



International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM)  
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM)



**Sudan**

عوب متمكنة. أمم صامدة.

### Minutes of a CRP consultative meeting

Project Title: Conflict Reduction Programme (CRP)

Date and Time: 14:00-15:30, Wednesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2011

Venue: MIC Conference Hall 9<sup>th</sup> Floor

#### In Attendance

Name	Organization	Title
Abdel Atti Elhag	MIC	Deputy Director, External Resources Department <i>Abdel Atti Elhag</i>
Osman Gadim	RPCM, SKS	Chairman
Bacash Talh Ibrahim	Peace Council, BNS	Representative* <i>Bacash Talh Ibrahim</i>
Sawsan Omer	Higher Council for Decentralized Governance	Desk Officer <i>Sawsan Omer</i>
Mohammed Mahgoub	MIC	Programme Officer <i>Mohammed Mahgoub</i>
Etidal Mohamed	MIC	Programme Officer <i>Etidal Mohamed</i>
Stefano Pes	IOM	Sr. Programme Coordinator <i>Stefano Pes</i>
Johannes Braun	IOM	Deputy Programme Coordinator <i>Johannes Braun</i>
Pontus Ohrstedt	UNDP	Team Leader, CPR Unit <i>Pontus Ohrstedt</i>
Samuel Rizk	UNDP	Peace and Development Advisor <i>Samuel Rizk</i>
Momodou Dibba	UNDP	Programme Manager, CRP <i>Momodou Dibba</i>
Helena Puig	UNDP	Peace Building Specialist, CRP <i>Helena Puig</i>
Hisashi Izumi	UNDP	Programme Officer, CPR Unit <i>Hisashi Izumi</i>

#### Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Overview of the Conflict Reduction Program (CRP)
3. Situation on the ground
4. Review of the CRP project document
5. Consultation on the way forward for CRP
6. Any other business

#### Points discussed or/and agreed upon

1. **Introductions**
  - MIC welcomed participants and the participants introduced themselves.
2. **Overview of the CRP**
  - UNDP made a presentation on the overview of the Conflict Reduction Programme (CRP), its objectives and achievements to date made during the inception phase of the CRP as well as the full-fledged CRP.
  - Questions were asked about the level of involvement of and engagement with other partners during the design, preparation and implementation of the inception phase both at state and



federal levels. UNDP and RPCM responded by saying the programme engaged and worked closely, through RPCM as a lead government body for peace building, with other line ministries and other actors in SKS. RPCM found the partnership with UNDP to be very fruitful and successful.

- A Peace Council (PC) representative explains that the PC in Blue Nile State is equivalent of the RPCM in SKS, and looks forward for support in the same way that UNDP provided for RPCM. PC hopes that support from CRP will impact on the situation in BNS.
- Reconciliation and Peaceful Co-existence Mechanism (RPCM) shared its history and objectives, and expressed their appreciation and continued support to working with UNDP. For example, 28 successful reconciliation conferences have been supported by RPCM with UNDP Support. Tribes have held on to the agreements put forward by the peace conferences supported by RPCM/CRP. The Joint CRP is in line with RPCM's strategy and plans to address critical needs in the state. For example, the situational analysis produced by RPCM, with CRP's support, is used for Southern Kordofan State's 5 years strategic planning. There is, however, a need to update the information in the situational analysis, given the emerging needs, taking into consideration early warning components too. Lessons which RPCM and UNDP learned in SKS over the past years can be useful for the Peace Council in BNS.
- The Higher Council for Decentralized Governance appreciates the achievements and successful implementation of the project to date while emphasizing the need to involve federal level ministries to learn from and share experience and lessons learned with each other. RPCM's useful experience in SKS can be shared and applicable in other regions such as Darfur. The Higher Council for Decentralized Governance can help coordinate between the work of CRP and UNESCO who has similar initiatives in BNS. RPCM responded saying that RPCM is ready to share its experience with other regions such as Darfur and other government agencies.

### **3. Situation on the ground**

- Both RPCM and PC gave a brief overview of the situation on the ground. Despite the unfolding situation both in SKS and BN, RPCM and PC confirm that they continue to work to address the needs of the communities for peace building and peaceful co-existence, and request for continued support from CRP.

### **4. Review of the JCRP project document**

- UNDP outlines how JCRP looks like, its objective and governance structure.
- MIC asked when the final version of the JCRP project document will be shared. UNDP responded that the draft document had been circulated together with the invitation to the consultative meeting and that it would be re-circulated as soon as UNDP had add feedback from this meeting. The participants agreed.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM)  
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM)



**Sudan**

عوب متمكنة، أمم صامدة.

- RPCM poses some caution about partnership with INGOs and shows willingness to help the process of identifying INGOs.
- RPCM and Higher Council for Decentralized Governance mentioned that 'individual' proposals may be confusing to imply that proposals are submitted by 'individuals'. The word 'individuals' need to be replaced by a more appropriate word.
- RPCM and Council for Decentralized Governance proposed that in the grant committee, decisions need to be made by consensus, not by voting.
- RPCM asked for some clarifications about ways in which to ensure financial transparency. The importance of ensuring more national ownership and transparency to partners was emphasized and it was agreed that financial reports would be shared with the Steering Committee members on a regular basis. Moreover, the project will put in place LOAs with key government counterpart which would allow more direct responsibility over the implementation of capacity development activities.
- MIC proposes to revise the composition of the project board and include Higher Council for Decentralized Governance and Ministry of Finance. The participants agreed.

##### **5. Consultations on the way forward**

- MIC proposes that joint field visits need to be organized to SKS and BNS as soon as the situation permits.
- It was agreed to find a title of the JCRP project in Arabic.
- It was agreed that the JCRP project document will be revised as follows:
  - ✓ Add an additional activity to Output 1 to convene LL workshops with other regions of the country to share the experience of RPCM
  - ✓ Add an additional activity to pilot an activity similar to what RPCM does in other parts of the country
  - ✓ Include working towards an LoA in the capacity building activities of the project
  - ✓ On the grant management committee, the word 'individual' need to be taken out. Decision making in the grant management committee should be 'by consensus', not by voting.
  - ✓ On broadening the membership of the Steering Committee, there is room for more membership. Higher Council for Decentralized Governance and MoF to be invited.
- It was agreed that this meeting is considered to be a Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) for the JCRP.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM)  
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM)



**Sudan**

عوب متمكنة. أمم صامدة.

#### Next steps

- All the participants agreed to review the revised JCRP prodoc and provide feedback and comment both on the revised prodoc in 10 days (the participants to give feedback to UNDP by 7<sup>th</sup> December).
- The composition of the Project Board needs to be revised by inviting other Federal-level Ministries, namely Higher Council for Decentralized Governance and Ministry of Finance.
- A Project Board meeting will be convened as soon as the PRODOC has been finalized and before the 15<sup>th</sup> of December. The Annual Work Plan (AWP) for 2012 will be circulated together or shortly after the revised PRODOC.
- Consultative meeting minutes to be circulated and feedback to be received in 5 days. Once finalized the meeting minutes should be considered LPAC minutes for the purposes of formal project approval.