



**SOUTH SUDAN RECOVERY FUND LIVELIHOODS PROJECTS  
FINAL PROGRAMME<sup>1</sup> NARRATIVE REPORT  
JANUARY 2009 – OCT 2011**

<p><b>Programme Title &amp; Project Number</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme Title: SSRF Round 1 Livelihoods</li> <li>• Programme Number (if applicable): N/A</li> <li>• MPTF Office Project Reference Number:00070595</li> </ul>	<p><b>Country, Locality(s), Thematic Area(s)<sup>2</sup></b></p> <p>South Sudan, 10 states of South Sudan.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Thematic/Priority</i></p> <p>(1) Improving agro-pastoral livelihoods,  (2) Increasing access to markets and skills,  (3) Water, sanitation and child protection initiatives, and  (4) Engagement and capacity development of civil society organizations and local authorities.</p>
<p><b>Participating Organization(s)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP South Sudan</li> </ul>	<p><b>Implementing Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Programme/Project Cost (US\$)</b></p> <p>MPTF/JP Fund Contribution: US\$20,837,779  • <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i></p> <p>Agency Contribution  • <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i></p> <p>Government Contribution  <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p>Other Contributions (donors)  <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p><b>TOTAL:</b> US\$20,837,779</p>	<p><b>Programme Duration (months)</b></p> <p>Overall Duration <i>34 Months</i></p> <p>Start Date<sup>3</sup> <i>Jan 2009</i></p> <p>End Date (or Revised End Date)<sup>4</sup> <i>Oct 2011</i></p> <p>Operational Closure Date<sup>5</sup> <i>Oct 2011</i></p> <p>Expected Financial Closure Date <i>June 2012</i></p>
<p><b>Final Programme/ Project Evaluation</b></p> <p>Evaluation Completed  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: N/A</p> <p>Evaluation Report – N/A  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>Submitted By</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Name: Amanuel Gebremedhin</li> <li>○ Title: Chief of Crisis Prevention &amp; Recovery Unit</li> <li>○ Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP  Email:amanuel.gebremedhin@undp.org</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

<sup>2</sup> Priority Area for the Peacebuilding Fund; Sector for the UNDG ITF.

<sup>3</sup> The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#).

<sup>4</sup> As per approval by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

<sup>5</sup> All activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF programme have been completed. Agencies to advise the MPTF Office.

## **List of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

AA	Administrative Agent
CHF	Common Humanitarian Fund
CMSI	Church Mission Society Ireland
FACE	Funding Authorization and Certification of Expenditure
GoSS	Government of South Sudan
GMS	General Management Service
HARD	Hope Agency for Relief and Development
IP	Implementing Partner
ICCO	Inter-Church Organization for Development Cooperation
IRD	International Relief and Development
IMAC	Inter Ministerial Appraisal Committee
MA	Management Agent
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPTF	Multi-Partner Trust Fund
NCA	Norwegian Church Aid
PCA	Project Cooperation Agreement
PUNO	Participating United Nations Organisation
SSRF	South Sudan Recovery Fund
SSC	State Steering Committee
SSRDF	South Sudan Reconstruction and Development Fund
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation
WVI	World Vision International

## **FINAL PROGRAMME REPORT**

### **I. PURPOSE**

In September 2008, the SSRF Steering Committee reviewed an initial allocation plan for funding recovery activities by NGOs in all ten states of South Sudan. In November 2008, the SSRF Steering Committee selected livelihood project proposals submitted by NGOs, which were then reviewed by the Inter Ministerial Appraisal Committee (IMAC) of the Government of South Sudan. The target sectors included agriculture skills training and income generation targeting vulnerable groups (youth, women, orphans and widows) and the historically under-served regions. The SSRF Steering Committee approved a total amount of US\$ 20,837,779 for Round 1, which focused on improving livelihoods through NGO implemented projects. See Annex I: List of NGOs/ IPs by State and Focus Area for Round 1. A total of 18 projects in ten states were selected for implementation by 12 NGOs. Seventeen of the 18 Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs) were signed in the first quarter of 2009, while the last PCA was signed in July 2009. The PCAs were signed between each NGO and UNDP, as the Management Agent (MA), for Round 1. US\$12 million was transferred by the Multi Partners Trust Fund (MPTF) to the MA in 2009 and US\$8.8 million was transferred in 2010.

UNDP was nominated as the participating UN agency in November 2009 and took over the responsibility for monitoring the 18 projects from the SSRF Technical Secretariat (Secretariat to the SSRF Steering Committee). The project award started in January 2009 with disbursement to 17 of the 18 projects through initiatives that promoted rural livelihoods in agriculture, education, water and sanitation, and in ensuring income generating activities and market access in support of rural economy.

The purpose of the South Sudan Recovery Fund (SSRF) livelihood projects was to accelerate recovery initiatives in South Sudan through high-impact, quickly disbursed projects, consistent with the Strategic Planning Framework that guides the operations of the Fund. The SSRF 18 Livelihood allocation was intended to improve rural livelihoods in each of the ten states of South Sudan and provide peace dividends to activities that target vulnerable groups to improve livelihoods, income generation opportunities, and rural infrastructure. The expected results of the SRF Round I livelihoods include the following:

1. Improved agro-pastoral livelihoods
2. Improved livelihood prospects through increasing access to markets and skills
3. Improved water, sanitation and child protection initiatives
4. Enhanced engagement and capacity development of local authorities

Consistent with the Strategic Planning Framework guiding the operations of the Fund, the SSRF Steering Committee developed the Round 1 Livelihood Projects based on the following premises:

- Alignment with the Government expenditure priorities: The six top expenditure priorities of the Government include improving rural livelihoods and income as well as increasing access to safe water and sanitation.
- The SSRF Strategic Framework identified rural livelihoods and income opportunities as key and urgent priorities for recovery. This includes improving the quality of life of the poor and direct peace dividends for communities.
- In prioritizing programmes that seek to bolster productivity at the rural level, SSRF provides immediate and direct benefits to communities that have been underserved.
- Complementary activities for gender and youth, as well as other vulnerable groups integrated with activities that address rural livelihoods and income opportunities as they are not amongst the uppermost Government expenditure priorities, and have limited international donor support. Efforts need to be made to specifically target women and youth groups through livelihood and income generation projects, community security, and improved governance.
- The opportunity for rapid implementation through NGOs with existing activities on the ground was seen as important, as was deepening and expanding the existing activities of the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF). A focus on rural livelihoods and income opportunities compliments efforts to support IDPs, which became important with the influx of returnees and the reintegration process in 2010.

#### **List of primary implementing partners and stakeholders**

1. **Direct Beneficiaries:** Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), organized groups (women's cooperatives, child clubs etc), children, youth, and government counterparts.
2. **Implementing Partners:** 12 Primary Implementing Partner NGOs: CMSI, ICCO, VETWORK, NCA, Save the Children SWEDEN & UK, STROMME, OXFAM GB, AMURT, WORLD VISION, IRD, HARD.
3. **Oversight and resource allocation at central level:** SSRF Steering Committees (Policy Body): Govt. of South Sudan, United Nations, Donor representatives (DfID, Netherlands).
4. **Oversight and monitoring at state level:** State SSRF Steering Committees (Guiding Implementation): 10 States of Eastern Equatoria (EES), Central Equatoria (CEQ), Jonglei (JS), Lakes (LK), and Northern Bahr el Ghazal. (NBEG), Unity (UTY), Upper Nile (UPN), Warrap (WRP), Western Bahr el Ghazal (WBEG), Western Equatoria (WEQ).
5. **Government counterpart on implementation:** South Sudan Reconstruction and Development Fund (SSRDF) and Local Govt. Board (Representative of 10 States).

The final programme report summarizes the progress made in the management and delivery of results by the South Sudan Recovery Fund (SSRF)<sup>6</sup> through 18 livelihood projects from 1 January 2009 to 30 October 2011.

## II. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME/ PROJECT RESULTS

### Overall Summary of Result

The intervention had more than half a million beneficiaries, approximately 577,000, from improved agro-pastoral activities (293,000 beneficiaries); beneficiaries from improved livelihood prospects through increasing access to markets and skills (103,400 mainly youth and adult beneficiaries); improved water, sanitation and child protection initiatives (180,522 beneficiaries including over 3,700 youth and children); and over 1,616 government counterparts and members of Community Based Organizations benefiting from various capacity building initiatives.

### Results Area 1: Improved agro-pastoral activities

The agro-pastoral component of the project was aimed at providing the necessary agricultural and pastoral inputs to households mostly engaged in both pastoral and agricultural activities. A total of 29,360 households across nine states of South Sudan benefitted from intervention in this area. The specific activities delivered include the following:

- Provision of vegetable, cassava and fruit tree seeds benefitted 16,700 households.
- Ox-ploughs and other agricultural tools benefitted 8,122 household across five states. Related to this, a total of 1,903 households benefitted from trainings in ox-plough use, treadles pump use, livestock management and other agricultural techniques.
- Provision of poultry, goat, cattle and other livestock benefitted 2,635 households across five states.
- Over 116,275 individuals organized into various types of groups (cooperative groups, women groups, community groups, farming groups, poultry groups, and livestock and fishing groups) were supported through various activities.
- 33,275 livestock vaccinated through mass vaccination campaigns in Eastern Equatoria and Upper Nile States.
- An estimated 2,254 feddans were ploughed across South Sudan in Central Equatoria, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Western Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap, Upper Nile, Eastern Equatoria Western Equatoria State, Jonglei and Unity benefiting an estimated 12,199 households.
- 1,039 ox-plough distributed across mainly four states (Upper Nile, Lakes, Warrap, and Northern Bahr el Ghazal) and additional 463 ox-ploughs distributed.

### Results Area 2: Improved livelihood prospects through increasing access to markets and skills

<sup>6</sup> The pooled fund was called Sudan Recovery Fund- South Sudan (SRF-SS) until July 2011.

Farming, fishing and livestock rearing are the key livelihood sources for most families in South Sudan. Diversification of livelihood has been supported through creating opportunities through skills improvement and also improving access to markets. More than 100,000 individuals benefitted from activities of the project in the area of improved access to markets and skills. The specific achievements include the following:

- A total of 11,448 individuals attended vocational skills training including welding and fabrication, auto-mechanics, plumbing, carpentry and joinery, nursery, tailoring, hairdressing, signage and painting, and small enterprise development.
- A total of 86,211 households were supported with business development schemes in CE, Jonglei, Lakes, NBeG, WBeG, Warrap and Unity States. These schemes included: Small business development, cash for start-ups, improved stoves, community business development and income generation, and trainings and grants.
- Supported the development of seven market points across three states (WES, EES and CES). The facilities included 4 market stalls, 1 model market, 1 dairy sales point, and 1 mini honey processing plant.
- A total of 3,412 adult members and 1,968 youths benefitted from Cash for Work schemes in Western Bahr el Ghazal State.
- Road construction equipment, valued at approximately US\$ 1 million, was procured and handed over on 28 November 2011 to Eastern Equatoria State to aid the state government in constructing feeder roads to facilitate access to markets across the eight counties.

### **Results Area 3: Improved water, sanitation and child protection initiatives**

While the focus of the SRF Round 1 livelihood project focused on improving livelihood opportunities, provision was also given to improving the living condition of target beneficiaries through the construction of water points, sanitation facilities and child protection facilities. The work under this results area involved construction of buildings and various groups. UNDP and partners have taken measures to ensure sustainability of the structures, facilities and groups through formation of water management committees, formation of child protection committees, and providing trainings to the different groups.

- A total of 170 boreholes and water points have been constructed and rehabilitated across the ten States benefiting an estimated 170,000 households. Water committees have been established to ensure sustainability of the facilities, including the provision of trainings on how to manage repairs and to maintain the facilities.
- The programme also supported the construction of latrines benefiting an estimated 300 households.
- Eight child protection centers were supported in three states; two in Jonglei, three in Lakes, and two in Northern Bahr el Ghazal and one in Unity State. A total of 850 vulnerable children were referred to Child Protection Units or offices and attended by social workers. A total of 61 social workers and more than 3,726 community members were trained in child protection and child rights issues to ensure the usability of the centers and also to improve protection of child rights.
- 45 Child Sports Clubs (involving a total of 2,250 children) were supported with sporting goods, construction of playgrounds and training in leadership and child rights in five states (Jonglei, Lakes, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Unity and Western Bahr el Ghazal).

### **Results Area 4: Enhanced engagement and capacity development of local authorities**

The SSRF Round I project TOR and strategic framework emphasized national ownership and capacity development of national authorities as an important component. Accordingly, the project has supported the training of more than 860 members of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and government personnel working in different ministries mainly at state and county levels. The training of local government personnel included veterinarians, social workers, teachers, child protection actors, country officers and women group members. Specific capacity building activities conducted include the following:

- 236 extension workers and more than 100 staff of different state ministries were trained in a variety of fields (project management, child protection, farming, etc.) across all ten states.
- Capacity building support was provided to 21 CBOs in a variety of areas, such as child protection, farming and food security, WATSAN, amongst others. Some of these organizations received sub-grants to implement small, community-based projects.

- A total of 52 social workers were trained in NBeG and Lakes States on basic computer skills (NBG) and psychosocial support and crises management (Lakes).
- One pharmacy unit was established under the State Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Resources in Lakes State. From the Awerial County, 14 veterinarians received management training to supply and run the pharmacy. A total of 95 para-veterinarians were trained and equipped and are now operational.
- A county agriculture office was constructed in Arroyo, Aweil Centre (Northern Bahr el Ghazal).
- The Western Bahr el Ghazal State Ministry of Agriculture received ten rain gauges to be located in different *bomas*, one desktop computer and two printers as part of the capacity building. This will enable the ministry to monitor the distribution and amount of rain fall in the state and focus on capacity building to give informed technical advice to the farming community.
- In Unity State, nine officials from the three County Agriculture Department (CADs) of Koch, Leer and Rubkona and State Ministry of Agriculture were trained on basic computer operations and maintenance to process data and preserve files on agriculture issues.

## Overall SSRF Financial Performance

The total allocation for SRF I was US\$ **20,837,779 for the NGO projects and UNDP's General Management Services (GMS)**. The total SSRF 1 Livelihood project expenditure by NGOs for all 18 projects, including GMS amounted to US\$ 19,949,772 against the total PCA amount of US\$ 19,594,408. The overall financial performance for the life of the project is summarized in Table 1 below:

	A	B	C	D = C/B*100	E	F = E/A*100
Project Title	Total Contribution (US\$)	Total Amount as per the PCA (US\$)	Advance by UNDP to 12 NGOs (US\$)	% Advanced against PCA amount	Expenditure by 12 NGOs incl. UNDP GMS (US\$)	% Delivery
SRF - Rural Livelihoods	20,837,779	19,594,408	18,530,535	95%	19,949,772	96%

## Strategic, Management and Sustainability Aspects of Project Implementation

**Contribution to Strategic Planning Framework:** The SRF Round 1 livelihood project is aligned to SSRF Strategic Planning Framework document identified rural livelihoods and income generation opportunities as key and urgent priorities for recovery, including improving the quality of life of the poor. The project was aimed at bolstering productivity at the rural level by providing immediate and direct benefits to communities that have been underserved.

**Contribution of key partners and collaboration:** The contribution of key partnerships and collaborations has been useful both during the design and implementation phase of the NGO projects. During the proposal development process, state governments played key role in vetting and selecting NGOs that would partner with them to implement the project. During the implementation process the states, through the State Steering Committees, played a key role in mobilizing communities, monitoring progress and also ensuring proper targeting of project beneficiaries. The South Sudan Reconstruction and Development Fund (SSRDF), as a Government body tasked with providing direct support to the SSRF projects, has worked closely with UNDP to address challenges that arose in the implementation phase.

**Primary beneficiaries of the projects:** The primary beneficiaries of the NGO projects have been the community members who are poor, most vulnerable and underserved, particularly women, youth and children. While the number and composition of beneficiaries varied from state to state and project to project, focus has been on those who are vulnerable and need direct support. The project benefited both individuals and groups depending on the nature of the intervention and focus of the project. Also, in line with the commitment made in the Strategic Planning Framework of the SSRF, the project has allocated resources and provided capacity building support to government counterparts mainly in the areas of child protection and agriculture.

**Cross-cutting issues:** In line with the content of the SSRF guiding documents, mainly the SSRF TOR and SSRF Strategic Planning Framework, cross cutting issues such as gender have been given due attention both during design and implementation of the projects. On the selection of interventions, the water and sanitation and child protection interventions have had positive effect on the welfare of women and children as they no

longer have to travel long distances from their neighbourhoods, which would have exposed them to different forms of gender violence.

**MPTF catalytic support:** The MPTF support to SSRF has been catalytic in attracting funding resources from other donors recently. The Norwegian Government has pledged support to SSRF programme to strengthen the stabilization programme currently funded through DFID and the Government of the Netherlands.

### III. EVALUATION & LESSONS LEARNED

#### Overall Project Evaluation

SSRF final programme evaluation covering SSRF Round I livelihoods project and SSRF Round 2 (Small Grants Mechanism and Support to South Sudan Reconstruction and Development Fund) has been scheduled to take place in mid 2012. The evaluation is expected to broadly look at the overall contribution of SSRF to the SSRF Strategic Planning Framework and also document lessons learned in the design and implementation phase. The key findings will be shared with primary implementing partners and stakeholders, including donor partners.

#### Evaluation of Individual NGO Projects Under the SRF Round I

Selected implementing partners conducted independent evaluations of their projects. An independent evaluation commissioned by the Implementing Partner ICCO on the introduction of energy saving stoves documented that the demand for fuel wood was increasing with subsequent cutting down of trees for charcoal making and fuel wood for cooking, fish smoking and brick burning in the project area. In some areas, there was increased dependence on fire wood and charcoal as a source of income. Notwithstanding the increased demand for fuel wood, the majority of the rural population still relied on the traditional three stone stove for cooking. By the introduction of the SSRF Project these improved stoves made savings of 30 -50 % energy decrease fuel-wood and charcoal consumption, and reduced the burden on women and young girls to collect fuel wood and also reduced the cost for households to buy charcoal. Thus it was seen to have a beneficial effect on natural resources and the environment, including on work load of women and on the purchasing power of households.

The project target was to reach 50% of women in the target villages (10 payams) using improved stoves at the end of the project period and that in each payam there would be a group of trained blacksmiths capable of making transportable improved stoves. The evaluation established that a total of 666 model energy conservation stoves were constructed in 6 payams during the project. This represents 44.4% of the 1,500 households, against the project target of 50%. Field visits made by the evaluation mission revealed that almost all households in sampled bomas had installed an energy conservation stove in their kitchens. This was attributed to the capacity built in the communities through the training of 234 energy saving promoters (64% of the targeted 360) and equipping 76 with construction kits, as well as 34 demonstrations set up in the project areas (94% of the targeted 36). Women who participated in the focus group discussions informed the evaluation mission that the stoves were easy to make with locally available materials, mainly constructed from mud.

Another independent evaluation by Stromme Foundation documented the positive contribution of the project through improving access to cash for groups working through cooperative structures. Respondents remarked that access to cash credit, and business capital was not available before the start of the SSRF project in the area. Most community members were returnees after a number of years and had come from different localities where they had been displaced. The evaluation found that the groups share the cash accrued from trading. In addition to increasing access to cash, beneficiaries reported that working in groups enhanced trust among members of the group. After settling down, elements of suspicion pervaded the community. This had been reduced or eliminated as the project has created an environment where communities work together in groups.

#### Lessons Learned

**Need for strong engagement with counterparts throughout the implementation phase of projects:** Performances of State Steering Committees improved towards the end of the programme, especially in 2011. In 2009, NGOs in most cases complained of the lack of support and delay in approvals of implementation plans by the State Steering Committees, as well as misunderstandings of the respective roles of the stakeholders. Regular engagement of UNDP personnel and implementing partners at the state level has helped to clarify

expectations and roles and responsibilities in the implementation process. Most State Steering Committees played a constructive role throughout 2010 and 2011 as a result of the concerted engagement.

**Showing flexibility in insecure project areas:** Some of the SSRF projects witnessed significant delays due to insecurity in the target areas. These included projects implemented by World Vision (Western Equatoria), Stromme Foundation (Jonglei), Save the Children-Sweden (Jonglei), ICCO (Central Equatoria), and Oxfam (Lakes). UNDP and the other project stakeholders initiated an alternate strategy to limit the effects of insecurity in many of these project sites. For instance, partners in Western Equatoria State were persuaded to redeploy resources to less insecure counties. Other projects strengthened the participation of the counties where projects are implemented to ensure that project resources are safe and implementation is not disrupted.

**Project design issues:** Based on the type of challenges described in the final progress reports submitted by the partners and the monitoring visits, it is clear that some of the projects had not clearly determined a baseline value and target for certain indicators before starting implementation. The Lack of proper baseline information made it difficult to perform an objective assessment of the project results in most cases. Most of all, it is necessary to establish a clear results framework for pooled funding allocations to which individual projects contribute. In the absence of such a framework, there is a high chance for getting scattered projects covering many sectors, and finally making it difficult for the implementing partner like UNDP to measure and report on concrete results.

### **Challenges and Mitigation Measures**

**Resource allocation for monitoring and oversight:** One of the key challenges to the effective and timely management of the SSRF 1 livelihood project allocation was the limited financial and human resources that were assigned for the monitoring and oversight of the 18 NGO projects. The management costs associated with this function was absorbed primarily by UNDP South Sudan's extra-budgetary account (income earned from the GMS 7%) on the SSRF 1Livelihood project. For similar arrangements in the future, UNDP should ensure that there is a necessary resource allocation to the Management Agent function.

**Implementation capacity of NGOs:** From the implementing NGOs' side, the major challenge has been the weak performance of some of the projects/NGOs and an uneven functioning of SSRF State Steering Committees across the ten States to oversee, coordinate, and monitor the NGO projects. NGOs reported logistical challenges and insecurity in some project areas (especially in Jongeli, Lakes, Upper Nile and Unity); intra-tribal and clan fighting; and poor road infrastructure that increases the cost of project inputs, as major challenges. Detailed challenges by the individual NGO projects are given in Annex V:

#### **Selected individual project level challenges:**

**Project implemented by Save the Children:** Save the Children (UK and Sweden) merged into a single organization called Save the Children South Sudan. The merger had legal implications that required signing a new PCA with UNDP. However, both parties agreed to maintain the initial arrangements for each of the five SSRF projects in the new PCA. The transition process has resulted in the slowing down of Save the Children project implementation. UNDP held several coordination meetings to accelerate the implementation. Nonetheless, Save the Children submitted a request for a no-cost extension, which was endorsed by UNDP, to complete the remaining activities and conduct the final evaluation.

**Projects implemented by Amurt, Vetwork and Stromme Foundation:** These projects were suspended or closed during the last quarter of 2010. The Amurt project was finally terminated at the end of 2010. The Vetwork project was also terminated in 2010 due to unfavorable audit result and lack of response to the management notice of suspension. Stromme Foundation project meanwhile responded to the notice of low target in 2010 and in Q1 2011 management reviewed the project target downward to reflect the budget approved and a no-cost extension was issued to complete remaining project activities and bring it to smooth completion in Q2 of 2011. UNDP in close collaboration with the State Steering Committee and approval of the SSRF Steering Committee has been able to reallocate resources to other organizations, ensuring that the intended beneficiaries of the project in the original proposal benefitted from the allocation.

**Systems:** The 2009 NGO audit recommendations introduced Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE)<sup>7</sup> forms mid-way through the life of the projects in Q3 of 2010. This generated

---

<sup>7</sup> FACE form is a form used to manage financial information including advances, expenditures, balances, funding request and other parameters.



bottlenecks for partners and subsequently created delays in the submission of quarterly reports for some NGOs. The consequence was delayed disbursement of funds from UNDP to the NGOs. It is expected that in the future, introduction of such instruments be applied at the project launching stage or within an acceptable allowance of time to enable better coordination and familiarity with instruments. UNDP engaged with NGOs through organizing consultation workshops and several face to face discussions with NGO personnel who work on project finances.

#### **IV. INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

The SSRF Round 1 Livelihood project had no project document and results framework. Instead, the SSRF projects were developed based on general guiding framework documents that did not have specific results. The final results were therefore assessed based on the performance of 18 individual projects and not on the overall contributions based on targets and indicators.

## Annexes to the Final Report

Annex I: Focus & Target Areas of Round 1 Projects by State

Annex II: Relevant Lessons learnt extract from discussion with partners during the Field Monitoring mission

Annex III: SSRF Governance Structure

<b>Annex I : Focus &amp; Target Areas of Round 1 Projects by State</b>					
<b>N<sup>o</sup></b>	<b>State</b>	<b>NGO</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Target Area(s)</b>
<b>1.</b>	Central Equatoria (CEQ)	CMSI	SRF-08/CE01	Vocational training on non-agricultural livelihoods	Juba, Kajokeji, Yei River, Morobo and Lainya
		ICCO	SRF-08/CE02	Agricultural production, alternative livelihoods, Vocational Trainings, and Support to Small Micro Enterprises (SMEs)	Juba County
<b>2.</b>	Eastern Equatoria (EEQ)	VETWOR K	SRF-08/EE03	Livestock production and cooperatives development.	Torit, Budi, Kapoeta, Riwoto and Mogos
		NCA	SRF-09/EEQ18	Agricultural production and market development.	Torit, Magwi, Lafon and Budi
<b>3.</b>	Jonglei (JNG)	SC SWEDEN	SRF-09/JG13	Agricultural production, vocational training and child protection.	Bor South, Twic East and Duk
		STROMME	SRF-08/JG04	Enterprise development, access to micro credit and adult literacy.	Bor South, Pibor, Ayod, Nyirol and Akobo
<b>4.</b>	Lakes (LKS)	SC SWEDEN	SRF-09/LK12	Youth education, agricultural development, child protection activities.	Cueibet, Rumbek East and Rumbek Central
		OXFAM GB	SRF-08/LK05	Provision of agricultural inputs, alternative livelihoods, veterinary services and peace building initiatives.	Rumbek Central and Greater Yirol
<b>5.</b>	Northern Bahr el Ghazal (NBEG)	SC SWEDEN	SRF-09/NBEG11	Vocational training and child protection.	Aweil East and Aweil North
		AMURT	SRF-08/NBG06	Agricultural training, provision of agricultural inputs and micro-credit.	Aweil South and Aweil Center
<b>6.</b>	Unity (UTY)	SC UK	SRF-09/UTY15	Agriculture, livelihoods, disaster risk reduction and child protection.	Loc, Leer and Rubkona
		WORLD VISION	SRF-09/UTY16	Vegetable and fish production and child protection.	Ruweng and Mayendit
<b>7.</b>	Upper Nile (UPN)	IRD	SRF-08/UN07	Community based agricultural development, livelihoods, water and sanitation.	Mabaan, Nassier and Ulang
<b>8.</b>	Warrap (WRP)	IRD	SRF-08/WR08	Agriculture cooperative and livestock production, veterinarian services and small business development	Gogrial west and Twic
		WORLD	SRF-	Agricultural training and cooperative support , and natural	Kwajok Town and Gogrial East

		VISION	08/WR09	resource management	
9.	Western Bahr el Ghazal (WBEG)	HARD	SRF-08/WBEG10	Agriculture and livestock production support and school construction.	Jur River and Wau
		SC UK	SRF-09/WBEG14	Agricultural training, income generating schemes and peace building initiatives.	Aweil Town, Aweil East, Aweil West, Aweil Center and Aweil South
10.	Western Equatoria (WEQ)	WORLD VISION	SRF-09/WEQ17	Vocational training, construction of boreholes and access to markets.	Izo, Nagero, Ibba, Mundri, and Mvolo

<b>Annex II: Relevant Lessons learnt extract from discussion with partners during the Field Monitoring mission</b>	
<b>Project (ID, NGO, State)</b>	<b>Lessons Learned</b>
<b>SRF-08/CE01 CMSI CES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Putting in place community dialogue has helped to speed up the implementation process in some places (Rokona) by increasing the involvement of the communities</li> <li>• Popularity of the Yei vocational training centre and village saving and loans activities has made it easier to identify and select beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/CE02 ICCO CES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set up a County Steering committee in order to engage Local Government in project implementation and monitoring. It has been difficult to involve members of the State Steering Committee due to competing priorities of the members</li> <li>• Implement community outreach and sensitization programs to increase the enrolment of women in education programmes.</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/EE03 SC UK WBEG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forming groups according to interest is very important for economic oriented activities this will enable easy group cohesion and focus.</li> <li>• Partnership with local CBO working well, however challenge of sustaining positive impact due to absence of funding for the CBO to meet basic administrative supervision requirements</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/UN07 IRD UPPER NILE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redistribution of small ruminants to resettled, returnees IDP and ex-combatants households can be beneficiary considering the year round availability of pastures in Upper Nile.</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/WR08 IRD WARRAP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The earlier relationship built between IRD and relevant state governments ministries; it has helped to involve government officials directly in the implementation (facilitating trainings etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/LK05 OXFAM GB LAKES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thematic management committees such as water management committee and youth groups, etc set up at inception of the livelihoods project ensure ownership and sustainability of the project results achieved. Therefore such groups should be set up at the starting phase of the project</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/CE02 HARD WBEG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good logistics management is necessary for ensuring the transport of materials to project sites and efficient project implementation, particularly to avoid delays caused by weather conditions, political events (such as elections), etc</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-09/NBEG11 SC SWEDEN NBEG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approached and work directly with the different DGs from the line ministries is more effective than high rank politicians who have many activities to attend and less time to analyze specific issues.</li> <li>• Regarding the Income Generation Groups. Regroup members in order to invest jointly in one unique business, helps to develop the same, since there are more persons to look after the business and the initial investment is bigger than if their create business individually. However the groups require good managerial and organizational skills, and good mutual understanding among members.</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-08/JG04 STROMME JONGLEI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the project design farming calendar/ cultivation cycle must be taken in to account specially for projects involving agriculture activities.</li> </ul>
<b>SRF-09/EEQ18 WORLD VISION WEQ</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGO Partners should raise day-to-day implementation issues with Director Generals of relevant State line Ministries to get agreements on the way forward more expediently, and to avoid delays in the decision-making process of State Committee Meetings.</li> <li>• Direct engagement of government counterparts during implementation reduced costs and allowed implementation of more activities</li> </ul>

### Annex III: SSRF Governance Structure

## Sudan Recovery Fund-South Sudan: Governance and Institutional Relationships

