

EASTERN EQUATORIA STABILIZATION PROGRAMME (EESP)

Q3 (July-September) 2013 STATUS REPORT

<i>SC Approval Date:</i>	8 November 2010
<i>EESP Start Date:</i>	1 January 2011
<i>Revised EESP End Date:</i>	31 August 2014
<i>Revised EESP Budget Total:</i>	USD 23,449,683
<i>Revised EESP Budget 2013:</i>	USD 8,546,736
<i>EESP Expenditure as of end of Q3 2013:</i>	USD 19,123,846
<i>EESP Coordinating Agency:</i>	UNDP South Sudan
<i>Revised EESP Outputs:</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation of the Lobira-Romula-Lotome-Kikilei-Lotukei-Kanangok road in Southern Kidepo Valley. 2. Four County Headquarters and one prison constructed and equipped. 3. Four haffirs (30,000m³ each) and nine human water consumption access points constructed.

1. Progress

Outputs	PUNO	NGO	Progress (as of end of Q3 2013)	% Complete ¹
Output 1	UNOPS	-	1. Road assessment: UNOPS completed the assessment of the Lobira-Chahari-Lotome-Kikilei-Lotukei-Kanangok road and submitted the report to the EES Security Committee, whereby the selection of this road (through the Southern Kidepo Valley) was confirmed.	100%
			2. Road Rehabilitation: Package 1 (50 km section from Lobira to Romula) and Package 2 (50 km section from Romula to Kikalay) are 99% complete, with slope trimming, stone masonry, drilling of boreholes and supply of office equipments remaining at the two engineer's facilities, which will be handed over to the State government as part of the project's capacity development support. Package 3 (40 km section from Kikalay to Kanangorok) is 98% complete, with corrective and masonry works on drainage structures of the road as well as some minor masonry works and clearing of drainage structures on the engineer's facility remaining. Construction of the bridge over Kidepo River and a culvert at Kiman in Ikotos County is 9% complete. A contract was signed on 12 April 2013 and the contractor has started mobilization, albeit slowly. Delay in awarding of the contract, insecurity in the Kikilay area and ongoing rains affected commencement and implementation of works under this package. UNOPS has held meetings and issued letters to push the contractors to mobilize and proceed to complete works within agreed timelines. The construction is expected to be completed in February 2014.	99%
Output 2	UNOPS	-	1. Construction of one County Headquarters in Kapoeta North: The County Headquarters was completed and handed	100%

¹ Percentage completed reflects progress in implementation of activities towards each output/sub-output.

Outputs	PUNO	NGO	Progress (as of end of Q3 2013)	% Complete ¹
			over to the State government on 30 October 2012, and is currently in use by local authorities. Rectification works on the building were completed during the reporting period.	
			2. Construction of one County Headquarters in Kapoeta South: The County Headquarters was completed and handed over to the State government on 30 October 2012 and is currently in use by local authorities. Rectification works on the building were completed during the reporting period.	100%
			3. Construction of one County Headquarters in Magwi: The County Headquarters was completed and handed over to the State government on 30 October 2012 and is currently in use by local authorities.	100%
			4. Construction of one County Headquarters in Lopa-Lafon: The County Headquarter was completed and handed over to the State government on 30 October 2012 and is currently in use by local authorities. Rectification works on the ceilings of the building were completed during the reporting quarter.	100%
			5. Construction of one prison complex in Ruwoto, Kapoeta North County: Construction of the main prison complex and administrative block is substantially complete. Furniture and equipment have been delivered to the site and the defects on the windows have been rectified. The prison complex is expected to be handed over to the government in Q4 2013.	99%
Output 3	UNDP	PACT	1. Construction of one haffir (30,000m³) in Jie: Construction of the haffir and training of the water management committee is fully complete. The haffir is in use by the community.	100%
			2. Construction of one haffir (30,000m³) in Lokages: The project site was changed from Lokuwato to Lokages, which is closer to the center of the villages. This change was based on a decision made by the local communities. The haffir is fully complete and it is being used by the community. Training of the water management committee is also complete.	100%
			3. Construction of one haffir (30,000m³) in Lokoal: The project site was changed from Lopuri to Lokoal, which is closer to the center of the villages. This change was based on the decision of the local communities. The construction work, rectification of defects as well as training the water management committee are fully completed. The final inspection is expected to be carried out in Q4 2013, though the haffiris are in use by the local community.	99%
			4. Construction of one haffir (30,000m³) in Naweiryatom (formerly Loele): The local authorities had changed the location of the haffir from Loele to Naweiryatom. The remaining rectification works on the cracks of the generator house and strengthening of the fencing is expected to be completed in Q4 2013.	95%
			5. Construction of eleven human consumption water access points: Three out of original six boreholes and one water filtration unit in Jie are completed and are being used by the communities. At the 16 th SSRF Steering Committee meeting, the SSRF Steering Committee approved a reduction in the total number of boreholes to three and the	100%

Outputs	PUNO	NGO	Progress (as of end of Q3 2013)	% Complete ¹
			addition of two slow sand water filtration units to be installed in Lokages and Naweiryatom, based on PACT's assessment and request. However, at the seventh Programme Board Meeting in Torit, the EESP Board resolved not to install slow sand filters and to drill seven new boreholes equipped with hand pumps instead. This led to expected savings of approximately USD 500,000 (to be confirmed on project closure). Out of these seven boreholes, one was drilled near the Lokages haffir, two were drilled near the Lokoal haffir, and two were drilled near the Naweiryatom haffir. The remaining two boreholes were not drilled in Kassangor, Kapoeta East County, due to the inaccessibility of the sites. The drilling of these boreholes was subsequently cancelled, as this was an additional request by the State government that was not part of the original project design. Water management committees were formed, trained and commissioned for all newly drilled boreholes.	
Coordinating Agency	UNDP	-	1. In August 2011, UNDP deployed a Stabilization Advisor, seconded from the UK Government, to support the team in overseeing and coordinating implementation of the EESP and provide technical advice on stabilization programming to the Governor and relevant line ministries in Eastern Equatoria.	-
			2. On 30 September 2011, UNDP organized the second EESP Programme Board Meeting with the Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee in Torit, where progress and challenges on implementation of the EESP were discussed and challenges addressed.	-
			3. On 19 December 2011, UNDP organized the third EESP Programme Board Meeting with the Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee in Torit, where additional funds and scope of works were discussed.	-
			4. On 16 January 2012, UNDP submitted an Amendment to the Joint Programme Document, Joint Programme Revision Request Form, Request for Movement within Budget Lines and Request for Budget Increase at the 13 th SSRF Steering Committee Meeting, to request the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eight months extension of programme duration to cover the defects liability period for road rehabilitation and maintenance as well as construction works and project closures under Outputs 1 and 2; - Change of scope under Output 1 for UNOPS to surface the Kikalay-Kanangorok Road (Package 3); - Reallocate USD 328,179 from cost savings of USD 667,179 under Output 2 to Output 1 to cover shortage of funds on rehabilitation of Romula-Lotome-Kikalay Road (Package 2) under Output 1; - Change of scope under Output 2 for UNOPS to procure and install solar power for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lafon and Magwi and the prison in Ruwoto, construct and equip an administration block and holding cell for the prison, and construct and install water supply facilities for County Headquarters and surrounding communities in Kapoeta North, Lopa- Lofan and Magwi; - Change of scope under Output 3 to reduce the total number of boreholes from eight to six and add installation of one water filtration unit; - Removal of reference to UNDP's role as "Lead Agency" and replace with "Coordinating Agency" to ensure 	-

Outputs	PUNO	NGO	Progress (as of end of Q3 2013)	% Complete ¹
			<p>compliance with United Nations Development Group's guidance on UN Joint Programming;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional amount of USD 2,125,369 for UNOPS to surface the Kikalay-Kanangorok Road (Package 3) under Output 1 (USD 600,000), procurement and installation of solar power for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lofan and Magwi and the prison, as well as construction and equipping of the prison administration block and holding cell, and construction and installation of water supply facilities for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lofan and Magwi under Output 2 (USD 1,100,000) and operational management cost to cover the changes of scope and extension of project duration (USD 425,369); and - Additional amount of USD 360,885 for UNDP to cover UNDP's personnel, operational support and related costs for effective coordination, monitoring and technical support under the EESP. <p>These revisions were approved by the SSRF Steering Committee.</p>	
			5. In February 2012, UNDP deployed an international engineer to Torit to monitor and provide technical support on the implementation of EESP at the State level and in building capacity of State engineers and local staff involved in the EESP.	-
			6. On 17 February 2012, UNDP organized the fourth EESP Programme Board Meeting with Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee in Torit, where extension of programme duration, change in scope under Outputs 1 and 2, and additional funding of USD 2,486,254 from the SSRF were reported.	-
			7. On 21 June 2012, UNDP organized the fifth EESP Programme Board Meeting with Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee in Torit, where progress and challenges on implementation of the EESP were discussed and updated project completion dates were agreed.	-
			8. In June 2012, UNDP processed the amendment of Project Cooperation Agreement with PACT to extend the duration of Package 3 until 30 June 2013 at no additional cost.	-
			<p>9. On 13 December 2012, UNDP submitted an Amendment to the Joint Programme Document, Joint Programme Revision Request Form and Request for Budget Increase at the 16th SSRF Steering Committee Meeting, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 months extension of programme duration to cover the defects liability period for road rehabilitation and maintenance as well as construction works and project closures under Output 1; - Change of scope under Output 1 for UNOPS to construct a bridge across the Kidepo River as part of the Romula-Lotome-Kikalay road and to construct drainage structures along the Lobira-Romula-Lotome-Kikalay-Kanangorok road; - Change of scope under Output 3 for PACT to reduce the total number of boreholes to be constructed from six to three and to add two water filtration units to be installed (one unit at each haffir site in Lokoges and Naweiryatom, respectively); 	-

Outputs	PUNO	NGO	Progress (as of end of Q3 2013)	% Complete ¹
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional amount of USD 2,310,990 for UNOPS to construct a bridge across the Kidepo River, to construct drainage structure (USD 1,954,090) and for operational and management costs to cover supervision and quality assurance of additional construction works during the project's extended period under Output 1 (USD 356,900); and - Additional amount of USD 1,252,439 for UNDP to install water filtration units at haffir sites in Lokoges and Naweiryatom under Output 3 (USD 768,414) and to cover UNDP's Coordinating Agency role, including personnel, operational support and related costs for effective coordination, monitoring and technical support under the EESP (USD 484,025). <p>These revisions were approved by the SSRF Steering Committee.</p>	
			10. On 17 December 2012, UNDP organized the sixth EESP Programme Board Meeting with Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee in Torit, where findings and recommendations from the joint monitoring mission were shared, discussed and challenges addressed.	-
			11. On 21 March 2013, UNDP organized the seventh EESP Programme Board Meeting with the Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee in Torit, where construction of four new boreholes and cancellation of slow sand water filtration units under Output 3, among other programmatic issues, were discussed and agreed. The EES State Government proposed drilling two boreholes in in Kassangor, Kapoeta East County; however, these additional target areas had not been included in the original programme and therefore had not been previously approved by the SSRF Steering Committee.	-
			12. From 6 to 14 June 2013, UNDP, UNOPS, PACT and the State government conducted a joint monitoring mission to the project sites. Community consultations with the relevant beneficiary communities were also conducted during this mission to gather information on community perceptions.	-
			13. In July 2013, UNDP, UNOPS and the State government conducted a joint monitoring mission to the project sites and noted that the problems on the prison's windows and cracks on the Kapoeta North County Headquarters' building have been addressed.	

2. Challenges

Challenges/Risks

Mitigation Measures

Challenges/Risks	Mitigation Measures
<p>2.1 The tender process on the rehabilitation of roads was delayed, pending further agreement with, and confirmation from, the State government. Available budget for road rehabilitation was limited, as the State government had reallocated funds from EESP Output 1 (road rehabilitation) towards constructing and equipping larger County Headquarters (EESP Output 2) in four counties. Therefore, scope of works for EESP Output 1 was reassessed in line with the available budget, and agreed at the first EESP Programme Board Meeting with the EES Steering Committee on 1 April 2011. <i>Additional funding is required for constructing a second road through the Northern Kidepo Valley.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the second EESP Programme Board Meeting on 30 September 2011, UNDP informed the Eastern Equatoria State Steering Committee that additional funding for road rehabilitation through the Northern Kidepo Valley was not possible due to the limited availability of funds in the SSRF. The State government expressed that they will explore alternative sources of funding for rehabilitating this road.
<p>2.2 The tender process on the construction of the County Headquarters in Lopa-Lofan was delayed, pending further confirmation from the State government on the exact locations of these facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A letter dated 29 March 2011 from State Minister of Finance confirmed the location of the County Headquarters in Lopa-Lofan, and selected the road through the Southern Kidepo Valley road.
<p>2.3 Insecurity due to communal fighting and cattle raiding constrained access and delayed mobilization of contractors to some target sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP, UNOPS and PACT regularly monitored the security situation in target areas. Armed escorts were provided by State and County authorities when required. <i>However, in some cases the security escorts did not have transportation, and demanded additional payments that unforeseeably increased the cost of some field missions.</i>
<p>2.4 The tender process on the construction of the haffirs in Loele and Lopuri delayed as only one company had submitted a proposal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PACT re-advertised the Request for Proposal for haffirs in Loele and Lopuri. Proposals were received from four companies, but only two had the necessary qualifications. From the two that qualified, only one, Texas Sudan, could initiate works during the dry season; however, its proposal exceeded the available budget. PACT negotiated and reached agreement with Texas Sudan on reducing the costs in its proposal.
<p>2.5 Additional staff and operational costs required for coordination, monitoring and technical support to State line ministries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional amount of USD 360,885 for UNDP was approved at the 13th SSRF Steering Committee Meeting to cover personnel, operational support and related costs for effective coordination, monitoring and technical support under the EESP.
<p>2.6 Scope of works, locations and building designs for County Headquarters and the prison were not clearly defined and required further clarification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS requested the State government to decide on the scope of works and locations of the County Headquarters. UNOPS also reviewed and developed drawings for country Headquarters and the prison that were approved by the State government.
<p>2.7 Roads in Northern Kidepo Valley and Southern Kidepo Valley run through ecologically sensitive areas, requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and related risk mitigation measures. Additional funding is required for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initial environmental screening was conducted by UNOPS. However, this was not completed along Northern Kidepo Valley road, due to inaccessibility and limited funding. A full EIA will require an aerial survey, at an additional cost that is not

Challenges/Risks	Mitigation Measures
<p>the EIA and ecological protection measures.</p>	<p>currently available in the project budget. Similarly, as the construction of this road is not feasible within the available budget, the State government, UNDP and UNOPS agreed to focus available resources on the Southern Kidepo Valley road.</p>
<p>2.8 One section of the road in Northern Kidepo Valley could not be fully assessed due to dense forestation that restricted access to the target areas along the route. Additional funding is required for assessment of the targeted area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP and UNOPS finalized the cost estimate on conducting assessment of the targeted area and UNDP has approached donors to mobilize additional funding.
<p>2.9 UNOPS received an email complaint from the “Torit Contractors Association” raising concerns that local companies were not qualified for construction contracts. This was followed by telephone call from an anonymous person threatening the UNOPS Procurement Officer that UNOPS personnel and contractors will not be allowed to work in Eastern Equatoria State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP and UNOPS met with the Governor of Eastern Equatoria State to discuss this issue, and shared the bid evaluation results of previous packages. The UNDP Programme Coordinator re-emphasized that all procurement through UN agencies is conducted in an open and transparent manner, based on the United Nations rules and regulations and in line with international standards. The Governor assured the full support of the State government to this principle and that he will contact companies listed in the email to ensure compliance and prevent such issues from occurring in future.
<p>2.10 Construction of haffirs and boreholes in Eastern Equatoria State was suspended by PACT in mid June 2011, due to heavy rain restricting access to and operations at target sites. Texas Sudan, PACT’s contractor for haffir construction in Lokoal and Loele, delayed mobilization to the project site. The contractor stopped work before making any major progress before the onset of the wet season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q2 2011, PACT organized a meeting with the Governor, the Commissioners of Kapoeta North and Kapoeta East, and the Director of Texas Sudan. Texas Sudan acknowledged the delay, but explained that they have the capacity to carry out the work and will resume once the wet season is over. With the approval of the Governor and the Commissioners, PACT decided not to cancel the contract with Texas Sudan but to extend it until the next dry season. ▪ During the second EESP Programme Board Meeting held on 30 September 2011, all parties agreed that PACT should terminate the contract with Texas Sudan, due to continuous poor performance as well as serious financial difficulties. PACT re-issued the Request for Proposal (RFP) for construction of haffirs in Lokoal and Loele. The RFP was advertised in national newspapers in Uganda and Kenya, and PACT staff travelled to Kampala and Nairobi to facilitate submission of bids from capable companies.
<p>2.11 There were prolonged periods during Q2 2011 when the price of fuel rose sharply, and there was no availability of fuel in Kapoeta.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contractors were forced to transport fuel from Juba and neighboring countries, causing delays in project implementation and increased cost of operations.
<p>2.12 The locations of the haffirs have undergone multiple changes as the final location decision lies with the communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neither the State government nor County authorities took responsibility for this, therefore PACT visited project sites often to consult with and agree on the location of each haffir and water point with target communities.

Challenges/Risks	Mitigation Measures
<p>2.13 As a result of the bid evaluation, UNOPS's Headquarters Contract and Procurement Committee (HQPC) in Copenhagen decided that MacDowell Ltd. should be contracted for Packages 1 and 2 under EESP Output 1. However, the State government requested UNOPS not to award the contract to MacDowell for Package 2 and allow re-bidding for this package. MacDowell is working on another State-owned road construction project in the same area as Package 2, and, according to the State government, these projects have been severely delayed for almost two years and the local community in that area is dissatisfied with the performance of the company.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MacDowell was selected for Packages 1 and 2 based on a technical and financial evaluation of its bids, in accordance with UNOPS rules and regulation. Due to the concerns raised by the State government, MacDowell was requested to prove their capacity to manage multiple projects, which was done by successfully mobilizing equipment for other projects awarded by UNOPS and the State government, assessing their technical staff at different project sites, and submitting performance guarantees. While the EESP Board approved the decision to award the contract for Package 2 to MacDowell on 19 December 2011, the delay in awarding this contract requires an extension to the original EESP end date to cover the defects liability period.
<p>2.14 The delay in payment of compensation to community members by the State government has affected the progress of the road rehabilitation project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Governor confirmed that it is the responsibility of the County Commissioners to ensure compensation is paid on time, and requested UNOPS to involve the County Commissioners should such problems arise.
<p>2.15 There was a shortage of funds for Package 2 (Romula-Lotome-Kikalay), which is the only package under EESP Output 1 for which a contract was not awarded. The contracts for all three packages amount to USD 5.2 million, whereas the allocated amount for Output 1 was USD 4.87 million. This led to a deficit of USD 328,000 for Package 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS secured a savings of USD 667,179 from the construction of four County Headquarters under EESP Output 2. The EESP Board Meeting agreed to reallocate the savings from Output 2 to Output 1 and requested that the remaining balance of USD 328,179 be allocated for covering the shortage of funds for rehabilitation of the road under Package 2.
<p>2.16 The current specification for Package 3 (Kikalay-Kanangorok) does not include road surfacing due to shortage of funds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SSRF Steering Committee had allocated USD 600,000 for road maintenance on the condition that the State government cost-share their own resources for road maintenance. UNDP proposed to assist the Eastern Equatoria State government to discuss with the Republic of South Sudan (RoSS) Ministry of Transport and Roads so that the State government can receive its annual allocation of SSP 1.5 million to contribute to road maintenance. The additional USD 600,000 from the SSRF will be used to surface the road under Package 3. The SSRF Steering Committee approved additional funding of USD 600,000 for surfacing of Package 3 at the 13th Steering Committee Meeting on 16 January 2012.
<p>2.17 An administration block is required for the prison being constructed in Ruwoto, Kapoeta North County, to provide adequate work space and detention facilities for prison officials.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional funding for procurement and installation of solar power for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lofan and Magwi and the prison, as well as construction and equipping of the prison administration block and holding cell, and construction and installation of water supply facilities for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lofan and Magwi under Output 2 (USD 1,100,000) request was approved at the 13th SSRF Steering Committee Meeting on 16 January 2012.

Challenges/Risks	Mitigation Measures
<p>2.18 In conducting bid opening and bid evaluation for the contractor for construction of haffirs in Lokoal and Loele, PACT had given prior notice to the State government to ensure that they are fully involved in the process. However, the representatives from the EES Ministry of Housing and Public Utilities were not prepared to attend the meeting when PACT arrived Torit as planned. The State government also criticized PACT for holding the majority on the evaluation panel (where PACT had three representatives and the State government had two representatives). It was only when the discussion had reached a stalemate and PACT decided to leave Torit without holding the bid opening that the State government consented to PACT's request and agreed to attend the meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forming a pre-selection committee between PACT's senior staff and the EES Ministry of Housing and Public Utilities would be beneficial, rather than conducting all preparatory work over the phone and email.
<p>2.19 The location of a haffir in Lopuri was changed to Lokoal in May 2011, as stated in the official letter issued by the Payam Chief and the elders and later endorsed by the County authorities. However in January 2012, PACT received a notice that the location is to be changed again.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PACT had resisted this change, noting the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This haffir has already been relocated from Lopuri, based on the communities' request. - Changing the location at this stage would cause serious delays; whereby the haffir may not be completed during the dry season. Texas Sudan, the previous contractor, had started to excavate the haffir in Lokoal, the site had been surveyed by PACT's Senior Resident Rainwater Harvesting Engineer, and then was contracted to Warsam Holdings. If the location was changed, the contract would require further amendments and modification, whereby the contractor could raise objections, renegotiate the budget and claim for expenses already incurred on work in Lokoal. - The proposed new site was on higher ground and therefore not suitable for rainwater catchment. <p>PACT held meetings with the Commissioner of Kapoeta North, the Chief and the elders, as well as with the Governor of Eastern Equatoria. All parties eventually accepted the decision to construct the haffir in Lokoal.</p>
<p>2.20 During Q1 2012, the location of a haffir in Loele was changed to Naweiryatom due to a decision made by the local authorities. Now locations of all four haffirs have been changed from what had been initially recommended by the State Government and approved by the SSRF Steering Committee. The constant changing of the location has caused significant delays in the effective and efficient implementation of these outputs. As none of the new locations for haffirs were subject to thorough conflict assessments, their utility as conflict mitigation measures must be reassessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State government should conduct close consultations with the local authorities and communities, and should reach an agreement on the locations, prior to the launch of conflict and environmental assessments. This would avoid local authorities and community members raising objections and/or requests to change the locations, which may delay project implementation, incur additional costs, and attenuate the conflict resolution impact of the project.
<p>2.21 The Chairperson of the Water Management Committee for the haffir in Jie had</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The community members and PACT eventually agreed to a system whereby

Challenges/Risks	Mitigation Measures
<p>been instructed to prevent community members from collecting water from the haffir, until the contractor returns to site and completes the extraction system. The Chairperson continued to prevent people from accessing the haffir even when all other water sources in the area had dried up. This led to an incident where he was assaulted by a woman who demanded she be permitted to access water from the haffir.</p>	<p>people will be allowed to access water in an orderly fashion for an agreed number of hours per day. This system continued until the contractor was able to set up a temporary extraction system, which pumped the water to the troughs outside of the perimeter fence of the haffir.</p>
<p>2.22 The construction of haffirs in Lokoal is delayed due to poor performance of the contractor, Warsam Holdings. It is very likely that the haffir will not be completed before the onset of the next rainy season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PACT had proposed to de-obligate the construction of haffir in Loele from Warsam Holdings and transfer it to the Universal Hydro Engineers & Contractors (UHEC), given Warsam's slow progress in Lokoal. However, in the meeting held between the Governor, PACT and its two contractors, UHEC and Warsam Holdings, to discuss the issue of the haffir in Loele, the Governor refused PACT's proposal and requested that Warsam holdings be given another chance to execute the work in Loele and thereby gain experience, as had been the case for UHEC.
<p>2.23 On 27 March 2012, a child fatality occurred at the Jie haffir site when he tripped and fell under the contractor's truck.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multiple meetings were held between PACT, local authorities and community members, culminating in a meeting held in Jie on 31 March 2012 with attendance of the State government and police authorities. The community acknowledged that it was an accident, and stated that they wish no harm on the contractor. The contractor is to compensate the community by providing livestock, the number of which will be determined through negotiations with the County Commissioner.
<p>2.24 On 8 May 2012, a truck belonging to the UHEC, the contractor for haffirs in Jie and Lokages, was attacked on the road between the haffir site and Kapoeta town. Many items were stolen and the truck was vandalized.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PACT brought the incident to the attention of the Commissioner of Kapoeta North. He immediately tasked the police to arrest the culprits and an equivalent amount of their livestock was confiscated in order to fully compensate UHEC.
<p>2.25 Consultation with counterparts on specifications of furniture and equipment for the County Headquarters and prison under Package 2 took time and resulted in delays of delivery.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultation with counterparts should be planned ahead and conducted in a timely manner to avoid delays in project implementation and delivery.
<p>2.26 UNOPS's procurement process for furniture and equipment for the County Headquarters and prison under Package 2 took longer than communicated to the State government counterparts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS should review its procurement process and expedite the procurement process where possible. At the same time, expectations of the counterparts should be managed appropriately based on realistic assumptions of the project implementation schedule.
<p>2.27 The contractor for the haffir in Lokoal was attacked by armed groups a number of times. The County Commissioner of Kapoeta North assigned 18 policemen to guard the project site, in addition to the two already stationed, however these</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The incidents were reported to the County authorities and suspects were arrested.

Challenges/Risks	Mitigation Measures
<p>18 policemen remained in the site only for a day and then returned to the County Headquarters. One day after 18 policemen had left, armed groups again attacked the project site, disarmed the remaining two policemen, stole and destroyed the contractor's construction materials, food, tools, cooking utensils, tents and mattresses. One of the contractor's staff was injured during this attack and was sent to the nearest local hospital in Kapoeta Town for medical treatment.</p>	
<p>2.28 During Q3 2012, the level of insecurity in the project site for Output 1 worsened and construction works had to be suspended. One of the staff of the contractor for Package 1 was shot and severely injured by the SPLA soldiers and later died.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS requested the State government to intervene and the insecurity in the project site was mitigated. The State government is providing patrols in the area and the construction works have resumed.
<p>2.29 Some of the items delivered by the contractor for Information and Communication Technology equipment for County Headquarters and a prison complex did not conform to required technical specifications. The contractor delivered another consignment, but again a few items were missing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS procured missing items through direct shopping option.
<p>2.30 Prior to the handover ceremony of County Headquarters in Kapoeta South on 30 October 2012, the Governor of Eastern Equatoria State had requested UNOPS to surface access road and parking area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These additional works were not included in the original contract and will result in increase of the contract amount. This has been resolved between UNOPS and the contractor.
<p>2.31 Community members using the haffir in Jie had difficulties using the diesel pump installed in the haffir, as only one technician was trained to use the pump who has left the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PACT and the community members agreed to identify four additional technicians who will receive technical training to use the diesel pump from the contractor.
<p>2.32 Heavy rains during the rainy season may cause flooding of the sewage water from the septic tank in the Ruwoto prison complex.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS to advise the State government to allocate resources for mitigation measures against flooding in the prison site.
<p>2.33 The two boreholes that were planned to be drilled in Kassangor, Kapoeta East County, under Output 3 could not be drilled due to the inaccessibility of the project site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP and PACT agreed to cancel the drilling of these two boreholes as the sites will not be accessible before the end of the project.
<p>2.34 On April 16 2013, there was fighting between cattle raiders and government forces. Construction works on roads under Output 1 had to be suspended for one month due to this security incident.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The contractors resumed work after the security situation had abated.
<p>2.35 Frequent insecurity in the area may cause delays to the rectification works as well as construction of the bridge and culvert at the road projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advise the State government to monitor security situation closely and find long term solutions.

3. Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned	Recommendations
<p>3.1 Assessments and tendering of construction projects should be conducted during the wet season, to initiate construction works planned at the beginning of the dry season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project design should allow adequate preparation time to ensure programme outputs are appropriately assessed, planned and budgeted with State government counterparts and target communities. This would serve to better manage expectations and provide adequate time to contractors for mobilizing to target sites at the beginning of the dry season and thereby, maximize time for construction works.
<p>3.2 A close, collaborative relationship between the State government, local authorities and target communities, participating UN organizations and NGO implementing partners is critical for overcoming challenges during project implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain close communication and engagement with State government and local counterparts throughout implementation. This will enable participating UN organizations and NGO implementing partners to better manage expectations of State government and local counterparts. <i>Decentralized Programme Boards convened by UNDP through existing State government forums have proven to be an excellent mechanism for steering implementation, mitigating challenges and enhancing coordination and dialogue on programmatic and other strategic issues related to stabilization.</i>
<p>3.3 In order to expedite delivery and limit bottlenecks and constraints to implementation, a contingency fund/mechanism is required to address the increasing cost of project inputs that is further compounded by frequently changing operational and security dynamics and uncertainties in target areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SSRF should include a mechanism for quickly disbursing funds to PUNOs in order to address contingencies that have occurred frequently throughout implementation due to various operational constraints including insecurity. This would help reduce transaction costs for identifying and securing additional resources, and is now even more critical during the period of austerity and economic uncertainty that was caused by the Government of South Sudan's shutdown of oil exports, due to a disagreement on transit fees with the Government of South Sudan during Q1 2012.
<p>3.4 Construction works had to be stopped during the wet season. Contractors attempted to continue working during the rain, but mobilizing heavy machineries to remote and inaccessible project sites was severely restricted. Tendering of construction projects should be conducted during the wet season, to initiate construction works at the beginning of the dry season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project design should allow adequate preparation time to ensure resources are appropriately allocated, budgeted and planned with State government counterparts. This would serve to better manage expectations and provide adequate time to contractors for mobilizing to target sites at the beginning of the dry season and thereby, maximize time for construction works.
<p>3.5 Issuing an RFP for large-scale earth-moving work in South Sudan and just waiting for companies to apply will not produce the best results. There are few competent regional companies with the required machineries, and usually they are already committed to other contracts. Participating UN organizations and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating UN organizations and NGO implementing partners should travel to neighboring countries and meet face-to-face with companies to facilitate their application to submit bids for tenders as well as pre-qualify potential contractors.

Lessons Learned	Recommendations
<p>NGO implementing partners need to be proactive in approaching companies to apply, because in many cases, working in South Sudan is perceived as high risk.</p>	
<p>3.6 Divergent views from different stakeholders led to delays in the procurement process of Package 2 under Output 1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State government to be advised that procurement processes undertaken by UN Agencies should not be subject to disputes between the State government and contractors on separate and unrelated contractual issues.
<p>3.7 Installation of solar-powered water pumps to County Headquarters allows community members to access those water sources, and thereby contribute to stabilization and increase in the State's presence and delivery of basic services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional funding of USD 1,100,000 for UNOPS was approved at the 13th SSRF Steering Committee Meeting for procurement and installation of solar power for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lofan and Magwi and the prison, as well as construction and equipping of the prison administration block and holding cell, and construction and installation of water supply facilities for County Headquarters in Kapoeta North, Lopa-Lofan and Magwi. This included solar-powered water supply for each County Headquarters.
<p>3.8 The locations of all four haffirs under Output 3 were changed from what had been initially identified by the State government. This delayed project implementation and could potentially undermine its impact as none of the new locations for haffirs were the subject to thorough conflict assessments and thus their utility as conflict mitigation measures should be reassessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State government should conduct close consultations with the local authorities and community members, and should reach an agreement on the locations, prior to the launch of conflict and environmental assessments. This would avoid local authorities and community members raising requests to change the locations, which may delay the project, incur additional costs, and attenuate the conflict resolution impact of the project.
<p>3.9 Project implementation could be delayed if consultations with counterparts are not conducted in a timely manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultation with counterparts should be planned ahead and conducted in a timely manner to avoid delays in project implementation and delivery.
<p>3.10 Counterparts will be frustrated and the credibility of participating UN organizations and NGO implementing partners will be damaged if the communicated project implementation timelines are not honored.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expectations of the counterparts should be managed appropriately based on realistic assumptions of the project implementation schedule. Participating UN organizations and NGO implementing partners should make all efforts to honor the agreed timelines.
<p>3.11 Strong pre-construction community engagement is necessary to ensure communities are committed to sustainability and maintenance of haffirs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In future programming the community engagement aspect should be conducted before construction begins and should be a focus area for implementing partners and contractors.
<p>3.12 To ensure sustainability and ownership of the projects, engagement with the different levels of government, community chiefs and County authorities is crucial. It is also beneficial to investigate approaches to sustainability that are being developed by the relevant national bodies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementing partners should work very closely with the State and County authorities as well as local communities to ensure ownership and sustainability of the outputs. It is also important that donors and implementing partners coordinate together to ensure sufficient budgetary allocation by the government for

Lessons Learned	Recommendations
	maintenance and proper management of the infrastructure.

4. Financial Status²

Programme	Output	Resp Agency	Imp Partner	Budget Category*	Total Approved Budget (US\$)	Total Cumulative Expenditure (as of end of Q3 2013)	Balance (US\$)	% Delivery
					[A]	[B]	[C=A-B]	[D=B/A]
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Staff and Other Personnel Costs	785,034	782,472	2,562	100%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Supplies, Commodities, Materials	12,000	61,053	(49,053)	509%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation	230,800	243,772	(12,972)	106%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Contractual Services	7,958,245	5,844,742	2,113,503	73%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Travel	50,000	48,761	1,239	98%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Transfers and Grants Counterparts	-	-	-	-
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	General Operating and Other Direct Costs	890,488	446,643	443,845	50%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Indirect Support Costs	664,753	519,805	144,949	78%
EESP	1	UNOPS	-	Subtotal 1	10,591,320	7,947,247	2,644,073	75%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Staff and Other Personnel Costs	758,500	787,142	(28,642)	104%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Supplies, Commodities, Materials	15,000	14,429	571	96%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation	860,163	819,739	40,424	95%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Contractual Services	5,123,000	4,933,258	189,742	96%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Travel	30,000	47,842	(17,842)	159%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Transfers and Grants Counterparts	-	-	-	-
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	General Operating and Other Direct Costs	484,027	511,112	(27,085)	106%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Indirect Support Costs	524,348	497,826	26,522	95%
EESP	2	UNOPS	-	Subtotal 2	7,795,039	7,611,349	183,690	98%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Staff and Other Personnel Costs	799,741	415,757	383,984	52%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Supplies, Commodities, Materials	1,000	-	1,000	0%

² All expenditures are indicative unless certified by each organization's financial controller.

Programme	Output	Resp Agency	Imp Partner	Budget Category*	Total Approved Budget (US\$)	Total Cumulative Expenditure (as of end of Q3 2013)	Balance (US\$)	% Delivery
					[A]	[B]	[C=A-B]	[D=B/A]
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation	163,774	13,407	150,367	8.2%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Contractual Services	2,121,200	2,110,427	10,773	99%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Travel	34,620	30,420	4,200	88%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Transfers and Grants Counterparts	-	-	-	-
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	General Operating and Other Direct Costs	452,846	236,773	216,073	52%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Indirect Support Costs	245,233	181,284	63,949	74%
EESP	3	UNDP	PACT	Subtotal 3	3,818,414	2,988,068	830,346	78%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Staff and Other Personnel Costs	729,679	331,448	398,231	45%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Supplies, Commodities, Materials	1,000	3,254	(2,254)	325%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation	139,848	39,036	100,812	28%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Contractual Services	-	3,972	(3,972)	-
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Travel	25,000	55,844	(30,844)	223%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Transfers and Grants Counterparts	-	-	-	-
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	General Operating and Other Direct Costs	280,508	112,324	168,184	40%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Indirect Support Costs	68,875	31,304	37,571	45%
EESP	CA	UNDP	-	Subtotal 4	1,244,910	577,182	667,728	46%
EESP	CA			TOTAL 1	23,449,683	19,123,846	4,325,837	82%