



***Sudan Post-Conflict Community Based  
Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP)***

**Final Report**

April 2012

Programme Title:	Sudan Post Conflict Community Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme, RRP
Programme/Award ID:	CA/STABEX/90-99/SU/001 – 00047467
Designated Institutions :	UNDP
Implementing Agencies:	Islamic Relief, MC Scotland, SOS Sahel, ROD, SC, ICCO, CRS, VSF-Germany
Programme Duration:	26 January 2005 – 25 October 2011
Programme Budget:	EUR 51,098,036.85 (EC/Govt) EUR 4,575,000 (UNDP)
Contributors:	EC/NAO and UNDP
Reporting Period:	January 2005 – October 2011
Contact Person:	<u>Adnan Cheema</u> RRP Manager United Nations Development Programme Khartoum Tel: + 249 (0) 908030184 Fax: + 249 (0) 183 773 128 Email: <a href="mailto:adnan.cheema@undp.org">adnan.cheema@undp.org</a>

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>II. ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>III. KEY RESULTS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>III.I. ENHANCED CAPACITY OF LGAS AND THE COMMUNITY</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>III.II IMPROVED LIVELIHOODS</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>III.III IMPROVED PROVISION OF BASIC SERVICES</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>III.IV RESULTS IN OTHER PROGRAMMATIC AREAS</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>IV. CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RRP .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>V. SUSTAINABILITY OF THE RRP .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>VI. CHANGES INTRODUCED IN THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>VII. MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>VIII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>IX. ASSETS HANDOVER .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>X. OVERALL FINANCIAL SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>XI. VISIBILITY AND COMMUNICATION .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>XII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>LIST OF ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>76</b>

## List of Acronyms

AAA	Abyei Area Administration
ABEAS	Annual Budget Estimate and Activity Schedule
ADA	Area Development Association
ADC	Area Development Committee
AHA	Animal Health Auxiliary
AMU	Action Management Unit
ANC	Antenatal Consultations
CHWs	Community Health Workers
CAHWs	Community Animal Health Workers
CBO	Community Based Organization
CDCs	Community Development Committees
CHD	County Health Department
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CRC	Child Rights Conventions
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DPT	Diphtheria, Pertussis and Tetanus
EC	European Commission
EPI	Expanded Programme on Immunization
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FSTP	Food Security Thematic Programme
GEC	Gogrial East County
GoNU	Government of National Unity
GoSS	Government of Southern Sudan
GPS	Global Positioning System
HAC	Humanitarian Aid Commission
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
HMIS	Health Management Information System
ICC	Inter-Church Committee
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IGA	Income Generating Activity
INGO	International Non Governmental Organization
IPT	Intermittent Presumptive Treatment
IT	Information Technology
KAPB	Knowledge Attitude Practice and Behaviour (related to Primary Health Care and Reproductive Health)
LGA	Local Government Authorities
LLITN	Long Lasting Insecticide Treated Net
LSC	Life Skills Centre
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFV	Monitoring Field Visit
MIC	Ministry of International Cooperation
MoE	Ministry of Education

MoEST	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
MoFEP	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MLS	Micro-lending and Savings Group
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoPI	Ministry of Physical Infrastructure
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRE	Mine Risk Education
MTR	Mid Term Review
NAO	National Authorizing Officer
NMAO	National Mines Action Office
OPD	Outpatient Department
PCM	Project Cycle Management
PHCC	Primary Health Care Centre
PHCU	Primary Health Care Unit
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRC	Policy and Review Committee
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
QIP	Quick Impact Projects
RDT	Rapid Diagnostic Test
ROM	Results Oriented Monitoring
SILC	Savings and Internal Lending Committees
SMC	School Management Committee
SMoA	State Ministry of Agriculture
SMoEST	State Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
SPLA	Sudan People's Liberation Army
SSB	Stabilized Soil Bricks
SSRRC	South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
TB	Tuberculosis
TBA	Traditional Birth Attendants
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
VDC	Village Development Committee
VHC	Village Health Committee
VSF	Veterinaries San Frontiers
VSL	Village Savings and Lending
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation
WFP	World Food Programme
WSC	Water Source Committee
VWC	Village Water Committee

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is the final report of the Sudan Post-Conflict Community Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP), which was implemented between January 2005 and October 2011. This programme, administered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and implemented through NGO consortia in ten areas across Sudan, had a total budget of around 56 million Euros, and was financed by the European Commission (EC) and the Government of Sudan (€ 51,098,036), and the UNDP (€ 4,575,000).

The main goal of the RRP was to promote 'quick start' agricultural and rural development interventions in order to provide "peace dividends", following the signature of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). Its overall objective was to reduce the prevalence and severity of poverty and increase food security amongst conflict affected rural households across Sudan, 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.

The RRP benefited approximately 1.1 million people across 10 areas in Sudan (Blue Nile, Abyei, Red Sea, River Nile, Southern Kordofan, Upper Nile, Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Warrap, and Northern Bahr el Ghazal) achieving significant results despite numerous challenges. RRP promoted the capacity building of LGAs and communities through the training of approximately 1,350 LGA officials, 1,797 health workers, 1,413 teachers and headmasters, and 264 pump mechanics. In addition 149 VDCs; 952 VHC members; 77 PTAs; 426 VWC; and 26 youth associations were established and trained.

Under the livelihoods component, the RRP was able to train 2,950 farmers, 278 veterinarians, and 1,783 fishermen, and to provide agricultural inputs/tools to 33,995 households. 4,926 households received animals for restocking, 5,562 people benefited from micro enterprise/income generation/micro credit activities, 12,226 people participated in adult literacy classes, and 1,614 persons received vocational training. Provision of basic services in the target area received a major boost through construction and rehabilitation of 685 water systems, 281 class rooms, 88 health facilities and 3,351 latrines. These achievements contributed in improving the living conditions of communities and also supported the government's efforts to establish and enable LGAs to manage the development process in their respective areas. The RRP also provided a platform for the government at different levels to work together on a major recovery initiative.

The RRP was an ambitious undertaking considering the limited time frame, insecurity and inaccessibility of some of the target locations. Some of the premises and assumptions included in the project design that were crucial for successful implementation, were not in place during most of the projects' implementation period, especially the LGA presence and capacity. During implementation major challenges were faced such as the fighting in Abyei and Southern Kordofan, insecurity in Warrap & Eastern Equatoria, deregistration of several Consortia NGOs, delays in issuance of visa, travel permits and custom clearances.

This report opens with an introduction to the RRP followed by a description of the activities and results. It then continues with analysis of the main challenges, sustainability of the programme, description of management and coordination arrangements, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms as well as changes introduced during the implementation. Included also is the financial report followed by description of visibility, communication activities and recommendations. The report contains six annexure which provide further details related to the programme.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Sudan Post-Conflict Community Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP) 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.

The RRP was administered by the UNDP and implemented through NGO consortia in ten areas across Sudan. The total budget was 55.7 million Euros (€ 51.1 from the EC/NAO and € 4.6 from UNDP). The programme's original duration was set at 60 months ending on 25 January 2010, which was subsequently extended to 81 months ending on 25 October 2011.

### **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 147<sup>th</sup> 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.

Between 2001 and 2003, Southern Sudan was among the poorest regions in the world; with a Gross National Income per capita four times lower than the rest of Sudan and one of the lowest in the world. By 2001 annual income per capita was US\$ 90 and an estimated 90% of the population was living with less than one dollar a day. The region was also scoring very low rate of access to primary education and literacy rate, but with high rates of infant mortality.

The Joint Assessment Mission in 2004<sup>1</sup>, concluded that North Sudan needed community-driven recovery and equitable distribution of wealth, in order to enable the Government at state and local levels to fulfil its responsibilities of providing basic services (especially, health care, education, and water and sanitation). Investment in improved agriculture and livestock productivity and promoting private sector development was also considered necessary. The same Mission also highlighted the absence of infrastructure and lack of institutional capacity to deliver basic services in South Sudan and the need to promote agriculture production.

Several food security assessments in the country also emphasized a high level of

---

<sup>1</sup> This Mission was launched by a Core Coordination Group that was established with representatives from the SPLA and the Government of Sudan, UN system, World Bank, and IGAD Partners Forum (EC, UNDP, IOM, World Bank), with the goal of assessing the rehabilitation needs of Sudan. The conclusions were presented in March 2005.

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.

Main characteristics and context of each one of the ten RRP intervention areas is described in Annex 1.

## I.II Target areas and beneficiaries of the RRP

In total, the RRP interventions across Sudan intended to benefit directly around 900,000 people, among host population, returnees and IDPs. The total number of beneficiaries reached by the projects through various activities was around 1.1 million people. The following table provides information about the target locations and beneficiaries of each one of the RRP.

**Table 1: Target areas and beneficiaries of the RRP**

RRP State/Area	Locations	Beneficiaries planned	Beneficiaries reached
<b>Blue Nile</b>	20 conflict affected communities of Kurmuk and Geissan localities	60,000 persons (including refugees and returnees) and LGAs	105,100 persons
<b>Abyei</b>	Four Payams in Abyei area	Direct: 40,000 (residents and returnees) Indirect: 24,000	90,000 persons (15,000 families)
<b>Red Sea</b>	33 villages in five localities (Port Sudan, Sawakin, Gonob, Olieb, and Halaib)	Direct: 44,314 persons Indirect: 40,482 persons	Direct: 91,731 persons Indirect: 43,316 persons (8,863 families)
<b>River Nile</b>	25 villages: 12 villages from locality of Abu Hamad, and 13 villages from locality of Berber)	70,000 persons	126,376 persons



RRP State/Area	Locations	Beneficiaries planned	Beneficiaries reached
<b>Southern Kordofan</b>	Five localities (Kadugli, Alburam, Umdorain, Hiban, and AlRief Al-Shargi)	Direct: 201,038 Indirect: 268,051	112,845 persons
<b>Upper Nile</b>	Almost 60 villages in 15 payams across the counties of Renk, Melut and Maban	180,000 persons (host population and resettled returnees)	99,805 persons (28,446 households)
<b>Central Equatoria</b>	Communities in six Payams: Wonduruba, Bungu Rokon, Dolo, Ganji and Tijor	100,000 persons, mainly IDPs	132,620 persons
<b>Eastern Equatoria</b>	Communities in the Counties of Torit (locality of Hyala), Lafon (locality of Imehejek) and Ikwotos (locality of Imotong)	Direct: 63,873 returnees (refugees and IDPs) women, children, demobilized soldiers Indirect: 250,000	217,000 persons
<b>Warrap</b>	Six Payams in Gogrial East County	100,000 conflict-affected rural household members, including returnees	70,000 persons
<b>Northern Bahr el Ghazal</b>	Aweil Centre and West Counties	81,190 direct beneficiary conflict-affected rural household members	80,000 persons
<b>Total</b>		<b>940,415</b>	<b>1,125,477</b>

***Annex 1 includes map of the RRP target areas.***

### **I.III Goals of the RRP**

The overall objective of the RRP was to reduce the prevalence and severity of poverty and increase food security amongst conflict affected rural households across Sudan, by achieving tangible improvements at the community and locality levels.

The goal of the RRP was to improve the livelihoods of 900,000 Sudanese nationals by increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity, stimulating economic activity, and contributing to improvements in health and quality of life in ten areas across Sudan, using a participatory approach by requiring the engagement of local government authorities (LGAs) and beneficiary groups, and by taking an integrated approach through the use of a consortium model.

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

The RRP was managed by UNDP, through the Action Management Unit (AMU), based in Khartoum and Juba with responsibility for its financial administration, monitoring of activities and reporting. It was supervised by a Policy and Review Committee (PRC), and implemented by ten NGOs consortia. Each consortium consisted of one lead agency, at least one partner, and at least one national associate.

Some consortia underwent changes in their membership during the implementation period. The ten implementing consortia were formed by a total of 26 international and 23 local NGOs.

**Table 2. RRP Consortia**

RRP	Lead Agency	Partners	Associates	Duration	Budget
<b>RRP 01 in Blue Nile</b>	Islamic Relief Worldwide (IRW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mines Advisory Group (MAG)</li> <li>▪ Save the Children (Sweden)</li> <li>▪ Spanish Red Cross (until May 2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Child Rights Institute (CRI)</li> <li>▪ JASMAR (Sudan Association for Combating Landmines)</li> <li>▪ Blue Nile Development Organization (BNDO)</li> <li>▪ Sudanese Red Crescent Society (until May 2007)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> March 2006 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 (52 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 30<sup>th</sup> September 2010</p>	€6,100,000
<b>RRP 02 in Abyei</b>	Mercy Corps Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GOAL, Ireland</li> <li>▪ Save the Children Sweden (from May 2009)</li> <li>▪ Save the Children US (until March 2009)</li> </ul>	ACAD (Abyei Community Action for Development)	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> June 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2010 (52 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011</p>	€5,100,000

RRP	Lead Agency	Partners	Associates	Duration	Budget
<b>RRP 03 in Red Sea</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SOS Sahel UK (as of May 2009)</li> <li>▪ International Rescue Committee (until March 2009)</li> </ul>	ACORD (Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SECS (Sudanese Environmental Conservation Society)</li> <li>▪ PASED (Port Sudan Association for Small Enterprise Development), until June 2008</li> <li>▪ Doa'a Charity Organization for Social Development (until 2007)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (44 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010</p>	€ 3,813,482
<b>RRP 04 in River Nile</b>	Roots Organization for Development (ROD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Global Health Foundation (GHF)</li> <li>▪ Nawafil Alkhairat Organization (NEO)</li> </ul>	African Charitable Society for Mother and Child Care (ACSMCC)	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 (51 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 10<sup>th</sup> October 2010</p>	€ 2,890,000
<b>RRP 05 in South Kordofan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Save the Children Sweden (from May 2009)</li> <li>▪ Save the Children US (until March 2009)</li> </ul>	Danish Church Aid (DCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Diocese of El Obeid (DOE)</li> <li>▪ Nuba Relief, Rehabilitation, Development Organization (NRRDO)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> March 2006 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011 (64 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 25<sup>th</sup> October 2005</p>	€ 5,995,000
<b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b>	Mercy Corps Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tearfund UK</li> <li>▪ Fellowship for African Relief (FAR)</li> <li>▪ Stromme, Norway</li> </ul>	Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS)	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> July 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2010 (43 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010</p>	€ 5,028,951
<b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b>	ICCO (Inter-Church Organization for Development Cooperation, Netherlands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AAH (Action Africa Help)-International</li> <li>▪ ZOA Refugee CARE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New Sudan Council of Churches (NSCC)</li> <li>▪ Sustainable Community Outreach Prog. for Empowerment (SCOPE)</li> <li>▪ Sudan Health Association (SUHA)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2009 (43 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010</p>	€ 4,596,338

RRP	Lead Agency	Partners	Associates	Duration	Budget
<b>RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria</b>	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MERLIN</li> <li>▪ Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale (AVSI)</li> </ul>	Catholic Diocese of Torit (DoT)	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> February 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009 (47 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 31<sup>st</sup> May 2010</p>	€ 4,000,000
<b>RRP 09 in Warrap</b>	VSF-G (Veterinarians Without Borders – Germany)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ World Vision International</li> <li>▪ Impact on Health, Germany</li> <li>▪ CESVI – Cooperazione e Sviluppo Onlus, Italy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEDA (Sudan Education and Development Agency)</li> <li>▪ INFRAID (Indigenous Forest Resources Awareness in the Improvement of Diet)</li> <li>▪ SUPRAID (Sudan Production Aid) (until 2008)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> May 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2010 (49 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010</p>	€ 5,234,888
<b>RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal</b>	Save the Children	Concern Worldwide	HARD (Hope Agency for Relief and Development)	<p><i>Implementation:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2010 (50 months)</p> <p><i>End of contract:</i> 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010</p>	€ 4,700,000

## II. ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED

A number of activities were implemented by the RRP's 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);
3. Support to provision of basic services (focusing on health, education, and water and sanitation); and
4. Specific activities as required by the needs in some projects locations (peace building, mine risk education etc).

### II.I. Capacity Development

The institutional strengthening and capacity development activities focused on the training of government authorities, teachers, healthcare workers, and others 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.

A total of 1,350 LGA officials were trained by ten RRP's across the country. The trainings were based on the identified needs and included public administration,

project planning, implementation and monitoring, general administration and finance, good governance and human rights, water supply, health/nutrition, information technology (IT), English, agriculture, education administration among others.

In support of the capacity development activities the RRP also undertook construction / rehabilitation and equipping of LGA infrastructures. Likewise, the projects engaged and supported the LGA in the elaboration of locality strategic development plans and promotion of LGA links with the communities, CBOs and higher governmental hierarchies.

**Highlights:**

- *1,350 LGA officials were trained;*
- *149 Village Development Committees formed and trained;*
- *952 Village Health Committee' members trained;*
- *77 Parents Teachers Associations trained/supported;*
- *426 Village Water Committees formed/supported; and*
- *26 youth associations formed/trained.*

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. Most of the CBOs were formed with the involvement of the RRP and therefore needed regular support to perform<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Annex 2 to this report gives a detailed list of activities implemented by RRP.*



Before RRP, the local government authorities in Gogrial, Warrap State, were working from the above pictured tukul, writing documents out by hand. The RRP has built a brick structure to increase the capacity of the local government.



## 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 as well as vocational training with the objective of reviving the target communities capacity to produce necessary products for both

### **Highlights:**

- *2,954 farmers, 278 veterinarians and 1,783 fishermen, were trained on farming, veterinary and fishing techniques respectively;*
- *33,995 households were provided with agricultural inputs/tools to support and enhance their food production capacities;*
- *28 grind mills, 7 grain storage, and 12 markets, were constructed;*
- *4,926 people received household animals (mainly goats) for restocking;*
- *5,562 people benefitted from micro enterprise / income generation / micro credit development activities; and*
- *12,266 people participated in adult literacy classes, and 1,614 received vocational training.*

internal consumption as well as marketing the surplus. RRP intervention in the livelihoods included: construction/rehabilitation of agricultural infrastructure (grind mills, grain stores, bulking stores, and markets), 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. The nature of these interventions ranged from demonstrating simple farming techniques to communities that have not been able to farm for about two decades as well as those that were aimed at building existing capacities and improving productivity.

Livestock related activities included: distribution and restocking goats, establishment of veterinary clinics and pharmacies, distribution of drugs and animal vaccination and diseases campaigns, trainings to para-vets and Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs), construction/rehabilitation of water systems for animal consumption, and establishment and support through training and equipment for fisherman and bee-keeping groups.



**Community farmers sow seeds in Eastern Equatoria**

Livelihood activities also included micro-credit and income generation activities, such as establishment and training of Micro-lending and Savings (MLS) groups (similar groups are also called Savings and Internal Lending Committees (SILC), support for women groups through provision of start-up capital to run small businesses in areas like tailoring, food processing and handcrafts. Various RRP projects have also provided/facilitated vocational trainings for selected groups of young people in carpentry, tailoring and construction. These activities were conducted in several locations.

### 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 (including refurbishment of the existing rooms or building additional ones in schools and primary health clinics), teachers training centres and other similar structure. Support to relevant health and educational facilities also included provision of furniture, equipment and supplies including medical and



**Community Health Workers in Gogrial East, Warrap**

#### **Highlights:**

- 88 health facilities were constructed or rehabilitated, providing health services for a total of 607,232 people;
- 281 schools/classrooms were constructed or rehabilitated;
- 3,351 household and institutional latrines were refurbished or constructed;
- 685 water systems were rehabilitated or constructed, providing access to safe drinking water to a total of 260,733 people.

teaching/studying materials in order to kick start appropriate and full operations of the established structures. Most of the consortia as well as UNDP have been engaged in lobbying the local and central authorities to provide funding and personnel for the established health and education structures. Although the problem has been acknowledged by the authorities the level of support varies among different project locations. Establishing 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.



**RRP success story: Sand water filters: Simple solution to a life threatening situation**

For as long as she can remember, 43-year-old Ajang Abier watched friends and family fall mysteriously ill in her remote community of Kolang, in Upper Nile State. It wasn't until she found herself rushing her 7-year-old son to the health centre due to severe stomach pain and vomiting that she vowed to look into the reasons why her village was vexed with a constant host of stomach complications.

After talking to all of the local nurses and elders it finally became clear to Ajang that the source of the problem was contaminated drinking water.

People had been drinking water from unsafe sources; prepared with makeshift filters such as dirty clothing, and the result was a deluge of waterborne diseases. This finally came to a halt when the RRP brought biosandfilters to Ajang's community.

"Since the introduction of the sand filters to households by the RRP, we have had no serious waterborne related diseases affecting us," explained Ajang.

The filters turned out to be a simple solution to a life threatening situation; made possible with cement, sand and willing hands; all of which were available in Kolang.

Here's how it works: Community members collect sand from nearby streams and then wash and sieve it to gather the finer grains. These finer grains are then placed on top of a cement filter that other community members have been trained to build and operate. Water is poured over the sand, which traps the harmful bacteria that was making people sick.

The sand filter project exemplifies what the RRP is all about: finding local solutions to local problems. And the solutions seem to be working. With the participation of Kolang members the RRP has managed to deliver clean drinking water to more than 1,500 households and 24 schools; and given women like Ajang and her son a chance for a healthy new start.

Funded by the European Commission and managed by UNDP on behalf of the Government of National Unity and the Government of Southern Sudan, the RRP is the largest recovery initiative across Sudan that strives to use community driven approaches that focus on sustainable development rather than relief. The RRP is implemented through 44 national and international NGOs working together to rehabilitate Sudan.



**Community members enjoying clean drinking water from a biosandfilter in Renk County, Upper Nile State**



#### I.IV. Context specific activities

In response to the specific needs in some of the project areas RRP's undertook activities that are not most directly related to the three main programmatic areas.

Mine action; demining/mine risk education, peace building, gender, environment and other activities were undertaken to address the needs of the host communities.

##### **Highlights:**

- 102,044 persons received training in Mine Risk Education;
- Several areas were cleared from UXOs; and
- 1,664 persons received training and participated in a total of 88 training sessions on peace building, human rights and gender issues.

Mines have been causing significant problem to the communities that reside close to the mine contaminated area. Mine and UXO explosions were causing death and injuries to the local population as well as their livestock. Besides, access to some land including pasture areas were dangerous because of the mines and other ordnances. RRP activities included demining of some areas crucial to livelihoods of the targeted areas. Concerned consortia also engaged in mine risk education via disseminating information about the dangers of various ordnances as well as encouraging safe behaviour when confronted with mine/UXO danger.

Other cross-cutting issues (peace building, gender, environment etc) were promoted both as stand-alone activities (community gathering, discussion forums etc) as well as part of other activities (e.g. environment and natural resource management as part of livelihoods intervention such as fishing and beekeeping)

##### **RRP success story: *Three-month de-mining campaign completed***



The true extent of the problems related to landmines and Explosives Remnants of War (ERW) remains unknown in Sudan. A country-wide survey has been initiated to measure both the scope and impact of the problem. It is believed that Africa's longest civil war has left up to 21 of the 26 states affected by landmines that threatens the daily-life of civilians, impedes the country's economic recovery and development, and delays the safe return of internally displaced persons and refugees to their hometowns.

##### ***An RRP EOD technician excavates a bunker***

Blessed with some of the best arable land in the region, Nuba Mountains was once considered the bread basket of Sudan. But landmines have often rendered this land inaccessible and uncultivable. People in Kadugli locality, in Southern Kordofan state, have endured the worst of the civil war and are still at risk of mines and UXOs. Great numbers of displaced persons and entire communities returning to the region also face the same risk as they walk into the Nuba Mountains, searching for clean water, and travel long distances on foot to reach schools and health clinics.

Since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) on 9 January 2005, the long and arduous road to recovery commenced with ridding the country of land-mines laid

over a long period of time. The de-mining activities are carried out through the RRP in Southern Kordofan.



***Excavated remnants of war***



***A UXO is set for demolition using an SM charge***

Between May and July 2007 the RRP ran an intensive de-mining campaign that enabled it to destroy a total of 20,160 small arms, 227 fuses, 14 propellants, 4 rocket propelled grenades, twenty-three 82mm mortars, twenty-two 60mm mortars, and a 76mm projectile. At the Kadugli and Dilling way stations, the RRP conducted safety briefings and MRE presentations benefiting 10,053 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).

The RRP also conducted mine awareness sessions in El-efien, Daldako, Al rosir and Karkaraya schools benefiting 1,045 children and teachers. Direct awareness sessions in Tabanja, Buram and Kadugli benefited 574 including children. The RRP also distributed 2,044 Information Education and Communication materials (leaflets) with MRE messages in all the areas of their tasks.



***The RRP gives and MRE presentation to IDPs in Kadugli***

The RRP consortium in Southern Kordofan is managed by UNDP, executed by Save the Children in partnership with International Partners Danish Church Aid (DCA); National Partners Diocese of El Obeid (DOE); and Nuba Relief, Rehabilitation Development Organization (NRRDO).

### **III. KEY RESULTS**

The RRP yielded tangible results for approximately 1.1 million people through its interventions across ten areas of the Sudan (including South Sudan). Details of key results achieved by the programme are presented below.

#### **III.I. Enhanced capacity of LGAs and the Community**

##### **LGAs**

Local governments supported by the RRP were in different organizational and technical condition at the outset of the programme. In many parts of the country local government structures had just been established after two decades of conflict, hence professional and organizational capacities were deficient in most of the LGA structures. Despite presence of some competent personnel many LGAs 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. Many of the LGAs did not have proper offices and equipment to operate efficiently.

RRP 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 RRP 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 has been significantly improved with local government officials going through various trainings organized/facilitated by the RRP. The trainings were designed around the needs identified, covering topics such as project management including planning, budgeting, institutional development, resource mobilization and management, health resource development and planning, water supply planning and management, education administration, fast track teachers training, general skills related to accounting, IT and English language.

The RRP reinforced the capacity development efforts by actively involving the LGAs in the implementation of the projects. LGAs were part and parcel of the RRP activities planning and implementation process. It was a requirement for the local authorities to endorse the RRP Annual Budget Estimate and Activity Schedule (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.

With the help of RRP consortia some LGAs also conducted local development strategic planning exercises (e.g. Gogrial East and County Development Plan in

Aweil) as well as planning for a particular sector (e.g. Health sector strategic plan in Gogrial East, Warrap state). Thus, despite acute shortage of skills and expertise, for the first time in many years local governments were brought to the forefront of local development initiatives. This was an important start for the LGAs and laid the foundation to make them increasingly active and effective players for the future local development undertakings.

Prior to the RRP interventions for many years the local communities were supported by humanitarian agencies in many parts of the country. Local government authorities in most parts of Sudan were either not functional or had very little exposure to the situation where they had to actively engage in consultation with the communities and NGOs/CBOs. Due to the RRP however the local government, local communities and NGOs/CBOs and international NGOs came together to address the local development challenges in holistic fashion thus reinforcing a stronger link between the three key stakeholders. LGAs were encouraged to lobby the state and federal governments to support and fund local development plans.

RRP initiatives enabled more active LGA participation in the local initiatives including the coordination role which ensures more coherent approach to local development. Establishment of local Project Steering Committees across all RRP provided a forum for broader coordination and partnership among the various stakeholders. With the senior most LGA official chairing the Steering Committee it also underlined the importance of the LGAs role in managing the development of their areas.

Major component of the RRP support for enhancing LGA capacities was to improve the working conditions of the LGAs through building/refurbishment of LGA offices as well as providing office and other equipment. LGA offices were built in Aweil (two offices) and Gogrial East counties (two LGA offices). RRP office in Abyei was provided to the Abyei Area Administration (AAA) after the conflict in May 2008. RRP project offices along with guesthouses in Blue Nile state were handed over to the local authorities for permanent use. In Central Equatoria, County agriculture office was built and equipped; an Information and Development Centre was built and equipped in Berber town (River Nile State) to be used by LGA officials and Community Development Committees. Computer and office equipment were provided as part of the input for the LGA capacity building efforts. At the end of the implementation period most of the RRP project assets (including vehicles and office equipment) with the approval of PRC were given to the local partners, primarily LGAs.

The result of these RRP interventions was a noticeable shift from the time when LGAs were working under the tree or at best in tukuls without proper equipment and furniture. Newly built or refurbished LGA buildings have physically and in most visible way put the government in the centre of local communities again. By providing material and equipment support the RRP facilitated the government at county and locality levels to be more mobile and efficient in managing the delivery of public services.

*RRP fostered linkages with related UNDP programmes such as the Local Governance Recovery Programme in South Sudan, the Governance Programme in Red Sea and Recovery Programme in Abyei in order to benefit from complementarities. Inspired by the RRP model USAID designed a similar programme called BRIDGE. RRP provided lessons learned and shared plans from the relevant RRP in order to coordinate and build on synergies between the two programmes*

## **Community**

Employing a holistic approach to local development as well as being a community-based “quick impact” initiative RRP also undertook the challenging task of strengthening the capacity of local communities enabling those communities 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. Many of these national organizations were from the area and will continue to play an important role in the development of their communities.

The main focus of the community capacity development efforts was to form (including registration with the relevant authorities) and train community based organizations such as Village Development Committees (VDCs), Cluster Development Committees, and Area Development Committees. These representative structures were established as suitable instruments through which local communities are able to identify, prioritize and address local development challenges. These organizations serve as a foundation for building strong indigenous civil society institutions in the longer term. With relevant training and appropriate composition these organizations were able to identify and prioritize the needs for local development. RRPs formed about 149 VDCs across the country preparing among other things a fertile ground for more active participation of the communities in local development interventions.

Establishment and training of 77 PTAs, 426 village water committees, village health committees comprising over 950 members enhanced the capacity of local communities support, sustain and manage the infrastructure and other outputs of the RRP.



**Parents Teachers Association (PTA) Meeting**

***in Blue Nile***

The PTAs have become instrumental in improving the quality of education by playing a management and facilitation role. Their support with providing reasonable living quarters for the teachers was a main factor in retention of teachers in difficult locations. Over two thousand four hundred people attended different education related trainings facilitated by the RRP. The primary focus of these trainings was to increase professional capacity and awareness of the teachers, head masters, parents and other representatives of the community, covering school management system, child rights and protection, general capacity building training for teachers and classroom assistants and kindergarten. Involvement of communities coupled with improved conditions eventually resulted in higher interest in education leading to increased enrollment rates.

In the health sector, the RRP worked on ensuring the availability of basic health services to the communities. RRP trained over 950 members of village health committees. These committees have proved instrumental in community mobilization and leading health campaigns encouraging people to seek qualified medical assistance when in need. The committees have also been playing increasingly important role in demanding from the local governments the resources needed to improve health services in remote areas. Over 400 midwives and traditional birth attendants went through the relevant trainings and improved their knowledge and skills of attending to the expecting mothers during the birth. These trainings have created valuable local expertise enabling the communities to have easy access to health care instead of traveling long arduous distances.

### **RRP success story: Skilled midwives help make motherhood safer in Blue Nile State**

*The first time I delivered a baby I felt so nervous. Although can I or can't I really do this? Says 18-year old Nafiza Abdallah as she sits outside her home in the small fishing village of Ofudin, Blue Nile State.*

*But then I thought about my community and how I wanted to make it better, so I just went ahead and did it.*

*This brave young woman has been delivering babies ever since she has completed a midwife training provided by the Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP); a community-based initiative funded by the European Commission/Government and managed by the UNDP.*

*I have delivered more than 12 babies since then, she says proudly, at first with the help of others and now on my own.*



**Midwife in Blue Nile State**

*Nafiza is one of the 73 women who recently completed an 18-month long midwife training programme in Damazine. The course organized and funded by the RRP, provided theoretical and practical training for women, bringing the total number of registered midwives in Blue Nile State to 364.*

*Before the course started I didn't have much to do. I spent most of my time learning to read, farming and harvesting. When I heard about the midwife training programme being offered by the consortium I decided to go because I wanted to help my friends and relatives with their pregnancies, says Nafiza.*

*I learned that I can time exactly when the baby will be born; and if they are going to have twins I will know. I can hear two heartbeats instead of one, she added.*

*The course focused on other issues besides delivering babies. The women received literacy training, learned about proper nutrition and attended awareness sessions on issues such as tribal scarring and female genital mutilation. They can now act as advocates against these harmful practices when they return to their respective villages.*

*This was the ninth midwife training programme offered in Damazine. The consortium expects to facilitate more in the future. Nafiza encourages other women in Blue Nile to attend the course even if they feel apprehensive.*

*At first it didn't really have a lot of meaning, I just felt scared, but after a while I saw how happy the mothers are; and feel grateful that I am able to save not only one life, but two.*

Over 570 health workers, volunteers and community health workers have had the opportunity to benefit from the RRP trainings on the control of various tropical diseases, immunization, outreach, general health related issues, HMIS, treatment protocol and others. Two thousand two hundred and forty people gained understanding of the importance of hygiene. The trainings, workshops and discussions involved campaigners and community mobilizers as well as teachers and other community representatives.

Supply of drinking water is one of the biggest challenges faced by the local governments and communities. With scarce resources the local governments were 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 supporting the community driven water and sanitation committees (also known as water users committees in some areas), 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. Community ownership and capacities to manage the water issues were strengthened through the establishment and training of 365 water and sanitation/water users committees. Over 671 members of the water committees have benefitted from targeted training particularly on their roles and responsibilities in the management of the new water sources. Self reliance of the communities has been enhanced as RRP have trained over 260 community members to serve as water pump mechanics.

RRP	Key Results: enhanced capacity of LGAs and the community
RRP 01 in Blue Nile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training of LGA officials raised the level of knowledge about the project's components and had a positive impact on LGAs' planning activities.</li> <li>▪ Establishment and training of Village Development Committees (VDCs) and Cluster Development Committees (CDCs) led to the community taking charge of identifying and prioritizing development needs of the local communities in the localities of Kurmuk and Geissan. These committees are now engaging local authorities and government ministries in articulating their development needs. The CBO status that the VDCs have acquired through registration with Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs gives them legal status as an organization and they will remain a vehicle through which development processes are channeled at Village level. LGAs are more receptive to the ideas and suggestions of the local development organizations and are giving support to the community initiatives. The NGOs and CBOs are playing an active role in capacity building and assisting the development efforts of the local communities. The skills acquired during the project are translating into better project management practices.</li> <li>▪ Training of health workers has contributed in improving the provision of medical services in the project area. In particular, the training of midwives has helped to make motherhood safer in the project area.</li> <li>▪ Training provided by the project to teachers and headmasters contributed to improving the learning environment in the schools and increased the enrollment rates.</li> <li>▪ PTAs established by the project were involved in the project implementation and participated in the mobilization of the communities for education related activities. These PTAs are also contributing to improving the governance of the schools.</li> <li>▪ Hand pump mechanics trained by RRP are helping to sustain the water systems built by the project.</li> <li>▪ Offices and guest houses handed over to the LGAs by RRP improved the operational capacity of LGAs.</li> </ul>



**RRP** **Key Results: enhanced capacity of LGAs and the community**

**RRP 02 in Abyei**

- Offices provided by RRP to the AAA following the conflict in May 2008 was extremely critical for the establishment and functioning of the AAA.
- Boma Administrators trained on community based planning and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools, later participated in the development of the Annual Budget Estimate and Activity Schedule (ABEAS) helped them to develop other community projects with NGOs.
- 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.
- Training of nurse students and their integration into the Abyei health sector bolstered health service provision by filling the gap of qualified personnel.
- Training of teachers contributed to improving the quality of education in the area.
- 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.

**RRP 03 in Red Sea**

- Training and sensitization of VDCs and ADCs on transparent practices has contributed to making these organizations more accountable and responsive to their constituency.
- Capacity strengthening activities, mainly focusing on project planning, have enhanced the capacities of the VDCs, ADCs and an Area Development Committee (ADC) to identify, design and manage implementation of simple community based livelihood and basic services projects. VDCs and ADCs have gained skills in terms of community mobilization, needs assessment, proposal writing, tender processing, selection of projects/beneficiaries, documentation of meetings, financial records, monitoring, administrative control, simple procurement procedures, reporting. This has resulted in a shift in the way demands from the communities are presented to the authorities – from individual demands/claims and verbal proposals to collective demands/claims and written proposals.
- Linkages and working relationships between VDCs, ADCs and LGAs in the development and implementation of community projects was enhanced by the project, through coordination, joint planning and joint monitoring. The LGAs are utilizing the VDC and ADC structures in carrying out development activities in the area.

**RRP 04 in River Nile**

- Capacity building activities directed at LGAs increased the planning and management skills of its members, resulting in the LGAs taking a lead in the formulation and development of locality development strategic plans. Capacity strengthening activities improved the LGAs engagement level with the project and their monitoring capacity.
- As a result of the RRP coordination structures linkages and relationship between the LGAs of the two localities strengthened collaboration on development issues.
- Training of CBOs/VDCs improved the functioning of the committees enabling them to mobilize communities for implementation of activities and monitoring progress.
- Women societies formed, trained and registered by the project enabled rural women to more effectively address their needs.
- PTAs supported by RRP started to play a positive role in the management and supervision of schools.

**RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan**

- Health Management Committees (HMCs) and Village Health Volunteers trained and supported by the project improved the local health structure.

**RRP Key Results: enhanced capacity of LGAs and the community**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PTA members trained by RRP played an important role in improving the quality of education.</li> <li>▪ Establishment and training of VDCs created broad based participatory institutions capable of prioritizing their needs and addressing them through developing linkages with a range of institutions.</li> <li>▪ 439 farmers increased production as a result of trainings conducted by the project on enhancement of crop production, optimal use of agriculture inputs, selection and preparation of land.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formation and training of Development Committees enhanced community capacity to plan and implement development activities for their communities.</li> <li>▪ CBOs, farmers unions and LGAs improved their knowledge and skills on entrepreneurship, project planning/budgeting/management, basic English and IT.</li> <li>▪ ECS, national associate of the consortium, through its experience with RRP built its capacity to independently mobilize resources and execute projects.</li> <li>▪ Training provided to PTAs and teachers contributed to improving the quality of education.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With the support of the project LGAs enhanced their capacity in planning, implementation and monitoring of projects.</li> <li>▪ Establishment and equipping of the County Agriculture Office contributed in strengthening a key LGA function.</li> <li>▪ Capacity of the local NGOs involved in the implementation of RRP has been enhanced.</li> <li>▪ Community Health Workers (CHWs) and Traditional Birth Attendants (TBAs) trained by the project have increased locally available access to health care.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity strengthening interventions helped the LGAs to assume their core responsibilities regarding the management of development and basic services provision.</li> <li>▪ Community members were trained in the maintenance and repair of water sources which ensured sustainability of interventions.</li> <li>▪ Training of health workers and health committees improved provision of medical services in the project area.</li> <li>▪ Trainings organized by RRP for teachers and SMC members contributed towards improving the learning quality in the schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RRP 09 in Warrap</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction and equipping of County offices has enabled the LGAs to improve their performance.</li> <li>▪ With the support of RRP a comprehensive three year County Strategic Development Plan was developed by the LGAs. The capacity of national NGOs, CBOs and local communities to express their needs and priorities was enhanced through their participation in this process.</li> <li>▪ Capacity building of health workers, namely, TBAs, has improved service delivery in primary and reproductive health in the target areas.</li> <li>▪ A comprehensive County Health Strategic Plan was developed and introduced in the County Development Plan, through a participatory process involving several stakeholders (County Health Department (CHD), VHCs, youth groups, peer educators, community members, and LGA representatives).</li> <li>▪ Capacity of national associate NGOs was strengthened through training and mentoring.</li> <li>▪ PTAs and Gender/Children Advocacy Groups supported by the project have improved the quality of education.</li> </ul>

RRP	Key Results: enhanced capacity of LGAs and the community
RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formation and training of water and sanitation committees has contributed in increasing the sanitation and hygiene practices of the target communities.</li> <li>▪ Construction of LGA offices in two locations has improved the performance of the LGAs.</li> <li>▪ Training of 302 LGA personnel in project management, technical skills related to livelihoods and food security, public administration, and gender issues, have enhanced their capacities on these issues.</li> <li>▪ The training and mentoring of Primary Health Care Centre (PHCC) staff has contributed in improving the health service delivery in the target area.</li> <li>▪ The training of VWC and community pump mechanics has contributed in ensuring constant availability of water.</li> <li>▪ The training of teachers has contributed in improving education standards.</li> <li>▪ The CAHWs trained by the project have undertaken livestock diseases surveillance and report diseases outbreaks to the County/State livestock department.</li> </ul>

### III.II Improved livelihoods

Communities that were dependent on food aid and prevented by armed conflicts from land cultivation and other agricultural activities found it challenging to restart agricultural production. The main obstacle was that many communities had been receiving humanitarian food aid for many years and it has taken time to make shift in thinking to self-sufficiency and self-reliance. Many communities that were hardest hit by the armed conflicts had also lost their agricultural production experience and “know-how” thus needed support to regain their experience and confidence. Due to absence of initial capital, communities had also been struggling to obtain basic agricultural inputs. It is intervention in agriculture to support the livelihoods that paved the way for increase in food production in the project areas.



**Women groups establishing a vegetable garden in Aweil**

RRPs across the country reached about 26,800 households by distributing tools and agricultural inputs including seeds (improved seeds) for staple crops (sorghum, groundnuts, sesame, okra etc.,) as well as fruit and vegetable. Various agricultural inputs were provided to individual farmers but most importantly farmers groups were supported deliberately to encourage more joint farming practices fostering concentration of existing resources to achieve better results and efficiency in agricultural production. Production capacity of over 260 agricultural groups, including farmer associations/groups, women groups was increased as they received seeds and seedling (in some cases on cost recovery basis), tools and irrigation systems. Case studies have shown an increase in production and available household income which is being used on education and other essential needs. The RRP also supported farmers to resume traditional ploughing techniques with oxen which had to

come to a stop during the conflict in South and Central Sudan. For this purpose about 224 pair of oxen were trained and given to the local farmers for more efficient cultivation of the agricultural land which ultimately resulted in increased agricultural production.

Significant support for the farmers was provided through the establishment and/or rehabilitation and revival 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 water pump management, improved irrigation practices, installation and repairs of treadle pumps; clean-up of water ways as well as digging ponds for small scale irrigation, creating terraces and water harvesting structures. These initiatives have improved access to irrigation water for 4,166 households, famers and producer groups.

Livestock plays an important role in the food security of most of the RRP target communities. RRP activities in this area had two main thrusts: a) selected economically disadvantaged community members were given livestock, mainly goats and b) veterinary services were extended to ensure proper care for the animals, thus preventing losses due to diseases. Disadvantaged households especially those headed by women boosted their economic well being by receiving around 11,350 head of livestock. Interviews of recipients reported improved nutritional status of these vulnerable households through availability of milk. Through trainings of paravets and CAHWs capacity within the local communities was developed to respond to the needs in terms of animal health. In addition the establishment and support of veterinary pharmacies and veterinary service points filled a critical gap. While the local government vet services were encouraged, private services were also supported. Considering livestock's important role in the local economy and food security in many parts of the Sudan the above interventions reduced losses and increased productivity of households dependent on livestock.

### **RRP success story: Fishermen Reel in Shared Profit**

You can always tell when you are getting near the sea, says 50-year old Ali Abu Ali. "The air feels different; cooler against your skin."

Ali and most of the men in his village have been fishing most of their lives. For them, fishing is more than a job, it is a way of life; a topic that finds its way into almost every conversation and an activity that sustains themselves and their families.



**Fishermen in Port Sudan**

For years in this poor, rural region of Arbaat in Eastern Sudan, the men had no proper equipment to fish. They spent their days walking to the shore of the Red Sea and renting very small wooden boats so that they could fish in the shallow coastal waters.

"We would carry the fish we caught slung over our shoulders, and walk from the sea back to the road, a distance of about 3 km," says Ali. The men would then wait by the side of the road for a ride. Sometimes the fish would spoil and they would return home empty handed. But today their hands are full. In the bustling fish market of Port Sudan, Ali and his cohorts sit behind plentiful baskets of fresh, varied fish caught deep in the Red Sea.

They have just returned from a week long fishing trip in one of the three motorized fiberglass boats provided by the **Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP)**. Ali points to dozens of different types of large, colorful fish on display for local hotel and restaurant owners to buy.

These are fish that can only be found in the deep sea," says Ali. "Before the small wooden boats we rented weren't strong enough to travel in the waves, but with the RRP boats we are able to go out to sea for days at a time"

And with the three ice boxes also provided by the RRP, the fishermen are now able to keep the fish fresh for up to one week. This means they can store the fish until they are ready to sell at the market, which is a great advantage, explains Ohaj Ahmed Eimali, of SOS Sahel-one of the RRP partners in Red Sea.

The RRP is the largest and most comprehensive recovery programme in Sudan, managed by UNDP on behalf of the Government of National Unity and the Government of Southern Sudan with funding of € 55.8 million; € 49.75 million of which comes from the European Commission. A total of 44 national and international NGOs are working together in 10 locations across the country (Blue Nile, Abyei, River Nile, Red Sea, South Kordofan, Northern Upper Nile, Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Warrap and Northern Bahr Al-Ghazal) concentrating on institutional strengthening, improving livelihoods and basic services.

In the Red Sea State; the harsh desert climate and isolation of many of its communities can make projects difficult. But despite the challenges faced these tight knit communities have demonstrated remarkable results.

Part of the Red Sea State consortium's success is because of the excellent coordination at the community level. Before the RRP began in this state, communities had already formed the Arbaat Development Association (ADA), a local organization that intended to address the region's development needs; but meetings and activities were sporadic and poorly organized.

The Arbaat fishing project is truly community-owned, with 105 families benefiting from just three boats. Here is how it works: there are three groups of 35 fishermen; and each group has one boat. Each group is split into five smaller groups and these teams have a rotating schedule for going out to sea. Every time a group comes back from sea, the fish are sold at the local market and the profits split between all 35 members.

*"The boats and boxes from the RRP changed so much – Now we can travel three to four hours out into the deep sea to fish," says 30-year-old Serie Abu Ali. "We can catch all kinds of fish that we didn't have access to in the coastal waters. On a seven day trip we can catch 800 kgs of fish and then sell them for 8 SDG a kg," he explains as he skins fish on the rocky seashore.*

*Ali and the other fishermen will cook it over an open fire and sleep on the beach before getting up at the break of dawn to take the boats out again.*

*It's a simple life; and requires a simple formula for success: "We catch more fish, we make more money," says Ali.*



Many riverside (seaside in case of Port Sudan) communities in Sudan 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. With direct access to the Red Sea fishing is a major nutrition and income source for the RRP targeted communities of rural Port Sudan and Halaib areas. Direct support was provided to over 1,000 fishermen providing fishing gear, engine boats and other equipment, including refurbishment of old boats. The fishermen were organized into groups/cooperatives for sharing the fishing gear which ensures effective use of the available resources. The groups also benefited from cool boxes and refrigerators provided by RRP that helped them to preserve their catches for longer periods. Establishment of fish stalls in the market helped the groups increase their earnings by cutting out the intermediary. Case studies showed an increase in the yields of the fishermen and consequently their income which is being used for essential household needs.

The RRP also supported communities through establishment of saving and lending groups (also known as micro credit groups or micro saving and lending groups). These initiatives promoted idea of small business expansion and start up. Small cash grants were made available for the groups to kick-start lending. Over 248 groups with about 4,500 members were able to access the RRP small cash grants for saving and lending schemes. Group members were trained in basics of business management and book keeping. The loans in many cases were used for small business start ups and expansion including setting up of small shops in the rural areas. Availability of capital and skills helped many small entrepreneurs to start earning/increase income.

Due to the long civil war many people in the Central and South Sudan 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. RRP supported literacy classes that reached 12,278 adult learners. Tailor-made vocational trainings to target communities, which were attended by over 2,300 community members, resulted in increasing employability. Because of their specific status and role in the local community special emphasis was placed on training of youth to increase their skills and future employability. Thanks to the mobilization efforts of the RRP partners on the ground, several communities participated in building access roads (cumulative distance of over 300 km) and bridges (e.g. Abyei, Blue Nile, Warrap) that increased access to local markets.

**RRP****Key Results: Improved livelihoods****RRP 01 in Blue Nile**

- Goat restocking activities benefitted 750 households as 80% of the households were using the milk from the goats to feed their children. Over the life of the project the size of the heard increased by 62% thus benefiting greater number of needy families. Availability of milk as a result of this scheme allowed beneficiary families to reduce their expenditures on purchase of milk.
- Agricultural and livestock activities implemented by the project increased production and consequently household income.
- Improved fishing equipments and tools benefitted 70 fishermen allowing them to increase their income as a result of increased yields. Besides, formation of fishermen groups increased their protection against low prices offered by traders and helped to standardize the market prices and increase profits.
- Workload and time spent on grinding significantly reduced with the establishment of grinding mills. The service of the mill had disproportionate positive impact on women as they spent less time on grinding process as well as shortened the distance to accessing grinding services.
- Small loans received by 480 women enabled them to start small businesses, generate income for the recipient families and improved availability of local business services. Increased income led to increased spending and borrowing capacity of the beneficiaries allowing them to improve their living conditions (e.g. purchase of house furniture).
- 1,293 students of the RRP literacy classes passed Ministry of Education (MoE) literacy exam and are now able to read, write and do basic math.

**RRP 02 in Abyei**

- The project contributed to increase agricultural production and alleviating food shortages in Abyei through trainings and support to vegetable production of several farmer groups, support to fishing groups and the work developed with the Ministry of Agriculture to establish tractor tillage services.
- Construction of physical infrastructure (meat vendor in a market, poultry houses, grain storage) facilitated livelihoods improvement in the area.
- 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.
- Village Savings and Lending (VSL) groups established by the project became self managed. The money that circulates in those groups comes from its members and the groups have established their own internal regulations.

**RRP 03 in Red Sea**

- Irrigation systems (pumps, piped irrigation and diesel generators) established by the project resulted in expansion of cultivable land, saving human physical power and time, timely irrigation and reduction of water losses to evaporation. Improved irrigation contributed to increase the level of agricultural production allowing beneficiaries to market their products and generate extra income.
  - New varieties of cash and horticultural crops were introduced and the use of certified seeds improved the quality of production.
  - Goats restocking activities increased the supplementary incomes and improved nutrition in the beneficiary households.
  - Availability of veterinary services and medicines as well as easier access to water led to improved livestock health and productivity.
  - Support provided by the project to groups of fisherman produced number of significant positive results:
    - provided motorized boats have increased the amount of catch while ice-boxes allowed the fishermen to store (up to a week) and deliver the product to the market avoiding losses;
    - established fisherman associations (linked to their respective VDC) improved management and use of the fishing equipment resulting in benefit to the community at large; and

RRP	Key Results: Improved livelihoods
RRP 04 in River Nile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ division of labor allowed the association to benefit from the complete value chain: i.e. fishing, marketing and commercial catering (restaurants group) eventually resulting in increased average daily incomes.</li> <li>▪ The income generating activities implemented by RRP have given communities new business services and increased incomes for the beneficiary families. The income generation and installment shops (mobiles, furniture, home assets, shells, etc) are run by groups (rather than individuals) and are providing new services to the communities, especially in remote areas.</li> <li>▪ The women centers supported by the project provided a platform for women where they are able to gather and discuss social issues and organize trainings for themselves.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goats restocking activities of the project improved economic condition of 470 women-headed households (benefiting around 2,350 people) resulting in improved households nutrition and increased income from the sale of milk. Additionally, 177 households benefited by receiving new born goats.</li> <li>▪ Increased supply of water facilitated production of vegetables in household gardens for family consumption as well as adequate supply of water for the households livestock.</li> <li>▪ Veterinary services are now available in 50% of the target areas, benefitting the communities with improved animal health and improved productivity.</li> <li>▪ The livelihoods and fisheries interventions carried out by RRP have improved income levels of the target groups.</li> </ul>
RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Introduced commercial tillage service resulted in additional cultivation of 1,365 acres of land and increased production. The farmers groups organized by the RRP were linked with the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) securing support through extension services and supervision.</li> <li>▪ Honey production was boosted with distribution of 450 beehives and other beekeeping equipment to local honey keepers. Trained on modern techniques local beekeepers have been able to increase production of honey as well as sustainable use of bee colonies.</li> <li>▪ Organized group of 48 vegetable farmers have been taking advantage of improved farm management as well as better opportunity for marketing of the produce.</li> <li>▪ 92 poor families received improved breed of goats resulting in increased incomes and nutritional levels of the households.</li> </ul>
RRP 06 in Upper Nile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The agriculture activities implemented by RRP contributed to improve the food security situation of the beneficiary households in target areas of the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More food is now available for household consumption and for marketing.</li> <li>- The amount of fertile land available for farming was expanded, due to the treadle pumps, opening new possibilities to previously confined farmers.</li> <li>- The benefited farmers gained more capacities related to seasonal cultivation methods, profit management and saving, equipment maintenance, use of pesticides.</li> <li>- The treadle pumps and vegetable seeds distributed to farmers enabled them to start dry season vegetable cultivation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Veterinary services are now available in the target areas improving livestock productivity.</li> <li>▪ Farmers and CBOs received financial support to establish Income Generating Activities (IGAs): 350 people, from seven CBOs and an association, received start-up capital; 17 new IGAs, benefiting 101 persons, were established resulting in increased incomes.</li> <li>▪ Access to credit and economic activity was facilitated with the establishment of 25 MLS groups (225 people).</li> </ul>



**RRP 07 in  
Central  
Equatoria**

- Nutrition and income of the targeted communities improved due to the increase in the level and variety of households' vegetable production. Inputs and trainings provided to the farmers and households also contributed to increased awareness in the communities about food security.
- RRP honey harvesting training programme and distributed equipment resulted in easier and increased production, improved quality of the product and increased income.
- Introduction of savings and the access to credit for market enterprise groups in the target areas coupled with the business skills training and micro credit schemes helped traders expand and consolidate their businesses.
- Vocational training enabled beneficiaries to engage in alternative livelihood and income generating activities.

***Honey harvesting in Central Equatoria*****RRP 08 in  
Eastern  
Equatoria**

- Level of production and household consumption has increased as a result of new crops introduction, distribution of tools and seeds.
- Small businesses have been established as a result of formation and training of 42 SILC improving livelihoods of the recipients.
- Number of vocational trainings beneficiaries gained new skills allowing them to fill the gap of lack of formal education, through practical training in literacy, carpentry and tailoring, and contribute to improved income generation.

**RRP 09 in  
Warrap**

- Agricultural production and consequently food security situation has improved as a result of the training of farmers on ox-plough cultivation, provision of certified seeds and community sensitization on diversifying agricultural activities. Introduction of improved technologies increased cultivation areas and livestock management
- Animal health has improved in the target area due to the vaccination campaigns and treatment of animals promoted by the project. Privatization of animal health care was introduced laying foundation for improved and efficient delivery of veterinary services.
- Quality of meat and its marketing has improved, with the establishment of basic animal health and market infrastructure.
- Farming business activities have been enhanced by access to market as a result of roads rehabilitation linking the farms to main regional markets. Introduction of donkey-carts significantly improved transportation of products from farms to the local markets.
- Formation and strengthening of traders associations (marketing committees) allowed more stability in the prices of farmers' products and improved protection of farmers from exploitation.

**RRP 10 in  
Northern  
Bahr el  
Ghazal**

- Livelihood activities implemented by the project contributed to increase resilience among households in the project area.
- Women groups enhanced their ability to produce food for domestic consumption improving their households' food security situation and nutrition through received support with seeds and tools as well as trainings. Sale of vegetables provided additional income to the beneficiary families.

- Individual and group farmers increased their knowledge and expertise in agricultural practices through trainings received from agricultural extension workers. Capacities of the community as a whole has been enhanced by trained extension workers training other individual and group farmers in the target locations elsewhere.
- Availability of cheaper fish in the local markets has increased as a result of the fishing equipment distributed to local fishermen. Local fishermen have increased their catch due to the improved fishing gear and equipment.
- The rehabilitation of roads has improved access to markets, contributing to improve supply of food and non-food items to the communities.
- Vocational training given to women has contributed to enhance their ability to conduct simple business activities, increase their incomes and alleviate vulnerability.

### III.III Improved provision of basic services

#### Education

In most RRP target locations access to education was severely limited and thus received one of the highest priorities by the communities and LGAs. RRP responded to this challenge by constructing or rehabilitating over 35 primary schools with a total of around 300 newly built classrooms and teachers' offices. Most of these schools were provided with furniture and some school equipment as well as teaching materials. Improved learning conditions increased enrolment especially among female students. In some areas school enrolment increased by over 100% which demonstrates the great need for such facilities and the number of children that would not have had the opportunity to go to school should these facilities have not been made available. In addition teacher training centres were supported which helped with developing and maintaining teaching standards. Local schools invested efforts in retaining teaching staff by building guesthouses for teachers which encouraged teachers to stay in remote schools for longer periods.



**RRP supported school in Port Sudan**

#### Health

Lack of health care facilities was one of the common features of the RRP target areas. The situation has however seen significant improvement as a result of RRP interventions. During the RRP implementation period over 80 facilities were constructed/rehabilitated providing health care to thousands of patients on a monthly basis. These facilities include health centers, primary health care units, clinics and basic health units. Both the newly built as well as existing health care facilities were

supported through provision of lab and other medical equipment, drug revolving funds, cold chains, solar powered fridges, vaccine and other supplies and equipment that led to improved quality of health care services.

Local health departments received support in the form of vaccination for over 35,000 children. Community health awareness campaigns managed to deliver important health messages (STI, HIV and AIDS, malaria, mother care, nutrition etc.) to various groups of populations and trained outreach campaigners continue with this task. Close to a hundred thousand people increased their awareness of various health issues from the mass health campaigns and on-the-spot consultations.

Health interventions carried out by RRP have given the community much better access to health care closer to home. Case studies and interviews have shown that the facilities constructed by RRP are providing regular health care to their communities. 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.

### **Water and Sanitation**

RRP within its scope addressed the enormous challenge of water supply for the targeted communities. Thousands of residents gained access to 196 new water points. Local water supply capacities were also boosted by repair of over 230 existing water points increasing availability of clean water for human and livestock consumption. Tens of thousands people benefitted from construction and rehabilitation of hafirs and water catchment structures. About 26 water reservoirs and wells were rehabilitated and three hafirs built, dramatically increasing the availability of clean water. The hafirs built by the RRP in Southern Kordofan for example have the capacity of storing 40 thousand cubic meter of water benefiting tens of thousands of residents. Water supply has also been increased via rehabilitation and repair of established water networks and 208 water sources. Availability of clean drinking water has reduced the incidence of water borne diseases as corroborated by case studies and 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. Promotion campaigns also reached schoolchildren thus creating hygiene and sanitation awareness from an early age. In parallel to the awareness campaigns garbage disposal pits were created. Target area communities and local authorities built 1,462 community latrines, 432 latrines were built at schools and health centres and 626 built in public areas. As a result of these interventions hygiene and sanitation in the targeted communities has improved.

<b>RRP</b>	<b>Key Results: Improved provision of basic services to target communities</b>
<b>RRP 01 in Blue Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction and equipping of five health centers greatly improved access to curative and preventive medical services in remote areas, and contributed to decreasing the prevalence of common diseases and in the mortality rates (especially children under five years old).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 48,000 persons benefited from good diagnosis and treatment;</li> <li>- 2,220 mothers benefited from deliveries assisted by RRP trained midwives in their villages;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

RRP	Key Results: Improved provision of basic services to target communities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 45,500 persons received free malaria medicines, and the malaria incidence rate was reduced from 25% (in 2006) to 18% (in 2009), according to the Consortium data; and</li> <li>- 64,000 children under five years old were immunized against Polio disease.</li> <li>▪ The school facilities constructed by the project (through a cost-effective brick making method), together with the training provided to schools and headmasters, have contributed to improve the learning environment and increase the enrolment of students (especially girls). By the end of the project, there were additional 400 basic education students and 99 teachers.</li> <li>▪ Rehabilitation of the Geissan teachers training institute, handed over to the educational authorities, will provide technical support to more than 1,000 teachers in the area.</li> <li>▪ The construction and rehabilitation activities implemented increased the access to clean drinking water (at least 15lt/day/person within 1km distance) to 41,000 persons (28,500 as direct beneficiaries and 12,500 as indirect beneficiaries). Increased water availability improved the economic and social situation of women in the project area, as they now have more time to dedicate to other productive activities.</li> <li>▪ Access to sanitation services has increased, and there is a reduction in the prevalence of waterborne diseases among 15,000 people, with the construction of household and institutional latrines and garbage collection centers, and with public health and hygiene education provided to the communities in the project area.</li> </ul>
RRP 02 in Abyei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Primary Health Care Units (PHCUs) constructed by the project are serving an average of 400 patients per month each with primary health care services.</li> <li>▪ Three schools constructed by the project are serving an approximate total of 3,000 students.</li> <li>▪ Water related construction and rehabilitation activities implemented by the project increased access to clean water for 35,000 people in several villages.</li> </ul>
RRP 03 in Red Sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project interventions resulted in a number of improvements in health care; availability of mother and child health care; improved availability of medicines; increased child vaccination; enhanced awareness on health issues and reduced costs of accessing medical services.</li> <li>▪ RRP enhanced the learning conditions through construction of facilities and provision of equipment, which has increased students enrollment (including girls).</li> <li>▪ Water related construction and rehabilitation activities implemented by the project increased the access to clean drinking water for more than 9,000 rural people alleviating the burden on women who used to travel long distances to fetch water. Increased access to water has also improved hygiene practices.</li> </ul>
RRP 04 River Nile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction/rehabilitation and equipping of 11 health centers contributed in improving the access to primary health services of 83,500 persons in the target areas. In particular, it contributed to reducing incidence of malaria and other endemic diseases, and mortality of pregnant women. Improved access to health services reduced health related expenses for the communities.</li> <li>▪ Project activities resulted in the improvement of the school infrastructure (construction/rehabilitation of 11 primary schools) and consequently, the education environment leading to increased enrollment (3.4% increases in Berber locality).</li> <li>▪ Rehabilitation of two teachers training institutes benefits 1,992 teachers.</li> <li>▪ Water systems infrastructure established by RRP contributed to access to clean water for around 15,000 people. Women now have more time and energy to dedicate to other productive activities, as the walking distance to water points has decreased. Water available for drinking, household gardening, laundry and bathing has increased. New water supply systems are more cost effective compared with the previous arrangements enabling the communities to save money otherwise spent on</li> </ul>

RRP	Key Results: Improved provision of basic services to target communities
<b>RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan</b>	<p>water supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction of latrines coupled with awareness raising campaigns on sanitation contributed to the improvement of the sanitation and environmental conditions in the target areas.</li> <li>▪ Construction/rehabilitation of four health units gave access to primary health care services for a total of 25,220 people. Immunization services were provided to 1,156 children and 769 women.</li> <li>▪ Construction and equipping of new primary schools in the target areas allowed 2,000 children access to improved educational facilities.</li> <li>▪ 22 boreholes were constructed, ensuring access to clean water for 11,000 people. In addition the project built two water reservoirs (hafirs) with the total storage capacity of 80,000 cubic meters, providing 18,354 people with year-round access to drinking water reducing the burden on women and leading to a reduction in conflict over scarce water.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RRP improved access and quality of primary education in the target areas, through construction of facilities and through targeted support interventions.</li> <li>▪ Water infrastructure construction activities implemented by the project increased access to clean drinking water for 2,625 people. Additionally, introduction of water biosand filters in households contributed to reduction in incidence of waterborne diseases.</li> <li>▪ Construction of latrines contributed to the improvement of sanitation and environmental conditions in the target areas, for 851 households and 14 institutions.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access to health services increased (less distance to the health centers) with the construction/rehabilitation and equipping of 35 health facilities. This contributed to a general decrease in the incidence of major health problems such as maternal and child mortality, malnutrition, tuberculosis (TB), diarrhea, and Sexually Transmitted Infection (STIs), in the project area.</li> <li>▪ Knowledge of communities on malaria prevention and treatment, HIV/AIDS has increased among the communities.</li> <li>▪ Access to safe drinking water by target communities has increased with the construction/rehabilitation of water system infrastructure. More water is now available and communities are better aware about water quality practices.</li> <li>▪ Hygiene and sanitation practices in the target communities have improved, as a result of the sanitation facilities and awareness campaigns.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access to health services increased (less distance to the health centers) with the construction/rehabilitation and equipping of three health facilities in remote areas, and contributed to decrease in mortality in the region.</li> </ul> <p>In particular, by the end of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 120,459 Outpatient Department (OPD) consultations were conducted;</li> <li>- 3,416 pregnant women attended Antenatal Care (ANC) services;</li> <li>- 4,111 children under one year old received Diphtheria, Pertussis and Tetanus (DPT3) immunization; and</li> <li>- 8,585 Rapid Diagnostic Tests (RDTs) were conducted.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction/rehabilitation of school facilities contributed to improvement in the learning environment in the target area and to increase in school enrollment (e.g. in one of the schools, there was a 107% increase).</li> <li>▪ The construction and rehabilitation of water systems and the provision of materials increased the access to clean water in the target communities for a total of 4,354 people.</li> </ul>

RRP	Key Results: Improved provision of basic services to target communities
RRP 09 in Warrap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access of the population in the target areas to primary and reproductive health services improved, through construction and equipping of health facilities, the support to LGAs in staffing of the facilities, and the introduction of mobile clinic services to remote areas of the County. The incidence of diseases (like polio, malaria, measles, whooping cough, waterborne diseases) has reduced, and mother and child mortality rates decreased. In particular, by the end of the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 94,033 patients had been examined and treated in primary health care facilities;</li> <li>- 9,967 expectant women attended ANC services in Gogrial East County (GEC) with 14,314 patients attended to by CHWs and TBAs;</li> <li>- 7,971 children under the age of five were immunized during the project period; and</li> <li>- 3,652 pregnant women were vaccinated against tetanus.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Construction of primary schools contributed to improve the learning environment and prompted increase of the student's enrollment in the target areas.</li> <li>▪ Access of the population in the target areas to safe water has increased (less distance), with the water infrastructure activities implemented by the project (borehole drilling, hand pumps and water towers establishment).</li> <li>▪ Sanitation and hygiene were improved in the target area with the construction of latrines and the awareness promotion activities implemented by the project.</li> </ul>
RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The activities implemented in basic services sector have increased access to health services in highly needed locations. The PHCC established by the project is the only health facility available in an area comprising three Payams with an estimated population of 100,000 people, and has attracted the support of health authorities.</li> <li>▪ Construction of primary schools has contributed to improve the learning environment in the target areas.</li> <li>▪ Water facilities constructed by the project have increased access of the target communities to clean water, reducing the distance by 50% to access water for a total of 78,567 persons.</li> <li>▪ Construction of latrines and garbage disposal pits as well as awareness campaigns on hygiene and sanitation contributed to improved human waste management and the sanitation conditions, and reduction of waterborne diseases.</li> </ul>

### III.IV Results in other programmatic areas

Some RRP projects implemented activities responding to the specific needs of their context namely, peace building, mine risk education/clearance, and environment. The main results achieved in these sectors are indicated in the following table.

RRP	Key Results
RRP 01 in Blue Nile	<p><b><i>Mine Clearance and Advisory Service</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Mine Risk Education (MRE) sessions reached a significant number of beneficiaries (45,395), contributing to increased awareness in the intervention area about the risks and corrective measures related to mines and Unexploded Ordnance (UXO), and to reduce civilian casualties.</li> <li>▪ Mine Risk assessments made in the project area found no evidence of mines/UXO contamination.</li> <li>▪ The Mine Action teams contributed positively to the creation of a safer</li> </ul>

RRP	Key Results
	environment, by clearing minefields and removing grenades and rockets from an area of 8,509 square meters outside Kurmuk town (which was outside the project sites).
RRP 03 in Red Sea	<p><b>Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Alternative environmental practices were promoted in communities, to reduce pressure on environmental resources, with the distribution of gas cookers and cylinders to 370 households.</li> <li>▪ Several environmental awareness activities were implemented, and reached 4,250 people in the project area. Tribal elites, religious leaders, teachers and pupils (at higher grades) were particularly focused on as agents for change.</li> </ul>
RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan	<p><b>Humanitarian Mine Action</b></p> <p>The Mine Risk Education reached about 35,868 persons of different group (IDPs, nomads, etc) informing and educating the targeted audience about the dangerous areas and required behavioral changes. The project has also managed to clear 4,872 sq meters of land from mine and UXOs.</p>
RRP 07 in Central Equatoria	<p><b>Peace building</b></p> <p>The peace building activities implemented by the project increased the level of awareness of the communities about the CPA, and contributed in building capacities of communities to solve problems between each other in peaceful ways, mainly through the awareness/training campaigns, the formation of Inter-Church Committees (ICCs) and the training of local leaders as peace facilitators (combined with Government peace messages on the radio).</p>
RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria	<p><b>Mine Risk Education</b></p> <p>Target communities increased their knowledge and awareness on MRE related issues. A total of 17,991 people were reached with MRE awareness campaigns by the project.</p> <p><b>Peace building</b></p> <p>Members of the target communities increased their level of awareness on peace building, human rights and gender issues. Also, the project area has connected communities with 46 kms of rehabilitated road and four Irish bridges (three rehabilitated and a new).</p>
RRP 09 in Warrap	<p><b>Peace building</b></p> <p>The integration of peace and reconciliation measures between clans contributed to stabilize the security situation in the project area, based on the involvement of traditional leaders.</p>

#### IV. CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RRP

The NGO consortia faced several challenges during the RRP projects implementation. The most common challenges were the following:

- In general, there was a weak presence of LGAs in the project areas, especially in the South. The RRP projects faced an absence of technical personnel at LGA level to support some of the project activities due, on the one hand, to the difficulty to find qualified staff and, on the other hand, to the high staff turnover in the Local Government structures. This turnover is motivated mainly by irregular and uncompetitive salaries paid by the government and the difficult living conditions in remote, inaccessible and insecure areas.
- In some of the RRP target areas, the further division of the target localities and counties during the project implementation period stretched the RRP resources as additional LGAs had to be supported compared with the original plan.
- There was a shortage of staff to run the health and education facilities supported by the projects in remote areas. Difficult living conditions including inadequate accommodation, together with inconsistent payment of salaries by the government are the main causes of staff shortages.
- Consortia agencies also experienced high staff turnover. The difficult living conditions of the project areas were the main cause, which affected smooth implementation process and led to loss of institutional memory.
- Relief mentality of stakeholders, especially the beneficiaries, limited the community contributions that were expected by the projects, especially for construction activities.
- Wide geographical coverage for some of the projects and tough road conditions (especially during rainy season) affected movement, implementation and monitoring of activities.
- Insecurity in some of the RRP project areas such as the fighting in Abyei, and Southern Kordofan, tribal conflict in Warrap and LRA activities in Torit caused delays and, in some cases, the temporary suspension of activities.
- De-registration of several Consortia agencies and the subsequent confiscation of project assets and records severely affected implementation.
- Considering the lengthy rainy seasons which affected accessibility in many of the project areas the original RRP timeframe was overly optimistic.
- Increase in costs of material and transportation along with logistical constraints such as delays in approval of tax exemptions, difficulties in obtaining internal travel permits and entry visas for Consortia staff, lack of sufficient vehicles and frequent vehicle breakdown posed obstacles to the timely and effective project implementation.

Project specific challenges are given in the table below.

RRP	Main challenges
RRP01 in Blue Nile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limited coordination between LGAs and State line Ministries, resulted in haphazard support and advice to the local community development efforts.</li> <li>▪ Limited presence of Government authorities at lower administrative levels affected the support available locally.</li> <li>▪ Frequent LGA staff turnover meant loss of institutional memory and greater demands on time as institutional relationships had to be established again with the new personnel.</li> </ul>



**RRP 02  
in Abyei**

- Shortage of health personnel to run the health units in the remote project areas affected service provision.
- Limited community contribution in the activities due to the poor economic condition of the people resulting from the conflict.
- Absence of qualified technical personnel at local level to support small scale irrigation projects to provide technical advice at the early establishment stage.
- High NGO staff turnover due to competition from the private sector and other employers impacted retention of competent staff and continuity.
- Delays in the approval from the government authorities in relation to tax exemption for purchase and registration of vehicles delayed programme implementation in the early stages.
- Difficulty in finding qualified service providers at local level affected quality and costs.
- Dual education system being followed in Geissan and Kurmuk posed difficulties in supporting the schools.
- High cost of materials transported to the project sites increased project costs.

- Outbreak of hostilities in May 2008 had significant consequences on activities already implemented (committees disintegrated, coordination with authorities disrupted, tree nurseries burned, schools vandalized and closed, displacement of beneficiaries). The consortium office and assets were looted.
- 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 RRP resources.
- In most cases the salaries of 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 RRP's 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.

**RRP 03  
in Red  
Sea**

- High staff turnover in the lead agency of the Consortium affected overall coordination and management.
- Time spent by the Consortium to adapt to this implementation model and to agree on reporting formats delayed implementation.
- The original two localities of intervention were divided into five, with the subsequent shuffling of technical and senior LGA staff with whom the RRP project had initiated the planning process, creating additional burden on the project to reorient the new LGA staff on its objectives and approaches, and revisit its old plans.
- Lack of technical expertise in the LGAs to provide technical support, causing additional costs and delays to the project implementation with the use of technicians from State line Ministries or subcontractors.
- Some logistical constraints affected the project implementation and the timely access to communities, such as difficulties in obtaining internal travel permits for national staff and entry visas for expatriate staff (which, for instance, left the RRP without a Project Coordinator for a year).
- During the implementation phase, other agencies were implementing relief activities, which was in contradiction with the RRP approach of community participation and contribution.
- De-registration of the lead agency (IRC) and the confiscation of the project assets by the authorities in March 2009 had serious implications for the project implementation.

RRP	Main challenges
<b>RRP 04 in River Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Low salaries limited the opportunities to recruit qualified personnel to work on the RRP.</li> <li>▪ Changes in the government senior level officials created discontinuity and affected the coordination with LGAs.</li> <li>▪ Lack of timely financial commitment from the LGAs delayed implementation of activities.</li> <li>▪ The relief mentality was still prevalent among stakeholders which made the delivery of RRP's recovery message more challenging.</li> <li>▪ The Consortium did not have enough vehicles to cover the widespread project area.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ De-registration of the lead agency and suspension of project activities for almost a year had serious effects on the project implementation.</li> <li>▪ Shortage of qualified staff for schools and health centers reduced the optimal utilization of facilities.</li> <li>▪ Government extension services did not cover all the project areas.</li> <li>▪ Lack of underground water in some clusters, meant that alternative more expensive solutions were required.</li> <li>▪ Existence of two parallel school curricula and two health systems in the project area in Kadugli and Kauwda.</li> <li>▪ High cost of construction materials made it impossible to build some structures in the facilities (like kitchens and stores).</li> <li>▪ High rate of illiteracy among beneficiaries, hindered proper record keeping of micro credit projects.</li> <li>▪ Outbreak of armed conflict in June 2011 impacted the structures and capacities established by the project. Additionally project assets were looted and an orderly closure of the project could not be carried out.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LGAs in the project area were constantly in a state of transition, posing challenges to project coordination and implementation.</li> <li>▪ Timely and efficient implementation of the project was affected by delays in obtaining entry visas and internal travel permits from the government; limited qualified staff willing to relocate to the project locations from State and County capitals.</li> <li>▪ Increased tensions along the north-south boundary in 2009 caused delays in the delivery of project materials and increased commodity prices.</li> <li>▪ Closure of Mercy Corps office in Khartoum in 2009, expulsion of its staff and the confiscation of its records caused delay in the project implementation (loss of orders for project materials, difficulties in fund transfers to the project).</li> <li>▪ Bad road conditions and long distances between project sites made effective monitoring of activities difficult.</li> <li>▪ Rise in the cost of construction materials; scarcity of skilled labor and high cost of equipment maintenance put a strain on project resources.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lack of support from LGAs, especially at Payam level administration, due to their absence from the duty station affected coordination and ownership.</li> <li>▪ Security situation in the project site was unstable during the first two years adversely impacting implementation.</li> <li>▪ Active involvement of LGA in project implementation was affected by the erratic payment of government salaries.</li> <li>▪ Difficulties in retaining staff (LGAs and project health/education facilities) in the project sites, due to difficult living conditions curtailed effective service delivery.</li> <li>▪ Poor road conditions (especially during rainy season) hampered accessibility to project sites and delayed the implementation.</li> <li>▪ Community participation and contribution was limited due to the relief mentality of the stakeholders resulting in increased construction costs.</li> </ul>

RRP	Main challenges
RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Poor presence of local government in the project areas (difficult living conditions, high staff turnover in County structures, erratic salary payments of health, education and agriculture staff) affected delivery of services.</li> <li>▪ Insecurity in the target areas limited access to the project sites and caused temporary suspension of activities.</li> <li>▪ Wide geographical coverage of the project and bad road conditions (especially during rainy season) disrupted movements and caused delays in the project implementation. Moreover it caused frequent vehicle breakdown and limited effective and regular monitoring and follow-up of activities.</li> </ul>
RRP 09 in Warrap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Weak capacity of staff in County structures affected the service delivery.</li> <li>▪ Abandoning of duty stations by health and education staff due to lack of clarity regarding enrollment and payment of LGA officials impacted basic services.</li> <li>▪ Frequent consultations at state level led to prolonged absences of key LGA staff including the Commissioner, hampering the capacity building efforts.</li> <li>▪ Clashes between tribes and cattle raids delayed project implementation and caused additional costs. Insecurity in the project area caused relocation and evacuation of staff and the suspension of activities on several occasions.</li> <li>▪ Increase in the costs of construction materials, transportation and casual labor reduced scale of planned construction.</li> <li>▪ Insecurity and bad road conditions hampered close supervision of activities.</li> <li>▪ High staff turnover in the Consortium and insufficient communication and coordination between the partners affected financial reporting.</li> <li>▪ High turn over of RRP staff in critical positions adversely affected project implementation.</li> <li>▪ Bad road conditions caused frequent vehicles breakdown and logistical constraints.</li> </ul>
RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High staff turnover of LGA staff due to difficult living conditions and irregular salary payments affected the project's level of engagement with the LGAs.</li> <li>▪ Difficult access to the project areas especially during the rainy season.</li> </ul>

## V. SUSTAINABILITY OF THE RRP

Sustainability of RRP 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 LGAs and community, exit strategies were developed with 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.

In a number of projects after successful advocacy efforts the Government authorities deployed staff and included staff on the payroll ensuring provision of services in schools and health centres. Community structures and committees established and trained by RRP are playing a vital role in ensuring the sustainability of interventions through oversight and cost recovery mechanisms. Water management committees and PTAs are notable examples.

The sustainability of the RRP's faced several important challenges. The key challenges were limited Government capacity to take over the facilities and services

established by the project particularly in South Sudan; the prevalence of community dependency on outside assistance; and insecurity in project areas.

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

RRP	Activities/Approaches, Achievements and Challenges
RRP 01 in Blue Nile	<p><b>Activities/Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community participation in the implementation of activities was promoted.</li> <li>▪ 12 members from LGAs and four from the national associate BNDO were seconded to provide technical support to the project and participated in the implementation of its activities, in order to provide technical expertise after the end of the project.</li> <li>▪ An exit strategy was presented in a workshop in July 2009, with the participation of different stakeholders of the project.</li> <li>▪ The establishment and capacity building of VDCs at grassroots level had as main purpose the sustainability of the project.</li> <li>▪ LGAs participated in the planning of ABEAS 3.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The State authorities are expected to continue supporting the health and education services strengthened by the project.</li> <li>▪ The target communities have a long tradition for water management committees, and the ones supported by the project are likely to continue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The VHCs need further supervision from the health authorities, in order to achieve better performance.</li> </ul>
RRP 02 in Abyei	<p><b>Activities/Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regular coordination was established with the AAA and the SSRRC (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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Abyei administration has been able to reduce staff turnover and even employed more staff. The current Chief Administrator has brought in strong skills in good governance, as can be 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 has been more government leadership into this RRP project than any other programme in Abyei.</li> <li>▪ The Boma administrators trained are now able to tell if their communities are adequately engaged in leading their own development process or not.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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 own internal regulations.</li> <li>▪ The graduation of the 20 students from nursing college reduced the dependence on</li> </ul>

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.

**Activities/Approaches:**

- VDCs/ADCs were established or reformed, and provided with training.
- The health and education facilities were established as a part of the LGAs' plans, which guarantees the coverage of its operational costs.
- Farmers were linked up with other ongoing projects in the area, such as the farmers' field schools of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

**Achievements:**

- LGAs are covering the salaries of the education and health facilities' staff, and confirmed that the provision of supplies and maintenance of these facilities are already integrated in their plans.
- The repayment rate of the poverty funds for women implemented by PASSED has been 96-100%. These women have two registered associations directly linked to the banking system and to PASSED's credit sub-offices in Port Sudan.
- Farmers' groups established group marketing arrangements and are contributing to cost operations from vegetables sales.
- The skills training for income generation activities continued to be practiced by women after the end of the project.

**Challenges:**

- Dependency of the communities on government and donors budgetary support, for instance, regarding water supply.
- Confiscation of the project's assets by the authorities in Port Sudan.
- Fluctuation in rainfall.
- Natural calamities and outbreaks (need to train LGAs and VDCs on early warning systems).

**Activities/Approaches:**

- A workshop about the exit strategy was held with the participation of government and communities.
- The financing, training, and the activities were built on the principle of being local-based, to increase the likelihood of sustainability.

RRP 05 in  
Southern  
Kordofan**Achievements:**

- The VDCs continued to function after the end of the project, due to their satisfaction with the project's activities.
- The women associations have continued to develop activities after the end of the project (such as literacy classes, health awareness sessions, and waste collection campaigns).
- The basic services facilities (education, health) were handed over to the local administration and the salaries of these facilities' personnel are covered by the Government.
- PTAs continued the improvement of schools through community contribution (ex. construction of latrines).
- The health facilities fees charged for medical examination and medicines, which ensures the sustainability of the services.
- The VWCs manage a user fee for the water supply systems to cover the operation and maintenance costs, which guarantees the sustainability of this service.

**Challenges:**

- The goat restocking activities are likely to have short-term sustainability.

**Activities/Approaches:**

- Line ministries were engaged in order to ensure continuity and sustainability of the RRP activities especially with respect to basic services outputs. This would ensure that ownership of the project outputs by the government in addition to the community members through the established structures such as PTAs, Water Management Committees and Health management Committees along with the Village Development Committees.

**Achievements:**

Line ministries were involved in implementation of activities:

- Ministry of Agriculture have been supporting and following up on activities like tillage services, beekeeping and support to vegetable producer groups;
- Ministry of Health has made considerable efforts to make sure the clinics built by the RRP are adequately staffed and supported; and
- Ministry of Education was lobbied to assist with staffing the newly constructed schools. Involvement of the Ministry helped in serious deliberations on the issues of retaining teaching staff.

**Challenges:**

Break out of the conflict in the area affected many of the project's achievements. Population movement led to collapse of the communities based organizations, the conflict caused damage to the physical assets created by the project; gains made in the livelihoods sectors have been eroded.

RRP 06 in  
Upper Nile**Activities/Approaches:**

- Establishment / strengthening of institutions/groups to oversee the activities initiated by the project.
- Privatization (support to individuals and groups to run projects on a commercial basis, to ensure sustainability).
- Creation of strategic alliances (linking local organizations and government departments to other stakeholders).
- Community participation and ownership (this project emanated from PRAs at the community level which identified and prioritized the interventions).
- The Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) will continue to support livelihood activities in the project area.

**Achievements:**

- Farmer groups in Renk have continued to develop their activities after the end of the

RRP	Activities/Approaches, Achievements and Challenges
RRP 07 in Central Equatoria	<p>project, without external support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water and school committees continue to develop its work, particularly where the government authorities are paying the salaries of the basic services facilities' staff.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The capacity building interventions are still dependant on the presence of international organizations.</li> <li>▪ Reluctance of government institutions to maintain structures not perceived as important (like the hygiene promotion clubs).</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities/Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promotion of community participation in the project planning and implementation.</li> <li>▪ ZOA continued to provide technical guidance to the County Health Department after the end of the project.</li> <li>▪ The FSTP programme will continue to support livelihood activities in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The health staff was successfully included in the government's pay roll in some Payams.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The integration of agriculture staff from the government institutions was not achieved.</li> <li>▪ Absence of a functioning local government affected by budget cuts, which was insufficiently engaged in the project implementation.</li> <li>▪ Dependency attitude and mentality from the project beneficiaries.</li> <li>▪ Capacity building activities depend on the continuation of the Consortium agencies support.</li> <li>▪ Communities rely more on the Consortium agencies than on the government to maintain the infrastructure built by the project.</li> </ul>
RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria	<p><b>Activities/Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Advocacy to MoH, SMOA and SMOEST for the payment of salaries of health staff, agriculture extension agents and life skills centers.</li> <li>▪ Training and empowerment of SMCs and PTAs in the running of schools.</li> <li>▪ Merlin has continued to provide support to the health facilities after the end of the project.</li> <li>▪ The FSTP programme will continue to support livelihood activities in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water systems established by the project with low maintenance costs are likely to be maintained by the communities and respective VWC.</li> <li>▪ The teachers of the schools supported by the project were included in the pay roll of the MoE.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Insufficient government support at line Ministries level (inability, lack of commitment) to the activities implemented by the project, namely the payment of salaries of health staff and vocational trainers.</li> <li>▪ Dependency of the communities from the Consortium agencies to maintain infrastructure, and relief mentality of the beneficiaries.</li> <li>▪ High needs in the sector of food security in the target communities.</li> <li>▪ Difficulties in the recruitment and retaining of staff for the basic services facilities.</li> </ul>
RRP 09 in Warrap	<p><b>Activities/Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LGAs capacity building and involvement of communities in the project implementation.</li> <li>▪ Intensive consultations with LGAs on the exit strategy and the handover.</li> </ul>

RRP	Activities/Approaches, Achievements and Challenges
RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Privatization and cost sharing schemes promoted during the project implementation (for instance, the privatization of the veterinary sector, and application of fees for water and health services).</li> <li>▪ The PARIS/FSTP programme will continue to support livelihood and LGA support activities in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The project collected some fees for veterinary services.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The sustainability of the project and the County Development Plan depends on the controlled financial resources for the LGAs from the State budget.</li> <li>▪ Lack of structures to ensure the continuation of technical/management training of LGAs and community committees.</li> <li>▪ Lack of government support and insecurity made participation of LGAs and communities in the project implementation difficult.</li> <li>▪ Low capacities of the communities (in terms of management capacity and financial means) to sustain cost sharing schemes for basic services</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities/Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Involvement of LGAs in the project planning and implementation, including in the selection of contractors.</li> <li>▪ Monthly Steering Committee meetings.</li> <li>▪ Facilitation of the drafting of strategic development plans for LGAs was included in the exit strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In some cases, the Counties and LGAs provided complementary funding for the construction of schools and health facilities, which increases the probability of sustainability of these facilities.</li> <li>▪ The payment of basic services facilities' staff was agreed to be covered by the Government authorities at the end of the project.</li> <li>▪ Institutional strengthening of national associate will impact on its future participation in local community development activities and, eventually, on the local populations.</li> <li>▪ Some cost sharing schemes were successfully implemented (for instance, user fees for the use of a motorboat).</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Low capacity and resources of communities for the maintenance of the basic services facilities.</li> </ul>

## VI. CHANGES INTRODUCED IN THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Following the recommendation of the Mid-Term Review conducted early 2008 the implementation period of the ABEAS 2 was extended up to the end of July 2008 for all consortia.

Additionally, at the time of the initially agreed end of the implementation period, most of the individual RRP's requested further extensions to the implementation periods to complete their respective project implementation. The duration, justification and amounts of the extensions granted by the PRC vary from project to project, and depended on progress and implementation status. The following table provides information about the extensions granted to the RRP projects.



**Table 3. Changes introduced to the project**

RRP	Justification	Objective	Extensions / Amount
<b>RRP 01 in Blue Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Slow implementation of the livelihood activities, as a result of the withdrawal of the Spanish Red Cross (Livelihoods Sector Lead implementing partner) and its national associate (Sudanese Red Crescent) in May 2007.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To implement delayed livelihood activities.</li> <li>▪ To upgrade the capacity of targeted population through the provision of capacities, inputs and awareness rising in the field of agriculture and socio-economic affairs.</li> </ul>	<p>From August 2009 to June 2010</p> <p>Amount: € 300,000</p>
<b>RRP 02 in Abyei</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Insecurity resulting from the conflicts and de-registration of NGOs did not allow the Consortium to implement all the planned activities in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To implement delayed and incomplete activities and ensure proper project closure.</li> </ul>	<p>From August 2009 to October 2010</p>
<b>RRP 03 in Red Sea</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In March 2009 the lead agency (International Rescue Committee) was expelled by the government and the project activities were suspended.</li> <li>▪ The implementation of activities was completed later than expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compensate the delays caused by the departure of the lead agency.</li> <li>▪ To enable smooth closure and handover of project outputs.</li> </ul>	<p>From August to November 2009</p> <p>Amount: € 225,000</p>
<b>RRP 04 in River Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction of the Merwe Dam, affected four targeted villages and delayed the implementation of activities. Therefore, there was a strong need to extend the project benefits to those villages which were selected at the early planning phase of the project.</li> <li>▪ Additional activities and funds were needed to ensure sustainability of activities initiated by the project and to build the strength of community and government institutions at the local level.</li> <li>▪ To further strengthen the livelihood activities.</li> <li>▪ Delays in the implementation of closure activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To complete planned activities in an orderly manner, and to ensure proper and smooth handover of the project outputs and long term sustainability (focus on capacity building).</li> <li>▪ To ensure sustainability of the project's activities and strengthen community and government institutions at local level (focus on capacity building and livelihoods).</li> <li>▪ Implement the project activities and closure activities (final audit and evaluation).</li> </ul>	<p>From August 2009 to October 2010</p> <p>Amount: € 90,000</p>
<b>RRP 05 in South Kordofan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Scale up of the water and livelihoods activities as per the recommendation of the MTR. Additional activities were also planned in capacity building and basic services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extension was requested to complete the activities planned for ABEAS 4.</li> </ul>	<p>From June 2010 to June 2011</p> <p>Amount: € 1,095,000</p>

RRP	Justification	Objective	Extensions / Amount
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expulsion of the lead agency (Save the children US) in March 2009 caused suspension of all the project activities for one year. Also, the handover to Save the Children Sweden took longer than expected.</li> </ul>		
<b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop Payam administrative structures: support the construction of an administrative LGA office in Maaban</li> <li>In line with the Mid Term Review (MTR) recommendations strengthening livelihoods interventions. Provide producer groups matching grants &amp; farm</li> <li>Improving access to potable water and mitigate water based community conflict and minimize water borne diseases by constructing new water points.</li> <li>Improving access to education by constructing an additional three schools – one in each county.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To complete the implementation of activities and handover responsibilities to the county governments including those identified as per the recommendation of the MTR.</li> </ul>	From August 2009 to January 2010 Amount: € 528,951
<b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening and mainstreaming livelihoods/economic development component across all activities and build on earlier programming successes (for instance in the micro credit provision and honey harvesting).</li> <li>Further strengthening LGAs, sector counterparts and community development committees in preparation for the takeover of activities hence ensuring ownership, and continuity and sustainability of the RRP projects.</li> <li>Support newly created Payams specifically Tijor, a highly undeserved area, and Bungu, which is hosting a very high number of returnees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To complete the proposed additional activities in livelihoods and LGA capacity building as well as orderly handover of the project outputs and assets.</li> </ul>	From August to October 2009 Amount: € 600,000
<b>RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insecurity in the project area affected the implementation and caused delays.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To complete project activities, facilitate proper handover and enhance sustainability.</li> </ul>	From August to December 2009
<b>RRP 09 in Warrap</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insecurity in the project area during seven months in 2008 delayed project implementation (during three months the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To complete activities pending as a result of insecurity in the area and facilitate proper handover to authorities and other</li> </ul>	From August 2009 to June 2010

RRP	Justification	Objective	Extensions / Amount
	<p>had to suspend activities and staff were evacuated three times).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Elections in South Sudan caused the Consortium to scale down its presence in the project area because of security concerns.</li> <li>▪ Delay with the transport of some materials affected construction activities.</li> </ul>	beneficiaries.	Amount: € 250,000
<b>RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Absence of key LGA officials and isolation of the project sites delayed the implementation of the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To consolidate the RRP project gains, entrench the project's outcomes with communities and LGAs and enhance its sustainability.</li> </ul>	From August 2009 to May 2010

## VII. 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 and UNDP. Meetings of the PRC were held on quarterly basis basic 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.

## **Consortia**

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.

## **VIII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS**

Several monitoring and evaluation activities were implemented during the RRP implementation, at several levels, namely, by the EC/Government, UNDP, and the Consortia. These activities included mainly monitoring visits by the different actors involved in the implementation, reporting procedures, Mid-Term and Final evaluations, and Lessons Learned exercises.

### **A) European Commission / Government**

At the EC and Government level, some activities were implemented related to the monitoring and evaluation of the RRP projects.

#### ➤ Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) mission

In March 2007, the EC conducted an independent ROM of the RRP, with the goal of gathering results-oriented information on the projects in the field and reporting on progress in their implementation. The ROM mission concluded that the RRP was extremely relevant as a national programme and, additionally, demonstrating peace dividends at the individual project level. The mission also identified some weaknesses in the design of the RRP and provided recommendations to overcome them.

➤ EC Monitoring Missions

In November, 2008, Ms. Natalia Lazarewicz from EC Brussels visited Blue Nile (RRP01) and Aweil (RRP 10) as part of the EC monitoring mission. Joined by government officials, the trip was arranged by UNDP with the support of each consortium, EC Khartoum and Juba. As follow-up to this mission, in April 2009, Mr. Daniel Gonzalez-Levassor and Ms. Brigitte Grosskinsky conducted a monitoring mission to Eastern Equatoria (RRP 08). A mission report was shared with stakeholders and AMU. The trip was arranged by UNDP with the support of RRP 08.

➤ Mid Term Review (MTR)

In February and March 2008, the independent EC/Government commissioned MTR visited six randomly selected projects equally distributed between the North and South, and conducted a desk review of the remaining four. The mission team presented its preliminary findings to MIC, UNDP management and the AMU, and the EC in Khartoum in March, and final recommendations at workshops with consortia members held in Khartoum and Juba in May. One fundamental recommendation of the MTR was that the final project annual project plans (ABEAS 3) be prepared with the active participation of all stakeholders. To this end, ABEAS 2 was extended to 31 July 2008 for all projects. On the programmatic front, while praising the performance of the programme in the area of basic services, the MTR highlighted the need to work more closely with LGAs and a greater emphasis on livelihoods. Main recommendations of the MTR were discussed at a PRC meeting. The AMU worked closely with the consortia to ensure that recommendations of the MTR were taken into consideration and acted upon.

➤ 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, and EC.

➤ Monitoring visits

The UNDP carried out several Monitoring Field Visits (MFVs) to the different RRP projects, and organized joint monitoring visits of the AMU and the EC/Government to the projects, to check the implementation process and progress, provide recommendations and discuss relevant issues with the stakeholders in the project locations. In total, 41 MFVs were conducted between 2007 and 2011.

### ➤ Exchange visits

At RRP consortia meetings, the idea of peer reviews or exchange visits was proposed as a good way to share ideas between projects and expose project staff to new/successful approaches. UNDP encouraged such exchange visits, even outside of the peer reviews that were part of UNDP monitoring missions. In November 2008, an exchange visit to RRP06 (Upper Nile) was arranged and coordinated by UNDP to improve inter-organizational learning between consortia. RRP01 (Blue Nile), RRP 02 (Abyei), RRP05 (South Kordofan) actively participated in the visit, hosted by RRP06 (Upper Nile). The outcomes of the visit were presented at the PRC meeting held in Juba late November 2008. Additionally, individual RRP projects organized exchange visits to each other, such as the RRP 05 and the RRP 01 in 2008 (the consortia visited each other to share lessons learned and discuss successful initiatives and approaches).

### ➤ 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: RRP01 (December 2009); RRP02 (March 2011); RRP03 (January 2010); RRP04 (September 2010); RRP05 (March 2011); RRP07 (March 2010); and RRP09 (February 2010).

- *Joint South Sudan Lessons Learned Workshop*

On the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> May 2010, the UNDP in conjunction with the EUD hosted this workshop, bringing 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 19<sup>th</sup> April 2011 the UNDP hosted this workshop, bringing together representatives from UNDP, EC, and MIC, and key participants 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) Consortia

### ➤ Reporting

Each 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.

### ➤ Internal monitoring mechanisms

The majority of the RRP projects conducted baseline surveys (comprehensive or sector wise) during the first year of the project's implementation, in particular the RRP projects in Blue Nile, Red Sea, River Nile, Southern Kordofan, Upper Nile, Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Warrap and Northern Bahr el Ghazal. Additionally, each Consortium developed its own monitoring mechanisms (monitoring visits, internal monitoring systems), with different levels of effectiveness, and some had dedicated M&E staff members. However, monitoring conducted by the Consortia also had some lacunas (in some cases, more focused on outputs than outcomes, weak or non-existent systems for internal monitoring and evaluation, inappropriate indicators, unreliable baseline information, lack of impact studies). Insecurity, wide coverage of the projects and bad road conditions were the main challenges for effective monitoring.

### ➤ External Final Evaluations

Each RRP project contracted an external evaluation after the end of the respective implementation periods:

<b>RRP/State</b>	<b>Date of Report</b>
<b>Blue Nile</b>	April 2011
<b>Abyei</b>	Cancelled due to security situation in the area
<b>Red Sea</b>	February 2010
<b>River Nile</b>	August 2010
<b>Southern Kordofan</b>	Cancelled due to security situation in the area
<b>Upper Nile</b>	December 2009
<b>Central Equatoria</b>	December 2009
<b>Eastern Equatoria</b>	August 2010
<b>Warrap</b>	April 2010
<b>Northern Bahr el Ghazal</b>	December 2010

## IX. ASSETS HANDOVER

RRP	Major Beneficiaries	Assets Categories	Remarks/justifications
<b>RRP01</b> <b>Blue Nile</b>	Kurmuk Locality Geissan Locality Blue Nile Network (NGO) Islamic Relief Worldwide Save the Children Sweden Sudan Association for Combating Landmines (JASMAR)	Office building (former project office), vehicles, office equipment and furniture Office building (former project office), vehicles, office equipment and furniture Vehicles office equipment and furniture Vehicles office equipment and furniture Vehicles, office equipment Demining and communication equipment, tents	Support to the localities that have been targeted by the RRP and to enable them to continue sustaining the RRP outputs and facilities. The NGOs are expected to make use of the RRP assets while implementing activities in the same geographic and programmatic areas.
<b>RRP02</b> <b>Abyei</b>	Abyei Youth Center ACAD Mercy Corps	Audio video equipment Vehicle, office and communication equipment Vehicle, machinery, office and communication equipment	Considering the prevailing security and political situation it was deemed necessary to hand the assets over to Mercy Corps which is continuing its operation in the area.
<b>RRP03</b> <b>Port Sudan</b>	SOS Sahel Locality Health Administration Arbaat Development Association Suakin Locality Halaib Locality	Vehicles, office equipment Vehicle Vehicle, office equipment Office equipment Office equipment	SOS is continuing its operation in the area. Hand over of the assets to the Local partners will support their capacity to operate more efficiently, including supporting RRP facilities.
<b>RRP04</b> <b>River Nile</b>	Roots Organization for Development Berber Locality LGA, Abuahmad Locality; Abuahmad Locality;	Vehicle and office equipment Office furniture and equipment Guest house items Vehicle and office equipment and furniture	To support the operational capacity of the Local NGO and targeted LGAs.
<b>RRP05</b> <b>South Kordofan</b>			All of the project assets were looted during the armed conflict in Southern Kordofan in June 2011. Four laptops and one drilling rig are remaining under the custody of the implementing partners.
<b>RRP06</b> <b>Upper Nile</b>	LGA Maban Locality LGA Melut Locality LGA Renk Locality ECS	Guest house, vehicle, office equipment and furniture Guest house, office equipment and furniture Vehicles, office equipment and furniture Office furniture and equipment	To support the operational capacity of the Local NGO and targeted LGAs.
<b>RRP07</b> <b>Central Equatoria</b>	Gnji Vocational Training Institute Payam Development Committees Action Africa Help ZOA IPCS Wondruba Farmer Training Center Wondruba Payam Health Department NSCC Sudan Health Association (SUHA)	Vehicles, office equipment and furniture Office equipment Items Vehicle Motorbikes, office and communication equipment Vehicle, motorbike, office equipment, and furniture items Vehicle, motorbike, office equipment, and furniture items Vehicle, motorbikes solar panels, computers etc Office items, Vehicle, office equipment, medical equipment	Local partners have received the assets to help them carry on supporting RRP facilities and initiatives. Assets given to ZOA and IPCS were expected to support the implementation of the new EU funded Food Security program in the South Sudan.
<b>RRP08</b> <b>Eastern Equatoria</b>	Catholic Relief Services AVSI CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF TORIT MERLIN	Vehicle, office equipment Office and communication equipment Vehicle, health equipment and reference material Vehicle, office and medical equipment,	CRS and AVSI were given project assets to support implementation of the new EU funded Food Security program in the South Sudan. MERLIN and DOT have been given the assets to ensure continuous support to the RRP funded facilities and initiatives.
<b>RRP09</b> <b>Warrap State</b>	VSF Gogrial East LGAs	Motor Vehicles, office and communication equipment Office equipment	To boost operational capacity of the LGAs an support VSF in implementation of the new EU funded Food Security program in the South Sudan
<b>RRP10</b> <b>Northern Bahr El Ghazal</b>	County Agriculture and Fisheries Department County Education Department Community Center Health Department CWW CONCERN	Officer equipment, boat, vehicle tractor, office equipment Office equipment Items, motorbikes Office building with some household and office equipment Vehicle Motorcycles Drilling Rig	To support the operational capacity of the LGA. CWW was given some items to use for the new EU funded Food Security program in the South Sudan



## X. OVERALL FINANCIAL SUMMARY

*Table 1* presents the financial status of the Program as of April 25th 2012. The Annex III included in the Addendum IV to the Contribution Specific Agreement is the basis of this report. Addendum IV was signed by the contracting parities in 2010 included allocation of all remaining contingency funds balance to the budget line A (NAO/EU Contributions to the Projects) and B (Indirect Eligible Costs) respectively.

***Table 1.***

**Contribution Specific Agreement for the Sudan Post Conflict Community Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme**  
**Final Financial Report**  
*(in Euros, as of 25 April, 2012)*

Item	Total Budget As per Addendum IV	Year 1 (Budget)	Financial report Y1 (2005)		Year 2 (Budget)	Financial report Y2 (2006)		Year 3 (Budget)	Financial report Y3 (2007)		Year 4 (Budget)	Financial report Y4 (2008)	
			Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)		Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)		Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)		Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)
A <sub>1</sub> NAO/EC Contribution to Projects	47,754,847.52	22,200,000	17,760,000	-	13,320,000	-	13,752,175	8,880,000	15,096,000	7,184,701	-	9,768,000	15,433,719.79
B <sub>1</sub> Indirect Eligible Costs (7% of NAO/EC contribution to projects)	3,343,189.33	1,554,000	1,243,200	1,368,875	932,400	-	-	621,600	1,056,720	-	-	683,760	578,700
<b>Sub - Total</b>	<b>51,098,036.85</b>	<b>23,754,000</b>	<b>19,003,200</b>	<b>1,368,875</b>	<b>14,252,400</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,752,175</b>	<b>9,501,600</b>	<b>16,152,720</b>	<b>7,184,701</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,451,760.00</b>	<b>16,012,419.79</b>
C <sub>1</sub> Contingencies (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total NAO Contribution</b>	<b>51,098,036.85</b>	<b>23,754,000.00</b>	<b>19,003,200.00</b>	<b>1,368,874.85</b>	<b>14,252,400.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,752,175.18</b>	<b>9,501,600.00</b>	<b>16,152,720.00</b>	<b>7,184,701.07</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,451,760.00</b>	<b>16,012,419.79</b>
D <sub>1</sub> UNDP Contribution (2)	4,575,000	768,885	768,885	768,885	604,267	604,267	604,267	624,532	624,532	624,532	739,926.00	739,926.00	739,926.00
<b>Grant Total</b>	<b>55,673,037</b>	<b>24,522,885</b>	<b>19,772,085</b>	<b>2,137,760</b>	<b>14,856,667</b>	<b>604,267</b>	<b>14,356,442</b>	<b>10,126,132</b>	<b>16,777,252</b>	<b>7,809,233</b>	<b>739,926.00</b>	<b>11,191,686.00</b>	<b>16,752,345.79</b>

Item	Year 5 (Budget)	Financial report Y5 (2009)		Year 6 (Budget)	Financial report Y6 (2010)		Year 7 (Budget)	Financial report Y7 (2011) & 2012		Totals 2005 - 2012		
		Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)		Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)		Income (Actual)	Disb.-ments (Actual)	Budget	Income (Actual)	
<b>A</b> NAO/EC Contribution to Projects	2,095,000.00	3,452,261.68	6,898,767.88	-	1,259,847.36	3,113,459.37	1,259,847.52	-	1,244,116.23	47,754,847.52	47,336,109.04	47,626,939.52
<b>B</b> Indirect Eligible Costs (7% of NAO/EC contribution to projects)	147,000.00	241,658.32	-	-	88,189.32	1,315,477.00	88,189.33	-	65,270.73	3,343,189.33	3,313,527.64	3,328,322.58
<b>Sub - Total</b>	<b>2,242,000.00</b>	<b>3,693,920.00</b>	<b>6,898,767.88</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,348,036.68</b>	<b>4,428,936.37</b>	<b>1,348,036.85</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,309,386.96</b>	<b>51,098,036.85</b>	<b>50,649,636.68</b>	<b>50,955,262.10</b>
<b>C</b> Contingencies (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total NAO Contribution</b>	<b>2,242,000.00</b>	<b>3,693,920.00</b>	<b>6,898,767.88</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,348,036.68</b>	<b>4,428,936.37</b>	<b>1,348,036.85</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,309,386.96</b>	<b>51,098,036.85</b>	<b>50,649,636.68</b>	<b>50,955,262.10</b>
<b>D</b> UNDP Contribution (2)	905,000.00	840,546.00	840,546.00	932,390.00	1,749,327.91	1,749,327.91	-	201,322.17	201,322.17	4,575,000.00	5,528,806.08	5,528,806.08
<b>Grant Total</b>	<b>3,147,000.00</b>	<b>4,534,466.00</b>	<b>7,739,313.88</b>	<b>932,390.00</b>	<b>3,097,364.59</b>	<b>6,178,264.28</b>	<b>1,348,036.85</b>	<b>201,322.17</b>	<b>1,510,709.13</b>	<b>55,673,036.85</b>	<b>56,178,442.76</b>	<b>56,484,068.18</b>

Notes:

\* Expenditure figures included in this report cover charges made during the period of October 2011 to April 2012 as per the authorization of NAO/EU (ref. BF/dg/eam/00035 and MIC/EU/5/3)

(1) According to Art. 4.4. of the Special Conditions to the Specific Contribution agreement the interests earned are added as Income to line C of the Budget and 7% to Budget Line B in accordance with footnote 1 of Annex III. The report is presenting expenditures against the budget as per Amendment IV to the Agreement.

(2) UNDP contributions were incurred in US dollars and were converted at the average UN Operating Rate of Exchange (UNORE) for the respective year

Years indicated in this report are calendar years, although RRP fiscal year did not correspond the to the calendar one.

Table 2 is presentation of the individual RRP project final financial status. The budget figure for RRP03, RRP07 and RRP09 were adjusted once it was established that certain amount will not be spent and the unspent amounts was incorporated in the allocation for the RRP AMU as per the Addendum IV to the RRP Contribution Specific Agreement.

The disbursement figures reflect payments made to RRP consortia considering the reported expenditures. Disbursement figures are equal to the reported expenditures amount with exception of the projects where interest was earned on the RRP funds. In those cases the RRP consortia have been allowed to use the interest earned amount for the project activities while equivalent amount was deducted from payments to the respective consortia.

Total unutilized amount being the difference between the agreement amount and actual expenditures is EUR 207,193.91, with 183, 933 Euro (88.77% of the unused funds) being unutilized by the RRP10 of Aweil Centre and West in Northern Bahr El Ghazal.

Difference between disbursements made to the NGO consortia and reported expenditures by the consortia are exclusively due the interest earned by the NGOs on RRP funds. As mentioned, these amounts were withheld while the NGOs were allowed to use the interest earned amount. The exception again is RRP10 consortium which under-spent the received advance by EUR 147,603 (difference between the cash received and expenditure). Note, the difference between the unspent cash of 147,603 and unutilized budget of 183,933 is EUR 36,330 reported interest earned which was expected to be spent should the consortium have used the resources in full.

<b>RRP Project Financial Summary</b>					
<i>(As of 25 April 2012, Euros)</i>					
RRPs	TOTAL BUDGET	DISBURSEMENTS	REPORTED EXPENDITURES	VARIANCES	
				TOT.BUDGET - REPORTED EXP.	DISB-MENT. - REPORTED EXP.
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)= (A) - (C)	(E)=(B) - (C)
RRP 01 Geissan and Kurmuk, Blue Nile	6,100,000.00	6,090,798.00	6,092,525.18	7,474.82	(1,727.18)
RRP 02 Abyei, Abyei SAA	5,100,000.00	5,054,954.56	5,099,990.99	9.01	(45,036.43)
RRP 03 Rural Port Sudan and Halaib, Red Sea	3,813,482.04	3,813,482.04	3,813,482.04	-	-
RRP 04 Abu Hammed and Berber, River Nile	2,890,000.00	2,890,000.00	2,890,000.00	-	-
RRP 05 Kadugli, South Kordofan	5,995,000.00	5,979,259.92	5,979,259.92	15,740.08	-
RRP 06 Renk, Upper Nile	5,028,951.01	5,017,422.20	5,028,951.01	-	(11,528.81)
RRP 07 Juba, Central Equatoria	4,596,338.00	4,596,301.00	4,596,301.00	37.00	-
RRP 08 Torit, Eastern Equatoria	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00	-	-
RRP 09 Gogrial East, Warrab	5,234,888.24	5,225,058.00	5,234,888.24	-	(9,830.24)
RRP 10 Aweil Centre and West, North Bahr El Ghazal	4,700,000.00	4,466,891.00	4,516,067.00	183,933.00	(49,176.00)
<b>Total RRP</b>	<b>47,458,659.29</b>	<b>47,134,166.72</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>	<b>207,193.91</b>	<b>(117,298.66)</b>

Table 3 is presentation of the RRP NGO expenditures by major budget lines broken down by the RRP implementation years.

**Table 3.**

<b>RRP Consortia Reported Expenditures by Budget Lines</b>						
<i>(As of 25 April 2012, Euros)</i>						
	<b>Budge Lines</b>	<b>Expenditures Year 1<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Expenditures Year 2<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Expenditures Year 3<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Expenditures Year 4<sup>1</sup> (*)</b>	<b>Total Expenditures</b>
<b>01</b>	<b>Good and Services delivered to beneficiaries (direct costs)</b>					
01.01	Capacity building and Institutional strengthening	1,286,774.54	2,304,030.34	1,483,759.29	118,825.97	5,193,390.14
01.02	Livelihoods	1,096,007.92	2,826,835.66	3,200,503.82	395,695.27	7,519,042.67
01.03	Basic Services	2,296,839.55	5,884,078.34	4,125,878.62	795,127.77	13,101,924.28
<b>Total 01</b>		<b>4,679,622.01</b>	<b>11,014,944.34</b>	<b>8,810,141.73</b>	<b>1,309,649.01</b>	<b>25,814,357.09</b>
<b>02</b>	<b>Supporting costs (direct costs)</b>					
2.01	Non-local technical personnel	1,127,815.92	1,662,805.63	1,705,738.82	175,802.49	4,672,162.86
2.02	Other Personnel	968,096.71	1,792,108.82	2,384,349.16	299,843.82	5,444,398.51
2.03	Durable equipment	1,946,361.89	452,548.29	122,329.65	49,966.82	2,571,206.65
2.04	Premises and supplies	978,168.33	1,858,712.02	1,575,034.43	319,100.45	4,731,015.23
2.05	Needs assessments and other studies	66,035.15	27,406.41	22,191.53	0.00	115,633.09
2.06	Audit and evaluation	13,316.93	137,052.39	230,497.52	12,538.95	393,405.79
2.07	Visibility actions	17,999.69	53,993.00	49,796.55	3,150.08	124,939.32
2.08	Insurance costs	26,634.04	76,852.42	71,162.82	4,281.51	178,930.79
2.09	Financial service costs	24,720.92	60,222.75	49,267.10	2,786.76	136,997.53
<b>Total 02</b>		<b>5,169,149.58</b>	<b>6,121,701.73</b>	<b>6,210,367.58</b>	<b>867,470.88</b>	<b>18,368,689.77</b>
<b>03</b>	<b>Indirect costs</b>	681,309.95	1,194,096.17	1,040,613.95	152,398.44	3,068,418.51
<b>Total 03</b>		<b>681,309.95</b>	<b>1,194,096.17</b>	<b>1,040,613.95</b>	<b>152,398.44</b>	<b>3,068,418.51</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>10,530,081.54</b>	<b>18,330,742.25</b>	<b>16,061,123.26</b>	<b>2,329,518.33</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>
<b>01</b>	<b>Good and Services delivered to beneficiaries (direct costs)</b>	4,679,622.01	11,014,944.34	8,810,141.73	1,309,649.01	25,814,357.09
<b>02</b>	<b>Supporting costs (direct costs)</b>	5,169,149.58	6,121,701.73	6,210,367.58	867,470.88	18,368,689.77
<b>03</b>	<b>Indirect costs</b>	681,309.95	1,194,096.17	1,040,613.95	152,398.44	3,068,418.51
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>10,530,081.54</b>	<b>18,330,742.25</b>	<b>16,061,123.26</b>	<b>2,329,518.33</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>

<sup>1</sup> Years refer to the RRP fiscal/implementation years not calendar year

(\*) Year 4 is applicable to RRP 02 (Abyei) and RRP05 (Southern Kurdistan) only

Table 4 is presentation of the RRP NGO expenditures by major budget lines broken down by the RRP implementation years.

**Table 4.**

<b>RRP Consortia Reported Expenditures by Regions and Budget Lines</b>			
<i>(As of 25 April 2012, Euros)</i>			
<b>Categories</b>	<b>REPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>		
	<b>NORTH</b>	<b>SOUTH</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01 Good and Services delivered to beneficiaries (direct costs)</b>			
01.01 Capacity building and Institutional strengthening	2,804,666.84	2,388,723.30	5,193,390.14
01.02 Livelihoods	4,338,945.60	3,180,097.07	7,519,042.67
01.03 Basic Services	6,364,567.97	6,737,356.31	13,101,924.28
<b>Total 01</b>	<b>13,508,180.41</b>	<b>12,306,176.68</b>	<b>25,814,357.09</b>
<b>02 Direct Support Cost</b>			
2.01 Non-local technical personnel	1,847,551.54	2,824,611.32	4,672,162.86
2.02 Other Personnel	2,635,816.86	2,808,581.65	5,444,398.51
2.03 Durable equipment	1,483,348.18	1,087,858.47	2,571,206.65
2.04 Premises and supplies	2,397,668.45	2,333,346.78	4,731,015.23
2.05 Needs assessments and other studies	60,319.64	55,313.45	115,633.09
2.06 Audit and evaluation	141,980.00	251,425.79	393,405.79
2.07 Visibility actions	70,165.58	54,773.74	124,939.32
2.08 Insurance costs	126,644.76	52,286.03	178,930.79
2.09 Financial service costs	44,991.17	92,006.36	136,997.53
<b>Total 02</b>	<b>8,808,486.18</b>	<b>9,560,203.59</b>	<b>18,368,689.77</b>
<b>03 Indirect costs</b>	1,558,591.10	1,509,827.41	3,068,418.51
<b>Total 03</b>	<b>1,558,591.10</b>	<b>1,509,827.41</b>	<b>3,068,418.51</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>23,875,257.69</b>	<b>23,376,207.68</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>

  

	<b>North</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>RRP</b>
<b>01 Good and Services delivered to beneficiaries (direct costs)</b>	<b>13,508,180.41</b>	<b>12,306,176.68</b>	<b>25,814,357.09</b>
<b>02 Supporting costs (direct costs)</b>	<b>8,808,486.18</b>	<b>9,560,203.59</b>	<b>18,368,689.77</b>
<b>03 Indirect costs</b>	<b>1,558,591.10</b>	<b>1,509,827.41</b>	<b>3,068,418.51</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>23,875,257.69</b>	<b>23,376,207.68</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>

Final program cash position is presented in the **Table 5** below. The report includes interest earned by UNDP and NGOs.

**Table 5**

**Program Cash Position as of 25 April 2012**

(Euros)

Program Implementation	Year 1 (2005)		Year 2 (2006)		Year 3 (2007)		Year 4 (2008)		Year 5 (2009)		Year 6 (2010)		Year 7 (2011/2012)	
	NAO/EC	UNDP	NAO/EC	UNDP	NAO/EC	UNDP	NAO/EC	UNDP	NAO/EC	UNDP	NAO/EC	UNDP	NAO/EC	UNDP
Income Received	19,003,200	768,885	-	604,267	16,152,720	624,532	10,451,760	739,926	3,693,920	840,546	-	1,749,328	-	201,322
Blance Carried Over			17,829,620	-	4,438,062	-	13,777,659	-	8,458,862	-	5,321,332	-	1,003,762	-
Paid (Disbursed) to Projects/AMU	-	-	13,752,175	-	7,184,701	-	15,433,720	-	6,898,768	-	3,113,459	-	1,047,343	-
Indirect Eligible Cost Charged	1,368,875	-	-	-	-	-	578,700	-	-	-	1,315,477	-	65,271	-
Paid/Mobilized Contingencies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111,365	-	-	-
UNDP Co-Financing (Expenditures)	-	768,885	-	604,267	-	624,532	-	739,926	-	840,546	-	1,749,328	-	201,322
Interest Earned (1)	195,295	-	360,618	-	371,578	-	241,862	-	67,318	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Cash Balance (2)</b>	<b>17,829,620</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,438,062</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,777,659</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,458,862</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,321,332</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,003,762</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(108,853)</b>	<b>-</b>

(1) Following the UNDP policy UN Operating Rate of Exchange (UNORE) is used for reporting interest income earned by UNDP.

(1) Interest earned by the NGOs was declared and included in this report for the year 2010. The amount was also incorporated in the Addendum IV to the Contribution Specific Agreement.

(2) UNDP contributions have been made on single year basis therefore no annual and carry over balances are indicated

**Table 6** below presents the summary of the program financial status. As indicated in the *Table 6.2* total disbursements and charges exceed the total receipts by 108,852.62 Euros which is the amount of final payment receivable from the NAO/EU.

**Table 6. RRP Financial Summary**

*(As of April 25, 2012, Euros)*

*Table 6.1*

<b>Total NAO/EU commitment:</b>	<b>51,098,036.85</b>
<i>Contracted with implementing NGOs</i>	<i>47,458,847.74</i>
<i>Eligible indirect cost</i>	<i>3,343,189.33</i>
<i>Allocated for the RRP AMU</i>	<i>296,000.00</i>
<b>Total funds received by UNDP</b>	<b>50,649,636.68</b>
<i>From the NAO/EU</i>	<i>49,301,600.00</i>
<i>Interest earned on RRP funds by UNDP</i>	<i>1,236,671.26</i>
<i>Interest earned on RRP funds by NGOs*</i>	<i>111,365.42</i>
<b>Commitments less receipts (amount of the final installment):</b>	<b>448,400.17</b>

\*This is the interest amount as included in the Addendum IV to the Agreement. Final interest amount reported by the NGOs is EUR 117,298.66 as per *Table 6.3* below

*Table 6.2*

<b>Funds received by UNDP:</b>	<b>50,649,636.68</b>
<b>Disbursements:</b>	
<i>To implementing NGO consortia</i>	<i>47,134,166.72</i>
<i>RRP AMU costs</i>	<i>296,000.00</i>
<i>Eligible indirect cost charges</i>	<i>3,328,322.58</i>
<b>Total disbursements and charges:</b>	<b>50,758,489.30</b>
<b>Receipts less disbursements:</b>	<b>(108,852.62)</b>

*Table 6.3*

<b>Funds received by the NGO consortia</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>
<i>Direct receipt from UNDP</i>	<i>47,134,166.72</i>
<i>Interest earned on RRP funds by NGOs</i>	<i>117,298.66</i>
<b>Total expenditures reported by the implementing consortia</b>	<b>47,251,465.38</b>
<b>Receivable (payable) from (to) the NGOs</b>	<b>-</b>

## **XI. VISIBILITY AND COMMUNICATION**

### **UNDP**

Several activities were undertaken by UNDP to enhance the visibility of the RRP and the internal communication between the stakeholders involved.

#### ➤ *RRP website*

During the second year, to improve internal communication among all partners UNDP created an RRP password protected website, which included a library section with archives of all the RRP documents of each Consortium (including the progress reports, project documents, ABEAS, technical guidelines, Consortium manuals, meeting minutes, and field visit reports). The website was also used by UNDP to list news and announcements and to share updates with the implementing partners. The PRC members had also access to this website. Additionally, the UNDP also created a public webpage for the RRP on Sudan's country office website, with regular updates. This webpage included a list of all the RRP partners, with links to their websites, and an interactive map of the project locations, with pop-up boxes containing a list of partner NGOs, the key objectives of each project, and key achievements to date (updated on a quarterly basis).

#### ➤ *RRP brochures*

Also during the second year, UNDP printed two brochures about the RRP, in both English and Arabic, which were circulated to partners and donors, at PRC meetings, to Sudanese media outlets, and to the United Nations community. During the 4<sup>th</sup> year, new RRP brochures were published and distributed (see Annex 3 – Visibility and Promotional Materials).

#### ➤ *RRP calendars*

RRP 2009 calendars were distributed in both English and Arabic to donors, partners, and the general public, in order to increase visibility (see Annex 3 – Visibility and Promotional Materials).

#### ➤ *Success stories*

Through field visits to project locations to interview beneficiaries, photograph key achievements, UNDP collected success stories during the projects' implementation, which were released, when appropriate, to the national media, emailed to RRP partners, posted on the UNDP Sudan country office website, and published in UNDP newsletters. A media trip to the Red Sea State (RRP03) was facilitated by the UNDP as a result of two RRP success stories, which were filmed and aired on Al Jazeera. A success story was published in a Sudanese newspaper (Sudan Vision), and some stories and photos were included in the Sudan Magazine (the annual EC/UN partnership report) and in the UNDP illustrated annual report (see Annex 4 – RRP Publications).

#### ➤ *Monthly E-Bulletin*

During the 4<sup>th</sup> year, a monthly E-Bulletin was produced, providing updates and success stories from the different projects. The stories included in these Bulletins generated interest from the local media and international outlets (see Annex 5 – RRP E-Bulletin).



➤ *Others*

Several panels with photos and success stories of the RRP were produced by the UNDP to be exhibited at the Europe Day on the 9<sup>th</sup> March 2009, organized by the European Commission in Khartoum (see Annex 3 – Visibility and Promotional Materials).

### Consortia

The different RRP designed a Consortium logo during the first year of the programme, and included the logos of the EC, UNDP, GoNU and GoSS in their visibility materials and assets, according to the requirements on this issue.

The main activities developed by the Consortia to enhance the visibility of the projects included, among others, the distribution of materials (such as t-shirts, brochures), the settlement of signboards in the project sites, and the elaboration of documentaries about the project's achievements. A detailed list of the different RRP projects main visibility related activities can be found in the following table.

RRP	Visibility/Communication activities
<b>RRP 01 in Blue Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sign boards were installed in the project sites.</li> <li>▪ Stickers were placed on vehicles.</li> <li>▪ T-shirts with project messages used to raise awareness of the public.</li> <li>▪ A documentary film was made to reflect the project achievements among local authorities and partners.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 02 in Abyei</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sign boards with the logos of the stakeholders of the project were installed in infrastructure activity sites.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 03 in Red Sea</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ T-shirts with project logos were distributed to communities and partners/associates.</li> <li>▪ Stickers were placed on vehicles.</li> <li>▪ Office display panels installed in all partners' offices and project sites.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 04 in River Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 20 metal signboards were placed in the road between project sites.</li> <li>▪ 44 metal signboards were placed in target villages, indicating the different activities of the project.</li> <li>▪ 2,500 printed materials (logos, leaflets) were distributed in the two localities.</li> <li>▪ Information about the project was disseminated through the River Nile State media.</li> <li>▪ A documentary film was produced.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RRP sign boards were placed in project sites.</li> <li>▪ Three large signboards indicating the project's budget, stakeholders and donors were placed at the main gates of Kadugli town.</li> <li>▪ Project calendars were distributed in the health units and to health stakeholders from the LGAs.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Signposts of the Consortium in English and Arabic were installed in project sites.</li> </ul>

RRP	Visibility/Communication activities
<b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Visibility flyers were distributed in the project sites, containing information about the project (funding sources, project location, implementing agencies and project duration).</li> <li>▪ T-shirts with the Consortium logo were printed for several activities</li> <li>▪ Consortium banners were used during workshops, campaigns and other project activities.</li> <li>▪ Three documentary films were made and distributed to different stakeholders. The first documentary was about the project location and implementing partners, duration, source of funding etc. The second one covered the project activities from 2006 – 2008 and the third one covered the project for the last three years from 2006 – 2009. The film has shown the impact of this programme on the communities.</li> <li>▪ Collaboration was given to UNDP's website on the RRP, with success stories, and to its quarterly newsletters about RRP activities and impact.</li> <li>▪ Quarterly newsletters highlighting key achievements and lessons learnt were produced during the life span of the project.</li> <li>▪ Information centers were constructed and equipped, to facilitate the communication among rural communities.</li> <li>▪ 100 sign boards were placed in the project sites in the six target Payams.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stickers were placed on vehicles.</li> <li>▪ Sign boards with the Consortium, EC, UNDP, GoNU, and GoSS logos were placed in the project sites.</li> <li>▪ Media announcements and press releases were made at regional and national levels.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 09 in Warrap</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Vehicles and other main assets were marked with the RRP logos.</li> <li>▪ RRP stickers were distributed to key stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ T-shirts were distributed to key stakeholders, including the members of the State parliament.</li> <li>▪ Signboards with RRP logos were placed in the project sites.</li> <li>▪ Exercise books with the RRP logos were distributed in the inauguration of primary schools and PHCU. Participants of adult literacy classes also received exercise books.</li> <li>▪ Three Annual Photo Reports (power point presentation) on the project achievements were edited and presented to the public in different occasions.</li> <li>▪ Print outs were handed over to LGAs, members of the Parliament and key ministries at State level.</li> <li>▪ Copies of Quarterly and Annual Success Stories were printed and regularly distributed to stakeholders. These were also available in the VSF Germany website.</li> <li>▪ 2,500 copies of RRP 2008 and 2009 calendars (total of 5,000 copies) were distributed in the area and to the stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ The RRP HIV/AIDS/STIs, Hygiene and Sanitation Tournament was filmed and covered by the Sudan Mirror.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Signposts with RRP Consortium logo were placed in project sites.</li> <li>▪ Consortium banners were used during training workshops.</li> <li>▪ Vehicles and other main assets were marked with the RRP logos.</li> </ul>

## **XII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The RRP, as part of the overall support provided by the European Commission to the post-war Sudan, made an important contribution to the recovery of post-conflict Sudan and to the preparation of communities for development oriented actions. Despite many challenges and constraints faced during its implementation, ten RRP projects were implemented between 2006 and 2011 in ten areas of Sudan and achieved significant results with positive impact on the beneficiary communities, in the areas of capacity building and institutional strengthening of LGAs and communities, livelihoods and basic services provision.

The RRP reached approximately 1.1 million people among host populations, returnees and IDPs, across 10 areas in Sudan, and made an important contribution to its overall goal of reducing the prevalence and severity of poverty of conflict affected rural households, achieving significant improvements at community and local authority levels. Among its achievements, the RRP promoted the capacity building of LGAs and communities through the establishment and/or training of: 149 VDCs; 952 VHC members; 77 PTAs; 426 VWC; and 26 youth associations. Also, approximately 1,350 LGA officials, 1,797 health workers, 1,413 teachers and headmasters, and 264 pump mechanics were trained in their respective sectors.

In the component of livelihoods development, the RRP was able to train 2,950 farmers, 278 veterinarians, and 1,783 fishermen, and to provide agricultural inputs/tools to 33,995 households. Also, 28 grind mills, seven grain stores and 12 markets were constructed, 4,926 people received animals for restocking, 5,562 people benefited from micro enterprise/income generation/micro credit activities, 12,226 people participated in adult literacy classes, and 1,614 persons received vocational training. Finally, among the main achievements of the component of support to basic services provision, 88 health facilities, 281 classrooms, 3,351 latrines and 685 water systems were built or rehabilitated.

These achievements have contributed, not only to the improvement of living conditions in the target areas, but also to the peace process in post-war Sudan, by bringing relevant “peace dividends” to conflict affected populations, in the follow-up of the CPA process. Besides, it also allowed for the Governments from North and South Sudan to work together on development issues.

The RRP was managed by UNDP, through the AMU, supervised by the PRC and implemented by ten NGO consortia, involving a total of 26 international and 23 national NGOs. The implementation mechanism included several innovative approaches. The use of a Consortium model was generally considered as positive, especially because it led to a higher level of coordination and synergy between different agencies in the field (both national and international), increasing the impact of the interventions.

On the other hand, the encouragement to a high level of participation of LGAs and communities in the planning and implementation of the projects, and in the management of its benefits, was also positive and should continue to be pursued. This approach has also allowed fostering a closer relationship between NGOs and LGAs, as well as between communities and LGAs. Also, the RRP allowed the development of useful partnerships between the different stakeholders involved in this programme which were actively involved since its inception, namely the EU, UNDP, and the Government (at central and local levels), and the engagement of these actors with a significant number of NGOs (international and local).

The achievements of the RRP should be analyzed in the light of the context of Sudan and the significant challenges that affected the implementation of this programme. Besides, it should be acknowledged that its initial objectives, defined at the time of

the CPA signature, may have been ambitious, and some assumptions a little unrealistic.

First of all, the objectives and targets defined in the RRP design may have been too ambitious for a three/four year projects design given the context of the intervention areas in terms of security, accessibility and living conditions of the communities (more similar to a relief context). Secondly, some of the premises and assumptions included in the projects design that were crucial for successful implementation, were not in place during most of the projects' implementation period, especially the Government presence in the target areas and its capacity to ensure the sustainability of the activities and benefits, and the existence of a peaceful post-conflict scenario with peace and security.

In order to extract conclusions related to this programme 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*

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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recruit and train committed staff and communicate project conditions to them from the beginning of the project.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>For Donors and Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>

## 2. Inclusion of capacity building component of LGAs and communities

<b>Strengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promotion of ownership in LGAs and communities.</li> <li>▪ Joint community needs identification and activities planning between LGAs and communities, strengthen LGAs and enables grounded needs assessments.</li> <li>▪ Confidence and trust building between NGOs, LGAs and communities.</li> <li>▪ Enhancement of participatory monitoring and proper implementation.</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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).</li> <li>▪ Lack of motivation, different incentive systems and unclear roles and responsibilities contribute to low ownership and participation from LGA staff in the projects.</li> <li>▪ High LGA staff turnover.</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><i>For Consortia:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Involve the LGAs and communities in all the stages of the project cycle.</li> <li>▪ Promote good relationships with LGAs and communities, through regular formal and informal meetings.</li> <li>▪ Involve a wider range of traditional authorities and committees in the LGA training.</li> </ul> <p><i>For Government:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Participate actively in all phases of the project cycle.</li> <li>▪ Support the retention of LGA staff, by improving their conditions (salaries and incentives) and regulations.</li> </ul> <p><i>For Donors and Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the LGAs regarding Standard Operational Procedures and monitoring.</li> <li>▪ Advocate to the Government for support to retention of the staff in the intervention areas.</li> </ul>

## 3. Sustainability

<b>Strengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The inclusion of LGAs and communities in project design and implementation improved their capacity to plan independently their own development in the future.</li> <li>▪ The transfer of skills and resources to communities introduced sources of income generation to develop self-sustained livelihood activities.</li> <li>▪ The involvement of communities sometimes led to a shift in attitudes and generates interest from the beneficiaries to voluntarily develop independent initiatives.</li> </ul>
------------------	---

<b>Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Unrealistic expectations regarding the change from relief to recovery setting within the timeframe of the projects.</li> <li>▪ Insufficient financing and weak quality of construction activities resulted in inappropriate and insufficient structures to be maintained in the long term.</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><i>For Consortia:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focus the livelihood training on skills that can be useful in the communities.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Provide capacity building to government authorities on budgeting and planning.</li> <li>▪ Provide awareness raising in communities about the responsibilities of the government and the consortia.</li> <li>▪ Forecast a contingency budget for changes in the price of materials.</li> <li>▪ Improve quality assurance of construction activities and recruit qualified contractors/firms.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>For Government:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incorporate the RRP costs with LGA staff in the government planning and budgeting processes.</li> <li>▪ Get involved in the monitoring of construction activities.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>For Donors and Administration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider a longer timeframe for the implementation of recovery/development projects in relief contexts.</li> </ul>

#### 4. The RRP conceptual framework

<b>Strengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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"> <li>- Capacity building of community committees (VDCs, ADCs/CDCs, and sector committees) was the most relevant activity of this component.</li> <li>- Agriculture and livestock were the most relevant activities of the livelihoods component, while income generating activities were less relevant</li> <li>- All basic services activities were highly relevant.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Involvement and support from Government and communities was highly relevant.</li> <li>▪ Transition from a relief to a development mind set in some RRP areas.</li> <li>▪ The LGAs were, in many cases, effective partners in the implementation of the RRP.</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ The RRP had to focus more on basic services due to the acute shortage of facilities and needs expressed by the community and LGAs.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Changing context of the intervention areas.</li> <li>▪ 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).</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More realistic goals should be defined within the established timeframe of the projects.</li> <li>▪ The RRP experience should be replicated in other areas, with increased fund allocation.</li> <li>▪ The Consortium model is a good implementation structure and should continue to be used in future programmes, with some modifications.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Lobbying of Government at State level is needed to support the training of LGA staff in the localities.</li> <li>▪ The capacity building of LGA staff should include ToT.</li> <li>▪ The involvement of the LGAs in all the stages of the Project Cycle Management should be pursued.</li> <li>▪ Clear exit strategies should be agreed with LGAs.</li> <li>▪ The promotion of links between the Government at State and Local levels should be developed in future programmes.</li> </ul>

#### 5. The RRP implementation mechanisms

<b>Strengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The structure of the Consortia allowed for different types of organizations to join efforts and benefit from each other.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Project Steering Committees were often useful to discuss and solve constraints during the project implementation and allowed improving the coordination with Government departments.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ The PRC enhanced the Government ownership of the RRP, allowed for mutual learning between the State and local levels, and supported changes in implementation.</li> <li>▪ The AMU played an important role in the oversight of the RRP, and its intermediary role between all the stakeholders was useful.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was some level of confusion about the roles and responsibilities of each Consortium member.</li> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ The lead agencies of the Consortia sometimes over-exercised or under-</li> </ul>

	<p>exercised its lead role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In some cases, changes in the management structure of Consortium members affected the whole consortium and the project implementation.</li> <li>▪ There were no clear and defined selection criteria at the time of the RRP Consortia composition.</li> <li>▪ Resources management among the Consortium members.</li> <li>▪ In some cases it was not clear who was responsible for the coordination among the consortia.</li> <li>▪ Understanding of the donor requirements by national NGOs.</li> <li>▪ Lack of involvement of HAC in the PRC.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ High staff turnover within the AMU during the initial stages of the programme.</li> <li>▪ The Project Steering Committees were sometimes affected by challenges faced by consortia and LGAs (staff turnover, division of localities, lack of qualified staff).</li> <li>▪ There were no strong links between the different levels of the RRP oversight.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Consortium members should agree and clarify the roles and responsibilities of each agency in the project implementation.</li> <li>▪ The consortium agencies should establish unified operational procedures for the project implementation.</li> <li>▪ The selection criteria for the composition of Consortia should be clearly defined in future programmes.</li> <li>▪ A careful analysis should be conducted to assess the added value of each agency to the respective consortia.</li> <li>▪ The coordination responsibilities should be clearly defined among the Consortium and minimum requirements should be established.</li> <li>▪ In future Consortia implementation structures, the use of the associate category should be avoided; all the members should be considered as partners.</li> <li>▪ The constitution of Consortia led by a national NGO should be promoted when possible.</li> <li>▪ The PRC should conduct frequent and rotational meetings at field level.</li> <li>▪ The PRC needs to ensure regular participation and involvement of key Government stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ The existence of an AMU, with unique and autonomous identify, playing an intermediary role between the different stakeholders should continue to be promoted.</li> <li>▪ UNDP should facilitate synergies with other programmes.</li> <li>▪ UNDP should provide more technical support and capacity building to national partners, according to the needs.</li> <li>▪ A strong interaction system for coordination and management at field level between the field level stakeholders should continue to be promoted.</li> </ul> <p>Stronger links between the different levels of project oversight should be established.</p>



### **Consortia specific recommendations**

The ten NGO Consortia that implemented the RRP projects have proposed several recommendations to be taken into consideration in future similar interventions, and summarized in the table below.

RRP	Recommendations
<b>RRP 01 in Blue Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LGAs should promote the establishment of Women Associations (Cooperatives) to coordinate women enterprises development activities, and the establishment of Village Livelihood Committees to ensure the sustainability of the project's activities.</li> <li>▪ Appropriate cost-recovery systems need to be established by the Water Committees, and should be affordable to the water users and adequate to cover the required operation and maintenance of the water schemes.</li> <li>▪ The government at national and state levels should deploy staff to the localities, in order to ensure the sustainability of the services provided by the infrastructure established by the project.</li> <li>▪ Less permit restrictions from government regarding staff movement are necessary, to ensure access to target areas.</li> <li>▪ National and state level government should harmonize school curricula.</li> <li>▪ More communication should be developed between the implementing partners and the authorities at state level about the activities related to the project.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP02 in Abyei</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Abyei community should make maximum use of the governance and civil society programmes that follow the RRP and implemented by the Consortium partners to strengthen their ability to collectively and positively engage with the administration.</li> <li>▪ The LGAs should allow active participation in identifying development priorities and designing their own development needs and strategies. An increased level of participation will guarantee community owned projects, including collective sharing of risks and gains.</li> <li>▪ More time should have been invested in evaluating worst case scenarios (e.g. if the government does not get funding what happens?) With the volatile environment in Abyei, more time should have been allocated for the project to avoid hurried up conceptualization of individual projects. Sometimes beneficiaries needed more time to prepare and adopt new ideas.</li> <li>▪ Assessments on community needs and activities viability should be done before the proposal writing and not after its approval.</li> <li>▪ A clear definition of livelihoods should be agreed between the stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 03 in Red Sea</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The distribution of work among the Consortium agencies should be done based on thematic issues, according to the expertise of each agency, rather than on geographical criteria (which means working in isolation with no connection between the agencies and lower impact of the project).</li> <li>▪ The involvement of the LGAs in the project should start in the initial stage (before the communities), to ensure the ownership of the project and the sustainability of the activities (especially the basic services provision).</li> <li>▪ National associates should have been more linked with implementing partners, and included in the handover strategies of the project.</li> <li>▪ A less expensive modality for the project implementation structure should be pursued.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 04 in River Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The monitoring systems in the localities need further improvement. Also, sources and flow of information, reporting systems and intersectional document circulation need to be repaired.</li> <li>▪ More emphasis should be placed on the establishment and/or strengthening of women associations.</li> </ul>

RRP	Recommendations
<b>RRP 05 in Southern Kordofan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The approval process of extensions and contingency funds should be clearer, transparent, and be developed within shorter time, in order to prevent delays in the project's implementation.</li> <li>▪ The project implementing partners should continue building on the successes and lessons of the RRP by mobilizing resources for the activities using similar approaches.</li> <li>▪ Trainings, financial support and incentive provision are key ways to engage and support LGAs</li> <li>▪ Besides the LGAs relevant state ministries involved in the programme should also be considered for capacity building intervention to address key sustainability issues of the post-conflict setting. Supporting state Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education is essential to provision of basic services in Southern Kordofan.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 06 in Upper Nile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The approval process of extensions and contingency funds should be clearer, transparent, and be developed within less time, in order to prevent delays in the project's implementation.</li> <li>▪ Additional long term funding with a similar mechanism and approach should be developed, to expand the recovery and development activities initiated by the RRP.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 07 in Central Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water and sanitation interventions should be designed and implemented taking into consideration the increase of the population during the project's duration.</li> <li>▪ EU and UNDP should increase its field monitoring and supervision support, and play a more active roll in lobbying the Government authorities for the project's sustainability.</li> <li>▪ Funds for the project implementation should be released to the Consortium on an annual basis, instead of quarterly, to prevent delays in the implementation.</li> <li>▪ More livelihood activities should be implemented, given the high poverty levels in the target areas.</li> <li>▪ Communities should be involved in the project since its initial stages, including in needs assessments and prioritization of community needs.</li> <li>▪ Clear Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) should be signed with the government authorities concerning the sustainability of the project's activities (namely, the staff of the project's established facilities).</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 08 in Eastern Equatoria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Government authorities should encourage the motivation of LGA officials and health/education staff in field locations, in order to avoid their high turnover.</li> <li>▪ Line Ministries at State level should be more involved in the project planning and implementation since its initial stages.</li> <li>▪ Communities need further sensitization concerning the ownership and sustainability of the constructed facilities.</li> </ul>
<b>RRP 09 in Warrap</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Further capacity building of LGAs and NGO staff should be supported, after a capacity building needs assessment that should be done during the inception period.</li> <li>▪ More focus should be placed on specific capacity building and strengthening of national/local CBOs and NGOs, using the action learning approach.</li> <li>▪ More income generation activities should be considered in follow-up projects.</li> <li>▪ EU and UNDP should support GoSS and State level in organizing the appointment of LGA officials and the payment of their salaries.</li> </ul>

RRP	Recommendations
<b>RRP 10 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Government authorities need to develop a strategy to attract and retain qualified LGA personnel in field locations.</li> <li>▪ LGAs should lobby State Government authorities to improve the conditions of the roads, in order to increase the accessibility in the county, to budget the salaries of staff from basic services facilities and pay them on time and consistently, and to equip the health centers and schools with qualified staff to render proper services to the communities.</li> <li>▪ The Government (County/State/National level) should endeavour to de-link the civil service from the politics to avoid the recurrent disruptions of services delivery every time the office bearers are changed.</li> <li>▪ The county development plans, formulated with the support of the project, need follow-up and further support.</li> </ul>

### ***General recommendations***

UNDP, as the administrator of the RRP, proposes the following recommendations in order to improve the implementation of future programmes:

- At the selection stage a more thorough assessment should be undertaken to gauge the strengths of implementing agencies in terms of their capacity, programmatic approach and value added to the specific areas of intervention.
- The Programme Management Unit should have at its disposal a range of built in punitive measures which can be promptly activated in case of non performing consortia.
- The role of the Associates within the programme should have been better defined and more structured which would have enhanced results in this specific area.
- Lack of participation by HAC in the PRC limited effective government participation. Considering that NGO operations fall under the purview of HAC their representation in the PRC could have had a positive impact on addressing the logistical and operational constraints faced by the NGOs.
- With most NGO staff having mainly relief experience, the programme at the outset should have required measures which ensured enhanced staff capacity in recovery and development approaches.
- One of the common denominators among the better performing consortia was continuity and retention of staff in key positions. Efforts should be made to retain staff for the entire duration of the project.
- Composition and participation of the NGOs in the consortium should be such that in the event a change in the leadership of the consortium becomes necessary the transition can take place without major disruption. The programme encountered this situation when a number of NGOs were deregistered by the government.
- The consortium lead agency should have active implementation role in addition to its coordination responsibilities.

## **LIST OF ANNEXES**

Annex 1 – Map of RRP Intervention Areas

Annex 2 – Activities implemented by individual RRP projects

Annex 3 – RRP Visibility and Promotional Materials

Annex 4 – Selection of RRP Publications

Annex 5 – RRP E-Bulletins

Annex 6 – RRP Photo Gallery