



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*



**NORWEGIAN MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS**



Final Report
Sudan Post-Conflict Community Based
Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP)
Norwegian government support to Abyei Recovery and
Rehabilitation Programme (ARRP)

Programme Title:	Abyei Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (ARRP)
Programme/Award ID:	00047467
Designated Institutions:	UNDP
Implementing Agency:	MC Scotland
Programme Budget:	14,000,000 Norwegian Krone

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
I. INTRODUCTION.....	6
II. ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED	9
III. KEY RESULTS.....	12
III.I. ENHANCED CAPACITY OF LGAS AND THE COMMUNITY	12
III.II IMPROVED LIVELIHOODS	14
III.III IMPROVED PROVISION OF BASIC SERVICES	15
IV. CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARR.....	16
V. SUSTAINABILITY OF ARR.....	17
VI. MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION.....	18
VII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS	19
VIII. FINANCIAL SUMMARY.....	22
IX. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23

List of Acronyms

AAA	Abyei Area Administration
ABEAS	Annual Budget Estimate and Activity Schedule
ADCs	Area Development Committees
AMU	Action Management Unit
CBO	Community Based Organization
CDCs	Community Development Committees
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
EC	European Commission
EPI	Expanded Programme on Immunization
EU	European Union
GoNU	Government of National Unity
GoSS	Government of Southern Sudan
HAC	Humanitarian Aid Commission
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
INGO	International Non Governmental Organization
IT	Information Technology
LGA	Local Government Authorities
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFV	Monitoring Field Visit
MIC	Ministry of International Cooperation
MoE	Ministry of Education
NAO	National Authorizing Officer
PHCU	Primary Health Care Unit
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRC	Policy and Review Committee
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
SPLA	Sudan People's Liberation Army
SSRRC	South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VDC	Village Development Committee
VSL	Village Savings and Lending
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main goal of the Abyei Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (ARRP) was to promote recovery efforts through agricultural and rural development interventions following the signature of the Abyei Road Map. Its overall objective was to reduce the prevalence and severity of poverty and increase food security amongst conflict affected rural households through the implementation of several activities under three main pillars: capacity building of Local Government Authorities (LGAs) and communities; development of sustainable livelihoods; and support to basic social services.

ARRP benefited approximately 90,000 people achieving significant results despite numerous challenges. ARRP enhanced the capacity building of LGAs and communities through the training of 9 Boma Administrators, 210 teachers, 125 classroom assistants, 20 nurses and 27 hand pump mechanics. In addition 42 Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) were established and 196 members trained. 35 water and sanitation (watsan) committees were established and trained. The LGA was also provided critical operational capacity through provision of offices and equipment.

Under the livelihoods component, ARRP was able to train 950 farmers, provide extension services to 570 farmers, provide agricultural inputs/tools to over 3,600 households including 440 women from 14 farming groups. 1,795 households were supported through the establishment of irrigation systems that ensured availability of water and enabled farmers to sustain their farms during the dry seasons. Micro credit and income generation activities implemented by the project allowed creation of over 300 jobs. Income of the beneficiaries increased as a result of grants given for business activities. Livestock sector was boosted through the construction of three poultry houses for women farming groups and through building of a meat selling hall used by 12 vendors. Direct support was provided to establish a fish marketing cooperative and a fish marketing shop was constructed to support the fish trading of four fishing groups.

Provision of basic services in the target area received a major boost through construction and equipping of four Primary Health Care Units (PHCUs) each serving on average 400 patients per month and through construction and equipping of four primary schools providing education for 3,000 students. Construction and rehabilitation of water supply systems provided clean drinking water for over 35,000 people. Community members received health and hygiene promotion and awareness messages as a result of campaigns that were supported by community organizations and local government authorities. This coupled with construction of latrines in schools, health centres and public places resulted in improved hygiene and sanitation in the targeted communities. These achievements contributed in improving the living conditions of communities and also supported the government's recovery efforts.

ARRP was an ambitious undertaking considering the limited time frame, insecurity and inaccessibility of some of the target locations during rainy season. Other challenges included absence of Abyei administration for some time, irregular salary payments for LGA staff and high turnover, lack of qualified teachers, health staff and dependency of the local population on food aid and free input distribution from relief agencies made ARRP's recovery agenda more challenging to implement.

I. INTRODUCTION

On 14th of May 2008 fighting broke out between the Sudan Armed Forces and Sudan People's Liberation Army in Abyei town and its surroundings. The conflict that involved use of heavy weapons, caused displacement of nearly 60,000 residents of Abyei town and nearby villages. According to some reports over 90% of Abyei town was destroyed in the wake of the fighting. Subsequent high level negotiations between the two parties to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA): the National Congress Party (NCP) and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) ended direct confrontation and led to the signing of the Abyei Road Map in June 2008. This paved the way for return of IDPs and implementation of the Abyei Protocol.

The concept for expanding the Abyei Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme was developed in response to the consequences of the May 2008 hostilities. ARRP was part of the Sudan Post-Conflict Community-Based Recovery and Rehabilitation that was launched as a five year initiative in January 2005 by the European Commission, in collaboration with the Government of National Unity (GoNU) and the Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS), following the signature of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed in 2005. The programme had been designed to facilitate the re-launching of development assistance to Sudan after the end of civil war and to promote 'quick start' agricultural and rural development interventions in order to provide immediate peace dividend to communities in need.

Prior to the May 2008 crisis about 60,000 IDPs returned to Abyei from different parts of the country. Majority of the returnees settled in Abyei but did not return to the expected final return destination in the surrounding villages because of the lack of basic services and livelihood opportunities. In response to the prevailing situation it was essential to expand on the efforts to provide support to the local authorities and communities. Effective handling of the need in the Area required building necessary capacities as well as contribution to the improvement of livelihoods. The project was also expected to contribute to the ongoing effort to improve delivery of basic services.

I.I Context of the intervention areas

RRP Sudan was launched immediately after the end of a long conflict that claimed enormous human and material resources. In 2005 Sudan ranked 147th out of 177 countries on the Human Development Index, with widespread poverty, skewed income distribution, inadequate delivery of social services, and poor socio-economic indicators (for instance, between 1997 and 2001, the global acute malnutrition rate was 26% (19.5% in the North, and 32.4% in the South). It was estimated that about 65% of Sudan's population derived their economic livelihood from agriculture indicating high dependence on the sector.

The socio-economic situation in the Sudan has been exacerbated by the prolonged war with disastrous consequences for the livelihoods of the disadvantaged rural population. Along with over two decades of civil war, several droughts and other natural disasters resulted in more than two million people dead, four million Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and 500,000 refugees. Considerable part of the country, especially the border areas and the South were devastated while other parts of the country could not get the necessary resources and attention they needed.

Several food security assessments in the country also emphasized a high level of household food insecurity with poor nutritional status. According to a Household Health Survey carried out in Sudan in 2006, the malnutrition levels exceeded the international limits for emergency interventions for acute malnutrition above 15%. Agriculture constitutes the major source of employment (65%) in the country, however, its development faces several important constraints such as water scarcity, land degradation, natural calamities (droughts, floods), high pest infestations, poor access to rural areas, land use conflicts, poor quality of seeds, price instability, and poor market-related infrastructure.

Sudan is also characterized by extremely weak institutions and structures for provision of basic social services. The problem is particularly acute in rural areas. According to a study carried out in 2008 by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 86% of the health care provision was being done by NGOs, and less than 30% of the population had a minimal access to primary health care.

The continuous conflict that had prevailed since 1983 ended in January 2005, with the signature of the CPA. However, disagreements over the status of Abyei and demarcation of borders, opposition from some groups to disarm and conflicts over land among other things created instability and insecurity in several parts of Sudan, disrupted the IDP return process and affected the security and livelihoods of the population.

Abyei area is the most bitterly contested area geographically, ethnically and politically caught between Sudan and South Sudan. It has significant oil reserves, and was given a special administrative status by the CPA, which placed it under the administrative responsibility of the Presidency and granted this disputed territory the possibility to vote by referendum to remain in Sudan or join South Sudan. In political and administrative terms, the lack of an agreed boundary and formal administration has been a key constraint to peace, and Ngok Dinka and Misseriya Arabs continue to dispute the territory. The vulnerability of this area to the conflict left it extremely underdeveloped. In the absence of local government, the Abyei area was severely affected by the lack of basic services provision, and the increasing demands due to the influx of returnees.

I.II Target areas and beneficiaries of the ARRP

In total, the ARRP intervention intended to benefit directly around 40,000 and indirectly 24,000 residents and returnees. The project far exceeded its targets by reaching up to 90,000 people.

I.III Goals of the ARRP

The overall objective of the RRP as a whole and ARRP in particular was to reduce the prevalence and severity of poverty and increase food security amongst conflict affected rural households, by achieving tangible improvements at the community and locality levels.

The expected outcomes were distributed across three macro areas:

- Capacity development of LGAs and institutional strengthening, to facilitate the LGAs carrying out their core competences and responsibilities in the provision of basic social services and local governance, as well as for the communities

- and community based organizations to become actively involved in local development processes;
- Development of sustainable livelihoods for the vulnerable rural households, through income generation initiatives including agriculture, fishery, livestock; and others; and
 - Support to provision of basic services (primary health, primary education, water and sanitation), through development of the required physical and organizational infrastructure.

The key principles of the RRP implementation strategy were:

- to link relief, rehabilitation and development.
- to ensure that a high proportion of total project expenditure is accrued directly to the target communities.
- to use a flexible and pragmatic process-oriented approach with the active involvement of beneficiary communities in all stages of the project cycle and emphasis on building self-reliance and beneficiary ownership.
- to ensure sustainability of actions by supporting capacity building within local government authorities (LGAs). LGAs will be fully involved with programming to allow them the ability to resume their core functions and responsibilities.
- to ensure coordination with other donors' interventions.

I.IV. Implementation Mechanisms

ARRP was implemented through a consortium of NGOs that encouraged holistic approach to addressing identified needs as well as responding to interest of the donor community in pooled funding mechanism. The ARRP was a ready structure uniting major international and national NGOs to implement the proposed project. The project was therefore a joint effort both from donors' side (with the contribution from the EU and government of Norway) as well as actors on the ground in the leading international NGOs (Mercy Corps, GOAL, Save the Children) and local partners (ACAD). Interventions were made with the endorsement and awareness of the local communities and authorities. Oversight of the RRP implementation was carried out by the RRP Policy and Review Committee (PRC) which served as the guiding policy direction instrument for the programme. The PRC consisted of representatives from the EU, Government of National Unity, Government of South Sudan and UNDP. With the approval of the agreement for Government of Norway contribution to the project, representative from the Norwegian Embassy in Khartoum become a formal participant of the PRC meetings, regularly attending its meetings including those held in field locations. The PRC among other things provided strategic direction for the programme where relevant and reviewed progress in project execution offering solutions to obstacles in implementation.

UNDP had the responsibility for general management, administrative policy design, oversight and substantive backstopping. The Action Management Unit that was established within UNDP solely for the RRP management was instrumental in channelling funds, enhancing coordination, performing monitoring role and ensuring accountability and transparency as per the UNDP standards and requirements. The AMU was also serving as a Secretariat for the PRC in terms of preparing agenda for each session and processing PRC conclusions as well as follow up on the

implementation of the PRC decisions.

II. ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED

A range of activities were implemented by ARRP in the following key areas:

1. Capacity development and institutional strengthening of local authorities, local NGOs and Community Based Organizations (CBOs);
2. Livelihoods development (agriculture/livestock, fisheries, income generation, vocational training); and
3. Support to provision of basic services (focusing on health, education, and water and sanitation).

II.I. Capacity Development

The institutional strengthening and capacity development activities focused on the training of government authorities, teachers, healthcare workers, and other communities' representatives with strong emphasis on developing professional and institutional capacities of LGAs and community based organizations aiming at empowering local communities to address their development issues.

In support of capacity development, activities also undertook provision of critical infrastructure for LGAs to perform their functions effectively. Likewise, the projects engaged and supported the LGA in promotion of LGA links with the communities and CBOs. Training activities took place in an environment where the LGAs were weak or just formed with organizational structures and not yet properly established with very high turnover of personnel. Key capacity development activities implemented are highlighted in the table below.

<p><i>LGAs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Nine Boma Administrators were trained during a three day workshop on PRA, Community Mobilization, and Community Based Planning. This training aimed to provide the Boma Administrators with skills to effectively facilitate a community mobilization and appraisal process, understand the process of participative community action planning, develop a profile of their community challenges, analyze and prioritize the challenges, identify opportunities within their communities to overcome challenges, and develop community action plans.▪ One capacity building workshop on planning and evaluation, supervision/inspection, and education office structure analysis was conducted with the Education Department of the administration and selected head teachers.▪ A Health Information System was developed, with the Health Secretariat.▪ An Abyei Development Committee was established, and composed of technical committees to oversee the different sectors of activities.▪ An Abyei town health committee was established.▪ A Chamber of Commerce was created, as well as an official trade association, to contribute to the recovery of business development.
<p><i>Communities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 42 PTAs were established and 196 members were trained on their role in supporting education activities.▪ 210 teachers were trained on creating conducive learning environment (SHIELD framework), communication and learning, scheme of work and lessons planning, schools and

classroom records keeping.

- 125 classroom assistants received training.
- 35 watsan committees were established and trained.
- 27 hand pump mechanics received training.
- The Abyei Youth Cultural Centre was constructed.

II.II. Livelihoods

The activities in this area focused on the support to agriculture, livestock and fisheries, provision of micro credit and supporting income generation initiatives with the objective of reviving the target communities capacity to produce necessary products both for consumption as well as marketing the surplus. ARRP interventions in livelihoods included: construction/rehabilitation of agricultural infrastructure (grind mills and grain stores), training of farmers (especially on agriculture extension, new technologies, and agronomic practices), support to group farms, establishment of irrigation schemes, and distribution of seeds and tools.

Livestock and fisheries related activities included: establishment of veterinary clinic, poultry houses, meat selling hall, fish marketing shop and cooperative. Livelihood activities also included micro-credit and income generation activities, such as establishment and training of Village Savings and Lending (VSL) groups. Details of activities carried out under livelihoods are listed below.

Agriculture and Livestock

- 2,023 families were provided with different farm implements (axes, pangas and malodas).
- 442 women, from 14 groups, received seeds and three different types of tools to support vegetable cultivation.
- 600 households were provided with seeds, in five Payams.
- Irrigation structures (dykes, water ways, and treadle pumps) were established, benefiting 623 families.
- Nine farmer groups (612 households) were supported through dry season with seeds and irrigation step-pumps to increase production.
- 950 small scale farmers received training through a farmer field school training programme.
- Treadle pumps were delivered to 12 producer groups for dry season small scale irrigation (560 members).
- 570 households were reached through extension services to farmer groups.
- Six grinding mill were established, as a social enterprise initiative (fee-for-service).
- Ten vegetable gardens received assorted vegetable seeds.
- 84 farmers had access to tillage services.
- Seven farmers (representing seven farmers groups) from Abyei area conducted a study trip to Bentiu to visit two commercial farms and learn about pest and farm water management.
- One twin pond and six household ponds were established.
- One fish marketing cooperative was established and a fish marketing shop was constructed to support the fish trading of four fishing groups.
- One commercial veterinary service was established, in collaboration with Abyei Livestock Owners.
- One meat selling hall was built in Anet market, used by 12 vendors, and serving an average of 240 people.
- Three poultry houses were constructed to support poultry production of three women farming groups.
- One grain storage facility was built, to improve post harvest storage.
- One foot bridge was constructed using local materials.
- Six key access roads were constructed, to improve access to markets.

Micro credit/Income generation

- A business plan competition was developed, with 22 participants. The three better business proposals were awarded with cash prizes.
- 24 VSL groups were established, with an estimate total membership of 902 people.
- Eight cash grants were administered to 5 VSL groups for small business start-up, and three cash grants administered to individuals for the same purpose.
- Cash grant was administered to four fishing groups, with a total of 53 members.
- Seven motor vehicle mechanics were supported to re-establish business, with a cash grant to procure start-up garage equipment and set up a business.

Vocational Training

- Six adult literacy classes were conducted.



Adult computer literacy classes at the Abyei Resource Centre.

II.III. Basic Services

The activities in this programmatic area focused on the support to the provision of basic services with particular concentration on primary health, primary education, and water and sanitation.

Considering the non-existent or poorly maintained structures and strong demand from the communities and local authority the projects had to invest considerable amount of time and resources into the construction and rehabilitation of physical infrastructure such as schools and health clinics. Support to relevant health and educational facilities also included provision of furniture, equipment and supplies including medical and teaching/studying materials in order to kick start appropriate and full operations of the established structures. Established structures were supported with provision of trainings for teacher, community health workers and sanitation promoters to ensure the sustainable and continuous provision of the services.

Water and sanitation activities were another component of support to provision of basic services. These activities focused on the construction/rehabilitation of water

systems as well as on improving sanitary conditions of the communities through construction of households and institutional latrines. Above mentioned interventions were complemented with health and hygiene awareness campaigns. The following Basic Services interventions were undertaken:

<p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Four PHCU were constructed, each one serving an average of 400 patients per month. ▪ Medical supplies, furniture, equipment and solar fridges provided to two PHCU. ▪ Three solar fridges were purchased to assist EPI activities. ▪ Health and hygiene messaging campaign were conducted for 500 persons.
<p><i>Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Four primary schools were built, each one with blocks of four classrooms. Three of these schools were handed over to the MoE serving a total of around 3,000 students. ▪ School Improvement Plan were developed and implemented, and equipments, furniture and materials were purchased and delivered to the target schools.
<p><i>Water and Sanitation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 35 hand pump boreholes were drilled. ▪ Two water yards were repaired. ▪ 50 hand pumps were repaired. ▪ 75 communal latrines were constructed in key risk areas (markets and communities with high population density). ▪ 167 emergency latrines were built. ▪ Latrine use sensitization conducted. ▪ Two environmental health campaigns completed.

III. KEY RESULTS

ARRP yielded tangible results for approximately 90,000 people through its interventions in Abyei. Details of key results achieved by the programme are presented below.

III.I. Enhanced capacity of LGAs and the Community

LGAs

Local government authorities supported by the ARRP had just been established after decades of conflict, hence professional and organizational capacities were deficient. Despite presence of competent personnel the LGA suffered from shortage of trained and skilled staff. High staff turnover exacerbated the challenge as people with skills and knowledge left their jobs to take on more attractive opportunities. The LGA did not have proper offices to operate efficiently.

ARRP interventions pertinent to the LGA capacity building had three main pillars:

1. Enhance LGA staff capacities through wide range of trainings with primary focus on improving overall governance skills and performance of the local government officials;
2. Involve LGAs in implementation of the ARRP to gain exposure and hands on

experience as well as encouraging the LGAs to be in the driving seat of their area's development agenda; and

3. Enhance operational capacity of LGAs provision of infrastructure and equipment enabling them to better manage delivery of public services.

Knowledge and skills of the LGA representatives with regard to general governance matters and specific government functions was significantly improved with local government officials going through trainings organized/facilitated by ARRP. Teachers and education department officials trained by ARRP helped to improve the quality of education. Boma Administrators trained on community based planning and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools, participated in the development of the Annual Budget Estimate and Activity Schedule (ABEAS) and developed other community projects with NGOs.

ARRP reinforced the capacity development efforts by actively involving the LGA in implementation of the projects. LGA were part and parcel of the ARRP activities planning and implementation process. It was a requirement for the local authorities to endorse the RRP ABEAS and take over major project outputs (especially physical basic services structures). LGAs participated in the planning, implementation and monitoring of project activities thus reinforcing their understanding of local development issues and capacity to address them. Establishment of the Abyei Development Committee and its sector subcommittees (water, health, education and economic development) gave the LGAs a platform from which interventions could be effectively coordinated.

Prior to ARRP interventions for many years the local communities were mainly supported by humanitarian agencies. Local government authorities had very little exposure to the situation where they had to actively engage in consultation with the communities and NGOs/CBOs. ARRP helped to bring together local government, communities and NGOs/CBOs and international NGOs for addressing local development challenges in holistic fashion thus reinforcing a stronger link between the three key stakeholders. LGAs were encouraged to lobby the federal government to support and fund local development plans.

Major component of the ARRP support for enhancing LGA capacities was to improve the working conditions of the LGA. RRP office in Abyei was provided to the Abyei Area Administration (AAA) after the conflict in May 2008 which was critical for enabling the LGA to perform its functions effectively. At the end of the implementation period most of the ARRP project assets (including vehicles and office equipment) with the approval of PRC were given to the local partners, primarily LGAs. By providing offices and equipment ARRP facilitated the LGA to be more mobile and efficient in managing the delivery of public services.

Community

Employing a holistic approach to local development as well as being a community-based "quick impact" initiative ARRP also undertook the challenging task of strengthening the capacity of local communities enabling those communities to actively participate in the local development and governance debate, identify local development needs and priorities and also effectively participate in monitoring and implementation of development initiatives. The RRP requirement of having at least one national organization in each Consortium provided an excellent opportunity for national organizations enhance their capacity through the experience of implementing RRP with the established international counterparts. ACAD, the

national associate of the consortium, had its capacity strengthened through sector trainings and through the improvement of its financial reporting and procurement procedures. In ABEAS 4, ACAD was able to perform as an independent but integrated implementer, with its own indicators and expected results. ACAD is from the area and with its enhanced capacity will play an important role in the development of the local communities.

Establishment and training of PTAs enhanced the capacity of local communities to play a positive role in education. The PTAs have become instrumental in improving the quality of education by playing a management and facilitation role. Involvement of communities coupled with improved conditions resulted in higher interest in education leading to increased enrollment rates. In the health sector, ARRP bolstered health service provision by filling the gap of qualified personnel through training of nurses. Supply of drinking water is one of the biggest challenges faced by the local governments and communities. With scarce resources the local government was not only finding it difficult to build new water systems but also struggling to maintain the existing facilities. These problems were addressed by forming and training community driven water & sanitation committees and hand pump mechanics, which took the responsibility for management of water supply points and facilities at the local level. Through these committees the communities effectively manage the water supply autonomously.

III.II Improved livelihoods

Communities that were dependent on food aid and prevented by armed conflict from land cultivation and other agricultural activities found it challenging to restart agricultural production. The main obstacle was that communities had been receiving humanitarian food aid for many years and it took time to make shift in thinking to self-sufficiency and self-reliance. Due to absence of initial capital, communities had also been struggling to obtain basic agricultural inputs. It is with this background that ARRP made intervention in agriculture to support the livelihoods of the targeted communities and pave the way for increase in food production and thus alleviate extreme poverty in the project area.

ARRP reached over 3,200 households by distributing tools and agricultural inputs. Production capacity of over 440 women from 14 groups was increased through provision of vegetable seeds and tools. Trainings and access to tractor tillage service with the support of the Ministry of Agriculture helped to increase production. Significant support for the farmers was provided through the establishment of irrigation systems that ensured availability of water in various locations and enabled farmers to sustain their farms during the dry seasons, thus increasing agricultural production. Availability of irrigation water has been increased through dykes, water ways and treadle pumps. These initiatives have improved access to irrigation water for 1,795 households and farmers groups.

Livestock plays an important role in the food security of the ARRP target communities. Livestock sector was boosted through the construction of three poultry houses for women farming groups and through building of a meat selling hall used by 12 vendors, serving an average of 240 people per day. In addition the establishment of a commercial veterinary service in collaboration with Abyei Livestock Owners filled a critical gap. Many communities rely on fishing for household consumption and livelihood. Fishing provides vital nutrition for members of the local communities and the fishermen groups play an important role in the local economy. Direct support was

provided to establish a fish marketing cooperative and a fish marketing shop was constructed to support the fish trading of four fishing groups.

Micro credit and income generation activities implemented by the project allowed creation of over 300 jobs. Income of the beneficiaries increased as a result of cash grants given for business activities. ARRP supported village savings and lending groups became self managed. The money that circulates in those groups comes from its members and the groups have established their own internal regulations. The loans in many cases were used for small business start ups and expansion including setting up of small shops. Availability of capital and skills helped many small entrepreneurs to start earning/increase income. Due to the long civil war many people were not able to learn reading and writing. With the establishment of peace and security this category of population was in need of gaining literacy to improve their life skills. ARRP supported six literacy classes for adult learners. Thanks to the mobilization efforts of the ARRP partners on the ground, several communities participated in building six access roads and a bridge that increased access to local markets.



Gangan nursery.

III.III Improved provision of basic services

In the target locations access to education was severely limited and thus received one of the highest priorities by the communities and LGAs. ARRP responded to this challenge by constructing four primary schools. The schools were provided with furniture, school equipment as well as teaching materials and are now providing education for 3,000 students. Improved learning conditions increased enrolment especially among female students. In addition training of teachers and education department staff helped with developing and maintaining teaching standards.



Mulmuk school.

Lack of health care facilities was one of the common features of the ARRП target areas. The situation saw significant improvement as a result of ARRП interventions through which four Primary Health Care Units (PHCUs) were constructed, equipped and provided with medicines each serving on average 400 patients per month. Health interventions carried out by ARRП have given the community much better access to health care closer to home. In the past either the patient would remain untreated or would have to spend a lot of time and money in traveling to the closest available health facility. These journeys were difficult especially during the rainy season.

ARRП within its scope addressed the enormous challenge of water supply for the targeted communities. Construction and rehabilitation of water supply systems provided clean drinking water for over 35,000 people. Availability of clean drinking water has reduced the incidence of water borne diseases alleviated the burden on women who are mostly responsible for collection of water. As a result they are now able to use the free time on more productive pursuits. Greater availability of water has also improved social cohesion as competition over scarce water resources is a major driver of conflict.

Targeted communities were supported with an effort to improve hygiene and sanitation. Community members received health and hygiene promotion and awareness messages as a result of campaigns that were supported by community organizations and local government authorities. This coupled with construction of latrines in schools, health centres and public places resulted in improved hygiene and sanitation in the targeted communities.

IV. CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARRП

The NGO consortium faced several challenges during ARRП's implementation. The main challenges were the following:

- Change in Abyei administration meant that there was no government counterpart for some period. Lack of funds from the Government for development projects increased expectations and demand on ARRП resources.

- In most cases the salaries of Abyei administration personnel were unpaid or paid very irregularly, which caused high staff turnover resulting in loss of institutional memory and continuity.
- Insecurity in the project area persisted causing frequent displacement of families and destruction of their livelihoods.
- High dependency of the local population on food aid and free input distribution from relief agencies meant that ARRPs recovery agenda was more challenging to implement.
- Lack of qualified teachers in the project area, and lack of salaries for teachers on duty caused problems with recruitment and retention of teachers.
- Consortium agencies also experienced high staff turnover. The difficult living conditions of the project area were the main cause, which affected smooth implementation process and led to loss of institutional memory.

V. SUSTAINABILITY OF ARRPP

Sustainability of ARRPP was pursued through the involvement of communities and LGAs in project planning, implementation and monitoring. In addition to foster the sustainability of outputs concerted capacity development activities were undertaken for the community and LGAs, community cost sharing schemes were introduced for continuation of services supported by the project, Government authorities were lobbied to cover the salaries of the basic services staff and maintenance of facilities.

Approaches used by ARRPP to enhance the sustainability of its interventions, as well as the main achievements and challenges are described below.

Activities/Approaches, Achievements and Challenges

Activities/Approaches:

- Regular coordination was established with the AAA and the SSRRRC (the project's only Government counterpart at the beginning). The consortium built on Government ownership most of the activities in the sectors of education, health and water, especially activities that required heavy investments and that were officially handed over to the AAA after its completion.
- Smaller activities were built into community ownership through working with community selected committees or management groups. Some activities also encouraged fee-for-service to guarantee sustainability.

Achievements:

- The Abyei administration has been able to reduce staff turnover and even employed more staff. The Chief Administrator brought in strong skills in good governance, as was seen by improved coordination with government departments as well as prompt responses from the administration. This project was a key driver of development for the people of Abyei and there was more government leadership into ARRPP than any other programme in Abyei.
- The Boma administrators trained are able to tell if their communities are adequately engaged in leading their own development process or not.
- The grinding mills are managed by the communities and generate income through the payment by the communities for the milling services, which is used to pay for the salary of the operator, the maintenance of the facility, and to accumulate savings to re-invest.
- The VSL groups have been sustainable and are self managed. The money that circulates in those groups comes from its members and the groups have established their

Activities/Approaches, Achievements and Challenges

own internal regulations.

- The graduation of the 20 students from nursing college reduced the dependence on NGOs to recruit and run the health facilities.
- The two water yards rehabilitated by the project are managed by the AAA Water Department through fees, which allows to pay the salary of the security guard and maintain the facility.

Challenges:

- Abyei administration is operating with irregular and uncertain funding from the federal Government, leaving the administration with no choice but to ask the Consortium agencies for support. The Abyei tractor tillage project was meant to be sustained by the agriculture secretariat but that has not been realized. Also, the AAA health department requested GOAL to take over full running of all the four health facilities constructed by the project, which is a major setback to sustainability plans of these health services.
- Sustainability at household levels has been a challenge due to heavy dependency on aid and distribution of inputs and insecurity in Abyei area, which forces families to relocate frequently to other areas.
- Collapsed markets after May 2008 crisis, which reduced the volumes of business and cash circulated, hence no jobs.
- Poor road network within Abyei; this has slowed down trade, merchandise and human transport.
- Lack of independent and commercial supply chains of farm inputs (seeds and hand tools) in Abyei area. Farmers and LGAs are still dependant on NGOs to purchase farm inputs.

VI. MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

The RRP was governed by a PRC, managed by the UNDP through the AMU, and implemented by NGOs Consortia.

Policy Review Committee (PRC)

The PRC was chaired by the NAO and included representatives from the EU, Norway and UNDP. Meetings of the PRC were held on quarterly basis in Khartoum, Juba, or in a RRP project field location, mainly to review the status of the RRP implementation. Main responsibilities of the PRC were to:

- review progress of the RRP in each sector;
- analyze the RRP beneficiary sectors and review the programme impact on the beneficiaries;
- review implementation obstacles; and
- provide macro strategic direction to the RRP projects when relevant and required.

Action Management Unit (AMU)

This Unit was established within UNDP and was responsible for the management of the RRP. It also acted as Secretariat for the PRC (meeting agenda preparation, processing of conclusions). Its main responsibilities were to:

- ensure quality control of the RRP projects implementation;

- verify the financial and programmatic results of the RRP projects;
- provide capacity building and related technical assistance to the RRP projects, through its dedicated AMU staff (especially the M&E officers);
- conduct field monitoring visits to track the progress of the RRP projects; and
- inform the RRP administration and the PRC about issues, challenges and constraints faced by the RRP projects.

Consortium

The RRP projects were implemented by Consortia, each constituted by a lead agency, partner(s) and national associate(s). The use of the Consortium model in the implementation of the RRP projects had different levels of integration, and presented some general strengths and challenges to the agencies involved.

➤ *Main strengths:*

- The Consortium members had working experience in their traditional geographic area, or expertise in their respective intervention sectors, which was an advantage for the implementation process.
- In the cases where the consortia used the “one-roof” approach, with common offices and shared human, material and technical resources, there was a more efficient use of the project’s resources, thus allowing for bigger percentages of the funds spent in the delivery of goods and services to the communities. Also, this approach facilitated communication and coordination among the Consortia members, as well as the planning and decision making.

➤ *Main Challenges:*

- Difficulties in the coordination and communication among the Consortium members, especially in the cases where the “one-roof” approach was not used and the Consortium members were based in different locations.
- Time dedicated by the Consortia to define a collective approach to the projects and agree on reporting formats and implementation, administrative, financial and logistical procedures.
- The staff turnover in the implementing agencies usually affected the whole project implementation and caused delays and continuity gaps.

VII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS

Several monitoring and evaluation activities were implemented during ARRP implementation, at several levels, namely, by Norway, EU, Government, UNDP, and the Consortium. These activities included mainly monitoring visits by the different actors involved in the implementation, reporting procedures, Final evaluation and Lessons Learned exercises.

A) Norway / EU / Government

At the Norway, EU and Government level, a number of activities were carried out related to monitoring and evaluation of the RRP projects.

➤ Norway Monitoring Mission

Representative from the Norwegian Embassy in Khartoum conducted a monitoring visit of the project area.

➤ EC/Government commissioned Final Evaluation

The first phase of this external final evaluation commissioned by the Government and the EC was developed between the end of July and the end of August 2010. During this first phase, a total of seven RRP projects in the South, East and North Sudan were visited by the evaluation team, and conclusions were presented in workshops in Juba and Khartoum. The second phase of this evaluation took place between March and April 2011, and visited three RRP projects in the Transitional Areas (Blue Nile, Abyei and Southern Kordofan).

B) UNDP

The UNDP, responsible for the management and administration of the RRP, implemented and promoted several monitoring and evaluation activities.

➤ Reporting

The UNDP reported on the progress of the RRP on quarterly and annual basis to several stakeholders of the PRC involved in the programme, namely, the MIC, the GoSS, the GoNU, Norway and EU.

➤ Monitoring visits

UNDP carried out several Monitoring Field Visits (MFVs), and organized joint monitoring visits of the AMU and the EU/Norway/Government to the project, to check the implementation process and progress, provide recommendations and discuss relevant issues with the stakeholders in the project locations.

➤ Lessons Learned Exercises

UNDP organized and facilitated several Lessons Learned exercises, with the participation of the relevant stakeholders of the different RRP, both at individual projects level and North/South joint level:

- *RRP projects individual lessons learned exercises*

Six RRP projects' lessons learned exercises were conducted including for ARRP.

- *Joint South Sudan Lessons Learned Workshop*

On the 10th and 11th May 2010, UNDP brought together key participants from NGO partners and associates, LGAs and community groups, from the five southern states Upper Nile, Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Warrap, and Northern Bahr el Ghazal, with a total of 54 participants. In this exercise, four critical areas were identified and discussed: the use of a consortium model; the inclusion of a capacity-building component for LGAs and communities; sustainability of the projects; and the role of UNDP in administering the project. Within these themes, the exercise hoped to identify underlying factors leading to strengths and challenges, and recommendations for maintaining successes or managing and mitigating challenges in future instances.

- *Joint North Sudan Lessons Learned Workshop*

On the 19th April 2011 the UNDP gathered together representatives from NGO partners and associates and LGAs from Blue Nile, Abyei, Red Sea, River Nile and Southern Kordofan, with a total of 29 participants. This exercise focused on the discussion of two main topics: the RRP conceptual framework (the relevance of the selected interventions, and the underlying assumptions); and the RRP implementation mechanisms (the Consortium model and composition, and the effectiveness of the RRP oversight and implementation structure). Within these themes, strengths, challenges and recommendations were identified.

C) Consortium

➤ Reporting

The consortium presented an ABEAS for each year, and reported to UNDP on a quarterly and annual basis on the implementation of the project and the results achieved. The AMU, then, reviewed the information contained in the reports, identified priorities and strategic needs for monitoring field visits and validated the impact on the ground. The information was later consolidated by UNDP into single Quarterly/Annual Progress Reports and presented to the PRC.

VIII. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<i>Abyei Recovery and Rehabilitation Project</i>		
<i>Final Statement of Income and Expenditures (USD)</i>		
Total funds received:		\$ 2,135,088
<i>Code</i>	<i>Heading</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>
01	Good and Services delivered to beneficiaries (direct costs)	
01.01	Capacity building and Institutional strengthening	65,973
01.02	Livelihoods	109,567
01.03	Basic Services	889,351
Total 01		1,064,891
02	Direct Support Cost	
02.01	Non-local technical personnel	202,473
02.02	Other Personnel	144,217
02.03	Durable equipment	34,350
02.04	Premises and supplies	220,312
02.05	Needs assessments and other studies	-
02.06	Audit and evaluation	14,609
02.07	Visibility actions	2,812
02.08	Insurance costs	-
02.09	Financial service costs	1,356
Total 02		620,129
03	Indirect costs	117,951
Total 03		117,951
04	Administrative Costs	
04.01	RRP AMU support costs	98,518
04.02	UNDP overheads	139,679
Total 04		238,197
Total Expenditures		2,041,169
Balance/(Deficit)		93,920

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to extract conclusions related to RRP from all the involved stakeholders, UNDP conducted several lessons learned exercises regarding the RRP, mainly focusing on the strengths, challenges and recommendations of core aspects of this programme, namely: the use of a consortium model; the inclusion of a capacity building component of LGAs and community groups; the sustainability of the interventions; the RRP conceptual framework, and the RRP implementation mechanisms. The main conclusions from these lessons learned exercises are summarized in the following table.

1. Use of a Consortium model

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The different specializations of the implementing agencies led to better results in programming. ▪ Sharing of experiences, expertise and resources within the Consortia contributed to improve quality of implementation. ▪ An integrated approach is more effective, as it avoids overlaps and bolsters the experience of each partner involved.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordination and communication among the Consortia agencies were sometimes weak. ▪ Unequal level of capacities and different structures and procedures among partners created some obstacles in harmonization of procedures, reporting and staff motivation. ▪ High turnover of staff has a critical impact in the consortium setting, due to organizational inter-dependence.
Recommendations	<p><i>For Consortia:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capitalize the different expertise and specialization of each consortium agency. ▪ Share experiences, resources and assets. ▪ Establish an efficient coordination and communication system that allows overcoming the obstacle of geographical distance between the consortia members. ▪ Define clearly, from the beginning, the roles and responsibilities of each consortium agency, and the relationship between them. ▪ Formalize coordination meetings requirements between the consortium members. ▪ Adopt a more proactive attitude regarding the information sharing among implementing agencies. ▪ Focus the “one-roof” approach more on financial and procurement procedures, rather than on human resources policies. ▪ Lead agencies of the consortia should be prepared to assume a critical coordination role in financial issues. ▪ Recruit and train committed staff and communicate project conditions to them from the beginning of the project. <p><i>For Donors and Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undertake a detailed analysis on the real capacities and comparative advantages of Consortia members at the inception phase, and assess the training needs of each agency.

2. Inclusion of capacity building component of LGAs and communities

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promotion of ownership in LGAs and communities. ▪ Joint community needs identification and activities planning between LGAs and communities, strengthen LGAs and enables grounded needs assessments. ▪ Confidence and trust building between NGOs, LGAs and communities. ▪ Enhancement of participatory monitoring and proper implementation.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient involvement of LGAs (due to absence from project areas, not enough commitment from NGOs, weak capacity and high turnover of LGA staff, or breakdown of counties). ▪ Lack of motivation, different incentive systems and unclear roles and responsibilities contribute to low ownership and participation from LGA staff in the projects. ▪ High LGA staff turnover.
Recommendations	<p><i>For Consortia:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involve the LGAs and communities in all the stages of the project cycle. ▪ Promote good relationships with LGAs and communities, through regular formal and informal meetings. ▪ Involve a wider range of traditional authorities and committees in the LGA training.
	<p><i>For Government:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participate actively in all phases of the project cycle. ▪ Support the retention of LGA staff, by improving their conditions (salaries and incentives) and regulations.
	<p><i>For Donors and Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the LGAs regarding Standard Operational Procedures and monitoring. ▪ Advocate to the Government for support to retention of the staff in the intervention areas.

3. Sustainability

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The inclusion of LGAs and communities in project design and implementation improved their capacity to plan independently their own development in the future. ▪ The transfer of skills and resources to communities introduced sources of income generation to develop self-sustained livelihood activities. ▪ The involvement of communities sometimes led to a shift in attitudes and generates interest from the beneficiaries to voluntarily develop independent initiatives.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government's capacity to take the projects forward and its ability to support and maintain staff contributed to the difficulties in sustaining the projects after its implementation period. ▪ Unrealistic expectations regarding the change from relief to recovery setting within the timeframe of the projects. ▪ Insufficient financing and weak quality of construction activities resulted in inappropriate and insufficient structures to be maintained in the long term.

Recommendations	<p><i>For Consortia:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus the livelihood training on skills that can be useful in the communities. ▪ Promote motivation activities for the communities, such as media exposure of communities about the results and changes achieved, and exposure visits to best performing sites. ▪ Provide capacity building to government authorities on budgeting and planning. ▪ Provide awareness raising in communities about the responsibilities of the government and the consortia. ▪ Forecast a contingency budget for changes in the price of materials. ▪ Improve quality assurance of construction activities and recruit qualified contractors/firms.
	<p><i>For Government:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate the RRP costs with LGA staff in the government planning and budgeting processes. ▪ Get involved in the monitoring of construction activities.
	<p><i>For Donors and Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider a longer timeframe for the implementation of recovery/development projects in relief contexts.

4. The RRP conceptual framework

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High relevance of the three components of the RRP, as the target areas were in high need for the selected interventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity building of community committees (VDCs, ADCs/CDCs, and sector committees) was the most relevant activity of this component. - Agriculture and livestock were the most relevant activities of the livelihoods component, while income generating activities were less relevant - All basic services activities were highly relevant. ▪ Involvement and support from Government and communities was highly relevant. ▪ Transition from a relief to a development mind set in some RRP areas. ▪ The LGAs were, in many cases, effective partners in the implementation of the RRP.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited timeframe of the programme, to achieve the initially defined and ambitious goals and to verify some underlying assumptions, such as the transition of the communities from a relief to a development mind set. ▪ The RRP had to focus more on basic services due to the acute shortage of facilities and needs expressed by the community and LGAs. ▪ Poverty reduction and food security was not possible to achieve as planned, as the limited timeframe of the programme and the resources available were not enough to achieve tangible results in this sector. ▪ Changing context of the intervention areas. ▪ Weak and incipient presence of the Government at local level in some project locations (lack of resources, high turnover of staff, and division of localities).
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More realistic goals should be defined within the established timeframe of the projects. ▪ The RRP experience should be replicated in other areas, with increased fund allocation. ▪ The Consortium model is a good implementation structure and should

	<p>continue to be used in future programmes, with some modifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Consortium members and stakeholders in the field should capitalize their experience in working together by creating an “RRP Forum” in their intervention areas as a platform for future projects. ▪ In future programmes, consider more realistic timeframes for interventions that aim at promoting changes from relief to development mind sets and at improving the food security of vulnerable populations. ▪ Lobbying of Government at State level is needed to support the training of LGA staff in the localities. ▪ The capacity building of LGA staff should include ToT. ▪ The involvement of the LGAs in all the stages of the Project Cycle Management should be pursued. ▪ Clear exit strategies should be agreed with LGAs. ▪ The promotion of links between the Government at State and Local levels should be developed in future programmes.
--	---

5. The RRP implementation mechanisms

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The structure of the Consortia allowed for different types of organizations to join efforts and benefit from each other. ▪ The selection of the Consortia members was generally positive and allowed a bigger geographical coverage in the project implementation and the capitalization of the relevant experience in the target areas and technical expertise of the agencies in their respective sectors of intervention. ▪ Project Steering Committees were often useful to discuss and solve constraints during the project implementation and allowed improving the coordination with Government departments. ▪ The national NGOs played an important and useful role in the Consortia and allowed the transfer of skills, knowledge and capacity development among its members. Besides, these organizations have an easier access to communities and contributed significantly to increase the participation and contribution from the communities in the projects’ activities. ▪ The PRC enhanced the Government ownership of the RRP, allowed for mutual learning between the State and local levels, and supported changes in implementation. ▪ The AMU played an important role in the oversight of the RRP, and its intermediary role between all the stakeholders was useful. ▪ The field level oversight of the RRP projects conducted by the consortia and the Project Steering Committees promoted the involvement and ownership of the local government.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was some level of confusion about the roles and responsibilities of each Consortium member. ▪ The Consortium members had different operational procedures, decision making structures, accountability requirements and organizational cultures, and each agency had its own perceptions and methods for project implementation ▪ The lead agencies of the Consortia sometimes over-exercised or under-exercised its lead role. ▪ In some cases, changes in the management structure of Consortium members affected the whole consortium and the project implementation. ▪ There were no clear and defined selection criteria at the time of the RRP Consortia composition. ▪ Resources management among the Consortium members. ▪ In some cases it was not clear who was responsible for the coordination among the consortia. ▪ Understanding of the donor requirements by national NGOs. ▪ Lack of involvement of HAC in the PRC.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The PRC faced some difficulties in ensuring a regular participation of other Government departments and ministries, and its ability to influence and advocate at State level was limited. ▪ High staff turnover within the AMU during the initial stages of the programme. ▪ The Project Steering Committees were sometimes affected by challenges faced by consortia and LGAs (staff turnover, division of localities, lack of qualified staff). ▪ There were no strong links between the different levels of the RRP oversight.
<p>Recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Consortium members should agree and clarify the roles and responsibilities of each agency in the project implementation. ▪ The consortium agencies should establish unified operational procedures for the project implementation. ▪ The selection criteria for the composition of Consortia should be clearly defined in future programmes. ▪ A careful analysis should be conducted to assess the added value of each agency to the respective consortia. ▪ The coordination responsibilities should be clearly defined among the Consortium and minimum requirements should be established. ▪ In future Consortia implementation structures, the use of the associate category should be avoided; all the members should be considered as partners. ▪ The constitution of Consortia led by a national NGO should be promoted when possible. ▪ The PRC should conduct frequent and rotational meetings at field level. ▪ The PRC needs to ensure regular participation and involvement of key Government stakeholders. ▪ The existence of an AMU, with unique and autonomous identify, playing an intermediary role between the different stakeholders should continue to be promoted. ▪ UNDP should facilitate synergies with other programmes. ▪ UNDP should provide more technical support and capacity building to national partners, according to the needs. ▪ A strong interaction system for coordination and management at field level between the field level stakeholders should continue to be promoted. <p>Stronger links between the different levels of project oversight should be established.</p>