



# FINAL EVALUATION

**Sudan**

Thematic window  
Conflict Prevention & Peace Building

**Programme Title:**

Sustained Peace for Development: Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building in Sudan through Targeted Interventions in Selected Communities along the 1-1-1956 Border

# Prologue

This final evaluation report has been coordinated by the MDG Achievement Fund joint programme in an effort to assess results at the completion point of the programme. As stipulated in the monitoring and evaluation strategy of the Fund, all 130 programmes, in 8 thematic windows, are required to commission and finance an independent final evaluation, in addition to the programme's mid-term evaluation.

Each final evaluation has been commissioned by the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) in the respective programme country. The MDG-F Secretariat has provided guidance and quality assurance to the country team in the evaluation process, including through the review of the TORs and the evaluation reports. All final evaluations are expected to be conducted in line with the OECD Development Assistant Committee (DAC) Evaluation Network "Quality Standards for Development Evaluation", and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Standards for Evaluation in the UN System".

Final evaluations are summative in nature and seek to measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented its activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes. They also generate substantive evidence-based knowledge on each of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned to be carried forward to other development interventions and policy-making at local, national, and global levels.

We thank the UN Resident Coordinator and their respective coordination office, as well as the joint programme team for their efforts in undertaking this final evaluation.

MDG-F Secretariat

*The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation are those of the evaluator and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Joint Programme or MDG-F Secretariat.*



## Final Evaluation

**Programme Title:** Sustained Peace for Development:  
Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building in  
Sudan through Targeted Interventions in  
Selected Communities along the 1-1-1956  
Border

**Thematic window:** Conflict Prevention and Peace Building

**Report prepared for:** UN Joint Programme Conflict Prevention and  
Peace Building, Sudan/  
MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F)

**Prepared by:** Ahmed Gamal Eldin

July 2013

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Acronyms .....	4
Executive Summary .....	6
1.0 Introduction .....	9
1.1 JP Outcomes and Outputs .....	9
1.2 The JP Context and Background .....	10
1.2.1 Four Stages of the JP Implementation .....	11
2.0 The Final Evaluation.....	11
2.1 Levels of Analysis .....	12
2.2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology .....	13
2.3 Evaluation Challenges and Limitations .....	14
4.0 Design Level Findings.....	15
4.1 The JP Problem Identification and Theory of Change.....	15
4.2 Designing Process .....	16
4.3 Design Strengths.....	17
4.4 Design Shortcomings .....	17
4.5 Alignment with National Priorities .....	18
4.6 Targeting .....	19
5.0 JP Implementation.....	19
5.1 Achieved Activities and Output .....	22
5.2 Ownership of the JP .....	26
5.4 Contribution to the MGDs.....	26
5.4 Implementing the MTE Recommendations .....	27
5.5 Coordination and Synergies .....	27
5.6 Gender Consideration .....	29
5.7 Beneficiaries and Gender Balance.....	30
5.8 Finance and Delivery.....	30
5.8.1 Budget Allocation.....	31
5.9 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	31
5.10 Challenges and Constraints during Implementation .....	32

5.3 Result and Impact Level Findings.....	34
The RPCM.....	36
6.0 Sustainability.....	36
7.0 Conclusions.....	37
8.0 Lessons Learned.....	39
9.0 Recommendations.....	40
10.0 Annexes.....	41
10.1 List of People Interviewed.....	41
10.2 List of Participating Bodies.....	41
10.2.1 UN Partner Agencies.....	41
10.2.2 Federal and State Government Bodies.....	42
10.2.3 INGOs and International Bodies/Projects.....	42
10.2.4 NNGOs, LNGOs and CBOs.....	42

## Acronyms

AA	Administrative Agent
ARC	American Refugee Committee
CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
CDC	Community Development Committee
CFCI	Child Friendly Community Initiative
CMR	Clinical Management of Rape
CO	Country Office
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CPRU	Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit
CRMA	Crisis and Recovery Mapping and Analysis
CRP	Conflict Reduction Programme
CSAC	Community Security and Arms Control
DDR	Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration
EWARS	Early Warning Alert and Recovery System
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FGM/C	Female Genital Mutilation/Circumcision
GBV	Gender Based Violence
IA	Interagency
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IP	Implementing Partner
JCRP	Joint Conflict Reduction Programme
JP	Joint Programme
LNGOs	Local Non Governmental Organizations
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MoL	Federal Ministry of Labour
MoSW	Federal Ministry of Social Welfare
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
NA	Native Administration
NSC	National Steering Committee
PCA	Permanent Court of Arbitration (Abyei Case)
PDSC	Peace and Development Study Centre/University of Dilling
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCO	Resident Coordinator's Office
RPCM	Reconciliation and Peaceful Coexistence Mechanism
RRP	Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme
SAF	Sudan Armed Forces
SKS	South Kordofan State

SMoAW	State Ministry of Animal and Water resources
SMoEA	State Ministry of Economic Affairs
SMoW	State Ministry of Water resources
SMSDWCA	State Ministry of Social Development, Women and Child Affairs
SPD	Sustained Peace for Development
SPLA	Sudan Peoples' Liberation Army
SPLMN	Sudan People Liberation Movement North
SRCS	Sudanese Red Crescent Society
SWC	State Water Corporation
ToT	Training of Trainers
UA	Youth Associations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	UN Fund for Population Assistance
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNW	UN Women
VDCs	Village Development Committees
WES	Water and Environmental Sanitation Project
WHO	World Health Organization
WMC	Water Management Committee
WN	Women Networks
WU	Women Unions

## Executive Summary

*“We request all the agencies & partners to give us **one peace message**”* A tribal Leader, Buram, SKS.

*“This is not like any water, this is **peace water**”* A local Community Leader, Harazaya, SKS.

The UN Joint Programme on Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building in Sudan (JP) was a three year long initiative funded through the Spanish Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F). The JP has a *Pass Through* fund management modality with the UNDP assuming the role of the lead agency and acts as the Administrative Agent (AA). The JP supports community-led socioeconomic development, foster community dialogue at local level and improve local governance that is conflict sensitive, accountable, accessible and responsive to public demands; in the targeted areas along the 1956 borders between north and south Sudan. The programme was designed and implemented under the MDG-F thematic window: *Conflict Prevention and Peace Building*.

The JP is a joint partnership between 8 UN Agencies, namely UNDP (Lead agency), UNICEF, IOM, ILO, FAO, UNFPA, UNWOMEN, WHO, as well as federal and state level government institutions, local community and national and local NGOs. The JP was initially approved by MDG-F on 07 December 2009 as programme covering north and south Sudan and focusing on four states at the borders between the two parts of what used to be one country. The total approved budget was \$6,000,000 to be spent over a period of two and a half years (10 December 2009 to 09 to June 2012).

The Purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the implementation, measure development results and potential impacts generated by the JP. The evaluation is holistic, comprehensive and summative. Thus the level of analysis is the JP as detailed in the project documents and the subsequent documented revisions, modifications and alternations, and not the individual activities, outputs, outcomes or components of the different participating agencies and their partners. Thus the evaluation assesses and evaluates different aspects of this JP (design, process and results). The evaluation critically and objectively considers the implementation journey of the joint programme in terms of relevance of the programme and its stated objectives and implementation approach and processes, and assesses the extent to which the programme has been effective and efficient in implementing its planned activities delivering its outputs and achieving its expected outcomes and ensuring the sustainability of its impact. The evaluation also identifies some good practices and draws some lesson learnt from the planning and the implementation of the programme for the benefit of similar interventions in Sudan and beyond.

At the design level, the objectives of the JP were over ambitious, especially if one takes into consideration the number of UN agencies and other implementing agencies involved, the limited timeframe and financial resources and indeed the challenging, fluid and volatile national and local contexts within which the programme has been implemented.

The implementation of the JP faced numerous challenges including the secession of the south, political instability outbreak of conflict in SKS, evacuation to Khartoum, restricted access to the field and fluid government structure. These challenges resulted in radical changes in the JP context and required major changes/shifts in the JP structure, coordination and implementation approach and strategies. The JP design lacks a risk management and mitigation strategy or contingency plan, and was thus not well prepared for timely and effectively making the necessary broad and structural changes. It's response was slow and fragmented. For example, the delays in abandoning Buram and replacing it with an accessible area wasted valuable time of the JP 3 years duration. The management and coordination structure of the JP and the complexity of the decision making process within the programme may have played a role in these delays, but from the available evidence, the evaluation was unable ascertain the extent to which these were detrimental to the delays. However, the lack of an

adequate risk management and mitigation strategy was certainly a key factor behind the slow response and the long delays.

Despite its design as a one joint programme, in practice, the JP has been implemented on the basis of largely autonomous north and south components; vaguely coordinated at high level from Khartoum and facing many operational challenges within the Sudanese structure of 'one country two and systems. Following the secession of South Sudan in July 2011, the JP was totally and officially split into two independent country programmes. The budget was also split into two halves (approximately 3 million USD each). The main activities of the programme in the north focused on Keilek, Muglad and Lagawa localities in South Kordofan State (SKS). The aspirations of cross-border peace initiatives were never seriously considered.

Available evidence support the relevance of the JP to ONE UN framework, the local context and the national and local priorities of the targeted communities. The intervention logic was highly relevant though some aspects were not well conceptualized and articulated. Also, despite all the challenges faced and the shortcomings experienced, the design and implementation of the JP has enabled the UN system and the government to work together to mobilize and empower local communities in SKS to engage in peace building and development. It is particularly evident that it implemented most of its planned activities and made significant impact in building local capacities for managing conflicts and advancing peace and provided relevant and badly needed basic services and peace-dividends.

With regard to the specific expected outputs that the JP was designed to achieve, it is evident that the JP has effectively achieved most of its planned outputs. Furthermore, in terms of outcome, it appears that the JP has succeeded in achieving its outcome 1 and it is quite visible that it made noticeable success in delivering its outcome 2. The effects of some aspects of outcome 2 have not yet been felt, as it will require more time to realize a measurable impact. Some of the initiated process will take a lot longer than the lifetime of the programmed to be fully realized.

The JP has been particularly strong and successful in terms of relevance of its intervention, the level of effectiveness and the sustainability achieved, especially in relation to building the capacities of state level and local peace actors and indeed mediating and mitigating inter and intra-tribal conflicts. The JP engagement and indeed effectiveness at national level has been limited and certainly below the level anticipated at the programme design level. In this respect, available evidence indicate that the JP worked much better in terms of wider participation, coordination, joint collaboration and alignment with priorities at state and local community level than nationally.

Given the challenging context, the relatively short duration, the large number of partners and the wide thematic and geographical areas covered, and the benefits delivered to institutions, communities and individuals, the JP has certainly been an efficient intervention. Available information show that the overall financial delivery of the JP was above 83%, with varying degrees of delivery among the 8 partner agencies. Some 537,626 women and men have benefited directly or indirectly from the various JP activities. Also, despite its relatively small budget compared to the huge operations of most participating agencies, the JP promoted itself as a unique, innovation and collaborative UN initiative in Sudan, and succeeded in making itself highly visible within and outside the UN system in Sudan.

In terms of impact on the UN Sudan Country Team (UNCT), although joint programming is a relatively new way of planning, coordinating and implementing, this JP has been an innovative initiative that provided various platforms and helped facilitate better coordination, collaboration and integration of UN interventions that are deliberately aligned with overall UN and national and local priorities. The RCO in Khartoum and its field offices in SKS provided good support and assisted the

national and state level coordination processes. Both internal and external coordination and communications efforts were also used for ensuring that the JP continues to be aligned with, and contribute to UN, national and local priorities. The conflict sensitive planning and implementation training provided by the JP for all participating UN agencies and other national partners and stakeholders has made a lasting impact within and beyond the programme and its participating UN agencies. In this respect, in spite of the challenges it faced, the JP has enriched the experiences of the UNCT in joint programming and contributed to enhancing their efforts to act with conflict sensitivity, attempt to deliver jointly and achieve better impact at local and community levels.

The weaknesses of some aspects of the JP design, the challenging, restrictive and volatile context within which the programme has been implemented, the different pace of implementation for various agencies, the “*pass through*” funding modality and the provision for each participating agency to work according to its own procedures and reporting have also contributed to the fragmentation of the interventions, and did not help the programme to be truly and fully a joint intervention. Instead it contributed to making it more of coordinated sum of interventions than a fully integrated joint programme delivered as one.

The M&E system of the JP had a number of weaknesses that made it inadequate for joint programme as it was segregated by agency and not well integrated into one whole system.

## 1.0 Introduction

The UN Joint Programme on Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building in Sudan (JP) was a three year long initiative funded through the Spanish Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F). The JP was designed and implemented under the MDG-F thematic window: *Conflict Prevention and Peace Building*. The JP was initially approved by MDG-F on 07 December 2009 as programme covering north and south Sudan and focusing on four states at the borders between the two parts of what used to be one country. The total approved budget was \$6,000,000 to be spent over a period of two and a half years (10 December 2009 to 09 June 2012). The JP has UNDP as the lead agency working in partnership with seven other UN agencies; namely FAO, IOM, UNICEF, UN Women, ILO, WHO and UNFPA, in addition to the Ministry of International Cooperation (MIC) as the main national government body and the Southern Kordofan Governor's Office as the main government counterpart at the state level. The JP has a *Pass Through* fund management modality with the UNDP acting as the Administrative Agent (AA).

The programme supports community-led socioeconomic development, foster community dialogue at local level and improve local governance that is conflict sensitive, accountable, accessible and sustainable. The programme was particularly designed to serve communities living along the 1. 1. 1956 borders between north and south, focusing on South Kordofan State in northern Sudan, and the States of Unity, Warrap and Northern Bahr El Ghazal in South Sudan.

Despite its design as a one joint programme, within the then dominant government structure of 'one country two and systems, the JP has practically been implemented on the basis of two largely autonomous components (North and South). Following the secession of South Sudan in July 2011, the JP was totally and officially split into two independent country programmes. The budget was also split into two half (approximately 3 million USD each). The main activities of the programme in the north were focused on Keilek, Muglad and Lagawa localities in South Kordofan State (SKS). Also because of the slow progress of implementation and the delays, the programme requested and was granted 6 months and 20 days no cost extension. Thus the official lifetime of the programme became just over 3 years (from beginning of December 2009 to end of December 2012).

### 1.1 JP Outcomes and Outputs

The JP has been designed to achieve two Outcomes:

**Outcome 1:** Strengthened systems and capacities for sustainable conflict prevention and management.

**Outcome 2:** Increased conflict sensitive recovery, reconciliatory practices and reintegration at community level (with a focus on women and children) through basic service delivery and development of economic opportunities.

The above **two** outcomes were planned to be achieved through the realization of the following **four** outputs:

**Output 1.1:** Increased technical capacities of targeted authorities/institutions in conflict prevention and dispute.

**Output 2.1:** Increased access to basic services for conflict affected communities.

**Output 2.2:** Increased livelihood opportunities for communities affected by conflict.

**Output 2.3:** Increased access to justice and significant participation in peace building for women and children.

## 1.2 The JP Context and Background

The implementation of this JP has been extremely challenging for all involved. In fact, by considering the Sudan context during the lifetime of JP and the way this programme has been structured and designed, it is obvious that this is a programme that was set against huge challenges, rather than just faced them during implementation. Yet, it is imperative to underscore that the contexts in which the JP was initially conceived is not the same as the one within which it has been implemented. Over 18 months have overlapped between the initial thinking about the JP and its actual launch in December in 2009. Given the fluidity and volatility of the political and security situation in the country at large and in the targeted area of SKS, so much has changed in the programme context to the extent that some of the underlying assumptions became less relevant even by the time of the start of implementation. Other events and changes that took place later changed the context all together from a 'one country two systems' to two countries, and in SKS from a post conflict to widespread conflict that spread for the first time into urban areas.

The overall national context within which the JP has been conceived and implemented can largely be characterized as one dominated by high political dynamism within a fluid situation of both longstanding and widespread civil wars and a fragile post-conflict situation in which two of the biggest international peacekeeping missions were involved (UNMIS & UNAMID). Widespread poverty and economic deprivation, coupled with uneven development and regional disparities have generated strong feelings of socioeconomic and political marginalization, especially among communities at the geographical peripheries of the state. The capacity of state institutions at both national and local level has historically been limited and has been further weakened by the long history of civil wars and political instabilities. Half way through the implementation of the JP The state itself broke into two parts that are not so much in peace with each other, and facing the threat of further disintegrations.

At the local level in the main targeted area of SKS, the context is even more volatile and challenging. After almost two decades of a devastating civil war, especially in the Nuba Mountains, the area entered into the peace deal between the government of Sudan and the SPLM and was given special status to become one of the special three areas of the CPA that has their own protocol and Popular Consultation to decide its future. Consequently the area hosted one of the largest bases of the UNMIS in Kadguli. In spite of the CPA, the agreement remained a high level one between the two signing parties and peace never trickled down to the grassroots in SKS. Conflict affected areas also received very little peace dividends. There is widespread inter and intra-tribal conflicts within a context of diminishing effectiveness of customary law and traditional conflict prevention/mitigation mechanisms. SKS also has a high population mobility including combination of IDP return and creation of new forms of displacement. Poverty is widespread and economic and sociopolitical marginalizations are strongly felt, especially among Nuba, and MDGs achievement indicators are among the lowest in the country. SKS is also littered with lawfully and unlawfully held small arms and armed groups and militias, and has a very slow moving and ineffective DDR programme

The conception of the JP and the start of its implementation coincided with a number of key events and process in Sudan including 1) the government expulsion of 13 INGOs and 3 NNGOs in Feb 2009 2) the Permanent Court of Arbitration decision on the boundaries of Abyei on 22 July 2009 3) the census 4) the Elections in SKS April 2011 5) the popular consultation in SKS 6) the referendum in

January 2011 7) the secession of the South in July 2011 8) the outbreak of conflict in the Nuba Mountains in SKS in June 2011 9) the outbreak of conflict between north and south in the Heglieg oil fields in SKS April 2012 10) the government of Sudan de-registration and expulsion of 13 international NGOs and dissolution and confiscation of the properties of 3 national NGOs in March 2009 11) the closure of all the operations of UNMIS in Sudan on 31 August 2011. These events and processes, together with the overall national and state level context issues discussed above, overshadowed the implementation of the JP and presented it with numerous challenges. Within these changes and challenges, however, it is possible to identify four distinct phases during implementation took place.

### 1.2.1 Four Stages of the JP Implementation

In considering the various challenges that faced the JP and the major changes in the local and national contexts within which the programme has been implemented, it is possible to discern four stages/context changes through which the JP implementation took place:

**Stage 1:** This is the initial stage during which the JP was conceived, planned and early implementation started. By then, Sudan was still united (though governed by two semi-autonomous systems), the CPA agreement was still holding and the two partners are sharing a coalition government at national and state level, the RPCM was able to engage in peace initiatives that aim to support the implementation of the CPA. The design of the JP seems to expect the whole programme to be implemented within this tense, fluid yet relatively peaceful and easy to operate in context. The development in the 3 stages outlined below reflects major changes that radically changed the JP context and posed serious challenge to its implementation.

**Stage 2:** The key features of this stage were that the secession of the south becomes a reality following the result of the Referendum in January 2011. During this stage, the JP started to formally become two independent rather than one joint country programme, cross border initiative become more complex, SPLM supporters in the SKS felt their future is becoming bleak and tension started to rise.

**Stage 3:** The political and social tensions of the SKS elections, the outbreak of conflict, evacuation and total loss of access to SKS. The key event that marked this stage was the re-eruption of the conflict in June 2011. The main implications of this were the restricted access to all areas of SKS and the change in government priorities and attention (focus on war defeating the rebels rather than peace dividends and development).

**Stage 4:** This is the stage all individuals and agencies involved in the JP started to accept that the civil conflict SKS, limited field presence and access restriction for international staff will last long. Thus, the new realities have to be acknowledged and dealt with to finish implementation. Alternative implementation approaches and strategies such as relying on national staff and national partners for implementation and monitoring etc, started to introduced or taken more seriously. The JP entered into this stage before the MTE (Jan, 2012), but the findings and recommendations of the evaluation were the key factor that marked this stage and helped in shaping the response to the challenges of the war and restricted access in SKS.

## 2.0 The Final Evaluation

This final evaluation has been conducted by an independent external consultant and planned and conducted in a transparent and inclusive manner. The evaluation has been conducted in line with the

OECD Quality Standards for Development Evaluation and the standards for Evaluation in the UN System of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The evaluation focuses on the JP activities implemented in the Republic of Sudan (formerly north Sudan components) and seeks to measure the extent to which the JP has fully implemented its activities, delivered its stated outputs and attained expected outcomes. The evaluation also generates substantive evidence-based knowledge on the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned to be carried forward to other development interventions and policy-making at local, national, and global levels. This evaluation is holistic, comprehensive and summative. Thus the level of analysis was the JP as detailed in the project documents and the subsequent documented revisions, modifications and alternations, and not the individual activities, outputs, outcomes or components of the different participating organisations and their partners. Given all the above, the specific objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solving the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. Measure the joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
4. Measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

## 2.1 Levels of Analysis

The levels of analysis and evaluation criteria are grouped in accordance with the three levels of the JP as stated in the evaluation ToR as follows:

### I. Design level:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the Millennium Development Goals.

### II. Process level

- **Efficiency:** Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.
- **Ownership in the process:** Effective exercise of leadership by the country's national/local partners in development interventions.

### III. Results level

- **Effectiveness and relevance:** Extent to which the objectives of the development

intervention have been achieved and the extent to which these achievements are relevant to and supporting local needs.

**Sustainability:** Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

## 2.2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

A participatory and inclusive approach was adopted to guide this evaluation. The consultant is independent and impartial, and has no institutional link to any of the implementing UN and other agencies. Different appropriate methods and methodologies for collecting and analyzing data were used. The evaluation went through different phases. Firstly, the provided ToR were thoroughly reviewed by the Consultant and a meeting was held with the focal person for clarifications and discussion before the assignment was formally accepted. Following this, the consultant provided a detailed Inception Report and received comments and suggestions from the evaluation reference group. A meeting with the JP Coordination team and other relevant UNDP staff to discuss and finalize the inception report was held at UNDP premises. A lengthy telephone discussion was held with MDGF Secretariat, who also kindly provided useful materials to help guide the evaluation process. The Consultant then fully embarked on the fieldwork and identification/collection of relevant documents and reports and started planning and conducting interviews with UN agencies in Khartoum and SKS, and with government bodies and other partners and stakeholders. Data collection and data analysis were carried out simultaneously and feed into and strengthened one another.

The different methods used for collecting and analyzing the qualitative and quantitative data on which this report is based were deliberately selected to complement and consolidate each other and produce the best possible results and generate the most objective and reliable evidence. However, the evaluation relied heavily on qualitative rather than quantitative data. Literature review and review of thousands of pages of programme and programme related documents, reports and minutes etc, and conducting semi-structured interviews were the main methods used during the course of this evaluation. Individual in-depth Semi-structured interviews were conducted with focal points and other relevant individuals at the 8 participating UN agencies, relevant government bodies and other implementing bodies and partners. Focused group discussions were initially plan to be conducted with members of the beneficiaries from local communities, however, due to cancellation of fieldwork this was replaced by SKS semi-structured interviews (by telephone) with community leaders and key informants in SKS. All interviews took between 1 hour 15 minutes and 2 hours each. The interviews were conducted with the relevant persons in their own chosen places (often place of work).

The validity and reliability of the information and data collected was improved through the use of cross-checking and triangulation. Information from documents and reports were often updated, checked or verified through interviews and collection of additional documents and/or reports and meeting minutes. Interviews were also conducted with different persons with different levels of responsibilities within the same participating agency or IP.

In terms of process and sequence, the core of the evaluation process started with a thorough and critical review of basic documents such as the programme document, the Midterm Evaluation (MTE), monitoring reports and meeting minutes. This review helped in both drafting the inception report and the guiding questions for the semi-structured interviews. Following the review, relevant persons in Khartoum and SKS were identified for interviews and two sites (Harazaya village in Keilek locality and Mugdama village in Muglad locality) were selected for field visits. Unfortunately, due to the security situation and access restrictions by the authorities, the planned field visits were repeatedly cancelled and eventually abandoned and replaced by telephone interviews. As the evaluation progressed more documents were identified and critically reviewed. Finance data were analyzed using simple mathematical and statistical tools. The JP final narrative report and the impact assessment

(conducted by an independent team led by the PSC of the University of Dilling became available at a later stage and were also reviewed and informed the evaluation).

### 2.3 Evaluation Challenges and Limitations

The challenges facing this JP programme extended beyond the lifetime of the programme and affected even the process of its final evaluation. The following are the main constraints and challenges that faced the evaluation process:

- The first challenge that faced the evaluation is the fact this JP was initially designed and implemented for over half of its three year duration as one programme covering both north and south Sudan, while its final evaluation was meant to focus on what remained as north Sudan components.
- Due to the security situation in SKS and the travel restrictions imposed by the authorities, the Consultant was unable to visit the project implementation areas. Instead, he relied on meeting relevant people in Khartoum and conducting telephone interviews with those who are not available for meetings in Khartoum. This represents the main constraint that faced the evaluation process.
- The JP assembled no comprehensive baseline data before or even during implementation, and the developed indicators were largely activity based. This makes it impossible for this evaluation to assess and measure with certainty some aspects of the outputs and outcomes of the JP and determine the extent to which changes can be attributed specifically to the intervention of JP.
- Information and combined reports on the overall performance of the JP as an integrated programme are limited, scattered and not comprehensive.
- Not all necessary documents were immediately available, many were provided after the submission of the Inception report and some were provided later during the fieldwork process. In particular the final narrative report, which was still being drafted when the evaluation started, and hence was not made available until very late in the process. Also individual agency reports were not made available to the Consultant.
- Although allocated budgets per agency were very clear, there is a confusion and lack of clarity with regard to financial delivery at the end of the project.
- Staff with good knowledge about the implementation on the ground and the challenges faced are often not closely involved in, or fully aware about the wider issues and high level arrangement such as total allocated budgets, financial delivery, coordination and collaboration at Khartoum level and details and procedures for programme reviews and adjustment. The implication of this is that more time to identify and interview relevant persons or seen clarifications and further details from written documents.
- As there were too many bodies involved in the programme (8 UN agencies, tens of government bodies at national, state and local level, NGOs etc); collecting relevant documents and assembling a complete picture that encapsulate the different perspectives and experiences was challenging and time consuming.
- Some government officials were extremely busy and not available for interviews. For example it took several weeks and many contacts and correspondence to arranging meetings with MIC and the Head of the RPCM.
- Most of the people who participated in the design of the programme or in the early stages of the programme implementation were no longer available in the country, which means a loss of some institutional memory about the JP. Many of those who are still in country have moved to other projects or areas of responsibilities, which made it difficult to track them down and arrange interviews with them.

## 4.0 Design Level Findings

The design level evaluation of the JP is rather challenging because the programme was design during time of transition and was initially designed and implemented for over half of its three year duration as one programme covering both north and south Sudan, while its final evaluation was meant to focus on what remained as north Sudan components implemented in SKS. In understanding the JP and its strengths and weaknesses, it is important first to explore the theory of change that shaped and guided the programme.

### 4.1 The JP Problem Identification and Theory of Change

The JP has carried out a critical analysis of the context and identified the challenges facing Sudan in general and the targeted areas along the 1956 borders between north and south Sudan, to which the programme attempts to contribute in addressing, as follows:

- Ensuring the full implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed between the north and south in 2005 at all levels.
- The need to sustain peace and promote peaceful coexistence at community level and provide relevant peace dividends.
- High tensions within and between different communities in the targeted areas
- Peaceful and violent competition over scarce resources, especially water, agricultural land and grazing lands for cattle.
- Violent conflicts between farmers and pastoralists and competition among various pastoralists over cattle migration routes is widespread in SKS.
- Deeply rooted poverty, separation of families and disruption of social networks.
- Gender inequality, violence against women and widespread human and women rights violations.
- Large number of returning IDPs and refugees and stress with host communities and/or those who remained in the area.
- Weak governance and rule of law institutions special at state and local levels.
- Lack of basic services and widespread feeling of socioeconomic and political marginalization.
- Limited capacity of national peace building bodies to generate and utilize conflict and threats data, and to accordingly coordinate and manage peace building responses.
- Reduced/weakened, undermined or ineffective local and traditional conflict prevention, reconciliation and peaceful coexistence mechanism. A lack of security and peace dividends to marginalized and conflict affect communities along the border areas. This may increase the risk of them returning to conflict.

The theory of change of the JP seems to have emerged out of the designers' above identification and understanding of the challenges facing the targeted areas. The theory of change that underline this JP design seem to be that the peace and development challenges that face SKS and the 1956 border areas are rooted in poverty and competition of the diverse local communities on natural resources and services that are increasingly becoming scarce. And that the best way of addressing this is through building local capacities, mobilizing local communities and combining 'software' work in peace with 'hardware' delivery of basic services. Although not adequately conceptualized and articulated, the JP assumed a strong link between local inter-tribal and intra-tribal conflicts and the wider peace process, including conflict and peace issues between north and south Sudan.

The evidence gathered by this evaluation show noticeable shifts in the theory of change during the course of the implementation of the JP. Different agencies and individuals involved in the implementation of the programme developed different understanding and interpretations of the goal/approach of the JP. Some of the initial assumptions and areas of focus were either not prioritized, did not materialize, reformulated or perceived and responded to differently. The evidence gathered by this evaluation also indicates that there was different of understanding of whether the approach adopted by the JP is primarily “development for peace” or “Peace for development”. Each understanding off course has its own implications on the implementation approach and the sequencing of activities.

However, given staff change and high turnover during the implementation of the JP, there is little institutional memory to explain the confusing and sometimes contradictory assumptions of the theory of change JP or the rationale behind, and the process of the selection of the 8 participating agencies.

## 4.2 Designing Process

In assessing any programme, at the design level, one needs to consider not only the design of the programme document, but also the process through which the final design has been reached. This is particularly so if the programme is a joint programme that is meant to be designed under the guidance of the MDG-F guidelines.

The JP designing process was led by the RC and was broadly participatory; involving UN agencies, government bodies at local and national levels. However, not all UN agencies involved in the implementation of the programme were involved at the design level. The design process took over 18 months to be finalized and approved. The programme concept note was approved as early as September 2008, and initial draft has been reviewed three times by the MDG-F Secretariat before finally approved in December 2009 for two and a half years ending June 2012. However, given the various challenges that faced the programme and their associated delays in implementation, 6 months and 20 days no cost extension was requested and granted on 31 May 2012. The end of the programme thus became end of December 2012. Following the secession of the south, the programme in the north was left with half of total budget and focused on three localities in SKS (Keilek, Lagawa and Muglad).

The process of designing the JP has been fairly inclusive and participatory and involved intense deliberations and discussions between representatives from most of the participating UN agencies. National government authorities were closely involved in the design process and at the national level, while the Ministry of International Cooperation (MIC) assumed the lead at the national level. At the later stages of the process, consultations were made with staff at the targeted areas and relevant local government authoritative, taking advantage of the presence of the many agencies in the targeted areas and their close links with government counterparts such as the State ministry of local governments, the ministry of Social Welfare and Agricultural and Animal Wealth, as well as Native Administration (NA) and local NGOs and CBOs. This process was facilitated by the UNDP and the RC, and involved consultations with agencies and government institutions in south Sudan. An external consultant helped in the final stages of the drafting of the JP document. The negotiations and the numerous face-to-face meetings of the task force involved in the design of the programme document, and the personal and institutional relations created or strengthened through this, rather lengthy, process helped create synergies and build consensus on issues (at the planning level) even before the project was approved. These in turn seem to ease/facilitate the coordination and collaboration during the implementation process, especially since many of the project design task force members became the focal persons for their respective agencies in the JP implementation. The inclusive and participatory process of designing the JP, particularly the involvement of national agencies and government bodies also played a crucial role in ensuring that the programme was well aligned with national and local priorities and also enhancing national commitment and national ownership.

The JP design was generally good but has several design issues that contributed to the less integrated and sometimes fragmented implementation approach. The following section summarizes the main strengths and shortcomings of the JP design:

### 4.3 Design Strengths

- The JP document was developed through a lengthy and participatory process in which most of the UN partners agencies and many government bodies took part. The document critically and adequately analyzed the country's context, and presented a real and relevant set of problems that need urgent response. Strong justification was made for the intervention that basically aims to combine community mobilization with institutional capacity building and service delivery in order to prevent/mitigate conflict and promote peace and stability. A clear case was also made for the proposed implementation approach and the selection of the targeted states in north and south Sudan. The relevance of the JP to the MDG-F was also highlighted.
- It is evident that at the design level, the JP was relevant to the national priorities of Sudan, and the interests and needs of the targeted individuals and communities at the time when the programme was conceived. The JP was also quite relevant to the **ONE UN framework**. The intervention logic was highly relevant though some aspects were not well conceptualized and articulated.
- The **Joint Management Structure** of the programme was planned in accordance with the MDG-F financed programmes guidelines and the nature and structure of the UN system in Sudan. The roles and responsibilities of the various management and coordination bodies such as the programme National Steering Committee (NSC), the Programme Management Committee (PMC) were structured, tasked and mandated in a way that maximize the chance of effective management and coordination, strong local and national commitment and ownership. However, the establishment of separate management committees for north and south represented a challenge for ensuring overall joint management, reporting and monitoring of the JP before secession.
- Placing the PMC in Kadugli and involving all relevant government, NGOS and other local CBOs in its membership is one of the main strengths of the management arrangement of the JP and it also enabled it to benefit from and contribute to raising conflict sensitive planning and implementation not only among the 8 UN agencies involved but also among the wider humanitarian and development actors in SKS.
- Placing the role of the lead agency in terms of management and coordination of such a programme within the UNDP was another visible strength of the JP; given its long history in Sudan and intensive experience in working in conflict and peace issues in Sudan, its wide presence in various parts of the country and its closer link with the RC and RCO. The UNDP integration of the JP (in terms of both management and implementation) with its other initiatives, especially the CRP/JCRP, in general the UNDP was well placed to assume this role.

### 4.4 Design Shortcomings

- The objectives of the JP were over ambitious, especially if one takes into consideration the number of UN agencies and other implementing agencies involved, the limited time frame and financial resources and indeed the challenging and volatile national and local contexts within which the programme has been implemented. In particular expecting the JP to be a 'one country' integrated programme, given the very different context, nature of government and existing capacities and main priorities in the south compared to the north was unrealistic. The JP was also over ambitious in its proposed activities and outputs, and in proposing to address various types and levels of conflicts in north Sudan and border with the south; and was somewhat ambiguous with regards to what specific peace issues and what nature and level of peace it intends to primarily attempts to address and how these conflicts/response link up with other conflicts in the targeted areas or the country at large.
- Preventing conflict and mitigating peace in a volatile area such as SKS and within a context of an obviously breaking country can never be achieved with such limited resources and programme duration. In this respect the JP is not simply overly ambitious in terms of the scope of its planned activities but also its expected results and outcomes.
- The fragmentation of roles and responsibilities of different partners did not help the intended joint nature of the program. The JP result framework lists the activities and output per implementing agency which opened the programme for segregated activity implementation that risk undermining the joint nature of this programme which is fundamental to its overall

success. The quantification of indicators was helpful for measuring success but at the same time it restricts the opportunities for creating and capturing synergies among and between the different activities and outputs delivered by the various partners involved in the implementation.

- The JP budget was also segregated and divided per agency and for specific activity to be implemented by that agency. This has limited the flexibility and adaptability of the JP to the changing context and shifting priorities in the targeted area, which left very little room for maneuver for the JP management and coordination bodies in response to changes on the ground.
- Many of the assumptions underlying the JP theory of change were not well conceptualized and articulated or clearly visible in the design of project expected outputs and outcomes. This makes operationalising them in a consistent manner a challenging task subject to different interpretation and prone to misunderstanding. For example, linking peace building with service delivery was not adequately conceptualized, which made it challenging to operationalise. Also, how outcome one and outcome two feed into one overall outcome that advances peace and prevents/mitigates conflict in SKS is not clearly articulated.
- The JP document discussed different types and levels of conflicts in its targeted areas, but has not clarified where primary focus is, and how this is linked to other nature, type and level of conflicts.
- The cross-border activities were poorly articulated and the obvious difficulties that they were surely going to face were never considered and planned for, especially given the long complex history of the local conflicts in the area (both within and between different tribal and ethnic groups) and its close association with the wider North-South Conflict.
- The JP design lacks a relevant contingency plan or risk management and mitigation strategies within the structure of the programme despite its obvious importance for a programme implemented within such a volatile area.
- The need for major reorientation of the programme if, rather than expected, secession of the south happened was not properly considered in the design of the programme.

The JP design issues discussed above and the radical change in context led to several changes in the original design of the programme. For example wider peace/conflict and CPA issues (DDR and Popular Consultations) were not dealt with, cross borders initiatives (e.g. Abyei) were never seriously considered, one of the main targeted areas with a distinct type of conflicts (Boram) was abandoned and replaced by Keilek. The linkages between software interventions on capacity building and conflict prevention and hardware provision of services were not often perceived, articulated and addressed by all agencies in the same way they were conceptualized and articulated in the JP document. Nevertheless, rather than representing totally new dimensions and activities, most of these changes reflect a selectivity of themes, focus area and targeted populations from within the many stated in the project documents with some slight modifications and implementation strategies.

However, there is generally weak documentation and little institutional memory with regard to the design of JP. Therefore, the evaluation has not been able to gather information that provides proper explanations for some aspects of the design process, a justification for the selection of the specific eight UN agencies, the distribution of fund among them or how each partner will add real and significant value that makes the JP an integrated one whole programme with coherent strategic impact.

#### **4.5 Alignment with National Priorities**

The design of the JP was well aligned with national and local government strategies, plans and priorities. The programme expected outcomes were designed in line with the National Priorities of the Government of Sudan which aims to “*sustain peace and stability while safeguarding national sovereignty and security, continuing to build consensus and reconciliation, and maintaining good relations with the international community*”. The programme was also well in line with the overall UN priorities for Sudan, particularly as

articulated in Outcome 1 of the UNDAF-Sudan (2009- 2012) which states that by 2012, *“the environment for sustainable peace in Sudan is improved through increased respect for rights and human security, with special attention to individuals and communities directly affected by the conflict.”*

#### 4.6 Targeting

- The JP has clearly identified its targeted areas (SKS) and its targeted communities (conflict affected communities in the localities of Keliek, Muglad and Lagawa), and individuals (focus on vulnerable farmers and pastorlists, especially women and children).
- The selected state, areas and individuals were highly relevant and in line with to the objectives of the JP and its results.
- The JP focused on the SKS which is one of the most vulnerable, conflict affected states in Sudan, which also has the lowest MDGs indicators.
- Although Buram was abandoned and replaced, the three main localities targeted were very well selected through field assessments and consultations with local authorities and local leaders.
- At the design level the JP identified women and children as the most vulnerable and excluded groups in the targeted area. During the implementation, however, there was clear focus on targeting women and addressing women issues (e.g. GBV training, inclusion of women leaders in peace workshops, peace conferences and CDCs, peace training for women singers (the *Hakamat*) and promoting and support for local women networks etc). Although not specifically planned, youth were also visibly targeted, but there is little evidence that children and children issues were particularly prioritized by the JP.

#### 5.0 JP Implementation

- Given the lack of baseline data, it is not possible to ascertain the significance of all the achieved outputs and their direct contribution to the overall results of the programme.
- Due to the security situation in SKS and the access restriction, repeated plans to visit the project implementation areas have been cancelled, rescheduled and finally abandoned all together. The Final evaluation Consultant was, therefore unable to visit SKS and instead met many of national and international staff involved in the implementation of the JP in Khartoum.<sup>1</sup> Given this situation, it is not possible for the Consultant to have a chance for first hand evidence to verify the level of implementation and the adequacy and quality of implementation of each activity that has been implemented by the JP partners, especially at community level. While considering activity and output level, whenever objectively feasible to do so, the evaluation has placed more emphasis and gave special focus on analyzing the process and outcomes of the JP.
- In accessing the implementation aspects of the programme, the evaluation relied on critical analysis of written materials, monitoring and periodic reports, meeting minutes and internal reports of various agencies and other institutions, and also conducted telephone interviews with key informants from the field, including community leaders, who are not available for meeting in Khartoum. Furthermore, the evaluation made use of critically reviewing the independent study of the JP impact assessment which was conducted by a team led by the Director of the PSDC at the University of Dilling. The impact assessment team was able to

---

<sup>1</sup> All international staff were anyway relocated to Khartoum since the re-eruption of conflict in June 2011.

visit the project sites not long before the end of the project and therefore it was able to verify and document level and quality of implementation.

- As stated earlier, the JP was planned to run over a period of two and a half years and to be implemented as one joint programme in what used to be Northern Sudan and Southern Sudan. The programme was planned to serve communities living along the 1. 1. 1956 borders between north and south while targeting South Kordofan State in northern Sudan, and the States of Unity, Warrap and Northern Bahr El Ghazal in South Sudan. However, during the course of the implementation all of these changed and the programme eventually split into two programmes (North and South each running independently). Also because of the slow progress of implementation and the delays, the programme requested and was granted 6 months and 20 days no cost extension. Thus the official lifetime of the programme became just over 3 years (from beginning of December 2009 to end of December 2012). On the other hand, the north-south structure and the cross border operations of the JP has never worked as planned and were eventually formally abandoned following the secession of the south in July 2011.
- The JP has utilized, built on drew lessons from previous and ongoing initiatives and experiences of UN agencies in Sudan, such as the Food and Livelihood Security Programme of the FAO, the Child Friendly Community Initiative (CFCI) of the UNICEF, the Integrated Community Recovery and Development (ICRD) in South Kordofan, the Community Based Initiative (CBI) of the WHO and the Resource-based Conflicts initiative and the Crisis and Recovery Mapping and Analysis Project (CRMA) of the UNDP.
- Because of the limited resources available and also in order to strengthen joint implementation, the JP was based on existing structures within the participating agencies rather than on a separately established structure and fully assigned staff. The only exception was the small coordination team at UNDP.
- The JP is well integrated into the CPRU of the UNDP and operates as a component of UNDP's conflict prevention and peace building efforts. This seems to result in positive impact for both the JP and the wider UNDP conflict prevention and peace building interventions.
- The implementation of the JP went beyond the initially planned period by 6 months and 20 days, yet not all planned activities were fully implemented and not all budgets were fully utilized. There are number of reasons behind the delay and budget delivery rate including: the outbreak of conflict in SKS and its associated looting of UN properties and ransacking of offices and guesthouses and its access restriction and the lack of clear contingency scenarios and its associated delayed response to changes in the context. The over ambitious planned timeframe for the whole programme, the lengthy and not well planned for inception and preparatory work phase at the design level, the complex planning and implementation of the field assessment for the selection of targeted areas and communities have also played their part in delaying implementation.
- The set up of the main formal coordination body (the PMC) in Kadugli was a good practice as it enhanced local coordination not only in the sense of sharing information but also in identifying and cultivating synergies, pooling some resources and coordinating implementation at the grassroots level. The PMC helped strengthened links with local authorities and enhanced local ownership of the JP activities and processes.
- The programme developed a communication strategy. This strategy, however, remained largely internal, especially in Khartoum, worked best in Kadugli and severely disrupted following the evacuation and relocation of the PMC to Khartoum.
- Despite its relatively small budget compared to the huge operations of most participating agencies, the JP promoted itself as a unique, innovation and collaborative UN initiative in Sudan, and succeeded in making itself highly visible within and outside the UN system in Sudan.
- The lack of risk mitigation strategy integrated into the design of the programme, particularly in response to the likely secession of the south, outbreak of fighting and restricted humanitarian access was one of the main weaknesses of the JP design. The attempts to develop a risk management strategy closer to the end of the programme achieved limited success.

- Similarly to other joint programmes, this JP was also meant to strengthen the role of the UN Resident Coordinator, who is given the role of co-chair of the NSC (together with the Head of MIC) and thus also expected to play a central role in coordinating and facilitating the implementation of the JP. Thus it is also important to consider the extent to which this has been well planned and the extent to which expectations and plans have materialized in facilitating closer coordination and joint implementation that enhance the ‘delivering as one’ principles. In this respect, Sudan is a rather unique situation where in addition to the very large number of UN agencies and other international bodies in Sudan, most of which has sizable budget and nationwide operations, there are also two UN missions in the country during the time of the implementation of the JP; namely, the UN Mission in Sudan (UNMIS), with a heavy presence in Khartoum and SKS) and the UN African Mission in Darfur (UNAMID). As a result of this unique situation the RC assumed huge responsibilities and dual role: acting as Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator as well as Head of the UNMIS. These roles and responsibilities have both provided multiple high level engagements and linkages that benefited the JP, and at the same time meant high demand for the RC time and attention. Thus issues of the JP have to compete with many other priorities of the RC and RCO.
- Minutes and internal reports of the JP show that all RC was closely engaged in, and supportive of the JP. However although the RC helped negotiating the JP, securing its funding and putting together the consortium of the eight participating UN agencies, it seems that due multiple mandates and responsibilities, and the competing demands their time<sup>2</sup> and staff change the RC and his Khartoum the engagement and high level coordination and support were thought to be below expectations during the early stages of the JP. Following the referendum, the end of UNMIS and the relative stability in Darfur, the engagement and high level support improved significantly.
- The state targeted by the JP when the programme was conceived in 2009 (i.e. SKS) remained as a main conflict area and top development and peace priority area for the government, the UN and indeed the international community.
- The approach and strategies adopted by the programme proved to be helpful in facilitating implementation and obtaining results, within the volatile and complex context of Sudan and SKS. Nevertheless, in some respects, the JP proved to be ill-prepared for timely and effectively responding to changing situations (outbreak of war and result of the referendum on the future of the south, restricted access etc), and was unable to reorient or adjust its operations and strategies in a timely manner.
- The review of various documents and interviews with key informants indicate that the JP has maintained a participatory and fairly inclusive approach during the implementation phase.
- Given the segregated budgets activities and outputs by agencies at the planning and reporting level (each UN agency has its own budget, reporting requirements and guidelines), the scarce and aggregated financial data available for the evaluation, providing a full and objective assessment of the efficiency of the JP proved to be a challenging task. Also there were no proper documentations for the logic of the distribution of the JP budget between agencies and along activities and outputs, and because of the change of staff there was no sufficient institutional memory to explain the rationale behind the very wide differences in agencies budget allocations (e.g. ILO and UNFPA etc) or costing of some activities. Nevertheless, given the number of UN agencies involved (8), the amount of activities implemented within a complex and restricted context, the wide geographical areas covered and the total number of beneficiaries reached (estimated at 537,626) and served by the JP over a period of 3 years, indicate that the degree of the efficiency of the programme must have been at least reasonable. The financial delivery rates of the various agencies by the end of the project shows that the JP as programme has 83% rate, which is very high given the various challenges that faced the programme.

---

<sup>2</sup> By then, the RC was acting as a humanitarian coordinator for one of the largest humanitarian operations by the UN, and also heading of the UN Mission during the turbulent time of national and state elections, the referendum on the future of south Sudan, and finally the secession of the south.

- Examples of highly successful and widely appreciated initiatives of the JP include, the field assessments and the conflict sensitive training programme conducted by the UNDP for all participating UN agencies staff and other government non-governmental partners. The impact of this training was felt by all interviewed persons, most of whom stated that the impact of this training goes well beyond the JP to provide positive impact their other interventions and help strengthen the delivery of their agencies' mandate, especially in conflict affected areas.
- The cross border activities and the envisaged links between SKS and Warap and Bahr El Ghazal has never materialized in any sense. Project management based in Khartoum and coordination structure mainly in Khartoum was not adequate given the visibly uneasy relationship between Juba and Khartoum, which among other things reflected in the fact that the First Vice-President Silva Kir was mostly operating from Juba and rarely uses his office at the Palace in Khartoum.
- Widespread insecurity, conflict and the political instability at local and national levels have severely constrained the JP and disrupted the abilities of the participating agencies to operate effectively.
- Although the funding modality and the fund management arrangement and implementation strategies of the JP worked well in facilitating the smooth implementation of the programme activities and ensuring transparency and accountability, the 'pass through' funding modality (whereby each participating UN organization is responsible for its own financial management and reporting, and the fragmentation of activities and output per agencies did little to help integrate the JP outputs and outcome as one whole and improve its joint planning and implementation. For example, participating UN Organizations use their own reporting systems and were made responsible for reporting only on their individual agency outputs and outcomes, while compilation is left for the Programme coordination Team.

## 5.1 Achieved Activities and Output

Although it was not possible for the final evaluation to verify the level of the JP delivery of activities and output on the ground through field visits, programme reports, meetings minutes, the report of the Independent Impact Assessment and face-to-face and telephone interviews with participating agencies and some government officials and local community leaders indicate that by the end of its lifetime, the JP was able to achieve the following activities and outputs:

### Main Activities, Beneficiaries and Relevant JP Output

Activity	Beneficiary	Implementing Agencies and Main partners	Relevant JP Output	Female	Male	Total
Community dialogue session	Community members (including community leaders and Youth)	UNDP, UNICEF, IOM, ILO with PDSC, RPCM, HAWA	1.1	463	523	986

Establishment of Project steering committees, Project coordination committees and Village Development Committees	Community members	UNDP, ILO, UN Women, FAO, UNICEF With RPCM, SWC, localities, SMoSW, WES	1.1 2.1 2.3	7	50	57
Training (conflict management)	Local Govt officials	UNDP With RPCM, PDSC	1.1	17	58	75
Training (Animal Health)	CAHW (Community Animal Health Workers)	FAO With SMoA, SMoAW	2.2	0	15	15
Training (conflict management)	Community members	FAO, UNFPA, ILO with SMoAW, PDSC, SMoSW, localities	1.1 2.1	6	29	35
15 Early Warning Alert System (EWAS) established	Community members	WHO With SMoH	2.1	241,804	232,323	474,127 (indirect)
Training (EWAS)	Medical cadres	WHO With SMoH	2.1	9	31	40
Provision of Medical supplies to 8 health facilities	Community members	WHO With SMoH	2.1	20,800	19,200	40,000 (indirect)

Training (Sanitary inspection and water quality)	Health inspectors	WHO With SMoH, Pancare	2.1	7	9	16
Training (Treatment guidelines)	Health workers	WHO With SMoH, Pancare	2.1	11	23	34
Water pump	Community members	UNICEF, IOM With WES, SWC,	2.1	8,500	8,500	17,000 (indirect)
Training	The Water Management Committees	UNICEF, ILO	1.1 2.1 2.2	0	14	14
Development committee	Community members	IOM, ILO, FAO, UNDP, UNICEF	1.1 2.1 2.2	6	14	20
Training (ToT, Business, Peacebuilding)	Community members	UNDP, ILO	1.1 2.1 2.2	175	120	295
Peace forum	Community members	UNDP, ILO, IOM With RPCM, HAwa	1.1 2.1	130	120	250
Training (UN Resolution 1325)	Govt. officials	UN Women With PDSC, Badya Centre	1.1 2.3	15	15	30
Training (UN Resolution 1325)	Community members	UN Women With PDSC, Badya Centre	1.1 2.3	60	30	90
Training (Peacebuilding)	Community members (CBOs, Leaders and local administration)	UNFPA, UN Women, UNDP	1.1 2.1	60	30	90

Workshop	Govt. officials	UNDP	1.1	90	60	150
Workshop	Local govt. officials	UNDP	1.1	42	58	100
Training (CMR)	Health personnel	UNFPA	1.1	37	43	80
		SMoH,	2.1			
Provision of the Dignity kit for GBV victims	Community members	UNFPA with SMoH, Badya	2.1	1,400	0	1,400
workshop (GBV, Women's right, gender equality)	Community members (including community leaders and Youth)	UNFPA	1.1	545	665	1,210
		With Badya Centre, Azza	2.3			
Training in conflict resolution and peace building	Native Administration	UNDP	1.1	1,238	4	1,242
		RPCM, PDSC	2.2			
Training on mediation, negotiations and conflict resolution skills	Intellectuals, Women, Youth, Pastoralists and Farmers	UNDP, UN Women	1.1	154	116	270
		With	2.1			
		PDSC, RPCM, Badya	2.2			
<b>Total</b>				<b>275,576</b>	<b>262,050</b>	<b>537,626</b>

**Notes:**

**Output 1.1:** Increased technical capacities of targeted authorities/ institutions in conflict prevention and dispute.

**Output 2.1:** Increased access to basic services for conflict affected communities.

**Output 2.2:** Increased livelihood opportunities for communities affected by conflict.

**Output 2.3:** Increased access to justice and significant participation in peace building for women and children.

Although all the above achieved outputs directly contribute to the achievement of the two programme outcomes, the following outputs are of particular importance and hence deserve a specific and more elaborate mentioning:

- The mobilization and capacity building of community leaders from the Native Administration (NA) on conflict prevention, mediation and peace building is another major achievement of the JP, especially given the trust and respect that local people have for NA. Although the targeted NAs came mainly from the western sector of SKS, leaders from areas well beyond the main targeted areas of the JP were included, as such the training of NAs is likely to have a far reaching and long lasting impact on conflict resolution and peace building.
- The work of the CDCs has succeeded in increasing the access to safe water, immunization rate as well as children's school enrolment rate in the communities.
- Water points that are used by different communities became permanent platforms for inter and intra-community dialogue on peace and service delivery, and there are evidence that the Water Management Committees established and trained by the JP are involved in ensuring access of various groups to the service and were active in mediating to resolve local disputes.

## 5.2 Ownership of the JP

Government authorities at state level appear to have strong ownership of the JP as a programme, the implementation of its various activities and most importantly the process of coordinating the JP. The RPCM which falls under the Governor's Office, and line ministries and government bodies such as the MoH, WES, MoSW, MoAAR, Centre for Peace Studies at the University of Dilling have all played a crucial role in planning, implementation and coordination of the JP. CBOs and local leaders viewed the JP as 'their' programme and were keen to show how they participated in its various activities and used the skills they gained to advance peaceful coexistence among their communities and with neighboring ethnic and tribal groups. However, available evidence indicates that the level of ownership at national level was less strong. The evaluation has not been able to find full explanations for this, but the nature of the JP as state and community level programme, the holding of most PMC meeting in Kadugli, staff changes and the conciliation and restructuring of the national line ministry (MIC) and the reservation of some senior MIC staff about some aspects of the JP design have indeed played a part in a rather lower levels of national ownership of the JP. Officials at MIC expressed feelings of being left behind, especially at the early stages of implementation when the PMC were held in Kadugli.

In terms of funding agencies, the MDG-F Secretariat has shown keen interest in following up and supporting the implementation of the JP and were closely engaged in providence guidance and background materials for the final evaluation. The Spanish Embassy in Khartoum also showed high level commitment and provided regular follow up and support to the JP through its regular participation in the NSC meetings.

## 5.4 Contribution to the MDGs

Although there is no conclusive data to quantify the exact impact of the JP in supporting the five MDGs identified as particularly relevant to programme (namely: **MDG 1**: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; **MDG 2**: Achieve universal primary education; **MDG 4**: Promote gender equality and Empower women **MDG 5**: Improve maternal health; **MDG 7**: Ensure environmental sustainability), it is evident that the JP has clearly contributed to the achievement of at least MDGs 1,2 & 4.

The selected SKS is one of the poorest states in Sudan has some of lowest MDG indicators in the country. Conflict, instability, illiteracy and the socioeconomic and political exclusion of women are known to be among the main underlying causes of poverty in Sudan. Thus as a peace programme that improved clean drinking water, primary education and the provision of livelihood services for the most vulnerable communities in Keilek, Lagawa and Muglad localities, with women as specific targeted group, the JP has indeed directly contributed to achieving the said MDGs. Despite targeting women and working with farmers and pastoralists, the JP specific contribution to the achievement of MDGs 5 & 7 is unclear.

## 5.4 Implementing the MTE Recommendations

It is important to underscore that the MTE had not been carried out midterm and that the JP had very little time to implement its recommendations of the MTE. By the time the MTE review report was submitted and reviewed, there were only 5 months left of the programme initial lifetime left. Even with the six months no-cost extension granted at the end of May 2012, there was just over 10 months of the project lifetime, most of which falls within the heavy rainy seasons when access become even more complex and local communities are busy with farming activities. Nevertheless, the JP took the recommendations seriously and convened a special meeting of partners and stakeholder for discussing the findings and recommendations of the MTE and how to implement them. Within the limited time available, the programme was able to, at least partially, implement all the relevant recommendations. The most important recommendations implemented were developing concrete plans before considering a six month extension, the abandonment and replacement of Buram locality, the drafting of a risk matrix, pushing IPs to implement or replacing them, strengthening the delivery of tangible support for communities, improving linkages and synergies between agencies, expanding the benefit of conflict sensitive training and improving external communication and visibility.

## 5.5 Coordination and Synergies

In the design process and during the initial implementation stages, especially following the joint assessments and the well attended regular coordination meetings of the widely representative PMC in Kadugli, the JP partners were able to explore and identify various useful synergies that have the potential to consolidate the integration of the programme and strengthen its joint implementation. Examples of these include: IOM, UNICEF, SMOw, WES and local committees on water issues and IDPs and returnees tracking; UN Women, UNFPA and Local women network on VAW and women empowerment; FAO, ILO, WHO and SMOsw on improving livelihood opportunities; UNDP, RPCM, NAs and local youth association on conflict prevention and peace building. A good coordination mechanism and information sharing methods making use of formal and personal channels were developed within the UN system as well as between some of the participating agencies and government and civil society counterparts. The regular and free of charge flights provided by UNMIS for JP partners, made the participation of Khartoum-based staff on the PMC meetings in Kadugli (some 900 Kms from Khartoum) possible and affordable. This improved coordination and collaboration.

However, despite the close and regular sharing of information and coordination, maintaining closer coordination and collaboration at all levels remained a big challenge for the JP. Among other factors, the radical change in context, the outbreak of conflict, the evacuation to Khartoum, the relocation of the PMC to Khartoum, access restriction by the authorities; led to the fact that many of the identified or potential synergies and opportunities for complementarities, closer collaboration, coordination and opportunities for reducing transaction cost were not fully utilized. Even when synergies emerged, they were often not fully exploited because of fragmented nature of the project design of activities and expected output, its segregated budget, the security situation and the restricted access by the authorities. The rather fragmented design of the JP also meant that the implementation procedures of different partners were not the same. Each agency has its own budget approved at the inception stage and remained more or less under the control of the respective agency. Thus, activities were often implemented separately and it is unclear how they are integrated in the JP in order generate relevant output that create collective outcome.

Available evidence also indicate that there are different level of coordination and collaboration among the various UN agencies involved in the JP implementation as well as between them and other partners and stakeholders. Some agencies coordinated and collaborated more closely than others. It is also clear that at implementation level, the coordination and collaboration between UN agencies and their respective line ministries and other IPs was much closer than among them. This was particularly the case following the evacuation of international staff from Kadugli after the outbreak of conflict.

Overall, however, similar to the whole programme itself, the coordination process of the JP went through different stages and achieved different results. Coordination at Khartoum and Kadugli levels, and collaboration and collaboration in implementation appeared to have started low and steadily grew to reach its peak during planning in implementation of the field assessment for the selection of targeted areas and communities in SKS. With the outbreak of the conflict in June 2011, all UN agencies closed down their field offices in Kadugli and withdrew their staff to Khartoum. The PMC meetings were moved to Khartoum and after a long period (over 6 months) of ‘wait and see’ where little happened on the ground, various agencies started to revise their plans and find their own ways of resuming implementation; largely by relying on national staff and through government counterparts, local NGOs and CBOs .

In the design process and during the initial implementation stages, especially following the joint assessments and the well attended regular coordination meetings of the widely representative PMC in Kadugli, the JP partners were able to explore and identify various useful synergies that have the potential to consolidate the integration of the programme and strengthen its joint implementation. Examples of these include: IOM and UNICEF, SMOw, WES and local committees on water issues; UN Women, UNFPA and Local women network on VAW and women empowerment; FAO, ILO, WHO and SMOsw on improving livelihood opportunities; UNDP, RPCM, NAs and local youth association on conflict prevention and peace building. However, due to the radical change in context, the outbreak of conflict, the evacuation to Khartoum, the relocation of the PMC to Khartoum, access restriction by the authorities; most of these synergies and opportunities for closer collaboration, coordination, complimenting initiatives and cutting transaction costs were not fully utilized.

UNDP and RCO presence in Kadugli and Muglad helped enormously in liaising with local authorities and security bodies to and obtaining travel permissions and making travel arrangements on behalf of all participating agencies. Many agencies staff interviewed stated that this was one of the big advantages of such programme, as it enables you to focus on what you could do best and leave other activities for the comparative advantages of other partners. They mentioned that such coordination and collaboration, especially during planning and the field assessment cut their transaction cost and spare them valuable time and resources so as to focus on other more programmatic matters, leaving some of the logistical and bureaucratic issues for the UNDP, which is better suited to deal with them in collaboration with government authorities and UNMIS and others. Other stated that because of their capacities and local linkages and field limited or lack of presence in the field, they would not have been able to deal with such matters in their own.

Although the sharing of information among UN agencies at the Khartoum level continued to be good throughout the lifetime of the project, the lack of presence of some agencies in the field even before the conflict and their limited capacity even in Khartoum and the relative size of the JP budget and its significance compared to their overall budget and operations must have contributing to the irregular attendance of PMC meetings and the overlap of participating staff, as shown in the PMC meeting

minutes. The PMC meetings minutes also show low level of participation of the main JP line ministry in Khartoum (MIC).

Despite the segregated nature of the JP budgets and implementation, there were cases where the programme delivered in a well coordinated and complementary manner that enhanced the impact of the JP intervention and contributed to the two main outcomes of the programme. The work done in Harazaya, an area of intertribal conflicts over water points, grazing and farm lands between Nuba and Messiriya, is a good example of this. Following the comprehensive field assessment, the UNDP and the government RPCM mobilized local leadership including youth and educated men and women who lived in and outside the area and organized peace building training programme and later on peace workshops and a conference. Local communities' from various tribal groups indentified the provision of water for human and animal consumption as the main priority that can prevent conflict and provide peace dividends. According to one community leader interviewed 'we did not want just water or any water, we planned water for peace. We made wider consultation and collectively decided the location of the water yard and its design in a way that reduce clashes among our youth'. A Water Management Committee was elected and trained by IOM on maintenance and by the UNDP on general management, book keeping as well as on peace mediation and water conflict mitigation. The interventions by other participating UN agencies added extra value. For example, the IOM, which besides water is involved in issue pertinent to returning IDPs, worked closely and benefited from the UNICEF work on WASH. UNFPA provided GBV training for young men and women and for Native Administrators, while the UN Women promoted and supported women networks in the area, and worked to link the women trained in enhancing economic recovery and expanding livelihood opportunities by the ILO with the microfinance initiatives of the State Ministry of Social Welfare.

## 5.6 Gender Consideration

- The JP rightly recognized that within the context of widespread poverty and deprivation, women in SKS are particularly underserved and their interests are undermined and their crucial role in conflict prevention and peace building are often overlooked. The JP thus identified women as specific targeted group. The promotion of women leaders was particularly important and persuading local communities to allocate over 30% of seats of the Community Development Committees (CDCs) and Village Development Committees (VDCs) for women has indeed helped in this respect and ensured that women voices on peace and development are heard. In both Muglad and Harazaya, the JP also supported the establishment of women protection networks at community level for the victims of GBV and FGM which provide psychosocial support and facilitate access to medical and legal service.
- The JP also strengthened the capacities of local communities in Harazaya and Mugadama through the formation of VDCs, with significant women representation, and trained their members on peace building, conflict prevention, natural resources management, and record keeping. Those committees, which remained active within and outside their respective villages even after the end of the JP, have provided local leadership and helped, enhance local sense of ownership.
- In addressing the GBV and early marriages, the JP partners recognized the importance of including in their awareness raising and training activities not only women but also ordinary men, and educated young men and community leaders. This approach seems to

strengthen local ownership, contribute to the effectiveness of the JP and produced better results.

## 5.7 Beneficiaries and Gender Balance

With regard to providing services that generate direct or indirect benefits for a large number of diverse people, available data shows that the JP revised activities have benefited some 537,626 women and men, including 6,499 persons who benefited directly from the various software and hardware activities of the JP partners.

In terms of gender balance, the JP was collecting and analyzing gender disaggregated data. Available data indicate over half of the total beneficiaries of the programme were females. This is commendable and not surprising given that the programme identified women as a particular focused group, with two of the 8 UN participating agencies (UNFPA and UN Women) focusing almost exclusively on women. The table below shows the details of planned and reached beneficiaries:

### Planned and Reached Beneficiaries

Gender	No of Beneficiaries	Percentage
Males	262,050	49%
Females	275,576	51 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>537,626</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 5.8 Finance and Delivery

- In June 2011 a meeting of the NSC decided to formally split the JP into two and form a new NSC in Juba. In fact this decision was largely a formality since in reality by then all agencies either running autonomous or semi-autonomous operations in the north and south, while for most agencies the JP budget has been split between north and south right from the beginning. It is unclear how some of the agencies dealt with the splitting of their allocated budget between north and south, however, the overall figures indicates that the overall budget was split into two equal halves (roughly 3 million US dollar each), indicating a principle of equality rather than equity, relative need or progress in financial delivery.
- No disaggregated split budget between north and south has been provided for the final evaluation, and the budget for the north indicates an overall financial delivery of 83%. Given the context and the various challenges that faced the JP this delivery rate is very high. The table and charts below provide details of the financial deliver per agency:

### Allocated Budget and Reported Expenditure

Agency	Total Allocated Budget	% of Total Budget	Total Reported Expenditure	Financial Delivery Rate
FAO	50,228	1.7%	43,228	86%
ILO	362,430	12.1%	310,790	86%
IOM	339,584	11.3%	200,956	59%



(International Staff). The NSC and the PMC meetings also played an important role (at higher level information sharing in terms of the NSC and in collaboration with government bodies and IPs in the case of the PMC) in monitoring and recording progress made.

- The Programme Coordinator and the UNDP Offices and RCSOs in Khartoum and Kadugli provided good technical and financial support for improving M&E efforts for whole programme as well as for individual participating agencies; making use of the experiences learned through the JP and benefiting from the well established M&E Unit of the UNDP and the M&E framework of the UNDAF. Quarterly reports were prepared and widely shared, and annual reviews were also conducted and many of their results incorporated into the programme. A midterm review was also conducted in Jan 2012, and most of its recommendations were implemented.
- Following the evacuation to Khartoum in June 2011 and the continued restricted access, the abilities of all UN agencies to regularly conduct on the ground monitoring and evaluation and to provide on the spot-technical supports for government and non-governmental implementing partners (IPs) have been significantly reduced. Given the capacity issues pertinent to almost all IPs in SKS, and the fact that one of the main objectives of the JP was to enhance local capacities, this reduced monitoring capacity impacted the ability to uphold the high level of UN accountability and quality of delivery standards.
- The revision of indicators and the organisation of an M&E workshop attended by partners and stakeholders helped improve the M&E system. Yet the M&E framework of the JP remained unclear and inadequate in terms of inadequate indicators (largely quantification of activities), absence of a dedicated M&E for the whole duration and its ability to jointly operate on the ground and monitor progress and gather information to feed into revision and adjustment of interventions. The lack of reliable state or locality level statistics made it difficult to measure progress in, for example, violent conflicts incidents, access to safe drinking water or adequate health service. Lack of clear baseline data made matters worse.
- Also, following the outbreak of the fighting, most agencies revised their strategy by engaging more local partners for implementation. However due to security and access related restrictions, field monitoring of interventions by the JP participating agencies was significantly reduced. Planned joint monitoring has never materialized, and attempts by individual agencies to carryout remote monitoring achieved mixed results.
- Some aspects of the inadequacy of the JP M&E framework have been mitigated by the fact that the JP is rooted in the CPRU of the UNDP. The Head of the CPRU worked closely with the JP team to ensure joint implementation and assure quality of delivery. In addition to this, almost all of the implementing agencies have their own M&E Unit or specialist, which helped in ensuring proper monitoring of implementation and evaluation of outputs and outcomes. The bilateral meetings organised by the JP coordination team with partner agencies and government counterparts also played a role in improving coordination and sharing of information for the purpose of monitoring overall progress. Yet such M&E remained inadequate for a joint programme as it was segregated by agency and not well integrated into one whole system, especially with regard to functioning at grassroots level.

## **5.10 Challenges and Constraints during Implementation**

The implementation of the JP faced many challenges, some of which are not unusual within the current context of Sudan and SKS. Other challenges can be attribute the joint nature of the programme (i.e. common in all joint programmes and not just this JP in Sudan), complex and slow decision making process, slow moving inception phase etc. The following can be considered as the main challenges that faced the implementation of the JP:

- Challenges related to the design and the implementation modality of this programme (ambitious, complex, too many agencies and other counterparts etc.)
- The outbreak of conflict in SKS in June 2011 and its associated sudden loss of access, deterioration in security across the state and the restriction of access by government authorities right up to the closure of the programme. The conflict also, shifted the priorities and attention of government and also some local communities directly affected by the war. This made activities of long term developmental nature such as developing business plan and setting up self employment businesses (ILO, FAO with MoSW etc) became challenging to implement as planned.
- Political dynamics at both state and national levels was extremely high and tense throughout the implementation period of the JP. Among other things, the JP period coincided with the census, national and local elections, the referendum of the south, the secession of the south, the beginning and the collapse of the popular consultation in SKS, the oilfields war between north and south.
- Two of the participating UN agencies (ILO and UN Women) did not have field presence in SKS, and the other who had presence lost it because of the evacuation following the conflict, looting of vehicles and ransack of UN offices in Kadugli.
- The JP took a very long time before it completed its management, reached a functioning coordination mechanism and became fully operational on the ground. This slow start, however, is not uncommon for JPs, especially those with such level of complexity of structure and multiplicity of partners and stakeholders.
- Delays and challenges caused by the high fluidity of government structure at both national and state level, which halt progress and caused severe delays in implementation as a natural by product for securing government commitment and ensuring national and local ownership. For example, the South Kordofan Government's structures and staff has been reformed, especially, the Ministry of Social Development Women and Child Affairs (MOSDWCA) which has been changed into Ministry of Welfare and Social Development (MOWSD). The RPCM has also been restructured and many other state ministries reshaped through government reshuffle. At the federal level in Khartoum, the main national line ministry has been dissolved and amalgamated into the federal Ministry of Finance and National Economy. As a result, JP faced difficulty in adopting new financial procedures and re-establishing relations with newly recruited staff/departments who were not fully aware of the JP and could not immediately provide the required support.
- The relatively new federal government system in Sudan is characterized with numerous 'concurrent powers' (that are exercised by both federal and state authorities), and also left many 'residual powers' that are still being negotiated and hence creating governance confusion. This situation, coupled with fluidity of government structure and the competition of government bodies at various levels over power and financial resources creates confusion for JP partners, especially with regard to coordination and reporting.<sup>3</sup>
- The long and heavy rainy season in SKS (June-September) makes many targeted sites inaccessible, especially given the very poor roads situation and lack of bridges.
- The presence of a big UN Mission in the country (UNMIS), including a large presence in SKS, presented both an opportunity for synergies with JP partners, provided available

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, during the implementation of the JP, the main national government counterpart (MIC) was totally abolished and reduced to Directorate at the Federal Ministry of Finance and National Economy. The SKS also witnessed a number of changes of cabinet, reshuffle and abolishment of state ministries and establishment of new ones. The main state level counterpart (RPCM) also lost key staff following the outbreak of war in June 2011.

excellent logistical and transport support<sup>4</sup> and high level engagement and coordination, but at the same time the Mission consumed a great of the time and attention of the Resident Coordinator, and the existence of bodies within UNMIS with similar mandates and objectives to the JP and its partners (the Civil and Political Affairs, DDR, the RRR and the Quick Impact etc) created overlap, confusion and sometimes competition, particularly at SKS level. The presence of a huge mission with different peace approach, ways of engagement and implementation strategies in the same JP area has also presented an added challenge to the programme.

### 5.3 Result and Impact Level Findings

The following are the main results and impact achievements of the JP to its stated two outcomes:

- Despite all the challenges faced, the design and implementation of the JP has enabled the UN system and the government to work together to mobilize and empower local communities in SKS to engage in peace building and development.
- JP triggered institutional changes and contributed to capacity development of local actors which enhanced their ability to plan more adequately enabled them to deliver services, especially to rural and pastoral communities, and engage in grassroots peace building work.
- Building the capacity of women networks, youth groups and clubs at community level and creating linkages among them and between them and other actors is also another aspect of the JP intervention that is likely to have a long term and wider impact.
- Interesting and innovative partnership with new vertical and horizontal linkages were developed to prevent conflict, advance peace and promote peaceful coexistence among targeted populations. The engagement with and the capacity building for that Native Administration (NA) and the educated and intellectuals men and women in the targeted areas was another good example of the JP activities that were effective and sustainable.
- The JP promoted and disseminated an innovative approach that links service delivery with peace building. Commenting on the impact of the construction of a water yard in his village, a local tribal leader stated that “this is not like any water, this is peace water”.
- Fostering dialogue and collaboration on peace issues among the UN agencies and between them and other partners and stakeholders, especially government institutions.
- Attitude change toward conflict sensitivity and ‘do no harm’, particularly within participating UN agencies.
- Enhancing the technical capacities of partners, especially at state and community levels, on development planning and conflict analysis and resolution.
- Raising awareness about conflict and its impact, and demonstrating practical benefits that community can generate from peaceful resolution of disputes and conflicts.
- Providing peace dividends in the form of badly needed services (e.g. drinking water, health services, veterinary services and classrooms) that will be used by various communities for a long time to come. Such services generate common and shared interests among diverse communities, whose leaders were trained in dealing with possible disputes over these services and also trained in maintenance in order to sustain the service.

---

<sup>4</sup> UNMIS regular and free of charge flights have particularly made the attendance of Khartoum based staff for the monthly PMC meetings in Kadugli (some 900 KMs away) possible.

- Achieving strong ownership of the programme, especially at state and community levels.
- Contributing to the drafting of the ToR of the RPCM and supporting it technically and institutionally through staff secondment, training and institutional capacity building.
- Evidence from the interviews conducted for this evaluation and the review of various programme reports and the independent impact assessment study clearly indicate that the JP has successfully engaged local authorities and mobilized local communities in the targeted localities in SKS, particularly in the areas of Harazaya and Mugadama, and provided relevant and needed services that are deliberately selected in order to build local capacities and advance local peace and promote peaceful coexistence within as well as between tribal and ethnic groups in SKS. The participatory approach adopted for the delivery of services also aimed at empowering communities and local leaders to improve the socioeconomic conditions of their own people during and beyond the JP interventions.
- Impact of the conflict sensitive training programme conducted by the UNDP for all participating UN agencies staff and other government non-governmental partners was felt by all interviewed persons, most of whom stated that the impact of this training goes well beyond the JP to provide positive impact their other interventions and help strengthen the delivery of their agencies' mandate, especially in conflict affected areas.
- Delivering in the same place and targeting the same communities with different initiatives and services maximized the impact of intervention but is not enough to guarantee that agencies are delivering jointly or as one.
- The JP partnership with, and capacity support for, the RPCM is another example of the long lasting impact of the programme. RPCM is an innovative government body avoiding overlap, institutional competition and jealousy within government. It took advantage of been a government agency within strong political support from the Governor's office, where it affiliates, but it remained reasonably autonomous in its operation. This made it flexible and adaptive, and enabled it to avoid government bureaucracy and slow decision-making (please see box below).

## The RPCM

Although the RPCM was established before the inception of the JP, the UNDP has always been working closely with it and the JP was involved in drafting the terms of references that mainstreamed and organized the work of the RPCM and cut overlap and confusion with other government bodies. The RPCM became the main government partner of the JP in SKS. To further build the capacities of the RPCM, the JP seconded two fulltime national staff to provide technical and administrative support for the RPCM, and also provided essential office equipment. Although, it lost some of its pro-SPLM members, and consequently its level of acceptance as a mediator among some Nuba groups, following the re-eruption of conflict; thanks to its charismatic leader and the support of the Governors' Office, the RPCM became a well equipped and experienced mediator that organized many successful peace conferences that followed up the implementation of their recommendations. The RPCM worked through, and coordinated closely with local leaders and the NA structure, which was already mobilized, trained, sensitized by JP, and it helped reactivate their traditional conflict resolution and peace building mechanisms. Encouraged and supported by its JP partners, the RPCM also recognized the importance of involving local youth, women leaders and educated and intellectual members of the community and effectively used them to reach and sustain peace within and between different tribal groups in SKS. The RPCM became widely used by government and non-government bodies, especially for promoting local peace and advancing peaceful coexistence between the different tribes of SKS. For example, following the occupation of Abu Karshola town by the rebel group (Sudan Revolutionary Force) in May 2013, and its associated tension between the diverse ethnic groups in the area, the RPCM was invited to come in and help restore intercommunity trust and peaceful coexistence, particularly between Nuba and Arabs.

## 6.0 Sustainability

It is clear that the JP was designed to achieve long-term, sustainable and replicable processes and results. The two intended outcomes of the programme and its implementation approach and strategy provided a good basis for building technical capacities of partners and stakeholders and providing types of soft and hardware services that last for long and can be replicated in Sudan or beyond. The following are examples of elements of the JP that are clearly providing impacts that will continue well beyond the lifetime of the project, continue to benefit more people than the ones directly targeted and provide experiences that can be replicated:

- The JP made use of the data produced by the Crisis and Recovery Mapping and Analysis (CRMA) project and went on to do its own fieldwork in the areas of Buram, Keilek and Muglad and produced a rich and wide range field assessment data, maps and analysis which helped it to improve its conflict sensitivity and targeting of the most needy communities. These data and analysis were also made available for partners and stakeholder including state level government institutions such as the RPCM etc, early warning on health, travel routes etc can be of great use for government and other actors in the area.
- A number of JP interventions have contributed to strengthening systems and capacities of local institutions in the area of sustainable conflict prevention and peace building. Government institutions (e.g. RPCM) and local community committees (e.g. WDC and VDC and women networks and youth networks), whose capacities have been enhanced by the JP trainings and other supports, have taken a number of independent (and in some cases integrated, coordinated or event joint) initiatives in resolving/mitigating conflicts and fostering peaceful coexistence.
- Many of the services, processes that were initiated as part of the JP intervention, are

continuing beyond the JP lifetime and their impacts were expanding well beyond the directly targeted institutions, communities and individuals.

- RPCM use of the experiences, approaches and techniques developed within the JP to engage in peace conferences and peaceful coexistence initiatives outside of the JP area (e.g. the recent Abu Karshola conflict is another evidence of the sustainability of some crucial element of the JP).
- The continued efforts of the local youth unions and women networks (all are established or receive capacity building training by the JP) to foster peace and achieve reconciliation and peaceful coexistence between different tribes and communities (e.g. Nuba-Nuba, Nuba-Arab and inter tribal such as Messiriya-Messiriya) are further indications of the sustainability of the JP.
- Lasting and far extending impact within the participating UN agencies and other partners has been particularly noticeable with regard to conflict sensitive trainings provided by the JP, which many people stated that they are now trying to apply it to various aspects of their work in conflict affected areas including Darfur and Blue Nile and Eastern Sudan. Many also stated that they are now more conscious and committed to avoid 'doing harm' in conflict situation
- The JP had indeed fostered dialogue and collaboration between UN agencies, the UN Mission, government agencies and civil society at grassroots level. This has been achieved through meetings of PMC in Kadugli and Khartoum, joint planning and implementation, especially in the first year of the programme, joint training programmes, joint assessment missions, secondment of technical staff from the JP to the RPCM in Kadugli, traveling together from Khartoum to Kadugli and from Kadugli to the field
- The injection of ILO and WHO, among others, for peace issues and peace messages in their general youth and health programmes.
- JCRP took over and built on the experience and resources, including linkages at state and national levels and human resources, of the JP.

## 7.0 Conclusions

- It may seem ironic that a programme introduced within a context of a post-conflict which was mediated and guarded by one of the largest peacekeeping missions in the history of the UN and tailored to prevent conflict and promote peace has found itself deeply immersed into a full fledged conflict. But looking at the history of the programme area and the fragile peace brought by the CPA, the troubled peace implementation process, especially in the three areas (SKS, Blue Nile and Abyei) and the strong secessionist tendency in the south, the outbreak of conflict was rather expected and no external programme could have ever prevented it. In this respect, the main shortcoming of the JP was in its failure to devise a good risk management and mitigation strategy that enable all the partners, individually as well as together, to timely and effectively deal with different scenarios as, and when they arise. Preventing the re-eruption of the conflict was well beyond the objectives and abilities of the JP or indeed any similar initiative.
- As a joint programme funded by the MDGF and implemented in line with MDGF guidelines, the JP's management and coordination structure as well as its implementation modality are very much different from other regular UN programmes. In this respect, the JP should be seen as unique, innovative and in some respect also experiential initiative, as Sudan has very little experiences with joint programme (the two other JP in the country: the Joint Conflict Reduction Programme (JCRP) and the Joint Programme for Creating Opportunities for Youth Employment are different in scope, structure, thematic window and participating UN agencies. Those JPs are also very recent or are still being implemented.
- It is evident that at the design level, the JP was highly relevant to the national priorities of Sudan, and the interests and needs of the targeted individuals and communities at the time when the programme was conceived. The JP was also quite relevant to the ONE UN framework. The intervention logic was highly relevant though some aspects were not well conceptualized and articulated.
- In general, the JP worked much better in terms of wider participation, close coordination, joint collaboration and alignment with priorities at state and local community level than nationally. The programme was also better received, appreciated and owned at state and local level than at federal.

- One of the major achievements of the JP was the establishment of good coordination structures in both Khartoum and Kadugli and the planning and implementation of the field assessment in SKS which presented a good example and demonstrated many benefits of joint programming that were appreciated by many interviewed UN staff and government officials as a different initiative that enhanced ownership, strengthened inter agency coordination and collaboration, reduce time and transaction costs and presented UN agencies to government bodies and communities as one integrated body with different, yet complimentary mandates and focuses and specialization.
- Another key achievement of the JP was its success in bringing the issues of conflict mitigation and peace building at community level into the forefront of the dialogue among participating UN agencies and between them and national and local government authorities. Bilateral meetings between JP management team and partners' agencies and the PMC meetings have provide platforms for regular deliberation and sharing of information on conflict and peace.
- The field assessment was truly jointly planned and conducted by all the UN agencies and their other government and non-governmental partners and stakeholders. The assessment also and provided strong evidence and a good information base for programming and effective targeting. However, because of some structural issues in the design of the JP and the outbreak of conflict and its consequences, other activities were not as joint and well integrated as the assessment.
- Delays in abandoning Buram and replacing it with an accessible area wasted valuable time of the JP 3 year duration. The management and coordination structure of the JP and the complexity of the decision making process within the programme may have played a role in these delays, but from the available evidence, the evaluation was unable ascertain the extent to which these were detrimental to the delays. As stated early the lack of a clear risk management and mitigation strategy was key factor behind the slow response and the long delays.
- The JP showed weak linkages with some crucial existing initiatives, such as DDR efforts (in which UNDP was involved) and the CPA related Popular Consultation in SKS. The JP was also not clear in conceptualising or operationalising how local peace initiatives will contribute to wider peace efforts. A link with, and a support for the Popular Consultation could have created this.
- Despite its importance to wider peace in SKS and its closer link to the design of th JP, the Messiraya-Dinka conflict was not prioritized, especially in relation to the JP intervention in Muglad and also parts of Keilek and Lagawa localities.
- As a result of their different field and head office capacities and the varying roles in the JP, the 8 participating UN agencies operated at different implementation pace. This made fully joint, same time or back-to-back implementation difficult and sometimes impossible.
- Despite widespread and well structured coordination mechanisms within the UN system in Sudan, and the long history of collaboration between UN agencies and government bodies and civil society organizations, Sudan has a relatively short history and limited experience with joint programming. In this respect, this JP can be viewed as part of the learning process of working jointly and delivering as one. These may have contributed to the limited successes in some aspects of the JP.
- There some evidence and strong likelihood that the JP impact will continue well into the future and its good practice be replicated in similar situations in Sudan and beyond.

## 8.0 Lessons Learned

As a relatively new way of operating for the UN system in Sudan and as an innovative intervention that faced many challenges and overcome many difficulties, there are many lessons that can be drawn from the JP. The following are the key lessons learned:

- Conflict prevention and peace building require sustained and long term intervention and follow up for dispute settlement and conflict resolution. The best that initiatives with limited time and financial resources, such as the JP, can do to achieve a durable peace is to build the capacities of various local actors (formal or informal), initiate and support, initiate and disseminate good practices and lesson learned.
- Close follow up and continuation of provision of support and advice is very crucial for the achievement of durable peace and stability.
- Peace building initiatives must be comprehensive and inclusive. Exclusion, gaps and grey areas in peace building processes create problems of new conflicts or the risk of the re-eruption of the same conflict.
- Strong advocacy component in peace building project is important. Joint programmes are particularly well placed to work together to achieve good and sustained results through advocacy at state and national levels.
- The flexibility in programme design, especially joint programmes is a strength, but it can also be a key source of weakness; as it may lead to induced agencies to develop their own understanding and go their own ways in implementing, which may fragment the programme.
- Coordination and collaboration is tough and time consuming, but it pays off in the end.
- UN agencies and international bodies must have strong government partners in order to work effectively in conflict prevention and peace building programmes.
- Capacity building for local level and grassroots institutions and organizations is good for mitigating conflict and promoting peace.
- The possibility of mobilization of financial support from government increases significantly when you pick issues of high relevance and top priorities for national government (e.g. reconciliation and mediation by RPCM, rural water, rural women livelihood).
- Working at state and local level pays off better and has potential for better results and wider impact, on state level and local institution capacity building.
- Engagement of state level government bodies in implementation reduce transaction cost, tap into government resources, ensures sustainability and works best within conflict situation where access to international organizations and personnel is highly restricted.
- Agencies with no prior field presence should not be included in a joint programme of such nature, limited budget, short timeframe and challenging context.
- Good, yet simple and clear communication strategy is essential for the smooth running of any joint programme.
- Having qualified and trained national staff and close partnership with local authorities and local NGOs and CBOs at field offices is extremely important for adjusting to context changes in highly insecure and volatile conflict and post conflict settings and responding to access restrictions in a timely and effective manner. In the case of the JP it was clear that agencies with such arrangements were able to adjust better and continue to implement on the ground, compared to those without such arrangements or without field presence.
- Having a good risk assessment and mitigation strategy with clear scenarios is essential for programme implemented in fluid and volatile post conflict situations.
- Peace conference and peace agreements raise expectations, sometimes to a level that peace dividends can only partially address.

- Joint programmes and other similar interventions need to be thematically, geographically and scope focused and realistic in what you can do with limited resources a challenging and volatile conflict or post-conflict context.

## 9.0 Recommendations

Recommendations are made for UN agencies operating in Sudan and their national and local partners as specified:

- It imperative for joint programmes and other initiatives of similar nature to take enough time and exert systematic efforts in order to build shared understanding of the theory of change that guide the programme and the assumptions that underline it. In this respect it is important for all involved agencies and key individuals to develop a shared understanding of what the programme is about and how its different activities and components fit together to form a truly joint programme and achieve shared overall outcomes and realize the desired impact. One of the implications of do so, is a rather lengthy time for the inception phase of the programme. The more UN agencies and other partners you have, the more time you require for the inception phase.
- In order to expand impact and build trust with government authorities, UN agencies must strengthen involvement of national (federal) government institutions and coordinate very closely and share information with them, even when interventions primarily or entirely focus on state or local government. Doing so will also ensure stronger federal ownership.
- National coordinating bodies and line ministries must be more proactive and must demonstrate more commitments and leadership when engaging with UN agencies and other international actors. This should be the case regardless of where the actual implementation takes place.
- Planning and designing process of joint programmes can best start by firstly identifying issues/problems to be addressed jointly, how they can be effectively tackled; and then look for who is best placed to add real value to what needs to be achieved.
- A strong advocacy component that operates at different levels must be an essential component in conflict transformation and peace building projects implemented by UN agencies or other national or international agencies. Joint programmes are particularly well placed to work together to achieve good and sustained results through advocacy at state and national levels.
- Programmes designed in conflict or post-conflict situations and areas of high political instability must have a risk management strategy integrated in the design and not simply developed as and when the situation arises or evolves.
- The MDG-F should look into the possible impact of the ‘pass through’ funding modalities on the fragmentation of joint programmes.
- Local partners at grass root level should be involved more in the planning and not just implementation of activities.
- Local communities, especially rural and pastoral communities in conflict and post conflict areas of Sudan must work together to confront, challenge and reverse the cultural values and social attitudes that condone, promotes and sometimes glorify violence, abuse and brutality. Community leaders, including women leaders, and educated local people, including youths, can play a crucial role in transforming war culture into effective tools for building and celebrating diversity and peaceful coexistence.

## 10.0 Annexes

### 10.1 List of People Interviewed

Name	Organization
Abdelmoniem Ahmed	UNWOMEN
Adnan Cheema	UNDP
Ahmed Gabir Subahi	Former UNMIS Civil Affairs Kadugli, currently JCRP UNDP
Fairouz Sheikh Eldin Farah	JCRP seconded Officer with RPCM, Kadugli
Hassan Deng	Community Leader, Keilak
Hiromi Amano	JP, UNDP
Hisashi Izumi	JP, JCRP UNDP, Khartoum
Ikhlas Mohamadani	UN agencies Unit, MIC
Johannes Braun	IOM/ Khartoum
Khadija Osman	UNFPA/ Dilling/Kadugli
Mahmoud Dafalla	FAO Khartoum
Musa Eldoud Ahmed	Community Leader, Mugadama
Nawshad Ahmed	UNICEF/ Khartoum
Nuhaida Rahim	JP, JCRP UNDP
Omer Mohamed Ahmed Elhaj	Director General, General Directorate for International Cooperation (MIC)
Osman Gadim	Chairperson of RPCM
Pontus Ohrstedt	CPRU Team Leader, UNDP
Rania Yousif	IOM/ Khartoum
Sara Ferrer Olivella	MDG-F, Secretariat, New York
Sawsan Ali	UN Agencies Unit, MIC
Suzan Elsadig Abdelislam	ILO/ Khartoum
Viridiana Garcia	MDG-F, Secretariat, New York
Yousif Jumaa	WHO, Kadugli, Now Darfur

### 10.2 List of Participating Bodies

#### 10.2.1 UN Partner Agencies

- UNDP
- UNICEF
- FAO
- UNFPA
- WHO
- ILO
- IOM
- UN Women

### **10.2.2 Federal and State Government Bodies**

- Federal MIC, Khartoum
- Federal MoSW
- Reconciliation and Peaceful Co-existence Mechanism (RPCM)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Social Development, Women and Child Affairs (SMSDWCA)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Education (SMoE)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Finance (SMoF)
- Water and Environmental Sanitation Project (WES)
- State Water Corporation (SWC)
- Child Friendly Community Initiative (CFCI)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Agriculture (SMoA)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Health (SMoH)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (SMoAF)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Animal Wealth (SMoAW)
- South Kordofan State Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (SMoWI)
- Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Social Welfare
- Buram Locality
- Keilak Locality
- Muglad Locality
- Lagawa Locality
- Peace and Development Studies Centre (PDSC/University of Dilling)

### **10.2.3 INGOs and International Bodies/Projects**

- UNMIS/Civil Affairs -Kadugli
- Community Development Fund (CDF)

### **10.2.4 NNGOs, LNGOs and CBOs**

- Azza Women Association (NGO)
- PANCARE
- SIBRO
- Badya
- HAWA Organisation
- Sudanese Red Crescent Society (SRCS)
- Gender and Peace Building Centre (NGO)
- Kundos Construction Company and Community Development Committees (CDCs/CBOs)
- Youth Union (Keilak, Lagawa: West Kordofan)
- Women networks (Lagawa, Keilak: West Kordofan)