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Executive Summary

Civil society organizations occupy a unique position within Palestinian society. Developing in the early years of the twentieth century, the trajectory of Palestinian civil society organizations has mirrored the evolution of Palestine. After the First World War and the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, a vibrant civil society emerged in Palestine consisting of religious groups, clubs, labor unions, and women’s societies. But with the creation of the State of Israel and the displacement of over 750,000 Palestinians, social networks became strained and began to break down. While civil society organizations continued to function post 1948, a large number of Palestinians began focusing their energy on political and resistance movements. When these movements turned violent in the late 1960’s a space opened allowing civil society organizations to once again take root. The years following Israel’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, led to the expansion of Palestinian organizations and the rise of the Palestinian Liberation Organizations (PLO). As Palestinians began to mobilize, civil society organizations became affiliated with political parties and essentially served as “satellites” to these groups. This persisted through the First Intifada up to the signing of the Oslo Accords. After the agreement was signed in 1993, the PLO began absorbing many civil society organizations to serves as ministries in the newly developed Palestinian National Authority (PNA). This move left room for new service-providing organizations to form that weren’t affiliated with any political party. In the 20 years since Oslo, Palestinian civil society organizations have flourished.

At present there are approximately 2,245 civil society organizations operating in the West Bank; a ratio of one CSO for every three square kilometers. The profusion of CSOs, combined with a high level of international funding, has created a complex environment in which social relations are conducted, at times preventing the optimal utilization of social capital. As a result, the social capital that was so instrumental in establishing Palestinian networks and meeting community needs in the early twentieth century is increasingly vulnerable, and over the past sixty plus years social relationships have come under increasing pressure. The domestic context and political situation has been further compounded by an influx of and growing dependency on foreign aid – factors that play a determining role in program goals and management style. The interplay between international donors, CSOs and local communities creates a situation that must be carefully navigated by Palestinian CSOs in order to ensure worthy collaboration and to avoid project duplication.
The political situation in Palestine since the end of the First World War has greatly affected civil society and social relationships thus leading to a decline in social capital. The ARIJ research team posits that in order for CSOs to enhance their social capital they must focus on strengthening their relationships with five key stakeholders; their communities, other CSOs, the government, the private sector, and the media.

In order to gain insight into the current relationships between CSOs and these stakeholders, a 100 question survey was administered to 20 organizations working throughout the West Bank. The survey asked the organizations questions regarding codes of conduct, cooperation between CSOs, the efficiency of Palestinian NGO networks, partnering with the private sector, whether or not organization have influenced government policies, and how the organizations utilizes the media. As a result of the quantitative and qualitative data, it became apparent that the primary steps that CSOs can take in order to enhance their social capital are focused around legitimacy and accountability.

Based on the results of the surveys and the historical background of Palestinian civil society, a comprehensive set of guidelines have been developed in order to assist CSOs in strengthening their relationships with the five identified stakeholders. The recommendations are broken down highlighting best and useful practices for each stakeholder. A checklist has also been provided which can aid CSOs in assessing their organizational structure as well as how they engage with the identified stakeholders.

The outcome of this study shows that due to strained social relations, harnessing the power of social capital has been challenging. Establishing clearly defined mechanisms, concentrated around accountability, will provide CSOs with the opportunity to strengthen their credibility throughout their constituency base which will enhance their legitimacy. When CSOs are seen as legitimate, civil society will be more willing to engage
and participate. Strong relationships with other CSOs, the private sector, and the media will support CSOs’ legitimacy thus leading to stronger relationship with the government and the community. It is impossible for CSOs to create lasting social change if they are not valued and respected by their stakeholders. By taking active steps to improve their relations with the five identified stakeholders, CSOs will strengthen social capital which will once again lay the foundation for a strong and vibrant civil society.
1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

There are almost approximately 2,245 civil society organizations (CSOs) currently working in the West Bank, many of which specialize particularly in democracy, good governance and human rights. (Ministry of Interior, 2012) Like specialized civil society organizations all over the world, these organizations have always played a catalytic role in the process of democratization. After all, the purpose of their work is to empower and encourage individuals and groups to participate in decision-making processes. This role renders CSOs critical to democratization, as does their role in promoting government transparency and accountability towards its own citizens.

Palestinian CSOs have occupied an integral position within Palestinian civil society since the Oslo accords. Due to the relatively high number of CSOs in operation there exists one Palestinian CSO for every three square kilometers, on average. Nevertheless, upon assessing the role of Palestinian civil society in democratization and good governance, we find that CSOs are caught within a difficult situation which hampers their work, despite significant numbers and funding. A number of factors have affected the role of Palestinian CSOs in advancing democratization. Perhaps the most trenchant factor is the imposition of the Israeli occupation which is centrifugal to a Palestinian economy which is subordinate to the Israeli one and the policies of the Israeli military.

There are numerous factors within the CSO operative framework which hinder the full potential of CSOs’ contribution towards democracy and good governance. These stem from the donor environment which is circumscribed by various supranational organizations and their desired goals. Meeting the demands of these institutions and their directives means that CSOs and the PNA are striving to attain funds within the same framework. This results in an undue amount of CSO personal power and resources being directed towards fund raising, inhibiting the full potential of social capital development and the strengthening social ties
1.2 Defining Social Capital and its Importance

In the broadest sense of the term, social capital is generally understood to refer to the internal unity of persons in a community. Scholars propose a diverse array of empirical indicators of this phenomenon which includes such terminology as structures of cooperation, civic engagement, political equality, trust and tolerance amongst others. Measures of social capital include the frequency of social contact, reciprocity, voluntarism and optimism. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s defines social capital as “the norms and social relations embedded in the social structure of society that enables people to coordinate action in order to achieve a desired goal.” For the case of this study this definition will be our standard.

The effects of social capital have important consequences for political processes and institutions such as democratic transitions and NGO functionality. When CSOs utilize social capital in a productive and transparent way democratization strategies are more likely to operate in a fluid manner. This is because enforced cooperation based on mutual trust and norms of reciprocity leads to the unequivocal flourishing of other kinds of capital, most notably human and economic.

1.3 Research Hypothesis and Questions

With several uncontrollable and controllable factors complicating the effective usage of social capital in Palestine, it was important to narrow the scope of this study. Due to the variable and unpredictable nature of the political factors involved, controllable, non-political factors within Palestinian civil society were found to be more appropriate targets for development. Specifically, Palestinian civil society’s network of social relations appeared to be the area with the most room for self-reflection and self-improvement.

With this in mind, the ARIJ research team uses the OECD definition of social capital as a lens through which to look at social capital in the West Bank, ignoring any factors that were irrelevant to social relations. The study looks at how exactly social relations have and do affect social capital mobilization in the Palestinian context—a question yet unanswered by previous studies and research.

Thus, taking a relational point of view, we hypothesized the following:

\[H_1. \text{Strained social relations obstruct Palestinians civil society organizations from utilizing social capital}\]
H2. Stronger relationships between CSO’s, the community, the private sector, the government, and the media will help enhance social capital

H3. Palestinian civil society organizations can take active steps to improve relations and, as a result, social capital.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of the study is to ensure that Palestinian CSOs recognize the importance of social capital and further capitalize on it in Palestinian democratization and governance processes. In addition to a theoretical analysis of social capital and the need for Palestinian CSO to harness it, this study also includes a practical component. It is the goal of ARIJ to move beyond the pages of this study and assist CSOs in implementing practices and procedures that will enhance their social capital, thus leading to a more effective civil society which will have a greater impact and influence in advancing Palestinian democratization and governance processes. This will be achieved through the dissemination of the recommendations and guidelines which will be developed throughout the course of the study and will be presented in the conclusion.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Social capital in Palestinian society has the potential, if used right, to advance the democratization and governance processes that lead to institutional state building, civic participation and cooperation, and social and economic development—all of which are important pillars of an independent state.

Previous studies, however, have measured and catalogued the relative strength or weakness of social capital in Palestine without using the data to develop tools that harness that potential. This project addresses this oversight in past research studies, using a participatory approach to develop and pilot guidelines for Palestinian CSOs.

Moreover, unlike previous studies, this study recognizes the unique position of Palestinian CSOs as catalysts for change. Instead of studying social capital within Palestinian society at large, this study focuses on the social capital practices and problems of Palestinian CSOs. Overhauling the practices of specific CSOs could lead to specific, outside effects, altering (and improving) the current approach to the national project of democratization.
1.6 Social Capital: Conceptual Overview

This study shall focus on relations and networking in the Palestinian society that produce real change in the democratization and good governance process. Given that civil society organizations play a major role in this process, this study shall measure social capital by measuring the relations of civil society with different sectors of the society. These relations include the relation with the community, government, media, and private sector in addition to networking with other civil society organizations CSOs.

Accordingly, achieving desired goals in the fields of governance and democracy depends on all the different networks of trust between all these sectors. In other words, the stronger the cooperation and coalition between all sectors of the community, the richer the social capital of that community as the following chart illustrates:
2. Methodology

Using a three part method the study reviewed Palestinian CSOs use of social capital by conducting a literature review, administering a survey, and performing a data analysis. The ultimate aim of the study was to create a report that provides CSOs with practical guidelines of social capital best practices in the Palestinian democratization and governance processes.

Initially, a literature review was conducted which covered the history of civil society organizations in Palestine throughout the 20th and 21st centuries. It then went on to evaluate the use of social capital within Palestinian CSOs. This had set the stage for the second phase in the research.

Next, 20 Palestinian CSOs that specialize in the field of democracy and governance were selected to complete (Annex 2) a 100 question survey (Annex 3). The surveys focused on CSOs relationships with five key stakeholders - the community, other CSOs, the private sector, the government, and the media. Surveys were administered by ARIJ associates through interviews. Organizations were chosen according to the following criteria:

1. CSOs from different locations of the West Bank
2. Active in the field of democracy
3. Active in the field of governance
4. Active for more than 5 years
5. Working to empower women to participate in governance
6. Working to empower youth to participate in governance

Once the surveys had been collected the results were analyzed and categorized into quantitative and qualitative data. The results were then compared against the information collected in the literature review. Based on this information gathered in the literature review, the surveys, and
the data analysis, guidelines and recommendations were developed to help enhance Palestinian CSOs use of social capital, in addition to a special check list which was introduced as an assessment checklist (Annex1).
3. Palestinian Civil Society Organizations

Over the course of the twentieth century, the changing political terrain in Palestine has required that civil organizations adapt to new leaders, regulations, and institutions—political and non-political alike. Consequently, the emergence and evolution of Palestinian civil organizations tend to mirror the evolution of Palestine, starting with the British Mandate for Palestine. Muhammad Muslih, political science professor and Middle East specialist at Long Island University, states that the history of Palestinian civil and social organizations, like the history of Palestine at large, can be divided into four eras: 1) British colonial rule from 1917 to 1948, 2) after the creation of Israel from 1948 to 1967, 3) after the Six-Day War, from 1967 to the 1993, and 4) from the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993 to the present. The following analysis of these four eras will help explain how Palestinian civil society organizations (CSOs) have evolved into their present form: small, disparate organizations that largely compete with each other for project-based funding from international donors.

3.1 Historical Background

The first era, per Muslih and historian Denis Sullivan, generated a robust civil society that was largely dominated by welfare organizations. (Muslih, 1993; Sullivan, 1996) Indeed, in British-controlled Palestine, “a wide array of civil associations existed, including religious groups, clubs, labor unions, women's societies, charitable organizations, town cafes, and village guest houses.” (Muslih, 1993) The diversity in civil associations marked a departure from the previous era, preceding World War I, when most Palestinian associations “were religious and denominational in nature.” (Payes, 2005) This shift can be attributed to the war, which had altered the needs of Palestinian civil and social life, as Ellen L. Fleischmann notes in her study of the Palestinian women’s movement. According to Fleischmann, “charitable women’s associations—established, funded, and run by women—had existed as early as 1910 and had filled important socioeconomic functions, particularly with the devastation and collapse following World War I.” (Fleischmann, 2000) As civil and social organizations grew in the post-war period, so did Palestine’s first pseudo-political organizations. Largely in response to the Balfour Declaration of 1917, in which Britain supported the creation of a Jewish state, associations like the Arab Executive Committee and Supreme Muslim Council were formed. These types of associational groups would lay the foundations for the political movements of the second half of the century.
If World War I and its aftermath brought the “first manifestation of organized political consciousness,” then the creation of Israel brought a deeper political urgency to Palestine in 1948. (Payes, 2005) That year, the Arab-Israeli War, triggered by the occupation of Palestine, forced over 750,000 Palestinians to flee the new state leaving less than 200,000 Arab Palestinians in Israel proper. This mass displacement disrupted the social, political, and geographical networks of the Palestinian communities in the region, ultimately “dealing a serious blow to the prospects of independent economic development” (Payes, 2005) as well as social development. In the disarray caused by the war, Palestinian communities established new civil organizations that “benefited from the legacy of the earlier period,” but which, scholars agree, were unable to crystallize into an efficient political or social movement or create a strong civil society. (Muslih, 1993) Instead, the Jordan-controlled Palestine of the post-war period produced political agitation that was “unfocused, operated on the grass-roots level, and was often channeled into Arab parties espousing radical national, social, or religious agendas.” (Sayigh, 1997) The ultimate impetus for a more structured and active civil and social life would not come until the Six-Day War in 1967.

Throughout the 1960s, Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza were in the process of “rebuilding [the] ‘sociological space’” that had evaporated with the post-war displacement in 1948. (Sayigh, 1997) This allowed Palestinian society to approach the “‘critical mass’ required to generate its own, overt politics and sustain an autonomous national movement.” (Sayigh, 1997) The movement ultimately turned violent in the 1965-67 period leading up to the Six-Day War. Yezid Sayigh suggests that it was this violent break that “kept open a space, a margin of freedom from Arab government control, within which Palestinian organizations could flourish.” (Sayigh, 1997) After Israel seized control of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, Palestinian organizations definitely grew, if they did not exactly flourish. The 1970s witnessed several developments that helped bolster civil society: the establishment of Palestinian universities and the subsequent creation of a new Palestinian intelligentsia, the proliferation of pro-Palestinian committees and funds created by neighboring Arab countries, and, most importantly, the rise of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), which had been created in 1964. The PLO rapidly became the apparatus through which civil society organizations operated. Rema Hammami argues that “the majority of NGOs had their roots in the PLO’s mass mobilization or national front strategy, which emerged following the 1977 Camp David Accords.” (Hammami, 2000) As a result, CSOs essentially served as “satellites” to the political group, ensuring that “Palestinian society was organized in and around political parties and mass grassroots organizations,” according to Islah Jad. (Jad, 2007) This system persisted through the First Intifada in 1987, which “initially
reaffirmed the original popular and mass nature of these organizations.” (Hammami, 2000)

### 3.2 Effects of the Oslo Accords

When the PLO signed the Oslo Accords in 1993, however, the organization triggered a shift in the structure and purpose of civil society in Palestine. Oslo stipulated the creation of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA), a governing body that would be responsible for the civil and military administration of Area A, as well as, the civil administration of Area B in the West Bank.\(^1\) As the new proto-government of Palestine, the PNA began to absorb several PLO-affiliated civil society organizations to serve as ministries in its government. This absorption of service-providing organizations left ample room for the growth of independent CSOs that were neither linked to any political factions nor necessarily focused on charitable services. The result was the widespread proliferation of smaller, independent CSOs in the decade following the Oslo Accords. According to Islah Jad, the anatomies and objectives of these new organizations were markedly different from the PLO-affiliated organizations of the past. It is worth quoting her at length:

> “The new NGOs that mushroomed in the post-Oslo period distinguish themselves from the older forms that are categorized as either charitable societies or popular mass organizations (*uttor jamaheryya*), which had an entirely different structure, discourse, leaders, projects, and networks (Taraki 1989; Shalabi 2001). The older mass organizations were open-access structures with public agendas, aiming to mobilize the largest number of students, workers, women, and youth into organizations serving each of these sectors. The newer ones, in contrast, are active in cities, run by an urban middle-class elite, and are smaller entities, dependent upon foreign funding.” (Jad, 2007)

As Jad indirectly references, the transformation of Palestinian CSOs was due in part to the massive influx of foreign aid that followed the Oslo Accords—an attempt by western governments to ensure the success of the Accords and, further down the road, to combat the violence and perceived political radicalism of the Second Intifada in the early 2000s. Although a significant portion of the funds were directed toward the newly-formed PNA, the international aid coming through Palestine from non-Arab countries was significantly higher post-Oslo than pre-Oslo. Scholar Benoit Challand notes that CSOs working in the health and advocacy fields

---

\(^1\) Notes on Area A, B, and C.
alone were receiving approximately $100 million a year in donor aid during the Second Intifada. Challand estimates that, all sectors included, Palestinian CSOs were likely receiving between $300 and $500 million per year at the time. (Challand, 2008) Anne Le More states that those numbers are even higher, at an average of just under $1 billion per year between 2001 and 2005. (Le More, 2005). These figures represent a significant increase from the pre-Oslo years, where funding came almost exclusively from regional governments and institutions and amounted to somewhere between $60 and $200 million.

3.3 Current Challenges

Of course, the flood of western aid had some positive effects on the growth of Palestinian civil society. Writing on state-society relations after Oslo, Amaney Jamal argues that, “compared with the rest of the developing world, the West Bank had a large and diverse set of civic associations; it certainly possessed one of the richest associational landscapes in the Arab world.” (Jamal, 2007) Without a doubt, there is some truth to Jamal’s statement. According to the Ministry of Interior’s registry, there are currently 2,245 CSOs operating in the West Bank, almost 20 years since the signing of the Oslo Accords. (Ministry of Interior, 2012) These organizations span the spectrum of associational life, including but not limited to sports clubs, political groups, charitable foundations, research institutes, educational institutions, health clinics, community centers, and industry-related unions. However, as scholars seem to agree, the civil society organizations of the current era tend to suffer from the same problems: dependency on foreign aid, which thereby determine programmatic goals and management style; fragmentation; and, more often than not, duplication of activities.

As Jad and Challand show, the rush of foreign aid into the West Bank both provided for the expansion of the civil society sector and, at the same time, saddled CSOs with new limitations. These limitations did not necessarily prevent the sector from expanding, but did direct and manage that growth, precluding any organic expansion of the sector. International donors could and did dictate the purpose of their funding, distributing aid to short, less controversial projects with measurable results that would be more palatable to their domestic constituencies and/or governments. A review of the literature suggests that the most significant shift triggered by the flood of western aid is what some scholars call the “depoliticization” of Palestinian civil society (Langhor 2004; Youngs 2003; Khalidi and Samour 2011). As Le More noted in 2005, “emergency aid is to relieve human suffering, avoid a total collapse of the economy and sustain the PA,” not to assist in the establishment of a Palestinian state or in the resolution of the conflict with Israel. (Le More, 2005) As a result, Palestinian civil society has become markedly
less politically engaged over the past decade.

The depoliticization of Palestinian civil society directly contributed to an equally complicated problem: fragmentation. As international aid forced CSOs into competition with one another, Palestinian CSOs grew smaller, more specialized, and more focused on service delivery. Ties to any cohesive social or political movement largely faded, replaced by “the spreading of a rather procedural approach to aid which has to be managed more than built in partnership with a variety of local organizations.” (Challand, 2008) CSOs became managers, not organizers. This led to fragmentation and a complicated political climate on top of the Israeli occupation, which was already helping create social, political, and geographical fractures within Palestinian society. Jamil Hilal and Mushtaq Husain Khan argue that the fragmentation has penetrated multiple cross-sections of society:

“The Palestinian intermediate classes were fragmented by geography (the territorial division of the occupied territories into the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem, and beyond that into a large number of ‘cantons’ separated by Israeli controlled territories and gatekeepers).

This fragmentation of civil society led fairly directly to the duplication of services. As organizations became less collaborative and more competitive, they began performing similar activities and providing similar services in an inefficient system that scattered resources instead of concentrating them. This degraded the quality of services and the potency of advocacy work, only leading to the creation of more CSOs to pick up the slack. As civil society struggled to find common ground in the post-Oslo era, the fledgling PNA remained unable to manage the sector as needed. Sullivan argues that “the fact that the occupied territories lacked a functioning state or independent economic system gave Palestinian NGOs a special prominence, resulting in a plethora of organizations and a duplication of services that clearly require better coordination.” (Sullivan, 1996) Without a strong state to organize the civil society sector, the sector slid into an increasingly disorganized and duplicative patchwork of disparate organizations.

3.4 Looking Forward

As we have seen, “Palestinian NGOs have again become major and very important actors in providing vital resources, knowledge, and services to their constituency.” (Challand, 2008) The proliferation of Palestinian CSOs in the West Bank and Gaza indicates the need for service-providing organizations in the absence of a fully functioning state. However, without a complete state apparatus and with the flood of conditional aid, these organizations are struggling to do
their work effectively. Civil society is fragmented by aid, the fragile security situation, and the constantly evolving politics of the region—not least of which is the politics of the PNA itself. As a result, there “is a widespread perception, even among civil society activists themselves, that Palestinian civil society has not been able to fully adjust to the new environment post-Oslo, and that it lacks a unifying identity or sense of purpose.” (Menocal, 2011)
4. Social Capital and Palestinian civil society organizations

A thorough review of the literature points us, again, toward history. Social capital usage in Palestine is perhaps best understood as an intersection of two historical influences: a cultural dependency on kinship ties and the need for strong networks in the face of the Israeli occupation. At present, however, these two influences do not carry equal weight in Palestinian civil society. Although kinship networks have long provided the foundation for network-building, the importance of kinship ties has lessened among civil society organizations. Over the past few decades, civil society networks appear to have grown in concentric circles around three major sources of social capital: religious institutions, universities, and political associations.

4.1 Background

As previously mentioned, the OECD defines social capital as “norms and social relations embedded in the social structures of societies that enable people to co-ordinate action to achieve desired goals.” (Grootaert, 1998) Harnessing social capital to “achieve desired goals” has long been a part of the Palestinian way of life. Palestinians use social capital to form networks that can help them acquire necessary (or desirable) resources and benefits—from basic food and shelter to professional advancement or political support. In a recent study on social capital in Palestine, the Palestine Economic Police Research Institute (MAS) noted that it is “widely understood that Arab culture is collective rather than individual-based.” (MAS, 2009)

4.2 Social Capital Under Occupation

In essence, the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza elevated, intensified, and multiplied the ties formed through previously established kinship and community networks. In response to the upheaval of Palestinian life that resulted from the Israeli takeover of the territories in 1967, there emerged “spontaneous and organized social adjustments originated by the Palestinian community to regenerate itself despite the restriction and handicaps inflicted upon it from the very first day of occupation.” (Hilal and El-Malki, 1997) These “social adjustments” were, according to a study conducted by Jamil Hilal and Majdi El-Malki in 1997, as often informal as they were formal. Hilal and Malki argue that these informal networks constituted an important part of Palestinian society, which were wrought from six challenges of the post-1967 period:

1. “Economic and political conditions.”

2. “Occupational instability.”
3. “The pessimistic outlook.”
4. “Weakness of public government institutions.”
5. “Dependence of local markets on consumer goods imported.”
6. “Dependence of numerous families on outside remittances.”

The “economic and political conditions” were arguably the most important and debilitating influence on Palestinian life, considering how they produced the five challenges that followed—from instability to dependency issues. According to Hilal and Malki, these economic and political conditions “created in the community a feeling of instability and insecurity, which has in turn led both groups and individuals to congregate ‘along’ traditional lines, such as kinship relationships, the neighborhood, the camp and the village.” (Hilal and El-Malki, 1997) In other words, the fragility of the political situation in West Bank and Gaza amplified the perceived value of pooling resources and forming networks that could survive the fluctuations of the region. As Brian Barber writes, “in the case of the Palestinians, historical, economic, and political realities have combined to require high levels of social cohesion for community survival.” (Barber, 2001) As a result, informal networks proliferated throughout Palestine, in turn bolstering the creation and maintenance of formal social networks. These networks were concentrated around three sources of social capital: religious institutions, universities, and political associations.

4.3 The Rise of Civil Society

Based on all that has been mentioned, the urgency of the political situation forced social networks to expand both vertically and horizontally. The production of social capital at these three hubs of activity—religious institutions, universities, and political associations—spurred the growth of civil society after 1967. As social networks formed and intensified under the Israeli occupation, families, students, professors, clerics, and political leaders established organizations with their newfound social capital to combat occupation and provide public services in the absence of a state apparatus. As Avram Bornstein argues, “organizing against the Israeli Occupation had a unifying impact on Palestinian civil society.” (Bornstein, 2009) The proliferation of civil society organizations and their increased interconnectivity was compounded by the outbreak of the First Intifada in 1987, when political parties were essentially banned and the importance, need for, and purpose of CSOs widened. As Benoit Challand notes in his work on Palestinian civil society, “To palliate this interdiction [the ban], political parties organized local associations dealing with topical or professional issues to escape Israeli wrath.” (Challand, 2009)
Civil society organizations were the means by which social capital could be utilized and social networks could operate. Their heightened importance during the Intifada is reflected in the number of organizations that were established in that period. Between 1988 and 1993, civil society organizations were established at a rate of 11.8 per year, compared to 2.5 per year between 1923 and 1987. (Kassis, 2001)

The importance of social capital within civil society organizations did not immediately diminish after the end of the Intifada. CSOs had become so deeply ingrained in the fabric of Palestinian life that Jeff Halper would eventually argue that “the only alternative agency to the Palestinian Authority is segments of international civil society.” (Halper, 2012) As a result, CSOs went from being the means through which groups combated the Israeli occupation to the means through which they either combated or supported the Palestinian National Authority.
5. Main Findings: Quantitative Analysis

5.1 Targeted Civil Society Organizations

As mentioned earlier, through the project, in-depth interviews were conducted with their representatives. As shown in Graph (1), the majority of targeted CSOs work in the fields of democracy and governance, human rights, gender and youth empowerment.

Graph (1): Fields of Intervention for Targeted CSOs
The targeted organizations were distributed around the West Bank as follows:

![Graph (2): Geographical Distribution of Targeted CSOs](image)

This geographical distribution refers to the office location of the targeted CSOs, but it does not mean their activities are limited to these locations. On the contrary, 25% of targeted CSOs target the north, 45% target the middle, while 35% target the south of the West Bank.

### 5.2 CSOs’ Relationship with the Community

The surveyed CSOs work in different locality types. Some 90% of CSOs “always” target rural areas for activity implementation, 70% “always” target urban areas, and 70% “always” target Palestinian refugee camps. This comprehensive targeting is often the product of CSOs’ regional or municipal focus. In other words, when a CSO targets a municipality, it looks to serve all three marginalized populations (refugee, rural, urban) within the municipality. Graph (3) highlights the targeted communities:
From the CSOs’ point of view, their relationship with their local communities—with which they implement their activities—is good. CSOs base their projects on need assessment studies, which are documented and published by 63% of surveyed CSOs. These need assessments are sometimes conducted on an annual basis, or project basis. Some CSOs also use focus group meetings with community citizens and representatives in order to identify needs. Despite these efforts, 84% of them still change some project activities in order to meet the changing needs of targeted communities. The services and activities provided to local communities by CSOs vary according to their capacities. While 79% of them provide local communities with needed information, and 95% conduct trainings, only 42% of them have a resource center to provide needed technical assistance.

In order to achieve their goals, 72% of CSOs always establish community committees in targeted localities, which is a positive tool for better communication with communities. This has not prohibited the emergence of conflicts with local communities, however, which 39% of CSOs have faced.
One of the main findings is that 50% of surveyed CSOs have adopted and implemented a code of conduct. Another 25% adopted a code of conduct, but they admitted that they had not implemented it. Graph (4) breaks down the adoption trends:

5.3 CSOs’ Relationship with other Palestinian Civil Society Organizations

The findings of the survey indicate that there is a relative weakness in the relationships among Palestinian CSOs. Although the majority of CSOs (90%) are members of NGO networks, only 32% are members of the Palestinian NGO Network (P NGO). And whether the networks have facilitated CSO interaction is debatable. Some 42% of CSOs do not think that their membership in the different networks have provided assistance or support for their work. During the conducted interviews, many organizations suggested that network membership lends professional legitimacy to a CSO, but does not provide additional resources. Instead, many networks appear to use the strength of member organizations to apply for projects and funding. Out of the surveyed PNGO members, only 33% are active members of the network, and 83% are general assembly members. All member organizations attend PNGO meetings and actively participate in voting for the decisions proposed either “always” or “sometimes”.
Although all surveyed CSOs (100%) agree that lobbying is highly important for change, only 28% of them view lobbying as a common strategy among organizations in Palestine. Furthermore, 67% of surveyed CSOs feel in competition with other organizations working in the same field, but only 25% of them think that this competition is unhealthy.

The strained relationship among CSOs is not limited to the previously mentioned factors, and has also been affected by donor-funded projects. The following graph shows a comparison of the cooperation between CSOs under/without funded projects. The percentage of CSOs that work together (always/sometimes) increases from 70% under donor-funded projects, to 85% without donor funded projects.

![Graph (5): Cooperation between CSOs under/without donor funded projects](image)

Most surveyed organizations (58%) think that they are highly informed about other CSOs’ programs and activities, and their sources of their information include TV and Radio stations (65%), newspapers (100%), websites (90%), personal and professional connections (95%), and social media (65%).
Although 64% of surveyed CSOs did not think that they can achieve their goals and implement their activities without cooperation with CSOs, it was found that 36% of them think that they can “always” or “sometimes” achieve their goals without cooperation. The survey also shows that 50% of CSOs think that working with other organizations can sometimes be a constraint.

**5.4 CSOs’ Relationship with the Private Sector**

The relationship between Palestinian CSOs and the private sector was described as the weakest relationship according to surveyed CSOs. The survey indicates that information exchange and partnership have the most significant interaction between both, but are only practiced by less than 50% of surveyed CSOs.

![Graph 6: Relationship between CSOs and Private Sector](image)

More than half of the surveyed CSOs (55%) never target the private sector in their capacity building activities, while 30% of them “always” or “sometimes” benefit from capacity development programs offered by private firms.

**5.5 CSOs’ Relationship with the Government**

The relationship between civil society organizations and the Palestinian government is not entirely clear-cut. Although 75% of surveyed organizations believe there are “direct lines of communication” between the two sectors and 95% think networking with the government is “always” important for facilitating procedures, few organizations appear to have strong relationships with the government. The majority of organizations (55%) do not believe their organizations to be influential at either the legislative or strategic level of government, despite the
fact that 70% have implemented projects with the government and 65% have been involved in the creation or alteration of a public law.

Half (50%) of surveyed CSOs have received assistance from the government. All assisted CSOs received financial assistance, while an additional 40% also received assistance in the form of programmatic support, and only 10% received research assistance. The quality of these forms of assistance varied.

These statistics suggest that while civil society and the government are constantly in conversation and consultation with one another, their relationship is neither beneficial nor harmful for either party. Only 10% of organizations feel that the government has “hindered” their projects, although 40% believe the government has “interfered” with their projects at least “sometimes” or “always.” One organization argued that the government had attempted to shut the organization down, due to the outcome of their General Assembly elections. This was the sole account of specifically hostile relations with the government; most organizations had benign working experiences, often with the Ministry of Women’s Affairs, the Ministry of Youth and Sports, or the Ministry of Agriculture.
5.6 CSOs’ Relationship with Media

Relations between the civil society sector and the Palestinian media appear to be stronger and more robust than relations with other sectors. All surveyed organizations (100%) reported having regular contact with newspaper, radio, and internet outlets. Almost all had regular contact with television stations (90%) and social media sites (80%). According to the large majority of organizations, this regular contact has resulted in benefits for the organizations. Some 75% believe they receive positive media coverage and 95% believe that the media raises awareness about their causes. By way of example, one organization that fought community resistance to mixed-gender activities contends that a series of radio interviews led to greater acceptance of the activities. Moreover, almost all organizations (95%) reported that they had been approached by some sector of civil society thanks to media coverage, often by other organizations hoping to pursue joint projects, the government, or more media outlets. The relationship between CSOs and the media is not perfect, however. Almost half (45%) of surveyed organizations believe that the media does not portray the role of CSOs, overall, in a positive light.

A few organizations claimed that the media was pursuing its own “agenda,” often picking and choosing to cover certain activities or events but not others. One organization argued that the media will publish information about CSOs, but do not examine “societal ills.”
6. Main Findings: Qualitative Analysis

During the study, some additional questions came to the surface as to what might be preventing the building of quality social capital amongst civil society organizations. Based on the qualitative data retrieved from the surveys and workshop, a further analysis of the situation is detailed below.

6.1 CSOs and the Community

Understanding community perception is essential when attempting to resolve the strained relationships between CSOs and the constituencies. If the community perceives CSOs as catering to the needs of their foreign donors they are going to be less inclined to support and participate in their activities. Trust is essential for building strong relationships between CSOs and the community, without community support CSOs will be ineffective.

Based on the qualitative data, CSOs are under the impression that they have strong relationships with their constituents. Not to say this is not accurate, but, generally speaking, there is often a disconnect between perception and reality. This goes both ways. CSOs might believe that they have strong relationships with their communities and that their work is addressing the needs of the people, when in reality CSOs are imposing projects on communities that do not address their needs but rather fit within a framework presented by international donors, thus leading to a negative image. While, at the same time, CSOs might, in fact, be deploying projects that do meet the needs of the community, but because the local citizens have become distrusting of projects funded by international donors they are unwilling to engage with the CSO. With this being said, in order for CSOs to see how they can build and strengthen social capital, it is necessary for them to be cognizant of community perception. Once CSOs are aware of community perception, they can evaluate effective ways to respond and develop more efficient way to include and educate their communities.

Establishing credibility is a key factor in building social capital within communities. In order for CSOs to be viewed as credible, the community needs to know that they can trust CSOs. The best way to create trust is to establish accountability systems. Credibility grows when CSOs commit
to the adoption of accountability mechanisms. Abiding by the policies laid out in codes of conduct can also assist in establishing trust. Additionally, when CSOs involve the community in the accountability process, beneficiaries will feel they have a greater stake in the projects. This will result in greater community participation.

### 6.2 CSOs and Palestinian Civil Society Organizations

The data also indicated that there is a lack of trust between CSOs and Palestinian NGO networks. Although, CSOs believe in the need for collaboration between organizations, there are not appropriate mechanisms in place to promote healthy cooperation and prevent duplication. It has also become apparent that networks themselves are not functioning efficiently. Instead of serving as a bridge between CSOs, the networks have become project implementing bodies. This has resulted in CSOs and networks applying for the same grants in order to deploy similar projects. According to Merriam-Webster, networking “is the exchange of information or services among individuals, groups, or institutions; specifically: the cultivation of productive relationships for employment or business.” It is important to note that, based on the surveys some of the existing networks in Palestine are failing to foster productive relationships between organizations. Instead, they have created environments of unhealthy competition.

Additionally, networks are falling short on holding their member organizations accountable. As a stipulation for joining Palestinian NGO networks, CSOs are required to sign a code of conduct. The challenge is that these networks don’t have sufficient means to ensure that members abide by the policies. AMAN’s 2011 Annual Corruption Report reveals that codes of conduct are not being implemented by NGOs; that monitoring of the implementation of codes of conduct is weak, and that few organizations have procedures in place to prevent conflict of interest.

Another issue that has come to our attention is that Palestinians networks are using member’s reputations to gain access to international funding. In many cases, this is putting the networks in direct competition with their members. Although, the Palestinian NGO conflict of interest policy does not address this particular scenario, its behavior appears to violate the role of networks, which as previously mentioned, are to promote the cultivation of productive relationships between organizations. Networks competing with their members does, in fact, contradict the purpose of a network. Moreover, this behavior is more likely to strain relationships between networks and their members, which results in distrust and inefficient networking.
6.3 CSOs and the Government

Based on the research, relationships between the government and CSOs appear to be good. Organizations have indicated that they have participated in the development of strategic plans while others have conducted trainings which have enhanced government officials’ skills in public relations, technology, and communication. Therefore, in order to strengthen relationships with the government it would benefit CSOs to be more persistent when including government officials in their activities. CSOs should be constantly inviting government officials to community meetings and activities. Even if they don’t attend, at least they are informed. Persistence will show the government that CSOs are determined to make a difference and that they could benefit significantly from the involvement of the government.

6.4 CSOs and the Private Sector

In 2011, The NGO Development Center (NDC, 2011) conducted a study which focused specifically on the potential for cooperation and partnership development between NGO’s and the public sector. This study indicates that there are some serious stumbling blocks that are hindering effective cooperation. It also highlights the private sector's perception of NGOs as well as pros and cons in cooperation between the two.

Some of the difficulties uncovered in NDC’s report are that private sector companies do not have a positive perception of Palestinian NGOs. They feel that because a substantial amount of the funding for NGOs is coming from international donors, international agencies are using the NGOs as tools to achieve their own agendas. (NDC, 2011) It expresses that there needs to be an improvement in financial and administrative transparency in order for the private sector to feel more comfortable working with NGOs. The report also claims that the private sector needs to deepen their understanding of the importance of Cooperate Social Responsibly (CSR).

The general consensus from the companies that took part in the study is that partnerships between the private sector and NGOs are favorable. Unfortunately, due to the influence of international donors there is a lack of trust between the two sectors. Strengthening relationships and establishing cooperation will lead to more multi-stakeholder collaboration which will also assist in holding NGOs accountable.
6.5 CSOs and the Media

Research shows that relationships between CSOs and the media is the strongest out of the 5 target groups. Although CSOs believe that the media doesn’t portray the role of CSOs in a positive light. This could be the result of the community distrust of CSOs and the relationships with their international donors. Seeing as the media is made up of members of the community, it would only make sense that personal perceptions would affect the way in which the media portrays CSOs. Therefore, in order for the media to view CSOs in a different light, CSOs must assess their activities and their organizational structures, and establish more effective means of accountability.

It would also benefit CSOs to take a more active role in providing information to the media outlets that highlights their activities. Acknowledging that some media outlets print exactly what is given to them, CSOs must make an effort to provide information to the media that accurately describes the problems that CSOs are tackling and their desired results. Also, when CSOs begin activities it would benefit them to extend invitations to the media. This way the media will be involved with the CSOs’ projects from the onset. Building relationships with the media and keeping the media up to date will help strengthen relationships.
7. Special recommendations: Legitimacy, Accountability, and Social Capital

Trust is the most valuable tool for CSOs to have in their toolbox. Without it CSOs might as well cease functioning. Trust is not something that develops overnight; CSOs must be dedicated to embedding systems within their organizations that prove to their communities that they are trustworthy. In order to do this, CSOs “must answer questions about their legitimacy and accountability.” (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, 38)

7.1 Accountability and Legitimacy

Before Palestine CSOs can begin to promote governmental accountability and transparency, they must prove to their communities that they are up to the task. As civil society organizations start to become “as much a part of today’s global governance as governments” (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.4) it is imperative that they direct their attention to strengthening their legitimacy as political and social participants. This can be achieved by enhancing their accountability to key stakeholders in order to guarantee that they are contributing to the public good. (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007) By concentrating on their own legitimacy and accountability, CSOs will be able to clarify their mission, visions, and values; and will be able to gain insight into their effectiveness. When CSOs include their stakeholders in the accountability process, they learn from their beneficiaries, donors, and supporters as to whether or not they are staying true to their mission.

With the role of CSOs shifting from “gap fillers” to capacity builders and advocates, it is becoming even more critical that they value integrity and community perception. “Traditional accountability mechanisms presume that the integrity of organizations is not guaranteed by heaven or protected by good intentions, but are acquired by hard work and respect for good practices.” (Deserving Trust, 2003, p. 2-3) Concentrating on their mission will allow CSOs to build trust within the community and improve their legitimacy throughout the civil society sector, the private sector, and the government. It is impossible for CSOs to create lasting social change if their stakeholders do not value and respect them. In the sections that follow we will provide some useful definitions and techniques that Palestinian CSOs can use to improve their legitimacy and accountability.
7.2 Legitimacy

In order for civil society organizations to be viewed as legitimate it is essential that they become aware of community perceptions. “The concept of legitimacy refers to perceptions by stakeholders that the existence, activities and impacts of CSOs are justifiable and appropriate in terms of central social values and institutions.” (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.7) Legitimacy enables organizations to operate with the consent of the community, the governments, and private sector. CSOs legitimacy derives from stakeholders confidence that CSOs will provide honest and quality services that achieve their intended mission. (Lehr-Lehnardt, 2005) According to Brown and Jagadananda (2007) there are four types of legitimacy that are crucial for CSOs:

1. **Legal Legitimacy:** Legitimacy that develops from compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, such as meeting state registration requirements or following national laws and codes that define appropriate CSO activity.

2. **Normative Legitimacy:** Legitimacy, which is rooted in widely held social values, norms and standards. This form of legitimacy is particularly significant for CSOs since they are often value-based organizations that stress assistance to the public good at the core of their missions.

3. **Pragmatic Legitimacy:** The legitimacy of CSOs may also develop based on the contributory value they provide to their various stakeholders, either directly as in their specific outputs or generally in terms of developing conditions that meet stakeholder interests.

4. **Cognitive Legitimacy:** CSOs are also perceived as legitimate when their activities and goals are widely seen as appropriate, proper, and “making sense” to the larger society.

Although these forms of legitimacy are out of the hands of the CSO, it is beneficial for organizations to recognize that these are most likely the standards that stakeholders use to evaluate their work.
Considering that the previous four forms of legitimacy are uncontrollable by CSOs, Brown and Jagadananda provides four approaches that CSOs can use to enhance their legitimacy. (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.8)

1. **Conform to existing models of legitimate organizations.** CSOs can adopt structures, procedures and systems that make the agency resemble other organizations that are widely perceived as legitimate.

2. **Construct new definitions and standards of legitimacy.** Aligning CSO activities with existing standards can support the very status quo the CSO seeks to change. It may be necessary to challenge existing laws, norms, cognitions, and interests to construct legitimacy consistent with a desired social transformation.

### 7.3 Accountability

In many instances within Palestinians networks, codes of conduct mention the need for CSOs to establish mechanisms that will provide for more accountability but rarely are the mechanisms ever provided. Networks have developed codes of conduct which identify the need for CSOs to establish accountability mechanisms, but they leave it to the individual CSOs to create their own (NDC Code of Conduct). In a study, conducted by the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations at Harvard University, in collaboration with CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation and Center for Youth and Social Development (CYSD) titled *Civil Society Legitimacy and Accountability: Issues and Challenges*, the authors indicate that establishing accountably is something that must be done on a variety of levels - organizational, domain, and societal. For the purpose of this study, we will focus on enhancing organizational accountability.

There are a variety of mechanisms, models, standards, and strategies that can be used to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of Palestinian CSOs. According to Simon Burall and Caroline Neligan (2005), “accountability is not the only way in which individuals and organizations are held responsible for their actions. It also provides a way for organizations to take responsibility for developing policies and procedures, for shaping mission and values, and for assessing performance in relation to goals.” (Accountability of International Organizations, p. 7) Therefore, in order for organizations to take responsibility they must first identify to whom they
are responsible. These individuals or organizations, more commonly known as stakeholders, take many forms and may include donors who provide financial resources and regulators who monitor legal certifications (upward), beneficiaries and clients who receive services (downward), allies, peers, and others who participate in projects and programs (outward), and staff and volunteers (inward). Additionally, the five target areas which have been mentioned throughout this study also qualify as stakeholders. Based on these various relationships different models of accountability can be used. For example, (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.9-10)

1. **Representative Accountability**: Relationships with beneficiaries may be centered on representative accountability when the CSO is serving as the greater voice to the government on behalf of their constituents.

2. **Principle Agent Accountability**: Principle agent accountability is often identified by the relationship between the CSO and donors. In many cases, donors will set standards that they expect CSOs to abide by in order to continue receiving funding.

3. **Mutual Accountability**: Mutual accountability is what binds members through shared goals, values, aspirations, and social identity. Mutual accountability is the relational piece that builds understanding, trust, and respect.

Based on the surveys and questionnaires two areas in Palestinian civil society that need the most attention are in the arenas of representative accountability and mutual accountability. As indicated in the NGO Development Center study on Palestinian Non-Governmental Organizations and the Private Sector (2011), CSOs are seen as the tools of their international donor. Too often, instead of concentrating on being accountable to their beneficiaries and peers, CSOs are focusing too heavily on principle agent accountability. Seeing that different relationships require different forms of accountability, the Global Accountability Project has identified four dimensions which are essential for managing accountability claims. These dimensions are starting points for accountability management strategies with both internal and external stakeholders. (Hammer and Lloyd, 2011)
1. **Transparency Mechanisms:** Transparency mechanisms assist in the free flow of information between organizations and stakeholders in decision making, performance and reporting. These can include auditing and annual reports.

2. **Participation Mechanisms:** Participation mechanisms include key stakeholders in the organization's decision making. This can include regular consultations between stakeholders and the Board of Directors.

3. **Evaluation Mechanisms:** Evaluation mechanisms provide a way for stakeholders and CSOs to assess their activities, outputs, impacts, and outcomes. This enables CSOs’ awareness as to whether or not they are achieving their goals.

4. **Complaints and Redress Mechanisms:** Complaints and redress provide means for CSOs to receive feedback on their performance from people within the community who might not be categorized as direct stakeholders. Complaints and redress differ from evaluations because they provide a way for CSOs to assess their actions on an ongoing basis.
This table illustrates the various models of accountability relationships and their differing requirements for core accountability mechanisms.

Table 1: Accountability Relationships and Management Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Parties</th>
<th>Representative Accountability</th>
<th>Principal/Agent Accountability</th>
<th>Mutual Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders participate in CSOs’ activities and those CSOs act on behalf</td>
<td>Donors select CSOs as agents to act on their behalf</td>
<td>CSOs and their peers engage with each other to achieve shared goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>CSOs report to stakeholders on goals and activities</td>
<td>CSOs report to donors on contracted goals and activities</td>
<td>CSOs and peer groups report to each other on agreed upon goals and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Stakeholders work with CSOs to articulate directives and define priorities</td>
<td>Donors negotiate contracts with CSOs to define goals and incentives</td>
<td>CSOs and their peer groups influence each other to define shared values, goals and agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Stakeholders, press, and oversight agencies assess CSOs’ performance</td>
<td>Donors and CSOs assess how each has lived up to contract</td>
<td>CSOs and peers assess performance defined by formal agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding accountability relationships and the mechanisms that accompany them are necessary for CSOs to work within a framework that enriches their legitimacy within their communities. “Defining the accountability of CSOs and how they are enforced is probably the single most powerful intervention for preserving and enhancing their legitimacy as social actors.” (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.13).

**7.4. Building Accountability Systems**

To avoid situations where CSOs are concentrating more extensively on upward accountability than downward, organizations must develop systems for maintaining accountability. Accountability systems require that organizations (1) provide a description of their performance, often identified as an accountability framework, (2) identify their key stakeholders, (3) provide tools for assessing their performance, (4) develop mechanisms for communicating their assessments internally and externally, and (5) establish means for generating performance consequences. (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.17).

**7.4.1 Accountability Framework**

The Humanitarian Accountability Partnership states that an accountability framework “is a comprehensive communication tool that captures the essential information for the affected communities” (HAP, 2010, p 1), and lets them know who the CSO is and provides them with their vision and mission, what the CSO does and how it goes about achieving its goals (methodology), what the CSO believes in and what matters most to them when making decisions, and the practices that the CSO is committed to in order to meet minimum expectations. When a CSO is developing their mission and vision statements they must be explicit about their intentions (Deserving Trust, 2003), by doing this their beneficiaries will have the ability to monitor the CSO outputs.

**7.4.2 Stakeholders**

Stakeholders are any persons, group, and/or organization that are involved in or affected by the actions of a business or an organization. In the case of Palestinian CSOs, key stakeholders are their targeted community/beneficiaries, donors, board members, support staff, volunteers, allied CSO, other CSOs or NGOs working in the same field, inter-governmental organizations, and government. (Deserving Trust, 2003) When CSOs are building their accountability systems it is necessary to identify, specifically, their stakeholders. Once there is a clear understanding of who has vested interested in the work of the CSO and who will be directly affected, CSOs can then
being to analyze which model of accountability, based on those previously presented, apply to which stakeholders.

**7.4.3 Performance Tools**

Once CSOs have identified which accountability model apply to their various stakeholders, they can begin to determine which mechanisms or performance tools can best be used to preserve their integrity. They must also develop documents which specify how the organization is governed. This provides stakeholders with an outline of who is responsible for making decisions versus who implements projects.

Other ways that CSOs can work to maintain their integrity is through the development of systems of internal accountability. These systems are geared towards making sure that organizations are accountable to their employees. Some examples of how CSOs can enhance their internal accountability is through the development of efficient forms of staff and management communication and by offering trainings to strengthen the skills and knowledge base of their employees and volunteers. CSOs must also establish policies “permitting only reasonable compensation, expenses, and fringe benefits for employees of the organization including its managers.” (Deserving Trust, 2003, p. 106).

External accountability mechanisms can be significantly more extensive than those mechanisms used to monitor internal accountability. These tools can either be established by an outside entity, i.e. the government, a network, or domains, while others are tools that the CSOs themselves adopt and implement. Some examples of the mechanisms that are used by external actors are codes of conduct, domain standards, certifications, and ratings. In the case of codes of conduct, government agencies might require them in order for the organization to be registered as a legal non-profit. (Bendell, 2006)

While some of these tools deal directly with the structure of the organization, others address the CSOs’ practices and procedures. A tool that can be used to enhance the structure of the organization is the implementation of, depending on the size of the organization, a Board of Director, a Board of Trustees, or an Oversight Committee. The size of the CSO will most likely determine the organizational structure. Larger organizations might have a Board of Trustees which is usually made up of individuals who have a financial stake in the activities of the organization. Members of the Board of Trustees might be individuals or private companies who support the mission of the organization and, therefore, have chosen to contribute funds. Large
to medium size organization should have a Board of Directors, which consists of individuals who have a stake in the CSO but are not directly affiliated with the organization. While smaller organizations should have Oversight Committees, which are made up of members or employees of the CSO. The role of boards and committees are generally the same, to serve the organization in an advisory role and to monitor the CSOs activities to ensure that they are staying in line with the objectives set forth in their mission statement. (Deserving Trust, 2003)

Another technique which is useful, both for accountability and transparency, is public reporting. As a means of achieving legitimacy, CSOs should provide reports to their constituencies about their activities. “Reporting an organization's performance is a key step to building accountability.” (Bendell, 2006, p. 59) Management or upper level actors in the organizations should take responsibility for providing their boards, members, stakeholders, and government with annual reports, periodic activity updates, and balance sheets. Keeping stakeholders informed helps CSO stay focused on their mission. Requiring that CSOs provide stakeholders with their annual reports and balance sheets keeps the organization honest, which benefits their overall legitimacy.

CSOs can also establish quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in order to build accountability. Service-providing CSO should “hold themselves accountable by committing themselves to meet explicit quality standards in their performance.” (Deserving Trust, 2003 p. 99) These quality standards are the same standards that have been mentioned previously. Through the use of the boards, oversight committees, and staff, organizations can assess their performance against a predefined set of goals. As a result of these evaluations, CSOs will be able to address issues as they occur and refocus their attention on the original objectives if, in fact, they discover that they have strayed from their intended goals.

Open communication is also an essential mechanism for maintaining accountability both within an organization and out. CSOs must be in constant communication with their employees, as well as their beneficiaries. The only way an organization can know if they are meeting the needs of the community is by being in dialogue with them. It is also crucial that CSOs invite their communities to participate in deciding what projects the CSOs undertake. Any form of development or service based project implementation must grow from the needs of the community. Without the participation of their beneficiaries, there is the risk that CSOs might impose projects on the community that do not meet their specific needs, verses the community identifying their needs and allowing projects to develop organically. Moreover, when CSOs listen
to their communities and structure their activities accordingly, they will build accountability and increase their legitimacy.

7.4.4 Sharing Assessment

Information received from the “performance indicators should be analyzed, interpreted, and communicated to key stakeholders if they are to hold the organization accountable.” (Brown and Jagadananda, 2007, p.22) Once the assessments have been analyzed the results should be disseminated to the stakeholders. The assessments should either be included in the various reporting mechanisms or a new report can be created specifically for this purpose.

In addition to developing opens means of communication between CSOs and their stakeholders, organizations should also establish procedures to receive and evaluate complaints. Boards and oversight committees can appoint an ombudsman to be responsible for investigating complaints. The boards, oversight committees, and leadership can then evaluate the complaints and make adjustments accordingly. Complaint mechanisms can take many forms from a whistleblower hotline for employee complaints to a physical drop box or an email address.
8. Conclusion

History shows that Palestine has the potential to have a vibrant civil society sector with strong social capital, although, the political climate over the past 60 years has strained social relations making it difficult for organizations to utilize social capital. To return to the initial definition of social capital, which is “the norms and social relations embedded in the social structure of society that enable people to coordinate action in order to achieve a desired goal”, it is clear that CSOs have the potential to reemerge as powerful actors in Palestinian society again. Based on the information gained in the interviews and workshops most of the challenges the CSOs face when it comes to strengthening relationships with the five targeted stakeholders are centered around three core issues, accountability, transparency, and legitimacy. By embracing accountability systems CSOs are setting standards that other sectors can follow. Once networks and organizations show their stakeholders that they can be trusted, social capital will build.

Furthermore, because the concept of social capital is still new within the Palestinian context, CSOs can take the lead to educate their stakeholders of its benefits. These organizations can initiate a change in the culture of civil engagement. Civil society must learn that it is acceptable and expected for them to be critical of the behavior of organizations who claim to be working on their behalf. CSOs also must learn to listen to the cries of their beneficiaries and be open to constructive criticism. The disjunction between self-perception and public perception need to be understood and given more attention. CSOs and their communities must develop ways to work together effectively. By allowing development to happen organically, the community becomes responsible for their own advancement. Ultimately, when society feels that their needs are being met they are going to be more trusting of CSOs. This will lead to greater participation in future activities, thus strengthening Palestinian civil society as a whole.
9. General Recommendations

Provided is a list of recommendation that CSOs can use to better engage the community, network with each other more efficiently, and participate more with the government, the private sector and the media.

9.1 CSOs and the Community

- Perform needs assessments at regular intervals, in order to ensure that your projects change as community needs change. Being responsive to community developments will help ensure a strong relationship with the community.

- Periodically hold open houses where members of the community can learn about the CSOs. This provides the opportunity for community members to offer feedback about ongoing projects and suggestions for new ones.

- Hold community meetings to learn about the needs of the community. Incorporate active listening as to not arrive at the meeting with preconceived notions about what the community needs/wants

- Use participatory methods, like workshops, to generate project ideas and ensure you are addressing community concerns.

- Acquire skills in active listening, “Active listening is a structured form of listening and responding that focuses the attention on the speaker.”(International Online Training Program On Intractable Conflict, University of Colorado) This will help members of the community feel more comfortable in expressing their needs and desires. By learning how to actively listen organizations are showing members of the community that they are indeed working in their best interests instead of self-interest or the interests of donors.

- Use appropriate selection criteria when targeting communities for needs assessments, surveys, focus groups, or projects. This will help avoid conflicts with the community.

- Establish small, reachable goals that, once reached, demonstrate your ability to deliver on promises, thereby gaining the community’s trust.
Hold quarterly stakeholders meetings where everyone who has stake in the organization has the ability to discuss the organization’s performance. These meetings exist so that the stakeholders are the ones responsible for holding the CSOs accountable.

Conduct mid-term evaluations in order to ensure that the community’s needs are being met.

Publish contact information in easily accessible venues, in order to ensure that community members can ask questions and voice concerns.

Publish information on all activities and programs online and in easily accessible venues, in order to gain the community’s trust. Include timetables for project implementation, explanations of project goals, expected outcomes, and instructions on where beneficiaries can file complaints or ask questions.

Disclose financial information regularly, at least once per year. Financial reports should include funding sources, budgets, expenditures, and liabilities.

Familiarize yourself with leaders, prominent groups, and marginalized individuals or families of targeted communities prior to project implementation. This will ease relations with the community.

Hold public meetings at the beginning and end of a project to inform the community about the goals and benefits of the project and answer their questions.

Establish fair and open hiring practices. Advertise for open positions in public spaces in order to provide community members with the opportunity to work in the organization.

Create a standardized procedure for all who seek membership in an organization. Fair and open membership is essential to ensuring that the community is involved in organizational accountability.

Hire (or assign) an employee responsible for establishing, organizing, and delivering a publishing schedule that will keep all aspects of the organization as transparent as possible. Transparency will help insulate your organization from misunderstandings and accusations, making it easier to establish a good relationship with the community.
9.3 CSOs and Palestinian Civil Society Organizations

- Create more efficient networks. Networks exist to help civil society organizations and non-governmental organization establish better means of cooperation, communication, and collaboration between each other, the community, the private sector, and the government.

- Networks themselves should not be project-implementing entities, nor should they be applying for funding unless the funding is to be used for network building through trainings and workshops.

- Codes of conduct and conflict of interest policies need to be enhanced to prevent networks from competing with member organizations for project funding.

- Networks need to establish new ways to receive funding to cover operating costs, whether through individual fundraising (not project proposals), private sector sponsorships, or membership dues.

- Networks should not have paid employees other than in the field of public relations and internet and social media. These employees’ salaries should be paid out of the membership dues.

- Invite other CSOs, whether partners or not, to all public events. This generates social capital for future partnerships.

- Distribute project or program “products,” like reports, to all CSOs working in the same field. This can also generate social capital for future partnerships.

- Networks should foster the establishment of issue-based coalitions. The creation of coalitions will provide the opportunity for CSOs focusing on common issues to share information regarding events, activities, projects, and to discuss the needs of the community. CSOs can then identify where work is needed and who can provide the best services.

- Coalitions must require that CSOs commit to a code of conduct that will seek to eliminate any unhealthy competition between CSOs.
➢ Bylaws are to be created to establish good governance practices within the coalition.

➢ Establishing a system of elected volunteer leadership, this way the coalitions will have leaders that are responsible for holding CSOs accountable to the conditions set forth by the code of conduct.

➢ Once a month coalitions should meet to review their mission and vision to confirm that the coalition is staying on track. During this meeting members are encouraged to express any concerns they have with how the coalition is functioning.

➢ Coalitions should use consensus when making decisions to allow all voices to be heard and for all decisions to be agreed upon by the coalition as a whole.

➢ If the coalition recognizes that they are no longer abiding by their mission and vision they should dissolve.

➢ Each coalition will elect representatives to represent the coalition in a Regional Network Group.

➢ Regional Networks consist of CSOs working in the various regions; CSOs do not need to be based in region.

➢ Regional Networks (Northern, Central, and Southern) will consist of representatives from the various coalitions.

➢ Each coalition will elect representatives to participate in the Regional Network.

➢ The responsibility of the representatives is to inform the Regional Network about activities happening within their coalitions and then report to the coalition about information gained at network meetings.

➢ CSOs are recommended to join National and International Networks individually.

➢ Coalitions should meet bi-weekly

➢ Regional (Northern, Central, and Southern) networks should meet monthly

➢ Coalition representatives should report back to groups about information gained at regional meeting
- Hire an employee to maintain websites and social media

- Use websites to send out e-newsletters to members of the coalition or network informing members of activities and events, update members on progress of projects, and provide financial information.

- Keeping websites and social media current is essential.

- Familiarize yourself with the structure, culture, and purpose of other organizations working in your field—especially potential project partners. This will make communication easier during partnerships.

9.4 CSOs and the Government

- Familiarize yourself with strategic plans of the respective ministries, and learn where your organization’s work fits best.

- Networks should hire an employee to serve as public relations representative. This representative cannot have any direct affiliation with any member CSO. This person will be responsible for building relationships with members of the respective ministries as well as government officials. Their focus should be on building relationships with officials one at a time. Recognizing that becoming known by government officials also requires extensive networking. Start small and allow the network to grow organically.

- Conduct regular workshops and meetings that target governmental policy and decision makers, to maintain an ongoing dialogue with them.

- Publish studies and reports to respective ministries.

- Conduct regular visits to the different governmental departments.

- Target governmental employees through capacity building projects.

- Involve governmental representatives in the organization’s activities.
9.5 CSOs and the Private Sector

- Networks should hire an employee to serve as public relations representative (same PR representative for government and media networking). This representative cannot have any direct affiliation with any CSO. PR representative should attempt to sit on the board of directors.

- Invite private partners, and all private sector actors working in your field, to all public events.

- Distribute project or program “products,” like reports, to all private partners.

- CSOs should require that a certain percentage of their working budget should come from private sector sponsorships. Private companies interested in contributing to the work of CSOs are to be invited to network meeting in order to learn about the activities of member organizations.

- Familiarize yourself with reputations, practices, and partnership history of potential private partners, whether local or international.

- Networks can best serve their member organizations by helping them establish relationships with private companies who are interested in contributing financially to the cause of the organization. Having private sector companies more directly involved in the activities of CSOs will help hold the CSOs accountable. If a private company witnesses that a CSO’s activities are not in line with their vision and mission, the private organization can revoke funding from the organization. This will provide an incentive for organizations to be more accountable for their actions.

9.6 CSOs and the Media

- Invite media to all public events

- Hire an employee to serve as public relations representative (possibly the same PR representative for government and private sector networking).

- Establish a point person for contact with the media. Having a reliable point person responsible for contact over an extended period of time will give both parties a chance to build a relationship based on mutual trust.
➢ Send professional press releases to the media about the CSO’s activities, project introductions, events, activities schedules, reports, etc.

➢ Use not only traditional media, but also social networks to advocate for various causes. Research most effective uses of social media as it relates to your target audience.

➢ A second employee should be hired to maintain the CSOs website and social media. In a highly technologically advanced world it is imperative that organizations keep their website current, providing information about projects and funding. It is also important for CSOs to have an active social media site informing followers of events and activities taking place within their community.

➢ Create 30-second Public Service Announcements to be aired on local television stations introducing the CSO to the community.

➢ Keep up-to-date with current events in the region and attempt to send press releases when it is newsworthy. Timely press releases or articles will be beneficial to the media outlet, helping the organization build a strong or stronger relationship with an outlet.

➢ Read articles by various media outlets. Being able to comment on them in conversation will help build social capital.
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11. Annexes

11.1 Annex I: Checklist for Best Practices Relating to Social Capital

**ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Has an Accountability System
- Has an accountability framework
  - Mission and Vision of CSO
  - Methodology
  - Beliefs and Values
  - Expectations and Good Practices
- Identifies key stakeholders
- Identifies tools for assessing performance
- Has mechanisms for communicating assessments

**RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COMMUNITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Holds open houses to educate the community about the mission of CSO and opens the floor for suggestions and feedback.
- Holds community meetings to learn about the needs of the community.
- Trains employees on active listening techniques
- Performs needs assessments in regular intervals
- Uses appropriate selection criteria when targeting community needs assessments, i.e. surveys, focus groups, and project.
- Developed small reachable goals
- Conducts mid-term evaluations to ensure that community’s needs are being met
- Published CSO contact information in easily accessible venue
- Published all activities and programs online or in a accessible venue making it easy for community to see and evaluate the progress of projects.
- Provides a timetable for project implementation, explanations of project goals, expected outcomes, and instructions on where beneficiaries can file complaints or ask questions.
- Discloses financial information regularly
- Has relationships with prominent groups, marginalized individuals, or families in the targeted community
- Holds public meetings at the beginning of projects to inform the community of the goals and benefits of the project
- Holds public meetings at the end of projects to inform the community of the results
- Has fair and open hiring practices, advertises for open positions in public spaces, i.e. newspapers, website, and social media sites.
- Has a standardize procedure for membership
- Has an employee who is responsible to making sure the organization is transparent

**Relationship with other CSOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have signed a code of conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is implementing a code of conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has signed a conflict of interest document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is adhering to the conflict of interest document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Distributes project and program “products” to all CSOs working in the same field
- Has a website that provides information about the CSO and its past and ongoing projects
- Collaborates with other CSOs on projects
- Invites other CSOs to partner in projects
- Is a member of a Coalition, i.e. Human Rights Coalition, Prisoner Affairs Coalition, Election Monitoring Coalition, etc.
- Attends coalition meetings
- Is a member of a National Network, i.e. PNGO, Union of Charitable Societies, etc.
- Attends national network meetings
- Is a member of an International Network, i.e. the Anna Lindh Foundation, Arab NGO Network, International Movement for Democracy, etc.
- Attends international network meetings

**RELATIONSHIP WITH THE GOVERNMENT**

- Has an employee who serves as a public relation representative to government officials*
- Familiar with the strategic plan of the respective ministries
- Participating in lobbying
- Implement projects in coordination with the government
- Participate in the formulation of national/local development strategies
### Relationship with the Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Has an employee who serves as a public relation representative to the private sector *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partner with private sector companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invites private partners and all private sector actor working in your field to public events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distributes project and program “products” to all private partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A portion of CSOs working budget comes from private sector sponsorships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relationship with the Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Has an employee who serves as a public relation representative to the media *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides profession press releases to the media in regards to projects and programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invites media to attend public events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has a facebook or twitter page which is updated regularly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has an employee who is responsible to maintaining social media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has Public Service Announcements airing on local television stations introducing the CSO to the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11.2 Annex II: Social Capital Research - Targeted Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>فئة</th>
<th>المدينة</th>
<th>الاسم</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>بيت لحم</td>
<td>منتدى الكرمة الثقافي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>بيت لحم</td>
<td>ملتقى الطلبة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>بيت لحم</td>
<td>مركز ونام الفلسطيني</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>الخليل</td>
<td>مركز مصادر التنمية الشبابية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>الخليل</td>
<td>مؤسسة أدوء للتغيير الاجتماعي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>بيرزيت</td>
<td>مؤسسة جهود للتنمية المجتمعية والريفية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>الرام</td>
<td>جمعية عباد الشمس لحماية الإنساني والبيئة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>نابلس</td>
<td>جمعية المستقل الفلسطيني للتنمية والديمقراطية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>نابلس</td>
<td>الائتلاف من أجل النزاهة والمساءلة - آمان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>رام الله</td>
<td>مؤسسة قيادات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>نابلس</td>
<td>المركز الفلسطيني للديمقراطيّة وحل النزاعات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>نابلس</td>
<td>جمعية مركز حواء للثقافة والفنون</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>رام الله</td>
<td>مركز إعلام حقوق الإنسان والديمقراطيّة &quot;شمس&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>رام الله</td>
<td>جمعية تواصل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>رام الله</td>
<td>الاتحاد الشباب الفلسطيني</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>رام الله</td>
<td>منتدى شارك الشبابي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>رام الله</td>
<td>مركز الدفاع عن الحرّيات</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>بيت لحم</td>
<td>تنمية وإعلام المرأة - كام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>بيت لحم</td>
<td>جمعية الحارس للديمقراطية والإعلام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>بيت لحم</td>
<td>جمعية بني نعم الخيرية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.3 Annex III: Questionnaire for Measuring Social Capital at Palestinian Civil Society Organizations

Applied Research Institute – Jerusalem (ARIJ) is implementing the “Measuring and Developing Social Capital in the Democratization and Governance Process in Palestinian CSOs” project under the Civic Participation Program (CPP) which is managed by the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and funded under the USAID/Civic Participation Program (CPP) Grants Program. The project targets 20 Palestinian CSOs in its aims at creating a guideline of social capital best practices in the Palestinian democratization and governance processes. The project shall be implemented through four phases. The first phase aims to diagnose how social capital is utilized and incorporated by CSOs. In the second phase, the research's results will be adopted into a training material format to train the 20 targeted CSOs on social capital concepts. The third phase will be a pilot implementation phase where two CSOs will be chosen to implement the lessons learned from the research results. These CSOs will evaluate their implementing experience and share it with the rest of targeted CSOs. The final phase of the project is to format the conducted research, best practices, and the pilot experience into an accessible report and disseminate it for CSOs, invested stakeholders and the public through several channels.

This questionnaire is part of the first phase of the project, and will be used as a tool to understand how social capital is currently utilized and incorporated by Palestinian CSOs, through a group of indicators.

Field researcher Name: 
Date: 

A. CSO Introduction
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CSO Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>City/Locality:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Governorate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fields of Intervention:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Director:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Website:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Relationship with the Community**

B.1. Indicate the type of services your CSO provides for the community.

- [ ] Democracy & Governance
- [ ] Health
- [ ] Education
- [ ] Housing
- [ ] Water & Environmental Protection
- [ ] Energy
- [ ] Economic Development
- [ ] Human Rights
- [ ] Gender Empowerment
- [ ] Youth Empowerment
- [ ] Other

B.2. Rate your level of intervention within the following categories:
### B.3. How does your CSO reflect the needs and priorities of its constituents and communities? Please explain.

#### B.3.1. Does your CSO document and publish its needs assessment studies?

☑ Yes  ☐ No

#### B.3.2. Have your CSO ever changed its projects plans to meet the community’s needs?

☑ Yes  ☐ No

### B.4. Does your CSO have a resource center or other means throughout the country to provide the following services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Location</td>
<td>West Bank – North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Bank – Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Bank – South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Type</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, please explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.5. Has your CSO adopted and implemented any code of ethics?

☐ Yes, we have adopted a code of ethics and implemented it

☐ Yes, we have adopted a code of ethics, but we have not implemented it

☐ No

B.5.1. Please name them.

B.6. Does your CSO implement its activities through establishing community committees in the different Palestinian localities?

☐ Always            ☐ Sometimes

☐ Rarely            ☐ Never

B.6.1. How are these committees established?

B.7. How would you describe the quality of your CSO’s consultation and communication with the community? Please provide examples.

B.8. Do you face any major conflicts with local communities while trying to implement your activities?
B.8.1. Please explain what type of conflicts and how you solve them.

C. Relationship with other Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)

C.1. Are you a member of any NGO network?

☐ Yes ☐ No

C.1.1. Which one?

C.1.2. Do you think that these networks are able to provide assistance and support for your CSO?

☐ Yes ☐ No

C.1.3 Is your CSO a member of the Palestinian NGO Network (PNGO)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

C.1.3.1. Are you an active member of the network?

☐ Yes ☐ No

C.1.3.2. What is your membership status?

☐ PNGO steering committee member

☐ PNGO general assembly member
C.1.3.3. How often do you attend PNGO’s meetings?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes

☐ Never

C.1.3.4. Do you actively participate in voting for the decisions proposed by PNGO?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes

☐ Never

C.2. Indicate the type of relationship between your CSO and other CSOs.

☐ Information exchange / Dissemination of information

☐ Planning

☐ Partnership

☐ Coalitions / Lobbying

☐ Advocacy Campaigns

C.3. Do you feel sufficiently informed about other CSOs’ programs and activities?

☐ Highly informed  ☐ Somewhat informed

☐ Not informed at all

C.3.1. What are your sources of information?

☐ TV & Radio stations  ☐ Newspapers
C.4. How do you rate the importance of lobbying for change?

☐ Highly important  ☐ Somewhat important  ☐ Not important

C.5. What are the most suitable lobbying tools/mechanisms for the Palestinian context?

C.6. If you have attempted to lobby with other organizations to achieve mutually beneficial goals:

C.6.1. Have you succeeded in achieving your mutual goals?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

C.6.2. Please provide successful/unsuccessful examples

C.6.3. Is this a common strategy among organizations in Palestine?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

C.6.4. Please explain.

C.7. Do you feel in competition with other organizations working in the same field in Palestine?
C.7.1. How would you describe this competition?

☐ Healthy ☐ Unhealthy

C.7.2. What do you recommend to make competition healthier?

C.8. How often do you work with other organizations under donor-funded projects?

☐ Always ☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely ☐ Never

C.9. How often do you work with other CSOs without donor-funded projects?

☐ Always ☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely ☐ Never

C.10. Does your CSO coordinate with partner CSOs at the planning level to ensure avoiding duplication of programs and activities?

☐ Always ☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely ☐ Never

C.10.1. Please explain how this is done.

C.11. Do you think you can achieve your goals and implement your projects without coordinating and networking with other Palestinian CSOs?

☐ Always ☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely ☐ Never
C.11.1. What tools would be effective to approach cooperation and networking?

C.11.2. What are the relevant indicators needed to measure cooperation and networking between Palestinian CSOs?

C.12. Do you think that working with other organizations can be a constraint sometimes?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

C.12.1. Please explain.

D. Relationship with Private Firms

D.1. Indicate the type of relationship between your CSO and private firms:

☐ Information exchange / Dissemination of information

☐ Planning

☐ Partnership

☐ Coalitions / Lobbying

☐ Advocacy Campaigns

D.2. If you have attempted to organize / work with private firms to achieve mutually beneficial goals:

D.2.1. Have you succeeded in achieving your mutual goals?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes
D.3. Do you ever target the private sector in your capacity-building activities?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes  
☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

D.4. Does your CSO benefit from capacity development programs offered by private firms?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes  
☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

D.5. Does your CSO adopt participatory written and coherent policies including programmatic activities (work programs, common activities, or through grassroots organizations) for joint cooperation and work with private firms?

☐ Always  ☐ Sometimes  
☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

D.5.1. Please provide examples.

E. Relationship with the Government

E.1. How would you describe your CSO’s relationship with the local government?

☐ Very good  ☐ Good
E.2. How would you describe your CSO’s relationship with the national government?

☐ Distant
☐ Hostile

☐ Very good
☐ Good

☐ Distant
☐ Hostile

E.3. How often do you provide special services for the government?

☐ Always
☐ Sometimes

☐ Rarely
☐ Never

E.3.1. Please provide examples, specifying whether the services are for local or national government, or both.

E.4. Does the government interfere with the internal procedures of your CSO?

☐ Always
☐ Sometimes

☐ Rarely
☐ Never

E.5. Has the government hindered the implementation of any of your projects?

☐ Yes
☐ No

E.6.1. Please explain, specifying whether you have been hindered by local or national government, or both.

E.6. Do you think that networking with the government is important for the facilitation of procedures?
E.7. How often does your CSO take part in the formulation of national/local development strategies?

☐ Always           ☐ Sometimes

☐ Rarely           ☐ Never

E.7.1. Please provide examples.

E.8. Have you ever received government assistance?

☐ Yes           ☐ No

E.8.1. If yes, what kind of assistance? Please

☐ Financial       ☐ Supervision

☐ Support in certain activities ☐ Research assistance

☐ Other

E.9. Have you implemented any projects in cooperation with the government?

☐ Yes           ☐ No

E.9.1 Please explain.

E.10. Have you participated in the formulation or improvement of a public law?
E.10.1. Please explain the law and the process.

E.11. Do you consider your CSO to be influential at the legislative level?

☐ Very influential ☐ Influential

☐ Not influential

E.12. Do you consider your CSO to be influential at the strategic level of the government?

☐ Very influential ☐ Influential

☐ Not influential

E.13. Are there direct lines of communication between your CSO and policy makers?

☐ Yes ☐ No

E.14. Are there mechanisms for your CSO to participate in the various levels of the governmental decision-making process?

☐ Always ☐ Sometimes

☐ Rarely ☐ Never

E.15. In general, how do you assess your organization’s actual influence on government decision-making?

F. Relationship with the Media
F.1. What media channels do you usually have contact with?

☐ Newspapers  ☐ TV stations

☐ Radio stations  ☐ Internet

☐ Social media

F.2. Do you think that your CSO enjoys positive media coverage at the local and national level?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

F.3. Indicate the purpose of communication between your CSO and media:

☐ Publicize project activities  ☐ Publish articles, reports, etc.

☐ Publish invitations for events  ☐ Announce for jobs

☐ Other

F.4. Do you believe that media provides positive analysis of the role CSOs play at civil society level?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

F.4.1. Please explain.
F.5. Do you think that your relationship with the media helps to create awareness about the causes you advocate for?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

F.5.1. Please explain how.

F.6. Were you ever approached by other CSOs, private sector, government or media as a result of your projects and activities?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

F.6.1. By whom and what were the circumstances?

G. Do you think that Palestinian civil society organizations were able to achieve real sustainable development in Palestine? Please explain