



**DIVISION FOR
PALESTINIAN RIGHTS**

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
THE QUESTION OF JERUSALEM**

Convened by the
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People with the
support of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation

“The Question of Jerusalem after 50 years of Occupation and 25 years of the Oslo Accords

Rabat, 26-28 June 2018

Content

	<u>Page</u>
Executive summary	3
I. Introduction	5
II. Opening session (I)	6
III. Opening session (II)	7
IV. Plenary sessions	9
A. Plenary session I	9
B. Plenary session II	12
C. Plenary session III	15
D. Plenary session IV	18
V. Closing session	20
IV. Key themes and recommendations	21

Annexes

I. Programme	24
II. Summary of the Chair	27
III. Message of King Mohammed VI of Morocco	31
IV. List of participants	35

Executive summary

The International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem on the theme “The Question of Jerusalem after 50 years of Occupation and 25 years of the Oslo Accords”, was convened in Rabat from 26 to 28 June 2018 in order to assess the impact of recent political developments with regard to Jerusalem and discuss how the international community can better support the peace process, as well as socioeconomic conditions of Palestinians in East Jerusalem.

The Conference brought together Palestinian, Israeli and international experts and representatives of the diplomatic community and civil society organizations to provide up-to-date information on the current situation in East Jerusalem, examine the latest legal developments having an impact on the political and social status of Palestinians and explore practical ways in which the international community can support the city’s development and the resilience of its residents, in particular its young people. In addition, opportunities to provide international and regional support and safeguard the rights of Palestinians in East Jerusalem were identified.

In a message to the Conference, delivered by the Moroccan Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Nasser Bourita, King Mohammed VI of Morocco, in his capacity as host and the Chair of the Al-Quds Committee of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), reiterated his rejection of the relocation of embassies to Jerusalem and called for greater diplomatic efforts and other actions to promote social and humanitarian development in the city.

The representative of the State of Palestine and Minister of the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction, Mohammad Shtayyeh, reiterated the plan presented by the President of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas, to the Security Council on 20 February 2018, adding that Palestinians would welcome an international conference and a mechanism to end the conflict on the basis of international law and international legitimacy. He also said that the Palestinian Government remained open to cooperating with other groups, such as Hamas, provided that they fully accepted, inter alia, the two-State solution, a single legitimate authority and the holding of elections to revive Palestinian democracy and embraced peaceful popular resistance. The Chair of the Committee reminded the international community of its obligation to support the Palestinian inhabitants of East Jerusalem morally and politically and through diplomacy.

The themes of the panels convened during the Conference were “Political and social status of Palestinians in East Jerusalem today”, “The Question of Jerusalem in international law and Member States’ obligations”, “Coming of age under occupation: Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem”, and “Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem and the International Community”.

The key themes that emerged during the Conference included those of Jerusalem being a final status issue that must be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties based on relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions; that greater rallying of diplomatic efforts is needed to ensure that international resolutions protecting the status and identity of the city are implemented; that recent developments have diminished the prospect of new rounds of peace process talks and the credibility of the United States of America as a mediator; that the Palestinian Government has recently established a proposal to express its readiness to negotiate

the two-State solution and to end occupation on the basis of the 1967 borders; and that future conferences and meetings on the question of Jerusalem should also be held outside the Arabo-Islamic world.

I. Introduction

1. The International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem on the theme “The Question of Jerusalem after 50 years of Occupation and 25 years of the Oslo Accords”, was held in Rabat from 26 to 28 June 2018 under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. The Conference was organized with the support of OIC and in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 72/13 and 72/11.

2. The Conference consisted of an opening session held in two parts, four plenary sessions and a closing session. The first part of the opening session was held at the Moroccan Ministry of Foreign Affairs and was followed by a press conference. The second part of the opening session, held on the second day, consisted of statements delivered by the Chair of the Committee and representatives of the State of Palestine, OIC and the United Nations. The themes of the plenary sessions were “Political and social status of Palestinians in East Jerusalem today”, “The Question of Jerusalem in international law and Member States’ obligations”, “Coming of age under occupation: Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem” and “Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem and the International Community”.

3. The participants included representatives of 55 Member States, 2 non-member observer States, 7 intergovernmental organizations, 7 United Nations bodies and 17 representatives of civil society organizations, as well as 21 accredited media representatives covering the event (see annex IV).

4. The Committee delegation comprised the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations and Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Fodé Seck; the Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations and Vice-Chair, Dian Triansyah Djani; the Permanent Representative of Cuba and Vice-Chair, Anayansi Rodríguez Camejo; and the Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations, Riyadh Mansour.

5. The Chair’s summary, statements and presentations (where provided), videos and other conference materials are available at the website of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (www.un.org/unispal/events/international-conferences).

Day 1

II. Opening session (I)

6. The Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations, Fodé Seck, chaired the opening session.

7. The Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Morocco, **Nasser Bourita**, delivered a message to the Conference from **King Mohammed VI**, who assured the continued solidarity of his country and its commitment to rallying international support to realize the right of Palestinians to an independent State, with East Jerusalem as its capital. The King emphasized that the Conference, unlike previous ones, was taking place in a context marked by serious developments on the ground, namely the decision by the United States of America to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to move its embassy there. He reiterated his rejection of that move, as communicated in letters to the President of the United States, Donald Trump, and the Secretary-General, António Guterres, because it would undermine international efforts to create an environment conducive to the resumption of peace negotiations.

8. The King blamed the current impasse in negotiations on unilateral decisions and the excessive use of force by the occupying Power. He denounced the use of live ammunition against Palestinian demonstrators along the Gaza fence. Morocco condemned the Israeli behaviour as incompatible with international law and expressed solidarity with the Palestinian people through the launch of a humanitarian initiative during Ramadan, including the establishment of a field hospital in the Gaza Strip, managed by the Royal Moroccan Armed Forces. That initiative reinforced the action on the ground through the Bayt Mal Al-Quds Al-Sharif Agency of OIC in various sectors, including health, education and social affairs.

9. The King welcomed initiatives to hold conferences on the question of Jerusalem, as long as their intent was sincere, forward-looking and realistic and they generated constructive recommendations. He also called for greater rallying of diplomatic efforts to ensure the implementation of international resolutions to protect the cultural, historical and political status of the city. That would help to bring the conflict back to two peoples and two States. A pledge by both parties to deal with final status issues within the framework of negotiations and to refrain from predetermining solutions would put the peace process back on track.

10. In his message, the King further underlined the importance of convening future meetings on the question of Jerusalem outside the Islamic and Arab worlds to reflect the universal and symbolic character of Jerusalem.

11. Following the message of the King, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Morocco, Nasser Bourita, the representative of the State of Palestine and Minister in charge of the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction, Mohammad Shtayyeh, and the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations and Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Fodé Seck, participated in a press conference.

12. **Mr. Bourita** recalled previous initiatives of Morocco on the question of Palestine, including the first Islamic Summit Conference, held in September 1969, following the Aqsa Mosque fire incident, and the 1974 conference, at which the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had officially been recognized. Those were in addition to the importance given to the question of Palestine by the King in his capacity as Chair of the Al-Quds Committee.

13. **Mr. Shtayyeh** thanked the King for his clear rejection of the transfer of the United States Embassy and the ongoing change in the historic character of Jerusalem. He lauded the efforts of Morocco through its chairing of the Al-Quds Committee, the establishment of the Bayt Mal Al-Quds Al-Sharif Agency and its call for rights, justice and respect for international law.

14. **Mr. Seck** referred to the friendship between Morocco and Senegal and their harmonious policies on the question of Palestine. While Morocco had held the conference leading to the founding of OIC, Senegal had been among the first nations to recognize PLO. He drew parallels between Palestine and the African continent, citing the adage of Nelson Mandela that Africa's freedom would be incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians. Underlining the importance of maintaining consensus on the question of Palestine, he highlighted the recent adoption of General Assembly resolution ES-10/20 on protection of the Palestinian civilian population.

Day 2

III. Opening session (II)

15. The Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations, Fodé Seck, chaired the second part of the opening session.

16. The Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, **Miroslav Jenča**, stated that Jerusalem was a final status issue that must be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties on the basis of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, with the concerns of both sides being taken into account. It had become more important than ever to take effective concerted action, as the convergence and global consensus of past decades were eroding. He spoke of the mediation role of the United Nations, carried out by the United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General to the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority, as well as efforts made at the development and humanitarian levels by the United Nations country team based in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, in particular East Jerusalem.

17. The Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine Affairs of OIC, **Samir Bakr**, delivered a message on behalf of the Secretary-General of the Organization, Yousef al-Othaimeen, in which he reiterated the rejection of the decision of the United States to move its embassy to Jerusalem and called upon that country to abide by international law to achieve the two-State solution. He called for responsible and effective intervention by the international community in favour of

the two-State solution and a just and holistic peace based on respect for international law and the Arab Peace Initiative. He lauded the recent General Assembly resolution on the establishment of an international protection mechanism, as well as the decision of the Human Rights Council to launch an independent commission of inquiry, calling for the speedy implementation of that decision and the referral of the investigation's outcomes to the International Criminal Court.

18. **Mr. Bakr** underlined the need to take the right of refugees into consideration in the context of such developments as the move of the United States Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Millions of refugees had been waiting for more than seven decades for the exercise of their inalienable rights and the implementation of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). The international community should therefore provide unconditional support to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in the fulfilment of its mandate.

19. **Mr. Shtayyeh** delivered a message on behalf of the President of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas. He explained that the failure of the peace processes under the auspices of four successive United States Administrations was a result of the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel and the absence of pressure on Israel to end the occupation. Washington had failed to play the role of fair mediator between Palestine and Israel, notwithstanding the international community's consensus on ending the occupation of the Palestinian territory, which had been occupied since 1967, establishing an independent Palestinian State, with East Jerusalem as its capital, and achieving a fair settlement of the refugee issue. Israel's strategy to defeat this internationally agreed solution was based on four main pillars: the expansion of settlements in some 62 per cent of the West Bank and the isolation of Palestinian areas; the Judaization of Jerusalem through the expulsion of some 132,000 Palestinian Jerusalemites; the subjection of the Gaza Strip to a blockade, causing its further isolation from the West Bank; and the worsening of humanitarian conditions.

20. The United States Administration's recent unilateral decisions – including the move of the embassy to Jerusalem and the proclamation that the city was the capital of Israel; the threat to close the PLO office in Washington, D.C.; the withdrawal from the Human Rights Council and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); and the defunding campaign against UNRWA – were developments in a war against Palestine and reflected Washington's unreadiness for peace, its lack of credibility as a mediator and its biased positions in favour of Israel.

21. In the light of these negative developments, a return to the negotiating table would be possible only under specific conditions, including impartial mediation and respect for international law, none of which existed then. **Mr. Shtayyeh** introduced the proposal of Mr. Abbas of an international conference and a mechanism to end the conflict in accordance with international law. The Palestinian Government was ready to organize general elections that included other actors, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad, provided that they accepted the two-State solution, embraced peaceful popular resistance and accepted unified official representation of the Palestinian people.

22. The Chair of the Committee, **Fodé Seck**, condemned the decision of the United States to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, leading to the violation of multiple Security Council

resolutions. He urged the United States to rescind that decision. He recalled the need for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the question of Jerusalem, taking into account the concerns of both parties to the conflict. The Chair described recent steps taken by the Committee, including raising with the Secretary-General the need for the protection of civilians, and the Committee's full support for General Assembly resolution ES-10/20 on the issue, adopted on 13 June 2018. The Conference provided an opportunity to better assess the situation in East Jerusalem and to listen to young people tell how the international community could better support the Palestinian community in East Jerusalem. The Chair reiterated that the Conference was part of the Committee's larger efforts to support the Palestinian people in attaining their inalienable rights.

IV. Plenary sessions

A. Plenary session I

Political and Social Status of Palestinians in East Jerusalem today

23. The panel, which focused on the theme "Political and social status of Palestinians in East Jerusalem today", was chaired and moderated by the Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations and Vice-Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Dian Triansyah Djani. The panel comprised four speakers: the Deputy Governor of Jerusalem, Abdallah Siam; the President of Foundation for Middle East Peace, Lara Friedman; the Director of Terrestrial Jerusalem, Daniel Seidemann; and a professor at Al-Quds University, Amneh Badran.

24. The plenary session was started with a statement of the League of Arab States (LAS), delivered by its Assistant Secretary-General for Palestinian Affairs, Saeed Abu Ali. On behalf of the Secretary-General of LAS, Ali Abu Ghaith, **Mr. Abu Ali** condemned the recent decision of the United States to move its embassy to Jerusalem, calling it void because it was in violation of international law and United Nations resolutions. He said that the biased support of the United States for Israel had encouraged the continuation of the occupation and a lack of accountability. The decision would not change the fact that Jerusalem was under occupation and could not be taken out of final status negotiations, as stated at the recent LAS Jerusalem Summit. The Conference was yet another opportunity to remind the international community of Security Council resolutions on Jerusalem and to reject all unilateral steps taken by the occupying Power to alter the historical and religious identity of the city. LAS called upon the international community, in particular the Council, to take moral, human and legal responsibility, ensure that the measures necessary to end Israeli aggression were taken and provide the Palestinian people under occupation with protection, allowing for the realization of their inalienable rights. He asserted that it was high time to make the transition from resolutions to practical measures.

25. **Mr. Siam** warned against the Trump Administration's proposed deal aimed at "liquidating" the question of Palestine and supporting Israeli violations in Jerusalem. Those violations included a Judaization policy carried out by Israel that was aimed at decreasing the size of the Muslim and Christian communities to less than 15 per cent of the total population, establishing checkpoints, isolating the city from the rest of the Palestinian territory and expanding Jewish settlements aimed

at destroying the internal social fabric. Other elements of that policy included the confiscation of properties from Palestinians who had been forced to emigrate; the expulsion of Palestinians through the non-renewal of their residency permits (14,000 since 1997) and the imposition of high costs and cumbersome laws, to prevent them from obtaining building permits (135 granted permits per year out of 1,800 applications); the demolition of “unauthorized” units; and the construction of settlements, leaving Palestinians with only 9 km² out of the 72 km² of East Jerusalem.

26. **Ms. Friedman** provided an update on recent political developments in Jerusalem, in particular the impact of the current United States Administration’s shifting policy on the two-State solution, settlements and Jerusalem. The city had become the focus of the ultimate deal that could be made and the origin of Mr. Trump’s miscalculations. The initial intention of his declaration in December 2017 had been to take Jerusalem off the negotiating table. Nevertheless, the United States Administration had not expected the magnitude of the Palestinian reaction, nor that of the international community. Overall, European and Arab States had remained united in their position, which had prompted the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to threaten Member States before the vote was held on the General Assembly resolution in December 2017. Their convergence showed an emphatic rejection of the recognition by the United States of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The United States had also underestimated the firm response to its decision by several of its close allies, including Jordan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia.

27. **Ms. Friedman** noted that, thus far, the United States policy shift on Jerusalem, instead of strengthening the Israeli grip on the city, had had the opposite effect: it had reinforced international consensus and had brought greater attention to the question of Jerusalem. In the end, she argued, the decision of the United States on Jerusalem would weaken the credibility of the new peace plan of the Trump Administration. Similarly, recent statements of the United States had brought greater attention to other issues, such as settlements and refugees.

28. **Mr. Seidemann**, speaking on Israeli measures in East Jerusalem, said that the essence of “occupation” was not resonating with the Israelis or the Trump Administration and, therefore, the Administration could not drive the conflict to resolution. Nevertheless, the status quo should not be considered a replacement for the need to end the occupation; the alteration

of the status quo through religious radicalization and the expansion of settlements had had a negative impact on the peace process.

29. **Mr. Seidemann** highlighted the Palestinians’ refusal to capitulate and their decision to stay resilient in the face of an increasingly aggressive occupation, notwithstanding Israeli attempts to join a coalition of Arab States against the Islamic Republic of Iran and thus neutralize the Palestinian issue. Mr. Seidemann also recalled the events that had unfolded concurrent with the Conference on the Question of Jerusalem that had been held in Baku in 2017. Mass demonstrations and protests led by Palestinian young people had ended in a rare and unequivocal victory over the Israeli Government, as the Israelis had been forced to remove metal detectors and cameras from Haram al-Sharif and restore the status quo ante.

30. **Ms. Badran**, speaking on the issue of exile and identity, recalled that, in 1948, nearly 100,000 Arab Jerusalemites, in the western and eastern parts of the city, had been forced to flee

their homes. Final status negotiations should therefore take into consideration the rights of Palestinians in West Jerusalem as well. After the 1967 occupation, Jerusalem had been unified with military might, but remained deeply divided at the community level. Since then, Israel had been trying to unify the city demographically within the newly decreed municipal borders, including the annexed territory of East Jerusalem and some suburbs, and had carried out various policies to change the identity of the city and replace the original population with Jewish-Israeli settlers. Palestinians in Jerusalem had been experiencing the dilemma of belonging to a different nation while living under Israeli occupation. They had been made foreigners in their own city, in violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

31. **Ms. Badran** acknowledged the importance of diplomatic efforts on the question of Jerusalem but advocated for support for local strategies to resist Israeli policies aimed at exiling Palestinians, since the Palestinian presence in Jerusalem was in itself a form of resistance. In that context, she called for investment in various sectors, which would encourage Palestinian young people to stay in East Jerusalem.

Discussion

32. Palestinian youth representatives from Jerusalem spoke of the importance of equipping young people in the entire governorate, not only the Old City, with new skills to empower them. Palestinians needed to appropriate that local strategy. An Israeli speaker encouraged the young people to pursue that project non-violently, because the occupation could not be emulated or lubricated, but could be ended only through the two-State solution. Another participant highlighted the role of interparliamentary unions and parliamentarians in supporting international investment in the educational, health and housing sectors in East Jerusalem.

33. Participants emphasized that, while the focus on restoring and protecting the rights of Palestinian Jerusalemites remained important, humanitarian questions and needs should not be a substitute for political ones. A political solution should go hand in hand with advocacy for residency rights and socioeconomic investments, while a purely human rights-focused approach would not help to end occupation. Some warned that United States policy may seek to shift the focus away from the political process, as it had successfully done in the case of Gaza.

B. Plenary session II

The Question of Jerusalem in international law and Member States' obligations

34. The panel, which focused on the theme “The Question of Jerusalem in international law and Member States' obligations”, was chaired and moderated by the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations and Vice-Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Anayansi Rodríguez Camejo. It comprised three experts: the former Minister for Jerusalem Affairs of the Palestinian Authority, Ziad Abu Zayyad; a professor at the University of Amsterdam, Dimitris Bouris; and a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Moshe Amirav.

35. **Mr. Abu Zayyad**, addressing international law provisions applicable to the question of Jerusalem, said that, historically, no one ethnic or religious group could lay exclusive claim to Jerusalem. In modern times, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 181 (II), Jerusalem was to remain a *corpus separatum* and an independent international entity, governed under a special international system. Thus, apart from the fact that its annexation of East Jerusalem was illegal, Israel could not lay claim to West Jerusalem until that was settled by agreement. For example, until 1967, the status of foreign consulates in Jerusalem had been considered *sui generis*, and consuls had not submitted credentials to Israel or Jordan. Even today, consuls in Jerusalem, including those of the United States, reported directly to their respective capitals, not their embassies in Tel Aviv or Amman. Hence, when referring to the theme of the Conference, one would have to speak of 70 years of occupation, not 50 years.

36. **Mr. Abu Zayyad** outlined how Israel had established its authority over Palestinian lands during the 1967 war as an occupying force, extending its jurisdiction over East Jerusalem, including the Old City. Israel had then expanded the municipal borders of the city to include the surrounding neighbourhoods of Sur Bahir, Qalandiya, Jabal al-Mukabbir and Shu'fat, in violation of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) and Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Israeli practices that changed the demographic, geographical, legal and political status of Jerusalem or expelled its Arab inhabitants were illegal under international law, as evidenced through numerous Council resolutions, the most recent being resolution 2334 (2016). The Assembly, in its emergency special session on 21 December 2017, had again rejected Israeli measures that had changed the legal status quo of Jerusalem. The move of the United States Embassy to Jerusalem had also been a violation of international resolutions; Jerusalem was still defined and ruled under Assembly resolution 181 (II) as an area of non-sovereignty under international supervision. Even Israel itself had not claimed sovereignty over Jerusalem in the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (Oslo I Accords), in 1993, and in the Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (Oslo II Accords), and had agreed that Jerusalem was a final status issue.

37. **Mr. Bouris** reviewed European Union policies and practices towards Jerusalem, noting that the organization was moving away from its long-standing position of being a payer, not a player. The shift in European Union policy on Jerusalem had been gradual: in the 1960s, the European Community had called for an Israeli withdrawal from East Jerusalem; in the 1970s, in the Schumann Document, it had called for the internationalization of Jerusalem; in the 1980s, the European Union had stated that it would not accept any change in the status of the city. Since 2000, it had held the position that Jerusalem should serve as the capital of two States: Israel and Palestine.

38. **Mr. Bouris** noted that European Union positions were taking time to form and were often based on the least common denominator among the Union's 28 Member States. A paradigm of the conflict had been established, whereby the United States decided, the World Bank led, the European Union paid and the United Nations fed. After the Oslo Accords, the European Union had provided more than half of the funding for Palestinian institutions and disbursed roughly \$500 million a year to the State of Palestine for institution-building, including under the Fayyad Plan. The pattern of the European Union acting solely as a funder was gradually changing, however, and the bloc was becoming more politically active on the issue. In 2012, the European Union had been

split over the bid of Palestine to become an observer State, but all the European Union States had voted in favour of the move or had abstained, except for Czechia. In November 2015, the European Union had adopted guidelines requiring its members to label products originating from Israeli settlements clearly, comply with European Union law and prevent the legitimization of Israeli occupation. In addition, the European Union strongly disagreed with the policies of the United States Administration on Jerusalem that had been announced in December 2017. There were, however, spoilers emerging inside the Union, including the Prime Minister of Greece, who, in 2015, had referred to Jerusalem as the historic capital of Israel, and the presence of Austria, Czechia and Hungary at the inauguration of the United States Embassy in Jerusalem, in May 2018. With regard to the protection of Palestinian civilians, the result of the June 2018 vote in the General Assembly had been that half the European Union member States had abstained, and the rest had voted in favour.

39. **Mr. Amirav** recalled how his views had evolved from strongly in favour of an undivided Jerusalem for Israel to a shared Jerusalem for Israelis and Palestinians. As a young person growing up in Israel and a child of Holocaust survivors, he had viewed the unification of Jerusalem under Israeli rule as critical. In 1967, he had been among the Israeli soldiers who had entered and occupied the Old City. The unification of the city had not led to peace, however.

40. Thus, during his time as Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, in the 1980s, Mr. Amirav, together with a Palestinian politician, Faisal Husseini, had developed a plan to make Jerusalem the capital of both Israel and the State of Palestine by creating two capitals in one undivided city, on the basis of the Rome-Vatican City model. The eastern neighbourhoods of Jerusalem would be Al-Quds, the capital of Palestine, and West Jerusalem would be the capital of Israel. The Old City, which constituted only 1 km² of the total 130 km² of Jerusalem, would be an open city managed jointly by Israel and Palestine. The Temple Mount would not have flags, and the concept of the sovereignty of God, and not of any State, on the Temple Mount would address the key concerns of Jews and Muslims alike.

41. That project had been developed in 1987, but neither the Palestinians nor the Israelis had accepted it. In addition, in December 1987, Mr. Husseini had been arrested and jailed by the Israeli authorities. In 2000, at a Camp David summit meeting, Mr. Husseini and Mr. Amirav had tried again to promote their plan as advisers on the issue of Jerusalem on each side, but the talks had collapsed, and another opportunity had been lost.

42. **Mr. Amirav** noted that the Israeli Government had channelled resources towards the following five national objectives to unify Jerusalem, none of which had, however, been realized:

- (a) To achieve international recognition of Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem;
- (b) To change the demographic reality on the ground by settling 1 million Jews in the area so that Jews would compose 90 per cent of the city's population. Notwithstanding billions of dollars spent on infrastructure, however, fewer than 300,000 Jews currently lived in East Jerusalem, compared with 400,000 Palestinians. That was a result of the ill-advised annexation of large parts of West Bank land in 1967, which had become what was currently East Jerusalem, and the attempt to extend settlements in the West Bank,

which had led to the emigration of Jews from Jerusalem to the West Bank. At current birth rates, by 2032, there would be a Palestinian majority in the whole city of Jerusalem;

(c) To make Jerusalem the economic centre of Israel, replacing Tel Aviv. Instead, currently, it was the poorest city in Israel;

(d) To “Israelize” the Palestinians in Jerusalem, just as had been done to Israeli Arabs. The Palestinians in Jerusalem had rejected Israeli citizenship and residency, however; and

(e) To separate the issue of the holy places in Jerusalem from the Israeli-Palestinian struggle. That had not come to be, however, because Israel had missed an opportunity, after the war in 1967, to allow the internationalization of the holy sites.

43. **Mr. Amirav** argued that, given the importance of the city and its function as a bellwether of the conflict, Jerusalem should not be left as a final status issue, but instead needed to be addressed, first and foremost, through negotiations.

Discussion

44. During the ensuing discussion, participants criticized successive United States presidents for trying to minimize the importance of Jerusalem to the Palestinians. They said that religious claims should not justify or legitimize the occupation. Participants suggested that Zionism had brought religion into the conflict because the Zionist movement used religion to create a nationality. Israeli society was becoming more extremist and was pushing Palestinians to adopt the same behaviour. There was a threat that the continuing occupation could change the conflict from a nationalist struggle into one between two religions.

45. Participants also felt that unilateral decisions were undermining peace and security and that solutions could not be imposed by force. The World Council of Churches reiterated its rejection of the decision of the United States to move its embassy to Jerusalem and the apocalyptic rhetoric of some evangelical churches as not reflective of the position of Christians who lived in Jerusalem and the region. The Council stressed that Jerusalem must be a shared city for Jews, Christians and Muslims, Palestinians and Israelis alike; the historical status quo must be maintained and respected; and the custodianship of Christian and Muslim holy sites must remain under the administration of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

46. Speakers stated that Palestinians were ready and open to negotiating, but Israel refused to return to the 1967 borders. Europeans did not want to be in control of mediating the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, even though the region was part of Europe’s security space. The United States had been dealing with Israel using carrots, but no sticks, and Israel had tried to empty Jerusalem of Palestinians. Even as 130,000 Palestinians had been forced to move out, more than 300,000 Israeli settlers had moved in. Haram al-Sharif, too, was currently considered part of a settlement zone. The real problem in the Occupied Palestinian Territory was not poverty, but refugee camps. Based on what Palestinians had learned about the peace plan of the United States Administration from Arab countries that the United States had approached, the plan would be a tragedy for Palestinians.

47. A participant from Europe said that the European Union did not want to play a leading role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict because the peace process was based on American hegemony; at the same time, Europeans were keeping the card of the recognition of the Palestinian State to play at the appropriate moment.

C. Plenary session III

Coming of age under occupation: Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem

48. The panel, which focused on the theme “Coming of age under occupation: Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem”, was chaired and moderated by the Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine Affairs of OIC, Samir Bakr. It comprised three experts: a project coordinator at Palestine Vision, Shoroq Nammari; a freelance journalist from Jerusalem, Ali Ghaith; and the Arabic spokesperson and Head of External Relations and Communications at the Jerusalem Office of UNRWA, Sami Mshasha.

49. Addressing the perspectives of the post-Oslo generation, **Ms. Nammari** focused on the challenges for Palestinians in Jerusalem caused by Israeli residency policies. Every year, Palestinians were forced to produce various documents, such as lease agreements and water and electricity bills, to prove their residency status. The need to produce the documents added to the existing challenges of having to maintain a number of residency years in Jerusalem and not have prolonged interruptions in residency and stays outside Jerusalem in order to maintain residency status. Breaks in residency were calculated on the basis of the number of years resided inside and outside the city, including the West Bank and Gaza. Such breaks could lead to the cancellation of residency status by the Israeli authorities. Such rules included complicated civil procedures, such as marriage and birth registration, for Palestinians in Jerusalem, were aimed at isolating Palestinians from Jerusalem from the West Bank. Housing and construction permits were also affected by constraining laws imposed by the occupying Power and had a high rate of rejection, 87 per cent, leading to an increase in anarchic construction in Jerusalem. **Ms. Nammari** expressed regret at the absence of a clear political reference for Palestinian Jerusalemites in the Oslo Accords, preventing the establishment of Palestinian leadership in the city.

50. **Mr. Ghaith**, speaking about the politics of education in East Jerusalem, explained that Palestinian students in Jerusalem attended one of four kinds of schools: (a) waqf schools, which were operated by the Islamic endowment affiliated with the Palestinian Ministry of Education and Higher Education and followed the Palestinian curriculum introduced in 2001; (b) UNRWA schools, which followed the Palestinian curriculum, but whose existence had been put in jeopardy after the United States made cuts to the UNRWA budget; (c) private schools, which were funded through high tuition fees and substantive funding from Israel; and (d) schools jointly supervised by the Ministry of Education of Israel and the municipality of Jerusalem, which teach an Israeli curriculum.

51. **Mr. Ghaith** explained how the occupation had affected the school curriculum in East Jerusalem, which was slowly making the transition from a Palestinian programme to an Israeli one. That approach was a way to contain the new generation, which may be as threatening as ones

who had participated in the first and second intifadas. Arabic-medium schools were obliged to adopt the Israeli curriculum in exchange for funding and were subjected to strict review and modification of textbooks before printing. The Israeli education policy in East Jerusalem was part of the strategy to normalize the occupation.

52. **Mr. Ghaith** cited some of the challenges encountered by East Jerusalemites in education: a multiplicity of authorities; the integration of the Israeli narrative into Palestinian curricula; a current deficit of 2,547 classrooms; the separation wall; the lack of qualified teachers, who usually preferred to teach in private and Israel-administered schools because of their more attractive compensation packages; the non-recognition of Palestinian school-leaving certificates by the Israeli authorities, which could affect the residency status of any Jerusalemite who had chosen to study in the West Bank; and the non-recognition of Palestinian high school diplomas. The consequences of such challenges included higher school dropout rates, currently at 33 per cent among Palestinian students in Jerusalem, and early marriage.

53. **Mr. Ghaith** suggested raising awareness among Jerusalem's Palestinian parents about the practices of the municipality and the Ministry of Education of Israel leading to gaps in the Israel-imposed curriculum, in particular regarding Palestine's history and the occupation; motivating competent teachers to join Palestinian schools; increasing funding to satisfy criteria for suitable physical infrastructure, including closing the classroom deficit; monitoring the education sector at the international level; and examining whether the curriculum forced on students includes their cultural heritage. Jerusalemites were resilient and had the potential to chart a new course of action, but they would need the international community to stand by them so that they could receive an education that met international standards while preserving their cultural heritage.

54. **Mr. Mshasha**, speaking about challenges relating to employment and entrepreneurship under occupation, referred to the Israeli occupation as a planned, innovative and complex project under which Palestinian Jerusalemites lived under daily pressure to make ends meet and experienced the fear of the withdrawal of their residency permits. Among the direct consequences of the latter that he cited were an increase in chronic diseases, nervous breakdowns and depression among Palestinian young people and older persons. Nevertheless, although young people were subjected to the Israelization of their minds and suffered from high debt, they continued to resist. Examples of successful youth movements peacefully countering the occupation that he cited included action during the Aqsa Mosque events of 2017 and the move of the United States Embassy of 2018.

55. **Mr. Mshasha** lamented, however, the absence of a Palestinian development strategy and vision, and a lack of coordination among organizations working in East Jerusalem, including those comprising Palestinian young people, which, together, had contributed to the Palestinian failure to counteract the effects of a planned occupation strategy. Adding to the challenges were the seasonal mandate and work of civil society organizations and the issue of the access and impact of West Bank-based organizations in East Jerusalem.

56. Discussing the discrepancies between investing in training young people and providing them with employment opportunities, Mr. Mshasha cited the example of the Shu'fat refugee camp, whose young people trained by UNRWA had been presented with the choice of relocating to

Tel Aviv and finding decent work or staying in Jerusalem and finding temporary work, which then would require them to take out significant loans in order to settle down. The job training received by Palestinian young people in the Shu'fat camp did not align with the reality of the job market and the opportunities available to them. That had underlined the planned and well-studied occupation strategy of Israel.

57. **Mr. Mshasha** also referred to the delegitimizing efforts taken against UNRWA for the benefit of the occupying Power and at the expense of the Palestinian people. That campaign had begun to have an impact on the lives of 5.4 million refugees in Jerusalem, the West Bank and the region. All sectors had been affected, including education, health, vocational training and loan programmes. In addition, it had increased the psychological pressure on the population, including Palestinian refugee young people, at times leading to suicide. Challenges in providing assistance were not only related to budget cuts, but also to operational difficulties, in particular gaining access to Jerusalem.

58. **Mr. Mshasha** called for increased coordination and planning between the international community and local youth organizations, and support for the UNRWA strategy, in particular vocational training and loan programmes, in the light of budget cuts. The underlying issue of the Israeli occupation should not be overlooked, however, when planning those programmes.

Discussion

59. Although participants made a number of suggestions to improve opportunities for young people, they focused mainly on the challenge posed by an increasingly aggressive and expanding Israeli occupation. Some referred to a negative perception by Palestinians of their national authorities, whom, it was felt, had not provided enough assistance. Palestinian officials explained that limitations on implementing projects were often posed by Israel, even when funds from external donors, such as the Islamic Development Bank, the Bayt Mal Al-Quds Al-Sharif Agency and the European Union, were available. It was also explained that a strategic development plan had been drafted by the Ministry of the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction and presented to Qatar. Nevertheless, the funds received had not been sufficient to implement the plan fully.

60. An Israeli participant suggested that, since Palestinians, including young people, represented 30 per cent of the population of the city, they should become more involved in local governance by creating their own electoral lists in order to be represented in the municipality of Jerusalem and thus gain access to its resources. Many in the audience strongly criticized that idea, explaining that Palestinian participation in municipal elections would amount to legitimizing the Israeli occupation and the annexation of East Jerusalem; it would be akin to inviting a "ghettoed" community to participate in how to best implement its own occupation. Others argued that suggestions that the occupiers would treat them fairly if only the Palestinians were more cooperative were deceitful, because the occupation was, by definition, biased and brutal. They encouraged the Committee to focus on practices of the occupation and not be diverted to discussions on local governance and internal dynamics.

61. On the resistance of young people vis-à-vis the occupation, it was noted that, although successes had been achieved during the Aqsa Mosque incident, nevertheless, overall, young people were still arrested by the Israelis and at times tortured, and they felt that Palestinian authorities rarely tried to provide them with support. It was suggested to put the focus on the empowerment of young people instead, through education and employment.

62. The Chief of Mission of the Embassy of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela in Morocco, **Omar Nabil Nasser Solórzano**, condemned Israeli military practices and joined the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that all violations and provocations by the United States Government had to stop, out of respect for international law and United Nations resolutions. He condemned the violation of Security Council resolution 2334 (2016), the move of the United States Embassy to Jerusalem and the casualties caused during the Great March of Return and called for respect for the two-State solution, 1967 borders and East Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine.

D. Plenary session IV

Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem and the International Community

63. The panel, which focused on the theme “Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem and the International Community”, was chaired and moderated by the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations and Vice-Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Anayansi Rodríguez Camejo. It comprised four experts: the head of the Bayt Mal Al-Quds Agency, Mohamed Salem Cherkaoui; the Director General of the OIC Research Centre in Istanbul, Halit Eren; the Chair of the Center for Strategic Research of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, Ufuk Ulutaş; and the Special Representative of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the West Bank and Gaza, Roberto Valent.

64. **Mr. Cherkaoui** described the work of the Bayt Mal Al-Quds Al-Sharif Agency, established by OIC and chaired by the King of Morocco, as a non-profit Islamic Arab institution whose purpose was to establish and preserve Islamic and Arab rights in Jerusalem and help the Palestinian people to remain steadfast on their land. The Agency had implemented a number of programmes and projects in the health, education and population sectors, as well as in safeguarding the religious and civilizational heritage of the city. The Agency had a budget of \$2 million for Jerusalem. Its strategy was to assist East Jerusalemites in obtaining services for which they had paid taxes and fines to the Government of Israel but saw no benefits in return.

65. **Mr. Cherkaoui** also referred to the establishment of the Equity and Reconciliation Commission in Morocco in the early 2000s to address past grievances and envisage the future; he encouraged Palestinians to do the same. The support of Moroccans for Palestinians in Jerusalem was based on their fraternal link with Jerusalemites and their feeling of responsibility to support Palestine, notwithstanding the distance between Morocco and the Middle East, and also because, after the 1967 war, Israel had demolished the Moroccan Quarter of the Old City to make space for Jewish worship at the Western Wall. Most important, that assistance went beyond the framework of friendship with the Muslim and Christian Palestinians because Morocco considered Jerusalem to be a city of unity and peace for all.

66. **Mr. Ulutaş** outlined Turkey's perspective on the question of Jerusalem. While, on the surface, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict looked like a conflict between Israel and its neighbours, in reality, it was about the question of Jerusalem, whose core element was occupation. In that context, the United States "deal of the century" would produce even more catastrophic results, because political engineering done by biased third parties and pressure put on Palestinians would not bring peace. Any deal short of making East Jerusalem the capital of Palestine was a non-starter.

67. **Mr. Ulutaş** said that, to Turkey, Jerusalem was a historic responsibility because it was an Ottoman and Islamic heritage site. In addition, the country was part of the three-member United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, established by the General Assembly in its resolution 194 (III) to mediate the final status of Palestine. Currently, Turkey supported the two-State solution and encouraged negotiations on all final status issues, the total withdrawal of Israel from Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

68. **Mr. Eren**, outlining the work of the Istanbul-based Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture of OIC to preserve the history and heritage of Jerusalem/Al-Quds, recalled that the plight of Jerusalem and Palestine had been the founding motive of OIC in 1969 and that the resolution of that conflict remained the foremost cause of the organization. Thus, the issue also constituted one of the priority areas for the Research Centre, the cultural organ of OIC, and in which it had been active for nearly four decades.

69. One of the long-term research projects on Jerusalem consisted of collecting official documents from the archives of the Ottoman State in Istanbul and other areas and putting them to use as historical reference works on economic and social life. Since 2016, four volumes had been published. In 2018, the Research Centre had launched a new research project on land and real estate registries of Palestine. The Centre archive of historical photographs also had an elaborate section on Jerusalem. From 2006 to 2016, the Centre had conducted an architectural preservation programme involving studies, training and theoretical and practical work to frame guidelines on the restoration of some of the key structures in the city. In 2016, the Centre had launched the Atlas of Al-Quds project, through which architects and urban planners coordinated with Palestinian authorities and universities on modalities for preserving the Islamic heritage of Jerusalem. The Centre had also organized international conferences on Jerusalem, in 2014 and 2017, in Istanbul.

70. **Mr. Valent**, speaking about United Nations support for East Jerusalem, drew attention to the right of Palestinians to development. Referring to the critical situation in East Jerusalem, and the State of Palestine in general, he highlighted such challenges as restricted residency rights in the context of the current the political situation; increased displacement, as seen in Bedouin communities; physical fragmentation; housing demolition; restrictions on health-care services, educational services and the representation of the identity of the people; and the closure of Palestinian institutions in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, he urged participants not to let such challenges be a deterrent to the infusion of capital into East Jerusalem because, in its efforts towards the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the international community should include the right to development. UNDP had been able to garner critical resources for East

Jerusalem through the support of such organizations as OIC and the Islamic Development Bank, and Member States close to Palestine, such as the Gulf countries, India, Norway, South Africa and Sweden, which had helped UNDP to support Palestinian resilience through the provision of services.

71. Pointing out that poverty levels in East Jerusalem were among the worst in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, **Mr. Valent** mentioned that United Nations agencies were currently working with the Palestinian Government and development partners on a new framework for resilient development. Given that annual direct budgetary support from the international community to the State of Palestine had been decreasing, from more than \$1.7 billion annually from 2007 to 2010 to approximately \$500 million in 2018, there was now an imperative for better coordination among all stakeholders.

Discussion

72. During the ensuing discussion, a participant drew attention to Israeli media reports that some Arab countries had been warning Israel about Turkish activities in Jerusalem, urging that aid to the Palestinian people should not be politicized.

73. With regard to the protection of Jerusalem's cultural heritage, it was suggested that UNESCO establish a permanent presence there, considering the rapid changes taking place on the ground and the transformation of the city, including in the names of quarters and streets. Participants appreciated Moroccan contributions to Jerusalem at the humanitarian and diplomatic levels.

74. In response to a question about whether Hamas was represented at the Conference and, if not, why, and a comment that Israelis were afraid of a future Palestinian State becoming a "Hamas-land" in Gaza and the West Bank, participants responded that the depiction of the Hamas threat was just the latest in a long list of Israeli attempts to depict Palestinian groups, from Fatah/PLO in the 1970s and 1980s to Hamas currently, as a threat. Rather than looking at an external threat or expecting Palestinians to constantly give certificates of good conduct, Israelis should build their own peace camp to end the occupation. The Palestinian side had already shown flexibility by settling for the two-State solution on 22 per cent of historic Palestinian land.

V. Closing session

75. The Director of the Mashreq, Arabian Gulf and Arab and Islamic Organizations Department of the Moroccan Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, **Fouad Akhrif**, delivered closing remarks on behalf of the host country. He emphasized that the message of King Mohammed VI had elevated the Conference and indicated the clear position of Morocco on the question of Palestine and Palestinian rights. The only possibility for a fair and just settlement of the conflict was the two-State solution, based on international law. The Conference had been another example of international and regional efforts towards the realization of

Palestinian rights. **Mr. Akhrif** called upon the international community to continue to be committed to the independence of the State of Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

76. The Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations, **Riyad Mansour**, noted that the Conference had started on a high note, with the message of King Mohammed VI. He called upon the international community to create conditions that would put an end to the current tragedy and said that Israel could not continue to oppress and humiliate Palestinians and still expect peace. Mr. Mansour said that a sophisticated form of ethnic cleansing of Palestinians from Jerusalem was then under way. At times, the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, had been pre-empted from making changes to the status of Jerusalem by the solidarity of Palestinians of all religions, as seen during the prayers at the Aqsa Mosque and in the closing of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

77. **Mr. Mansour** added that Israel had ignored the Palestinian offer to agree to a withdrawal to the 1967 lines and had instead focused on Hamas. Citing the heavy human toll taken during the Gaza protests of March to June 2018, he called for the international protection of Palestinian civilians. He emphasized the need to redouble efforts in order to defend the two-State solution.

VI. Key themes and recommendations

78. The following key themes and recommendations emerged during the Conference deliberations:

- Jerusalem is a final status issue that must be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties on the basis of relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.
- Greater rallying of diplomatic efforts is needed to ensure that international resolutions protecting the status and identity of the city are implemented. More important, however, the conflict needs to be brought back to the concept of two peoples and two States, and final status issues should be dealt with within the framework of final status negotiations.
- Recent developments have weakened the prospects for new peace process rounds and the credibility of the United States as a mediator. Nevertheless, the Palestinian Government has recently announced a proposal to express and reiterate its readiness to negotiate the two-State solution and end occupation on the basis of the 1967 borders.
- The Oslo Accords have been misused as a distraction from Israeli settlement activities. The PLO has been forced to recognize the State of Israel, while Israel has not recognized the State of Palestine. Palestinian commitment to the Accords and readiness to postpone negotiations on the status of Jerusalem should have been made conditional on Israel's commitment to freezing its settlement activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territory.
- The Palestinian Government remains open and ready to cooperate with other Palestinian groups, such as Hamas, provided that they fully accept the two-State solution, abide by

international law, embrace peaceful popular resistance and a single legitimate authority and cooperate in the holding of elections to revive Palestinian democracy.

- While the focus on the status and rights of Jerusalemites under occupation remains important, the question of Jerusalem should not be reduced to a humanitarian issue. To avoid another scenario similar to that of Gaza, political solutions should be pursued, along with the issue of legal and socioeconomic rights.
- In the light of the trend of peaceful protests by Palestinian young people that has emerged during the past year, in particular following the closure of the Aqsa Mosque, Jerusalemites are encouraged to stay in their city and adopt forms of non-violent resistance against an increasingly sophisticated occupation. Local Palestinian authorities are encouraged to have a development strategy that values the empowerment of young people at the city and governorate levels.
- The fundamental problems remain the Israeli occupation and Israeli reluctance to recognize the Palestinian people as equals, which has resulted in a colonizer-colonized power dynamic between the two peoples. Against this background, Israeli proposals that Palestinians in East Jerusalem participate in local governance in order to improve their social and economic situation are calls for a de facto acceptance of the annexation of East Jerusalem.
- Israel has used religious claims to legitimize occupation, as the Zionist movement had used religion to create a nationality. As a result, the ongoing occupation is turning the conflict from a national struggle into one between two religions.
- International and regional organizations, such as the European Union, should adopt a more active political role and not restrict themselves to funding development.
- The international community should have a presence in Jerusalem to ensure the protection of the city's cultural and historical heritage, considering the threat posed by expanding settlements and the resulting transformation.
- The international community should focus on the Palestinians' inalienable right to development despite the challenges posed by occupation, including restrictions on residency, the demolition of property and the closing of Palestinian institutions.
- Israel's targeting of the Palestinian education sector is part of its strategy to normalize the occupation.
- Civil society organizations, the Government of Palestine and funding agencies need to coordinate better with one another with regard to programmes for young people in East Jerusalem. Assistance should take into consideration the political situation in East Jerusalem, its isolation from the West Bank and the issue of access.

- Given the cuts made to the budgets of some development agencies, there is a need for investment in vocational training and loan programmes for Palestinian young people.
- At future conferences, the focus should be put on the violations of the occupying Power and the asymmetry of power in the conflict, rather than on opportunities to improve local development and governance.
- Future conferences and meetings on the question of Jerusalem should also be held outside the Arabo-Islamic world.

Annex I Programme

Day 1

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Rabat

- 3 p.m. **Opening session (I)**
 Statement
 Representative of Morocco:
 Nasser Bourita
- 3.30 p.m. **Press conference**
- 4 p.m. Reception, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation

Day 2

Hôtel la Tour Hassan Palace

- 10-10.50 a.m. **Opening session (II)**
 Statements
 Representative of the United Nations:
 Miroslav Jenča, Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs
- Representative of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation:
 Samir Bakr, Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine Affairs
- Representative of the State of Palestine:
 Mohammad Shtayyeh
- Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the
 Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People:
 Fodé Seck
- 11 a.m.-1 p.m. **Plenary session I**
 Political and social status of Palestinians in East Jerusalem today
 Abdallah Siam
 Deputy Governor of Jerusalem
 Palestinian strategy for East Jerusalem
- Lara Friedman**
 Foundation for Middle East Peace
 Recent political developments on Jerusalem
- Daniel Seidemann**
 Terrestrial Jerusalem

Israeli measures in East Jerusalem

Amneh Badran

Al-Quds University

Residency and exile

3-6 p.m.

Plenary session II

The Question of Jerusalem in international law and Member States' obligations

Ziad Abuzayyad

Former Minister for Jerusalem Affairs

International law provisions applicable to the question of Jerusalem

Moshe Amirav

Professor, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Israeli non-compliance and civil society action

Dimitris Bouris

Assistant Professor of European External Relations

European Union policies and practice

6.15 p.m.

Reception of Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People—Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Hôtel la Tour Hassan Palace

Day 3

Hôtel la Tour Hassan Palace

10 a.m.-1 p.m.

Plenary session III

Coming of age under occupation: Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem

Shoroq Nammari

Palestine Vision

Perspectives of the post-Oslo generation

Ali Ghaith

Freelance journalist

The politics of education in East Jerusalem

Sami Mshasha

External Relations and Communication, United Nations Relief and Works

Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

Employment and entrepreneurship under occupation

3-5 p.m.

Plenary session IV

Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem and the International Community

Mohamed Salem Cherkaoui

Director, Bayt Mal Al-Quds Al-Sharif Agency

Moroccan support for East Jerusalem

Ufuk Ulutaş

Chair, Center for Strategic Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey

Turkey's perspective on the question of Jerusalem

Halit Eren

Director General, Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation

Organization of Islamic Cooperation support for East Jerusalem

Roberto Valent

Special Representative of the Administrator, United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People

United Nations support for East Jerusalem

5.15-6 p.m.

Closing session

Statements

Chair of the Committee:

Fodé Seck

Representative of Morocco:

Representative of the State of Palestine:

Riyad Mansour

Annex II

Summary of the Chair

The International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem on the theme “The question of Jerusalem after 50 years of occupation and 25 years of the Oslo Accords”, was convened in Rabat from 26 to 28 June 2018, under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and with the support of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). Ahead of the Conference, on 26 June, a delegation from the Committee held bilateral meetings with the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives (lower house) of the Parliament of Morocco, Yousef Gharbi, and the Vice-President of the House of Councillors (upper house), Abdelhakim Benchamach. The delegation also held a bilateral meeting with the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Morocco, Nasser Bourita.

The Conference brought together Palestinian, Israeli and international experts, representatives of the diplomatic community and members of civil society to provide up-to-date information on the current situation in East Jerusalem, examine the latest legal developments affecting the political and social status of Palestinians and explore practical ways in which the international community could support the resilience and development of the city, in particular its young people. In addition, participants in the event identified opportunities for international and regional support while safeguarding the rights of Palestinians in East Jerusalem.

At the opening session, in a message delivered on his behalf by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, **King Mohammed VI** of Morocco, Chair of the Al-Quds Committee of OIC, reiterated his rejection of the movement of embassies to Jerusalem and any modification of the legal, political or historical status of Jerusalem, because they would undermine international efforts to find a peaceful solution to the question of Palestine. He also called for greater rallying of diplomatic efforts and actions on the ground to promote development in the social and humanitarian fields. Specifically, and in relation to the Conference held in Rabat, the King suggested that future such conferences also be held outside the Arabo-Islamic world.

The United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, **Miroslav Jenča**, recalled that Jerusalem was a final status issue that must be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties on the basis of relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. He stressed that it was more important than ever to take effective concerted action because the convergence and global consensus of past decades were eroding. He also noted that recent developments in Jerusalem, which were incompatible with international consensus and Security Council resolutions, risked emboldening antagonistic voices on both sides and further diminishing hopes of reaching a peaceful and sustainable solution.

The Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine Affairs of OIC, Samir Bakr, delivered a message from the Secretary-General of the Organization, **Yousef al-Othaimen**, calling upon the international community to intervene responsibly and effectively to protect the vision of the two-State solution by engaging in a multilateral political process based on international legitimacy and the Arab Peace Initiative. He reiterated the OIC rejection of the decision of the United States of America to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital and to transfer its embassy to the city,

and he expressed regret at the failure of the Security Council to act against Israeli transgressions of international law.

The representative of the State of Palestine and Minister of the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction, **Mohammad Shtayyeh**, stated that the components of the solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict were well known and enjoyed the near-consensus of the international community. Negotiations through the sole mediation of the United States had failed, however, because that country was not a fair mediator. Mr. Shtayyeh reiterated the eight-point plan presented by the President of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas, to the Security Council on 20 February 2018, adding that Palestinians would welcome an international conference and a mechanism to end the conflict on the basis of international law and international legitimacy. In reference to internal Palestinian divisions, he added that the Palestinian Authority under Mr. Abbas remained open and ready to cooperate with other groups, such as Hamas, provided that they fully accept the two-State solution, abide by international law and embrace peaceful popular resistance, a single legitimate authority and the holding of elections to revive Palestinian democracy.

The Chair of the Committee, **Fodé Seck** (Senegal), reiterated the Committee's rejection of recent decisions by the United States and other countries to transfer their embassies to Jerusalem, in violation of international law. Recalling that the international community had an obligation to support the Palestinian inhabitants of East Jerusalem morally, politically, through diplomacy and materially, he pointed to the activities of the Committee in the diplomatic and capacity-building arenas – such as conferences, bilateral visits and numerous training sessions for Palestinian civil servants – as contributions to the larger goal of the Palestinian people of attaining their inalienable rights.

During the first panel discussion, on the theme “The political and social status of Palestinians in East Jerusalem today”, speakers outlined the Israeli policy of implementing unilateral decisions - such as regarding the expansion of settlements, the building of the wall and the imposition of restrictions on the residency status of Palestinians in Jerusalem - in order to assert the claim that Jerusalem was the capital of the State of Israel, with the goal of making the decisions irrevocable. They also addressed the motives behind United States decisions under the current Administration and their impact, among them the fact that, instead of taking the question of Jerusalem off the negotiating table, such decisions had brought greater attention to the question from the international community. Panellists also highlighted the genesis and current status of Israeli residency regulations for Palestinians living in Jerusalem, which were aimed at transforming Palestinians into a minority in their own city, without full political, economic or social rights. Participants called for the launching of initiatives to keep Palestinians in Jerusalem in the city; they also referred to the role played by parliamentarians in support of the Palestinian people. Others cautioned against losing sight of the political aspects while focusing on humanitarian questions. Everyone agreed that the Palestinian community in Jerusalem, including its heritage and institutions, needed to be reinforced.

During the second panel discussion, on the theme “The question of Jerusalem in international law and Member States' obligations”, participants recalled General Assembly resolution 181 (II) and the international status of the entire city, which made it a final status

question for Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. They examined the cautious engagement of the European Union and recent fissures in the political consensus of the regional bloc and explored why, during previous rounds of negotiations, the question of Jerusalem could not be resolved. During the discussion, speakers pointed to the hardening political positions in Israel and a colonizer-colonized power dynamic between Israelis and Palestinians. They called for the European Union to take a more active role and fulfil its obligation to safeguard human rights. Addressing the question of why Israelis and Palestinians had failed thus far to reach an agreement, attendees pointed out that the fundamental problem was the Israeli occupation, as well as Israelis' reluctance to recognize the Palestinian people as equals.

On 28 June, the third panel discussion, on the theme “Coming of age under occupation: Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem”, focused on the hurdles faced by the younger generation in maintaining its right to live in the city, seeking an education and creating a liveable future. The speakers representing Palestinian young people echoed the calls of earlier panels for increased international political and development-related support. Participants also highlighted United Nations support for East Jerusalem. Speakers argued that suggestions that Palestinians in East Jerusalem participate in the Israeli municipal elections, which could help increase budget allocations to their neighbourhoods, would nevertheless amount to accepting and legitimizing the Israeli annexation of occupied territory. Others remarked that the task for Israeli partners in the quest for peace was not to advise Palestinians on how to accommodate the occupation, but to work inside their own community with the goal of ending the occupation.

During the fourth panel discussion, on the theme “Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem and the international community”, speakers highlighted the contributions of Member States and intergovernmental organizations – among them Turkey, the Bayt Mal al-Quds Al-Sharif Agency, the Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture of OIC and the United Nations Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People – to supporting the population of East Jerusalem in the realms of development aid, resilience and the preservation of its historic and cultural identity. The discussion revealed a strong appreciation for regional and United Nations support for the Palestinian people, as well as calls for a permanent presence in Jerusalem of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as a safeguard against further Israeli alterations. In response to a query on why no representative of Hamas, the de facto authority in the Gaza Strip, was present at the Conference, participants pointed out that the focus of Israel and the United States on Hamas was only a new phase of the long-standing attempt to put the onus of compliant behaviour on the Palestinian side; in fact, the core problem was the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territory and population. In addition, while the Committee always tried to invite Palestinians from Gaza – albeit not Hamas as an organization – to its conferences, Israel would not issue exit permits.

During the closing session, statements were made by the host country and the State of Palestine. The Director of the Mashreq, Arabian Gulf and Arab and Islamic Organizations Department of the Moroccan Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, **Fouad Akhrif**, recalled that the message of King Mohammed VI had elevated the Conference and indicated the clear position of Morocco regarding Palestine and Palestinian rights. The only possibility for a fair and just settlement of the conflict was the two-State solution based on international law. The Conference was set in the framework of international and regional efforts

towards the realization of Palestinian rights. Mr. Akhrif called upon everyone to continue to be committed to the independence of the State of Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital. The Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations, **Riyad Mansour**, emphasized the importance of redoubling efforts towards defending the two-State solution if the international community, including Israel and the United States, did not want to see a further deterioration of the situation. He called upon the international community to create the conditions under which everyone could put an end to the current tragedy and said that Israel could not continue to oppress and humiliate Palestinians and still expect peace.

Note: This summary attempts to provide an overall picture of the deliberations of the Conference. A detailed report, including specific questions that were addressed during the interactive discussions, will be published by the Division for Palestinian Rights in due course.

Annex III
Message of King Mohammed VI of Morocco

English translation of the message of King Mohammed VI of Morocco, read by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Morocco, Nasser Bourita, at the opening session of the International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem, organized by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People with the support of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, from 26 to 28 June 2018 in Rabat

The following message was read in Arabic; translations into English, French and Spanish were distributed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Morocco.

Praise be to God

May peace and blessings be upon The Prophet, His Kith and Kin

Your Excellencies,
 Ladies and Gentlemen,

I should like to welcome to the Kingdom of Morocco all the participants in this Fifth International Conference on Al-Quds, which Rabat is proud to host.

First of all, I wish to reaffirm our strong commitment to the Palestinian cause as well as our unwavering support and full solidarity with our Palestinian brothers in keeping with the irreversible pledge Morocco has made to maintain its support until the Palestinian people regain their inalienable rights. The latter derive their legitimacy from international law, from facts on the ground and from historical evidence.

This session is very different from previous ones. It is taking place in a context marked by serious developments, namely the decision by the United States of America to recognize Al-Quds as the capital of Israel and to move its embassy there, which it did officially on 14 May 2018. We, in Morocco, immediately rejected this step and considered it to be incompatible with international law and with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

As Chairman of the Al-Quds Committee, I foresaw that decision and therefore wrote to the President of the United States, Mr. Donald Trump, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. António Guterres. In my letters, I emphasized that any modification of the legal, political or historical status of Al-Quds would have serious repercussions on peace in the region and would undermine international efforts to create an environment conducive to the resumption of peace negotiations with a view to finding a just, comprehensive solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

I also informed my brother President Mahmoud Abbas that we reject the American decision and assured him of Morocco's full solidarity and its strong commitment to exert all possible efforts to

rally international support to uphold the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to an independent State, with East Al-Quds as its capital.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The American decision is a step outside the bounds of international legitimacy; it undermines the frame of reference set by the relevant resolutions, diminishes the stature of the United Nations and puts security and stability at risk in the region and beyond.

Given the serious, disturbing developments which followed the American decision, I consider that the resolve shown to hold this session as planned attests to international awareness of the importance of overcoming all difficulties still hindering the settlement of this conflict. It also shows there is still hope of finding a way to achieve that settlement.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

There are a number of misconceptions regarding the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. It has been feeding on false, misleading ideas and has been governed by narrow-minded perceptions. All of that has made it a difficult, complex issue. Nevertheless, it is still possible to address it as a mere conflict which can be brought to an end, rather than as an inevitable destiny.

This is a conflict that can be resolved if delusions and nostalgia for the past are abandoned and provided a sense of realism and confidence in the future prevail. What is required, therefore, is a rational approach to history through the unleashing of a constructive dynamic that charts the way forward towards a better future; what is needed is a break with negative, destructive ideas that take their proponents one step back.

This conflict has lasted for far too long, causing a great deal of sorrow and pain. It has caused and is still causing far too many innocent victims and has ruined many opportunities not only for development, but also for a free and safe life for many generations. It has also created deeper rifts and divisions within the international community.

What is even more serious is that the longer the conflict is allowed to go unresolved, the more difficult and complicated a settlement will become, and the greater and more disastrous the impact will be on the region and the world.

The duration of the conflict and the state of political stalemate it has been in since 2014 should not lead to apathy or indifference; nor should the stalemate lead to negative attitudes or unjust decisions that deepen the feelings of frustration and resentment among the Palestinians, plunging them into situations conducive to radicalism and despair.

In view of the above, the international community is duty-bound today to pool efforts at a faster pace so as to put the issue on the table with a view to reaching a negotiated, safe and fair settlement. This should be achieved through an orderly process based on a realistic vision and a specific

timeline, using the existing frame of reference to which the parties concerned would commit in a serious, proactive and responsible manner.

The influential global powers, particularly the United States of America, and dominant regional countries, should each play their role in a responsible, equitable manner in their respective sphere of influence.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The lack of political prospects in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict – which is compounded by unilateral decisions and practices the Palestinians find provocative – is the main reason for the tense situations that lead to acts of mutual violence and to the excessive use of force by the Israeli occupation forces.

This tension was clearly felt in the demonstrations which were held during the Great March of Return at the Gaza border and which were of a peaceful, symbolic nature. The Israeli occupation forces reacted to them by firing live bullets directly at the demonstrators, killing dozens and wounding hundreds of unarmed Palestinian civilians.

The Kingdom of Morocco immediately condemned and rejected this dangerous Israeli behaviour which is incompatible with international law. Morocco also expressed deep sorrow at the tragic events which exacerbate human suffering among our Palestinian brothers.

As I was keen to help alleviate this suffering and demonstrate our concrete solidarity with our Palestinian brothers on the ground, during the holy month of Ramadan I launched a humanitarian initiative, which I supervised personally. It concerned the Gaza Strip and was later extended to Al-Quds Al-Sharif and Ramallah.

We have also set up a field hospital in the Gaza Strip, managed by the Moroccan Royal Armed Forces. It covers a range of medical specialties, including paediatrics, orthopaedics, gastroenterology, ophthalmology and ear, nose and throat conditions.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Many symposia and conferences have been held on Al-Quds. These are praiseworthy, welcome initiatives, so long as such events are based on solid foundations, their intent is sincere and they serve the cause, either through solidarity, insight and supportive stances, or through realistic, constructive recommendations.

However, I believe Al-Quds needs greater rallying of diplomatic efforts to secure binding international resolutions that protect the City and safeguard its spiritual, cultural and legal character. It also needs action on the ground to promote development in social and humanitarian fields to help Palestinians resist policies of displacement, eviction and expulsion applied against them.

This is the approach I have adopted as Chairman of the Al-Quds Committee through close, regular contacts with the leaders of the influential powers, with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and with the Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, and also through the continuous action on the ground, carried out, under my guidance and supervision, by Bayt Mal Al-Quds Al-Sharif. This institution has managed to implement many important economic and social projects in the holy city, in such areas as housing, education, health and social affairs, as well as care for women, children, young people and groups in precarious situations.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Al-Quds needs a realistic, equitable political settlement leading to the determination of the final status, through direct negotiations between the parties concerned based on the existing international frame of reference. The entire international community has a responsibility to shoulder in terms of working to achieve this settlement by putting the peace process back on track, by supervising it and by accompanying the two sides concerned.

The issue of Al-Quds does not concern a specific faith, people or country. It is a question that concerns two peoples and two states. Its settlement requires genuine political will, concerted efforts and the involvement of international sponsors, relying on their experience, clout, neutrality and the ability to exert influence.

This requires mobilizing the good will of all those concerned, within a unified framework, relying on a balanced collective mechanism that helps both parties to the conflict to abide by international law, international legitimacy and bilateral agreements and understandings, to refrain from predetermining solutions to any of the final status issues, particularly those relating to Al-Quds, refugees and borders, and to pledge to deal with these issues within the framework of final status negotiations.

Al-Quds has been and will remain a space for coexistence and tolerance – a collective heritage shared by the followers of the revealed religions. We must all preserve and safeguard it by being purposefully mobilized, exerting sincere efforts and proposing sound ideas.

To give concrete substance to this approach, which reflects the importance and universal, symbolic value of Al-Quds, I suggest that the convening of certain sessions of this international Conference in countries outside the Arab and Islamic world be considered.

I pray that Almighty God grant you success in your efforts to promote peace and security.

* * *

Annex IV

List of participants

Speakers

Ziad Abuzayyad	Former Minister for Jerusalem Affairs
Moshe Amirav	Professor of Political Science, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Amneh Badran	Chair, Department of Political Science, Al-Quds University
Dimitris Bouris	Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Amsterdam
Mohamed Salem Cherkaoui	Director, General Affairs and Communication Bayt Mal Al-Quds al-Sharif Agency
Halit Eren	Director General, Research Centre for Islamic History Art and Culture of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation
Lara Friedman	President, Foundation for Middle East Peace
Ali Ghaith	Freelance journalist
Sami Mshasha	Director, Communications and Arabic Language Spokesperson United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
Shoroq Nammari	Project Coordinator, Palestine Vision
Daniel Seidemann	Director, Terrestrial Jerusalem
Abdallah Siam	Deputy Governor of Jerusalem, Palestinian Authority
Ufuk Ulutaş	Chair, Center for Strategic Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey
Roberto Valent	Special Representative of the Administrator, Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People, United Nations Development Programme

**Delegation of the Committee on the Exercise of the
Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People**

Fodé Seck	Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations Chair of the Committee, New York
Anayansi Rodríguez Camejo	Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations Vice-Chair of the Committee, New York
Dian Triansyah Djani	Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations Vice-Chair of the Committee, New York
Riyad Mansour	Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations Observer of the Committee, New York

Representative of the Secretary-General

Miroslav Jenča	Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs United Nations Balázs Dobrosi, Assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General Department of Political Affairs, New York
----------------	---

Governments

Algeria	Ahmed Benyamana, Ambassador Ahmed Banyahya, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Argentina	María Fernanda Cañas, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Austria	Sieglinde Fedele Di Catrano, Chargé d'affaires Embassy in Rabat
Azerbaijan	Nail Gojayev Embassy in Rabat
Bahrain	Khalid Salemane Jaber Elmaslem Embassy in Rabat

Bangladesh	Suhana Laila Hossan, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Brazil	Jose Humberto de Brito Cruz, Ambassador Edison Luiz da Rosa Junior, Secretary, Political Affairs Embassy in Rabat
Chile	Alex Geiger, Ambassador Nicolas Franjola, Political Adviser Embassy in Rabat
China	Fu Yu, Attaché Zhu Kewei, First Adviser Fu Yu, Second Secretary Wang Linglin, Third Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Croatia	Dujic Davor, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Cyprus	Sevag Avedissian, First Counsellor Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Denmark	Zineb Abbad El Andaloussi, Personal Assistant to the Ambassador and Cultural Officer Malene Sigaard, Political Intern Embassy in Rabat
Djibouti	Ibrahim Bileh Doualeh, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Dominican Republic	Grecia Pichardo de Decamps, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
France	Elena Katia Christine Tonev, First Secretary Raphaël Doléans, Assistant Trainee Embassy in Rabat
Gabon	Barthélémy Leboussi, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Germany	Götz Schmidt-Bremme, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat

Guatemala	Jacobo Cuyún, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Guinea	Arafa Armando Albito Embassy in Rabat
India	Nirav Kumar Babubhai Sutariya, Second Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Indonesia	Ali Wardhana, Third Secretary Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the United Nations, New York
Italy	Barbara Bregato, Ambassador Pietro Paolo Proto, First Secretary Francesca Graffagnino, Intern Embassy in Rabat
Japan	Shintaro Nakaaki, Second Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Jordan	Hazem Al-Khatib Al-Tamimi, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Kuwait	Abdellatif Ali Abdellah Yahya, Ambassador Naser Al-Sabej, Diplomatic Attaché Embassy in Rabat
Lebanon	Ziad Atallah, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Libya	Mohamed Alaouzi, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Malaysia	Astanah Abdul Aziz, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Mexico	María Angelica Arce Mora, Ambassador Rocío Carbajal, Deputy Head of Mission Embassy in Rabat
Morocco	Mohamed Methqal, Ambassador, Director General Noureddine Tabete, Adviser Moroccan International Cooperation Agency

	Houda Belhaj, Head of Section, United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development Khadija Elzabani, Constitutional Union Samah Houmg, Intern Alia Marso, Intern Leila El Euldj, Intern Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Niger	Ibrahim Sidi Oumar, Second Counsellor Embassy in Rabat
Oman	Abdullah Bin Obaid Al-Hinai, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Pakistan	Nadir Chaudhri, Ambassador Mohammed Wasif, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Panama	Naddia Avila, Third Secretary of Foreign Affairs Embassy in Rabat
Paraguay	Oscar Rodolfo Benítez Estragó, Ambassador Saad Ahkoul, Administrator Embassy in Rabat
Qatar	Abdullah Falah Al-Dosari, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Romania	Daniela Bazavan, Ambassador Daniela Oprisan, Chief of Mission Embassy in Rabat
Russian Federation	Shcherbakov Kirill, Third Secretary Embassy in Rabat
Saudi Arabia	Faisal Alhakhbani, Head of Fourth Committee Permanent Mission of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations, New York Rafat Charaf, Diplomatic Adviser Embassy in Rabat
Serbia	Sladjana Prica, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
South Africa	Marysia Dusinsri, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat

Sudan	Abdeltowab El Zein Suliman, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Sweden	Jonatan Henriksson, First Secretary, Deputy Head of Mission Embassy in Rabat
Switzerland	Massimo Baggi, Ambassador Luca Gäng, Academic Trainee Embassy in Rabat
Togo	Ali Tiloh, First Secretary Lennah Togi, Assistant Embassy in Rabat
Tunisia	Mohamed Ben Ayed, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Turkey	Ethem Barkan Oz, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Ukraine	Yaroslav Koval, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
United Arab Emirates	Saeed Muhair Al Ketbi, Minister Plenipotentiary Mouza Anwar Abdulaziz Alkhuwaiter, Third Secretary Ouail Ousfar, Economic Research Coordinator Embassy in Rabat
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Thomas Reilly, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Omar Nabil Nasser Solórzano, Chief of Mission María Elena Colmenares Magallanes Imane Ben El Hassan Embassy in Rabat
Yemen	Ezzadin Saeed Al-Asbahi, Ambassador Embassy in Rabat

Non-Member States having received a standing invitation to participate as observers in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly and maintaining permanent observer missions at United Nations Headquarters

Holy See	Don Marcel Diouf, First Secretary Embassy in Rabat
State of Palestine	Mohammad Shtayyeh, Minister Representative of the State of Palestine Jamal al-Shobaki, Ambassador Qudaih Mohammed, Counsellor Fulla Abu En Rob, Counsellor Embassy in Rabat

Intergovernmental organizations

European Union	Calin Ilie, Political Counsellor Delegation of the European Union to Morocco
League of Arab States	Saeed Abu Ali Assistant Secretary-General for Palestinian Affairs Gehan Khaled Youssef Soltan, Director Occupied Arab Territories
Organization of Islamic Cooperation	Samir Bakr Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine Affairs Shaher Awawdeh, Deputy Permanent Observer of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation to the United Nations, New York Ahmed Saïd Bah, Director of External Relations and Cooperation, Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Rabat
Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean	Bellal Qasem Vice-President

Other entities having received a standing invitation to participate as observers in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly and maintaining permanent offices at United Nations Headquarters

Islamic Development Bank Group	Said Mourabit, Regional Economist, Islamic Development Bank, Regional Hub in Rabat
--------------------------------	--

Organs, Agencies and Bodies of the United Nations System

Department of Management	Cherine Baali, Human Resources Business Partner
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Marta Piccarozzi, Specialist in Evaluation and Strategic Planning Florence Rolle, Representative, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Morocco
United Nations Industrial Development Organization	Hanan Hanzaz, Country Representative

Civil Society Organizations

Proper Thought for Development	Abdelilah Ghazioui, President Abdelhai Abdelmoula, General Secretary of the Organization, Morocco
Sharek Youth Forum	Bader Zamareh, Executive Director, Palestine
Sustainable Development Forum	Yomn Mohamed Hafez Elhamaky, Professor of Economy, Egypt
Women's Center for Legal Aid and Counselling	Randa Siniora, General Director, Palestine
World Council of Churches	Munib A. Younan, Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land, Palestine

Media

Agence France-Presse	Sophie Pons, Bureau Chief Hicham Rafih, Journalist
Alexandria International Center	Aly Elbaroudy, Journalist
Al Jazeera	Abdelmounim El Amrani, Correspondent Yassine El Mchiek, Camera Operator Abdelhak Eshassah, Producer
Al Jazeera Network, Côte d'Ivoire	Eric Biantuadie

Asdaa Elmaghreb Arabie

Rachid Moulid

Associated Press

Nadine Achoui-Lesage, Video Journalist

Associated Press TV, Morocco

Houda Benalla, Journalist
Mosa'ab Elshamy, Photographer

Daal Research and Media

Karim Shafik, Journalist

Le360

Gamal Noursaid

Le Reporter

Ben Achour

Maghreb Arabe Presse

Rachid Karom, Journalist

Morocco World News

Dana Leger, Journalist

Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation

Zaid Abu Shamaa, News Correspondent

Reuters

Zakia Abed Alnabi

Société nationale de radiodiffusion et de
télévision

Zakaria Garnaoui, Journalist

United Nations News

Magdy Abdelmaged Mostafa, Journalist

Wikalat Anadoul

Mohammed Tahiri

Public

Faculté des Sciences Juridiques,
Economiques et Sociales, Rabat

Yassine Ezzaime, University Professor

Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3

Sarah Boukri

Unaffiliated/in personal capacity
Unaffiliated/in personal capacity
Unaffiliated/in personal capacity
Unaffiliated/in personal capacity
Unaffiliated/in personal capacity

Mira Maoz
Dorit Seidemann
Jihane Alaoui
Youssef Fajr
Mark Provenza

* * *