengthened. This is part of what should be sorted out through the revision of the Planning and Building Act (PBA). One of the big challenges linked to the finalisation of the PBA, is that no conclusive decision or agreement has been made regarding the

---

<sup>34</sup> The idea that a central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level. (Oxford English Dictionary).

mandates and responsibilities of MOP and MOLG, and it was only after 2004 that the two ministries really started to cooperate in a good manner with each other.

The Draft PBA has been revised several times, and there are currently some discussions between the relevant ministries regarding setting up a new committee to go through and make recommendations regarding the PBA.

### 3.2.2 The Higher Planning Council

Plans that relate to national policies and strategies have to be adopted and approved by the Cabinet.

The Higher Planning Council has been assigned the responsibility for approving physical plans at regional and local level. The HPC shall monitor and coordinate the planning carried out at decentralised level.<sup>35</sup> The procedure is that MOLG presents local plans to the HPC.

The HPC has representatives from all relevant ministries, and can stop plans when they find this to be necessary. However, the unresolved legal framework (lack of PBA), has made the work of the HPC difficult, and there are currently discussions regarding the position and role of HPC. Some are arguing for making the HPC more independent. The finalisation of the PBA could help to sort out and clarify some of these issues.

### 3.2.3 Practical challenges linked to planning at regional and national level

At the outset of the PPIB project, the idea, objective and the intention was to focus on, and work with, almost all relevant aspects of planning: national, regional, local – across sectors and topics. Gradually, the work became more focused on regional and national planning, and one continuously had to adapt and accommodate to the geo-political situation and framework.

---

<sup>35</sup> That is, HPC focuses on the planning for areas A and B. At the moment, the Israel control area C.

The infrastructure planning becomes very difficult when you cannot relate to, and work with, the whole geographical area that is of relevance for, and covers/influence the various sectors of planning. In Palestine, this has been the case throughout the period of the PPIB project. This is also illustrated to the extreme in Palestine, by the division of the geographical area into areas A, B and C, and where the Israelis control area C (the national) area, and which makes it practically impossible for the Palestinians to make plans at this level.

### 3.3 The political situation and the different stages of the PPIB project

There is a close relationship between the contextual framework for formulating a plan; the political situation, and the priorities given at political level; the organisational structure, ownership and capacity; and the possibility of implementing the plan. So far, the implementation of the plans that have been produced as part of the PPIB/MOP project has not been efficient enough.

The geo-political framework and situation has influenced the PPIB project to be quite different during different periods and stages. In the first years after 1995, the work was closely related to the establishing of the new Palestinian State. This was the main and fundamental framework of the PPIB work from 1995 to 1999. The project also played a central role in the negotiations with Israel. A lot of essential input, data, maps etc. was produced and constituted crucial background information to the negotiations. In many respects, 1995-99 can be considered to have been the “golden period” of the PPIB project.

#### **Planning focus after 2000**

After the negotiations collapsed, and after the Intifada in 2000, the situation became much more unstable and unpredictable, and it has been more difficult to implement the original plans. One of the main concerns and priorities of the project after 2000 has been to carry out work linked to *emergency plans* and development plans.

During the period 2000-2003 there was somewhat limited interest in national and regional level planning, and the focus was more on emergency planning.

In the period *2003-2005*, the planners could once again start to focus on regional planning, and especially regional development plans, – but not so much on physical and spatial planning. During this period the Regional Plan for Gaza was approved. However, due to the political turmoil and situation in Gaza, it has not yet been possible to implement this plan.

During *2005-2006* the situation was in many ways characterised by stalemate: there were lack of funds, wages were not paid to staff, and there were a lot of frustration among the staff in the ministries.<sup>36</sup>

In *2006-2007* the main focus was on economic development and poverty alleviation. Physical planning and spatial planning lost some of its influence and position.

### 3.4 The Training

The PPIB project can be considered to have been an institution building project that to a considerable degree raised the expertise and competence of Palestinian planners. The PPIB project established a good understanding and awareness of concrete and professional planning; provided high level and very professional on-the-job training, as well as academic training.

A relatively large number of the PPIB staff received education abroad – in Norway, UK, Holland, France and elsewhere, and very many of them have later been attached to various planning institutions in Palestine. They are carrying out work as physical planners, engineers, financial planners, educators, etc. The increased knowledge, expertise and capacity that was generated by the PPIB project, significantly contributed to and strengthened the Palestinian professionalism and expertise in the field of planning.

A lot of very good and efficient models and methods were introduced and used to formulate, structure and organise the planning work. This also included the training and awareness-

---

<sup>36</sup> During this period several of the ministries experienced a considerable turnover of staff. At one stage, the employees in the ministries had to go for 6-months without getting their salaries, and the staff entered into strike because of this.

ancing on issues such as environment and natural resource management, and integrating wider aspects of planning into the data-collection and analysis.

The former and present PPIB staff share the opinion that the capacity building that was generated through the project was of very high quality and value. Both in terms of the training and education that was provided within the project, as well as the top-level equipment and facilities that the staff got access to and could use.

Initially the PPIB project had a relatively strong focus on training of personnel for the central, national planning authorities. This was linked to the fact that there was a very strong need to develop this kind of national level planning, and also that there had not been established any local level planning activity or tradition in Palestine – the Israelis had not allowed this to be developed. As a consequence of this, the municipalities and local level institutions were not included in the initial years of the physical planning training.<sup>37</sup> The training could perhaps, also at this initial stage, have focused more on the needs of the regional and local level authorities. However, this was, of course, also a question of resources available as well as capacity.

The MOLG and MOP staff are praising the cooperation they have had with the Norwegian experts and consultants. All the interviewed persons say that, the project has been very successful in terms of managing to introduce high level expertise and models for concrete operational physical planning.

The Norwegian consultancy team was composed of experts with very high academic, professional and administrative experience and expertise in developing and preparing concrete physical plans. The Norwegian advisors have all been top level qualified, both in terms of management and academic and practical experiences. They have been hard working, and have been very efficient in the work they have carried out, at the same time as they have been easy going and friendly in their relationships and cooperation with the Palestinians. All the persons that have been interviewed in

---

<sup>37</sup> This is somewhat paradoxical; taken the strong position of physical planning at municipal level in Norway.

Palestine appear to have the same kind of experience, and are of the same opinion.

“We will need cooperation with our colleagues from Norway also in the future, regarding formulation of particular plans, detailed plans, methods, etc.”

This wish of more cooperation with the colleagues and friends from Norway is a wish that is shared by all the interviewed persons who have been a part of the PPIB project.

### 3.5 The transfer from project staff to government payroll

A relatively large number of persons have been attached to and working in the PPIB project. At one stage 70-80 persons were working in the project. A crucial challenge has been how to keep the skills that had been developed as part of the project in the planning authorities.

It is a very widespread opinion among the former PPIB staff, that it is very important that people who have more than 12 years experience and training in professional planning can be utilised and used in future national planning. A large number of the persons who received their formal education and training through the PPIB project and activities has left MOP. MOP has not been able to employ them all, that is, to pay them a competitive salary. This is, of course, regrettable.

The transfer of the PPIB staff into the government structure and payroll was a very slow process, and it took a long time. It was only after 2003 that this issue was really taken seriously at the top level, and that the transfer and integration of the PPIB staff into the government payroll could be carried out. The ministry had not at an early stage been discussing and considering this issue in an adequate manner. There were also several financial constraints linked to this.

At the start of the project, one did not put enough emphasis on the question of how to transform the PPIB from a project to becoming an integral part of the Ministry of Planning. The PPIB and MOP did not have a policy or plan for how to keep in the



ministry the staff that had been trained and got their skills as part of the project. “This issue should perhaps have been taken more seriously at political level in 1997-98. Then we would not have had this problem later”.

The slow transfer process is also linked to the stagnation one experienced in Palestine after 2000, and again after 2005, the incursion of the Israelis, and the effects this has had on people’s lives. At one stage, many government employees in Palestine did not receive their salary for several months. After a while, a number of persons lost the confidence regarding the chances of getting a job in the ministry, and, partly as a result of this, many ended up working in other institutions in Palestine.

### 3.6 The integration of environmental considerations in the planning

To a large extent, the planning carried out as part of the PPIB project has focused on the direct and urgent development needs. But the project has also managed to look upon and incorporate central environmental challenges and problems, and have applied methods and procedures for dealing with this in the planning.

In some areas, the integration of environmental questions and issues has been more successful than in others. This is particularly the case regarding the focus on landscaping and cultural heritage. Here various methods for classifying, weighting, and assessing different environmental aspects have been introduced and used.

The Palestinian authorities have also discussed what role Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) can, and should, have relative to the planning.

Many of the interviewed persons argue that Palestine has “an excellent environmental law”. However, at the same time they say that “we do not have the instruments to implement or enforce it.” A central challenge has been – and still is – to convince the politicians about the importance and value of the natural resources and the environment.

### 3.7 Sustainability

All through the implementation of the PPIB project a major concern has been how to make the activities, the institutional arrangements and the generated expertise sustainable. That is, transforming the PPIB from a project into functioning as a generic institution for planning within the Palestinian authorities, and organically linked to the structure of MOP/PNA. The basic assumption has been that the PPIB activities should be phased over to PNA as part of the completing of the project.

The PPIB project established a very strong forward drive and momentum for the development of planning in Palestine. Much of this momentum is still present. All the PPIB persons obtained a very professional, high-level expertise and training, and they became very competent and qualified planners. Even though, many of the ones who received their training in physical planning are not working in MOP any longer, most of the persons who have been attached to the PPIB project are still working as planners or educators in Palestine, and they have very good relations and connections with the people in MOP.

#### **Long-term institution building vs. production of quick & concrete results – the expectation of the donor**

Institution building is usually long-term in nature. It requires time, patience and resources to establish new institutions with clear mandates, authority, and with competent staff and expertise and capacity to prepare plans, carry out decisions and to implement the activities according to the plans. In this sense, the initial three-year period intended for the PPIB project was over-optimistic. It was way too short, relative to the challenges faced in Palestine in terms of establishing and making operational institutions for physical planning. The initial 3-year project period was therefore extended several times: First by the so-called extension phase, then by the “bridging period, and thirdly by the consolidation phase, which, by and large, lasted until March 2008, when the PPIB was finalised as a project.

However, according to the PPIB project managers and staff, some of the representatives of the Norwegian donor<sup>38</sup> were several times

---

<sup>38</sup> At that time Norad.

raising questions regarding: “What are the concrete results of the project; where are the plans you have been making?” The donor representatives were in a way looking upon the project, much in terms of being a traditional consultancy job, where the consultant was expected to produce some concrete results (in this case: concrete physical plans), rather than looking upon the consultant’s role primarily as *advisors*, that were supposed to provide input to the Palestinian authorities in building up their new institutions and authority for physical planning. In this way, the donor representatives also under-emphasised the very crucial principle regarding the *ownership* of the plans, which implies that it is crucial that the concrete plans are made by the ones who are going to implement them. Experience has demonstrated that this is a very fundamental principle that one ought to stick to – if one is going to have plans that can be implemented successfully and which are sustainable.

In many respects, the representatives of the donor expressed opinions and acted in a way that, to a certain extent, also demonstrated a contradiction in terms:

- On the one side, the donor emphasised the importance of – and gave priority to – the *recipient’s responsibility* (that is, that the recipient of the donor funds should also be responsible for how the funds are spent, as well as the results of the spending).
- At the same time, the donor expected the consultants to be responsible for coming up with the necessary plans on behalf of the new planning institutions that one was striving to develop.

This indicates that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between: Institution building that should be carried out as a long term process, involving capacity building, training, cooperation, dialogue, etc., on the one side, vs. more short term consultancy work aimed at producing concrete plans and results, on the other. The leaders of the PPIB project were well aware of this and argued that the main goals of the project only could be expected to be fulfilled in the long term. Even though this was clearly and explicitly stated and communicated a number of times by the project managers, this was not always well understood, or

accepted, by the representatives of the donor. This demonstrates that it is often necessary to repeat and explicitly discuss and explain the objectives, constraints and challenges of this kind of long term projects.

## 4 Conclusions

### **Institution building**

The PPIB project was initially meant as an institution building project, which had two main objectives:

- To carry out institution building that could establish professional physical planning in Palestine
- To produce plans that would be of relevance and value for the development of Palestine

To achieve these objectives, the PPIB project focused on three major areas: i) establishing a sound professional framework for planning, by creating maps, databases etc. for physical planning; ii) organising the PPIB's planning efforts and activities, and enhancing its integration into the existing institutional structures; and iii) securing financial and technical support for these activities. That is, the aim was to establish and institutionalise appropriate and sustainable physical planning processes, structures, and procedures, through setting up modern and high quality planning models and produce concrete and relevant physical planning outputs.

The total costs being more than US\$ 17 million, the PPIB has been a relatively large project of this kind in Palestine. The results and output have also been very comprehensive and impressive in a number of ways:

- A high number of concrete plans, studies and reports have been produced (see Appendix 1), and these have been of great relevance and importance for the development of Palestine.

- A large number of persons have obtained very professional, high-level training and education in physical planning and related topics – both as informal on-the-job training, and as formal education and university studies. Very many of these persons have been able to utilise the expertise and experience gained through the PPIB project in the work they later have been engaged in, whether this work is still within the MOP, or in other ministries or institutions.

The project also played a central role in providing background information and data, maps, etc. in the negotiations between Palestine and Israel.

The establishing of the technical support unit in MOP, and the work that this unit has carried out must be considered to have been very successful, even though some institutional constraints and challenges meant that the results and impacts perhaps never came to its full potential.

### **Training**

The PPIB project has provided twelve years of training and capacity building in the field of planning. This was carried out as intensive on-the-job training, internal seminars and courses in Palestine and internationally. Many of the staff became linked up in formal education – taking master's degrees or PhDs in Palestine, in Norway or elsewhere internationally. The project thus generated increased knowledge, expertise and capacity in the field of planning, and this has significantly raised the Palestinian professionalism and expertise in the field.

PPIB was a well-organised and very successful project in terms of training of professional personnel.

The project managed to establish top-level expertise, competence and capacity in physical planning among a large number of Palestinians, and these persons are now working in various institutions in Palestine. They have become high level experts with several years of experience from carrying out concrete plans, and today they are involved in work as physical planners, engineers, financial planners, educators, etc.

The establishing of a very professional staff of planners with high skills in carrying out and making plans – as well as a strong awareness about the role and importance of physical planning, policy making and decision making, has been a major achievement of the PPIB.

During the whole project period the relationship between the Norwegians and the Palestinians was very positive, human and good. In all respects, the project is, by all the ones who participated in it, considered to have been very successful – PPIB has served its purpose well.

### **Some challenges**

There has been a number of challenges linked to the institutional framework and development. Central in this respect, has been that it has taken long time to define, and agree upon the organizational division of responsibilities for planning at different levels in Palestine. There has thus been some clear overlap in the planning responsibilities assigned to the different ministries and agencies, and one of the big challenges in terms of institutional building, has been to find a good way and good procedures for the cooperation between the different ministries.

Many of the persons who are involved in planning in other ministries deal with topics and issues that are closely related to the work MOP has been, and is, carrying out. It is therefore necessary to clarify the mandate of the individual ministry, as well as the relationships between the different ministries and departments: the linkages to other institutions; the regulatory framework; legal acts, guidelines; etc. To a certain extent, some of this has been sorted out by 2008. However, there is still a need to clarify which ministry and (administrative) level that should be responsible for various parts and aspects of physical planning in Palestine. And in connection with this, there is a need to finalise the Planning and Building Act (PBA).

There have also been a number of challenges linked to the career opportunities of the personnel that were employed and trained in the PPIB. A large number of persons received very professional training and expertise through the project. However, many of these individuals later had to seek employment in other institutions. These challenges were especially felt after 2000. One

can ask whether sufficient emphasis was initially put on the question of transforming PPIB from a project to becoming an integral part of the Ministry of Planning. The plans regarding the long term employment of staff should have been more clearly discussed from the outset of the project. This is a problem that has also been experienced by many other projects and institutions around the world which have focused on institution building and which have contributed to raise and strengthen the qualifications of their staff.



## References

- Endresen, L, Schou, A. Stadig, P. (2000): “Review of Norwegian Support to the Palestinian Civil Society and the Rule of Law”, Fafo Report 345, 2000. Oslo.
- Forss, K. et.al. (1997): Development through Institutions? A Study of Private Companies and Private Consulting Firms in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance. Andante.
- Kleven, T. and Schou, A., Safi, A., Shalbak, H.A. (1998): “The Physical Planning and Institution Building Project (in the Palestinian Authority). Project Review of the Extension Phase”. Norad. Oslo.
- Kleven, T. and Schou, A. (1999): “The Physical Planning and Institution Building Project (in the Palestinian Authority). Appraisal of the Consolidation Phase”. Norad. Oslo.
- Schou, A. (2003): Comment to the Norwegian Physical Planning and Institution Building Project in The Palestinian Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation), Paper for NORAD. Oslo.

---

# Appendix 1

## Major PPIB Plans and Publications

### **National Planning**

1. National Policies for Physical Development, 1998.
2. The Basis for Spatial Distribution of Projects, 1999
3. Framework for Palestinian Strategic Development Plan, 1999.

### **Population**

4. Population Estimates and Projections, November 1996
5. Population in Palestine - A Historical Survey, January 1997
6. Forecast and Distribution of Population in Palestine, January 1997
7. Palestinian Labor Force and Employment, July 1997

### **Regional Planning**

8. Coastal Zone Plan - Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates, December 1996
9. Agricultural Land Use - Regional Plans for Gaza Governorates, December 1996
10. Regional Plan for West Bank Governorates: Existing Situation and Problem Identification, January 1997
11. Regional Structural Plan for Water and Sewage - Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates, January 1997
12. Urban Development Study - Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates, January 1997

13. Rural Areas in the West Bank Governorates, Current Situation and Future Development Potential, March 1997
14. Urban Development in the West Bank Governorates, Existing Situation, May 1997
15. Preliminary Regional Transportation Plan - Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates, March 1997
16. Preliminary Regional Transportation Plan (Annexes) - Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates, March 1997
17. Gaza Regional Plan, 1997
18. West Bank Regional Plan, 1998
19. Guidelines and Regulations for the Regional Plan for Gaza Governorates, 1999.
20. Fact Book about Gaza Governorates, 1999

#### **Natural Resources and Environment**

21. Emergency Natural Resources Protection Plan for Gaza Governorates, Sept. 1995
22. Emergency Action Plan for Solid Waste at the Gaza Strip, October 1995
23. Emergency Natural Resources Protection Plan for the West Bank, September 1996
24. Landscape Assessment of the West Bank Governorates, October 1996
25. Landscape Assessment of Gaza Governorates, October 1996
26. Sensitive Water Resources Recharge Areas in the West Bank Governorates, November 1996
27. Ecologically Significant Areas in the West Bank Governorates, December 1996
28. Valuable Agricultural Land in the West Bank Governorates, December 1996
29. Landscape Assessment - Regional Plans for Gaza and West Bank Governorates, January 1997
30. Endangered Cultural Heritage Sites in the West Bank Governorates, February 1999
31. Jerusalem Archeological Sites, 1999.

## **Water & Wastewater**

32. Regional Structural Plan for Water and Sewage in Gaza Governorates, January 1997.
33. Existing Situation in the West Bank Governorates (Water & Wastewater), July 1997
34. Regional Plan for the West Bank Governorates (Master Plan for Water & Wastewater), Vol. I, II, III. 1998
35. Environmental Impact Assessment for Gaza Central Waste Water Treatment Plant
36. Palestinian National Policy for Sanitation Improvement
37. The Study on Sewage Development Plan in the Area of Khan Younis

## **Traffic and Transportation**

38. Transportation / Land Use Study for the West Bank, Introduction, Vol 1, October 1996
39. Transportation / Land Use Study for the West Bank, Set-up for Analysis: Roadway Network and Traffic Zones, Vol 2, October 1996
40. Transportation / Land Use Study for the West Bank, Traffic Survey and Data Collection, Vol 3, October 1996
41. Transportation / Land Use Study for the West Bank, Travel Demand Estimation, Vol 4, October 1996
42. Preliminary Regional Transportation Plan for Gaza Governorates, March 1997.
43. Development Needs of the Infrastructure in Palestine

## **Housing**

44. Housing Development Strategy, April 1995
45. The National report for the Second Conference of the United Nations on Development of Human Settlements, the Second Al-Mawa'el, Istanbul, 3-14 of June 1996 (in Arabic)
46. Physical Housing Needs - West Bank (1997-2010), March 1997

## **Industry**

47. Preliminary Study of Border Industrial Zones, April 1996
48. Trade and Commerce - Sector Report - Regional Plans for Gaza Governorates, December 1996

49. Industry in the West Bank, The Manufacturing Sector- Current Situation, April 1997
50. Industry in the West Bank, part II, December 1997
51. Reservation of Land for Future Regional Industrial Areas in the Gaza Region
52. Status Report on Gaza Industrial Estates

### **Tourism**

53. Preliminary Study on Tourism Services in the West Bank Governorates, 1997
54. Preliminary Physical Planning for the Dead Sea Area, 1998

### **Legal Studies**

55. Legislation Pertaining to Planning and Construction in Palestine, December 1995
56. Compilation of Planning and Building Laws and Regulations in the West Bank and The Gaza Governorates, December 1995

### **Local Planning**

57. Jericho Physical Guideline Plan, April 1996
58. Urban Structure of Gaza City, May 1996
59. Ramallah/Al-Bireh Physical Guideline Plan, October 1996
60. Ramallah/Al-Bireh Proposed Land Use Plan, October 1996
61. Structural Plan for Gaza City, Parts One Two and Three, January 1997 (in Arabic)

### **Geographic Information**

62. Data Needs in Palestinian Planning, February 1996
63. Planning Atlas for Gaza, 1997
64. Geographic Information System (GIS) for the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, West Bank Governorates, ***Selected Thematic Maps***, April 1998

### **Selected Plans and documents produced after 2000**

- Palestinian Development Plan (PDP) (2002).
- Updating the border of Israeli colonies using Spot images of 2000 (2002).

- Monitoring colonies expansion, new bypass roads, and new outposts.
- Emergency plans.
- Internal revision of NPPD document (2003).
- Cross-border land-use analysis in the vicinity of the Armistice line. In cooperation with the Land Research Center (2003).
- Finalization of a GIS shape file of land-use for the 10 km buffer area along the Green Line (2003).
- Plan for the integration of evacuated colonies in Gaza Strip and Northern West Bank (2004).
- Update of Base map of Gaza and regional plan for Gaza (2004).
- Update of Jerusalem built-up areas and road system integrated into the GIS database system, and Vision for Jerusalem – Short and medium term strategy for development in East Jerusalem as input to the MTDP (2004).
- Documentation of the Armistice Line between Israel and West Bank/Gaza – including list of definitions of fields chosen, and territorial analysis of the defined areas (2004).
- Identification of main push-pull forces affecting immigration into WBG – Assessment of the absorptive capacity of West Bank and Gaza (2004).
- Assessment of the existing situation in various types of refugee camps (2004).
- Monitoring, digitizing and mapping of colonization activities in West Bank and Gaza (2004).
- Identification of impacts of the Separation Wall: economic, social, infrastructure (2004).
- Water Maps for the water file in the negotiations. The maps cover water resources in the Occupied Palestinian Territories including basins, aquifers, wells and springs for the area of West Bank, Gaza and Israel. (2004).
- Development of the Spatial Development Framework for the MTDP - in order to link the Regional Plans for West

Bank and Gaza Governorates and the National Policies for Physical Planning to other planning processes (2004).

- Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) 2005-2007. (2005)
- Strategic Development Plan (2005).
- Gap Analysis for MTDP (2005).
- Physical Plan for the Metropolitan Ramallah-al-Bireh-Beitunia area (2005).
- Master plans for selected villages and towns in the West Bank & Gaza (2006).
- Policy framework document for the absorption of Palestinian returnees in WBG (2005).
- Regional Plan for Gaza Strip (2007).

---

## Appendix 2

### Persons with completed Master's degree as part of the PPIB project

#### **West Bank**

Bashar Juma'a

Sana Birawi

Fadwa Azem

Salem Thawaba

Lama Shameyeh

Faten Jaooni

Taghreed Hitnawi

Amad Saleh

Lana Rabadi

Jean Hudal

Ashad Hamida

Nibal Abu Lawi

Nancy Jaber\*

Adla Khalaf\*

Zeina Awwad\*



**Gaza**

Tayseer Mushtaha

Nabeel Ayyad

Sami Kaadan

Said Abu Jalaleh

Ismail Abu Shehadeh

Zaher Abu Baker

\*) These persons also received support from French sources to complete their Master's degree.

## Appendix 3

### Persons interviewed

Name	Institution	Period with the project	Comments
Bashar Juma'a	MOP	1996-2007	
Bader Abu Zahra	MOP		
Sana Birawi	MOP	1995-2007	
Fadwa Azem	MOP	1995-2007	
Amneh Al Atrash	MOP	1995-2007	
Taghreed Hitnawi	MOP	1999-2007	
Nabeel Ayad	MOP, Gaza. Head, GIS section	1995-2007	Telephone meeting
Ohood Enayeh	MOLG		
Tawfiq Al Budeiri	MOLG		
Dr. Ahmad Hamad	Bir Zeit University		
Dr. Kamal Abdulfatah	Bir Zeit University		
Dr. Salem Thawaba	Bir Zeit University		
Musa Jwayed	Al Bireh Municipality		
Dr. Sameer Abu Eisheh	Al Najah University	1995-1999 +	Telephone meeting
Dr. Khalid Al Sahli	Al Najah University	2004-2007	Telephone meeting
Khalil Nijim	MOP until 2007. Now consultant in Abu Dhabi	1995-2007	Telephone meeting

## Appendix 4

### Documents examined

	<b>Document</b>
	The original Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Palestinian Authority, regarding financial and technical assistance to institution building in the field of physical planning. Signed 31 October 1994, as well as the subsequent amendments concerning the Extended Period (Amendment I); the Bridging Period (Amendment II); and the Extended Bridging Period (Amendment III).
	Work Plan for Phase II, dated 30 October 1995
	Project Document for Extension Period 01.01.-31.12.98. Dated December 1997.
	Project Document for the Bridging Period July 1 – December 31, 1999. Dated July 1999.
	Revised Activity Plan for an Extended Bridging Period 01.01. – 31.12.2000. Dated June 2000.
Reviews:	
	Project review covering the first (pilot) phase of the project. Report dated 28 November 1995.
	Mid-term review. Report dated 29 September 1997.
	Final project review. Report dated December 1998.
Project progress reports:	
	Final Progress Report – For The Physical Planning and Institution Building Project (PIIB): For the period 1 January 1995 – 30 April 2001. PNA/MOPIC. October 2001. (FPR1)
	First Annual Progress Report: Phase Two: The Consolidation Phase (PIIB-CP): For the period 1 May 2001 – 30 September 2002. PNA/MOPIC. October 2002. (FAPR1)
	Status Report: Phase Two: The Consolidation Phase (PIIB-CP): For the period 1 September – 31 December 2003. PNA/MOP April 2004. (SR 2004)
	Annual Progress Report – For the period 1 January – 31 December 2004. PNA/MOP. April 2005. (APR 05)

## Appendix 5

### Norwegian and International Advisors involved in PPIB

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Long-Term Advisors:	
August Røsnes	Regional Planning, Institution Building, Training
Bjørn Tronstad	Regional Planning, Transport Planning
Frank Haugan	Mapping, GIS, Training
Haldor Fosse	Regional Planning, Institution Building
Knut Felberg	Regional Planning, Environmental Planning
Lasse Bjerved	Urban and Regional Planning
Marco Zanussi	Regional Planning
Morten Lie	Regional Planning, Institution Building
Olav Hauge	Team Leader
Øystein Grønning	Urban Planning, Training
Petter Daae Slipher	Regional Planning
Rolf Jensen	Team Leader
Trond Ottersland	Mapping, GIS, Training
Ulf Tellefsen	Urban and Regional Planning, Team Leader, home-based Project Coordinator
Yngve Frøyen	Regional Planning, Transport Planning, GIS
Short-Term Advisors:	
Alf Haukeland	Landscape Planning
Christine Hjortland	Legal Advisor

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Dag Tvilde	Urban Planning, home-based Project Coordinator
Erik Ravdal	Infrastructure Planning
Esben Rude	Housing
Hans Neumann	Planner
Jan Martin Ståvi	Regional Planning, Environmental Planning
Jannike Hovland	Urban Planning, Training
Jostein Sageie	GIS
Kjell Lønne	Regional Planning, Transport Planning
Lars Nastaas	Economist
Leiv Landro	Institutional Building
Lisbeth Lovstad	Institutional Building
Martin Kelly	Landscape Planning
Paul Parks	Economist
Per Arild Garnåsjordet	National Planning
Petter Paus	Urban Planning, Training
Roald Huseth	Mapping, GIS
Steinar Tamfoss	Statistics, Data
Terje Kleven	Institutional Building
Terje Lind	Institutional Building
Thor Krogh	Planner