

**SUDAN &  
REPUBLIC OF  
SOUTH SUDAN**

**Sustained Peace for Development:  
Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building in  
Sudan (MDGF- 1978)**



*Conflict Prevention and Peace Building*

<b>Total Budget:</b>	<b>USD 6,000,000</b>		
<b>Budget by Agency:</b>	IOM: 779,017 UNDP: 1,545,743 UNICEF: 1,157,285 FAO: 535,910	ILO: 724,860 WHO: 498,738 UNFPA: 362,169 UNIFEM: 396,278	
<b>Participating Gov. Entities:</b>	Ministry of International Cooperation; Ministry of Regional Cooperation; Southern Sudan Peace Commission; Ministry of Labour, Public Services and Human Resource Development; Federal Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports; Federal Ministry of Social Welfare, Women and Child Affairs; Ministry of Gender, Social Welfare and Religious Affairs; Federal Ministry of General Education; NCVE		
<b>Start Date:</b>	15 December 2009		
<b>Est. End Date:</b>	15 December 2012		
<b>Extension Date:</b>			
<b>Disbursements:</b>	First Disbursement:	15 December 2009	USD 3,219,962
	Second Disbursement:	4 October 2011	USD 2,770,038
	Third Disbursement:		
<b>In Brief:</b>	<p>The programme aims to prevent conflict from relapsing in 4 bordering states of Sudan, by bolstering peace building, rule of law and socioeconomic recovery within -and between- vulnerable communities and local authorities in targeted areas and villages. The contested border area is one of the most complex conflict systems in the country, with increasingly serious tensions building since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005. In light of this fragile and volatile context, and the crucial need of linking local level conflict management with national priorities, the programme will strengthen conflict resolution mechanisms, better resource management, planning and leadership to reduce the likeliness of inadvertent clashes triggered by local disputes over cattle grazing, water and land use, that can lead to increased instability. It will increase access to justice and generate peace dividends directly tackling the root causes of resource-based conflicts.</p>		

**Outcomes:**

- Strengthened systems and capacities for sustainable conflict prevention and management of natural resource based conflict.
- Citizens' (with a focus on women and children) utilisation of rule of law institutions and access to justice increased due to enhanced conflict sensitive capacity of relevant state authorities.
- Increased conflict sensitive recovery and reintegration at community level through basic service delivery and development of economic opportunities.



<b>Regions of Intervention:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bordering states of Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap, Unity, Southern Kordofan</li> </ul>
---------------------------------	---

<b>MDGs</b>	MDG7 T7.A
-------------	-----------

Beneficiaries	Direct	Indirect																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. Institutions</li> <li>No. Women</li> <li>No. Men</li> <li>No. ethnic groups</li> </ul>	50 2,880 22,274 4,645	46 3,750 3,800 5,200																									
Project coordinator: Adnan Cheema RCO Focal Point: Margaret Eelman Web page:																											
<b>Status</b>	<p>During the course of implementation of this joint programme, a new country has been born, the Republic of South Sudan. The joint programme is currently reviewing its operations following this division to re-establish the governance structures and working modalities. In the meantime, the security situation has also worsened in the areas of intervention. The midterm evaluation is scheduled to take place at the end of November 2011 and it can be helpful for the teams to take stock and reflect on latest events and agree on best ways to proceed with the implementation of programme interventions.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty of the political situation and the resumption of activities in targeted areas (particularly in Southern Kordofan), the JP will continue to monitor the situation and where necessary share ongoing information with UN implementing partners. Alongside this, the JP will continue to maintain regular communication with government counterparts and key local partners to facilitate smoother delivery of activities. At present it is difficult to anticipate when the team will be requesting for a no-cost extension and for how long.</p>																										
<b>Estimated financial execution status as of the June 30, 2011 biannual report:</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>TOTAL</th> <th>Transferred</th> <th>Committed</th> <th>Disbursed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-2</td> <td>6,214,378,00 (100,00%)</td> <td>3,229,962,00 (51,98%)</td> <td>1,247,286,86 (20,07%)</td> <td>988,383,38 (15,90%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-1</td> <td>6,214,378,00 (100,00%)</td> <td>3,229,962,00 (51,98%)</td> <td>428,867,00 (6,90%)</td> <td>132,291,00 (2,13%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-2</td> <td>6,214,378,00 (100,00%)</td> <td>3,229,962,00 (51,98%)</td> <td>1,250,262,86 (20,12%)</td> <td>988,383,38 (15,90%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-1</td> <td>6,214,378,00 (100,00%)</td> <td>0,00 (0,00%)</td> <td>1,806,519,00 (29,07%)</td> <td>1,507,971,00 (24,27%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Period	TOTAL	Transferred	Committed	Disbursed	2009-2	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	3,229,962,00 (51,98%)	1,247,286,86 (20,07%)	988,383,38 (15,90%)	2010-1	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	3,229,962,00 (51,98%)	428,867,00 (6,90%)	132,291,00 (2,13%)	2010-2	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	3,229,962,00 (51,98%)	1,250,262,86 (20,12%)	988,383,38 (15,90%)	2011-1	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	0,00 (0,00%)	1,806,519,00 (29,07%)	1,507,971,00 (24,27%)
Period	TOTAL	Transferred	Committed	Disbursed																							
2009-2	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	3,229,962,00 (51,98%)	1,247,286,86 (20,07%)	988,383,38 (15,90%)																							
2010-1	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	3,229,962,00 (51,98%)	428,867,00 (6,90%)	132,291,00 (2,13%)																							
2010-2	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	3,229,962,00 (51,98%)	1,250,262,86 (20,12%)	988,383,38 (15,90%)																							
2011-1	6,214,378,00 (100,00%)	0,00 (0,00%)	1,806,519,00 (29,07%)	1,507,971,00 (24,27%)																							
<b>Main Achievements:</b> <i>(by expected outcomes)</i>	<p>The Joint Programme aims to prevent the eruption, escalation and relapse of conflict along the North-South states of Southern Kordofan and Warrap by bolstering peace building, rule of law, and socioeconomic recovery within and between vulnerable communities and local authorities in targeted areas along the 1-1-1956 borders.</p> <p>A number of JP interventions that have contributed to strengthening systems and capacities of institutions for sustainable conflict prevention and peace building include: (1) institutional capacity assessments identifying technical skill gaps/know-how and needed trainings of local partner institutions, (2) conflict sensitivity trainings provided to ministries, women and youth groups, and (3) implementation through government counterparts, CBOs, and national NGOs. Conflict sensitivity workshops and discussions conducted by UNDP's CRP allowed for JP implementing partners to gain insights into specific do-no harm approaches and exchange knowledge and experience.</p> <p>Community workshops that brought conflicting sides together to identify and prioritize basic service interventions has helped to contribute towards a more sustainable conflict sensitive recovery. Continued GBV trainings and awareness sessions supported by UNFPA through local partners in Southern Kordofan and community awareness sessions on children's rights conducted by the Warrap State Ministry of Social Development supported by UNICEF created greater awareness for human rights and advocated against violence.</p>																										
<b>Observations</b>																											
<b>Paris Declaration</b>	<p><b>Leadership of national and local governmental institutions:</b>            Government counterparts and local partners participated in joint coordination meetings and missions, contributing technical expertise and local knowledge. A number of government counterparts are directly involved in or lead the implementation of activities.            Representatives at various levels (i.e., government, civil society, private sector, etc.) were</p>																										

	<p>also invited to the state level PMC meeting.</p> <p>Through various activities, the JP also supported training for local, state, and Southern Sudan government to bolster their capacity to sustain projects, including training related to conflict-related data and analysis, peace reconciliation, land and resource management, GBV, health, and child protection. Government stakeholders have also been involved in the planning and decision-making process of the JP through both joint and bilateral meetings and they (such as the MoH, MoSDWCA, RPCM, MoE, and MoH&amp;PP) are, in many cases, the key implementing partner of project activities to ensure local ownership and, thereby, the sustainability of the implemented measures.</p> <p><b>Involvement of CSOs and citizens:</b> Local communities have been critical to the JP planning and decision-making process, including in the conflict and needs assessments and in identifying and prioritizing interventions. Community members have also participated in training sessions related to health, GBV, and HIV/AIDS. In particular, the involvement of youth and women are emphasized.</p> <p>For example, as part of its sustainability approach, IOM provided training to selected members of the community on water yard maintenance, mobilization of communal support for water sources/supplies, and basic hygienic use of the water resources provided. In Harazaya (Keilak locality), communities from both the targeted and bordering areas participated in a joint meeting to discuss and decide on the type and location of the water resource intervention most appropriate for the area, the parties responsible for management and maintenance, the beneficiaries entitled to use it, and the terms and conditions for use.</p> <p>Given that a key component of the JP is to work with government partners and civil society organisations (to ensure ownership and sustainability), limited capacity within these local institutions and difficulties in finding competent partners (especially in Gogrial East) has slowed programming delivery and execution. Delivery of capacity takes time, though it has proven to be of considerable value to the beneficiary organizations. Some agencies have also experienced internal administrative issues with delays in getting funds released.</p> <p><b>Alignment and Harmonization:</b></p> <p><b>Innovative elements in mutual accountability:</b></p>
<p><b>Delivering as One</b></p>	<p><b>Innovative elements in harmonization of procedures and managerial practices:</b></p> <p><b>Role of the RCO and synergies with other MDG-F JPs:</b> This JP continues to remain in communication with the Joint Programme on Youth Employment, seeing where synergies might be possible.</p> <p><b>Inter-agency coordination:</b> It must be noted that due to the design of the JP, there is no incentives or repercussions for not cooperating. As such the JP management had to rely mainly on goodwill and relationships developed to gain cooperation. In some circumstances, there have been some challenges in coordinating between the Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan, particularly within agencies.</p> <p>Several of the JP partners continue to coordinate amongst each other in the decision-making and implementation process to create synergies and to deliver an integrated set of interventions to address conflicts in targeted areas but some partners (particularly those without field support or ground presence in the field) tend to focus on their individual agency mandate and objectives and have not been as ready to share information as others, which has created duplicative efforts and/or conflicting agendas.</p>
<p><b>Sustainability</b> (concrete actions and strategic partnerships)</p>	<p><b>Sustainability Plan in place?</b> yes To ensure sustainability, the JP continues to work closely with local and state authorities and local partners to develop and strengthen their capacities in conflict management and</p>

	<p>recovery, human rights, and peace building. This is conducted through assessing current and past conflict dynamics to identify conflicts that can be pragmatically addressed through delivery of JP activities and services together with key stakeholders (ministries, state institutions and targeted communities) and to develop interventions targeted to address such conflicts. At state level, the JP works in partnership with state counterparts to support the institutionalization of conflict-sensitive planning across multiple sectors and among stakeholders.</p>	
<p><b>Innovation and Scale-up</b></p>		
<p><b>External Factors and mitigation</b></p>	<p>Referendum in January 2011: In the latter half of 2010, focus by government and agencies, particularly in Southern Sudan, was primarily on preparing for the referendum, making it difficult to focus on JP activities and management. A number of activities were delayed due to the referendum-related activities. The political uncertainty, the postponed referendum in Abyei, the popular consultation process and delayed elections in Southern Kordofan created much tension, temporary road blockages, which prevented JP partners from accessing some of the targeted areas and thus delayed implementation. The influx of South Sudan returnees from the north, who were stranded in Southern Kordofan also meant some agencies' work were shifted to provide temporary assistance and relief to this group.</p> <p>(2) State elections in May 2011 and outbreak of violence in Southern Kordofan: During April and May, a number of activities were halted or delayed due to the government's preoccupation with preparing for the state elections. On June 6 2011, heavy fighting broke out in Kadugli between the Sudan Armed Forces (SAF) and Southern Kordofan Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA). Following this, most activities were suspended excluding humanitarian assistance and staff evacuated to Khartoum. The fighting resulted in damages to much of JP partners' assets on the ground as most offices and vehicles were looted or destroyed.</p> <p>(3) Fighting in Abyei in May 2011: Following an attack on an UNMIS convoy transporting 200 troops of Joint Integrated Units (JIU) of the Sudan Armed Forces, fighting between SAF and SPLA broke out and intensified in and around villages north and east of Abyei town as well as in Abyei town itself. This led to the displacement of nearly 80,000 people from Abyei area to states in southern Sudan. A number of JP activities were halted in Warrap state, where the vast majority of the IDPs have been registered and verified. JP partners including WHO, UNICEF and IOM were directly involved in providing humanitarian assistance in the state.</p>	
<p><b>Communication and Advocacy</b></p>	<p><b>C&amp;A plan in place?</b> Yes</p> <p>The objective of the JP communications strategy is to accelerate JP progress by strengthening outcomes and capacities, raising awareness of MDGs, and increasing citizen participation for sustainable conflict prevention and peace building in Southern Kordofan and Warrap states in Sudan. Its intended outcomes include: (1) Leveraged program outcomes to create broader systemic change and achieve policy impact; (2) increased community participation and engagement for sustainable conflict prevention management and peace building efforts; and (3) increased awareness of the JP, MDGs and MDF-F both at policy and public level.</p> <p>The use of community outreach sessions to inform citizens on outcomes of peace conferences and follow up activities. In Southern Kordofan, this was also facilitated by ongoing follow-up by respective agencies that continue to communicate with local partners to gain insights and feedback from targeted communities.</p>	
<p><b>M&amp;E</b></p>	<p>The joint programme conducts joint monitoring and field visits. The monitoring reports submitted are of quality and provide a good overview on advancement towards the accomplishment of outputs/outcomes. The M&amp;E framework is regularly updated with relevant information.</p>	
<p><b>Missions from MDG-F Secretariat:</b></p>	<p><b>Date:</b> November 2009</p>	<p><b>Members:</b> Sophie De Caen, Sara Ferrer Olivella</p>

**Mid Term Evaluation:**

**Evaluator:** Steve Munroe

**Period:** November 2011-January 2011

**Link to final report and improvement plan**

<http://www.mdgfund.org/jointprogrammidtermevaluation>