



TEMPLATE 4.4

PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF) ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

COUNTRY: Sudan REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2013

Programme Title & Project Number Programme Title: PBF/IRF-29 Consolidating Peace through DDR in Southern Kordofan State and Central Sector State Programme Number (if applicable) MPTF Office Project Reference Number: 1 00077920

Recipient UN Organizations List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: UNDP DDR Programme

Implementing Partners List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations: Sudan DDR Commission (SDDRC), ISRA, NIMIAD, CORD, Sibro, SHO, Abrar, SOLO, MAMAN, GHF, SUDIA, IRD, JASMAR, Al Manar, SDA, Twasol-Alamal, Vetcare, Zenab, NEF and NCFM

Table with 2 columns: Contribution Type, Amount. Rows include PBF contribution (US\$ 4,680,010), Government Contribution, Other Contributions (US\$ 70,711,709.82), and TOTAL (US\$ 4,680,010).

Programme Duration Overall Duration (months) 34 Start Date (dd.mm.yyyy) 01.03.2011 Original End Date (dd.mm.yyyy) 31.12.2013 Current End date (dd.mm.yyyy) (Proposed for extension to 31.07.2014)

1 The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to "Project ID" on the MPTF Office GATEWAY 2 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 3 As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee. 4 If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed.

**Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.**

Assessment/Review - if applicable *please attach*

Yes     No    Date:

Mid-Term Evaluation Report – *if applicable please attach*

Yes     No    Date:

**Report Submitted By**

Name: Mr. Srinivas Kumar

Title: Programme Manager

Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP

Email address: [srinivas.kumar@undp.org](mailto:srinivas.kumar@undp.org)

**PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS**

**1.1 Assessment of the current project implementation status and results**

**For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project is contributing:**

<i>Priority Plan Outcome to which the project is contributing.</i>
<i>Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project is contributing.</i>

**For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project’s overall achievement of results to date:** on track

**For both IRF and PRF projects, outline progress against each project outcome, using the format below. The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes.**

**Outcome Statement 1:** Outcome 1: Respond to imminent threats to the peace process and initiatives that support peace agreements and political dialogue & Outcome 3: Stimulate economic revitalization to general peace dividends.

**Rate the current status of the outcome:** on track

<p>Indicator 1:</p> <p>1.1 # of XCs who completed reintegration training and received support (South Kordofan).</p> <p>1.2 % of XCs who report sustainable income (or successful individual reintegration support) (South Kordofan)</p>	<p>Baseline:</p> <p>1.1 By end of 2011, 24,309 combatants were demobilized in South Kordofan.</p> <p>1.2 XCs with no or very little income opportunities.</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>1.1 1,400 supported under PBF contribution</p> <p>1.2 70% report</p> <p>Progress:</p> <p>1.1- 1,400 XCs supported under PBF have received support and completed reintegration training in 2012. In total, 16,904 XCs in South Kordofan have completed trainings and received their reintegration support by the end of 2013. PBF contribution was vital as it filled a funding gap in 2012 which otherwise would have affected the programme negatively and it would not have reached this stage of gathering lessons on reintegration that would be useful towards transitioning to a more contextual programme for Sudan in view of the</p>
---	---



## **Output progress**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

All of the reintegration activities to be supported by PBF have been completed in the Central Sector and South Kordofan (as reported in the annual report of 2012). To date, the client surveys has reached 1,500 direct beneficiaries and an additional 35 focus group discussions with communities, in SKS . These are vital in informing lessons for the programme. There were delays in completing surveys in SKS largely because of the fluid security situation. However, by July, all target DDR beneficiaries were reached by an independent NGO conducting the survey. The remaining activities are the client satisfaction survey, in Central Sector States which was scheduled to complete by the end of 2013 and assessments/workshops on the project to help inform future approaches. The Central Sector survey was pending mainly due to security delays, i.e. surprise joint attack in North Kordofan, Um Ruwaba, last April 2013, in addition to challenges experienced in pursuing the SKS project activities.

## **Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

From 2009-2013, there are 21,269 XCs in both Southern Kordofan State (16,904 XCs) and Central Sector (4,365 XCs) that has received reintegration support. PBF's contribution supported 2,100 XCs (1400 in SKS, and 700 in Central Sector) and this was critical and timely as it addressed a gap in funding and facilitated confidence-building to beneficiaries. Thus, the programme was able to deliver support which aims to contribute to security and stability, specifically through successful livelihoods that help dissuade former fighters from being drawn back to conflicts.

Rural communities continue to witness economic recovery processes which are exemplified by established livelihoods of beneficiaries. In turn, viable livelihoods provide unemployed youth and people with conflict carrying capacities with an alternative to joining conflict. As evident in the surveys of SKS, reintegration support not only benefitted ex-combatants but also communities and small enterprisers in the private sector, which in turn helped to consolidate peace dividends and economic revitalization of the target rural areas.

Reintegration activities implemented in 2012 continue to provide peaceful dividends. The sheep rearing projects which started in late 2012, in North Kordofan has so far proven to be sustainable. By February 2013, all beneficiaries (two separate groups) have re-paid their first micro financing installments and by the end of December 2013, they had paid 80% of their second installment. Participants are all very committed to this initiative as a means to ensure a source of food and income security. This new approach has not only yielded positive results amongst former fighters but has also caught the eye of other interested community members wanting to receive the same kind of support.

## **Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

Conflicts remain at play in the "Two Areas" (South Kordofan and Blue Nile). The on-going challenge affecting project activities in SKS, in 2013, are insecurity and limited access to certain parts of the state. As a mitigation measure, UNDP has continued to utilize a revised and an interim M&E framework and has been working closely with SDDRC to monitor and report activities in accordance with UNDP standards. The rainy season is a challenge which the programme has been aware. However, other factors beyond the control of the programme (i.e. insecurity in certain areas that result in access constraints) push the programme to pursue activities in the rainy season, thus resulting in delays. Mitigation efforts on this issue is focused on support to the Commission's capacity and relevant state ministries as they are key to sustaining positive efforts at the state level. This is important as establishing livelihoods as part of reintegration support is a helpful model for unemployed youth with conflict carrying capacities. The current situation demands a response that strengthens the resilience of individuals and communities to conflict. UNDP is also piloting community security and arms control initiatives (CSAC) funded by Norway and Japan to complement the successes of reintegration activities. In this regard, PBF's support to the reintegration process has been vital in complementing CSAC activities in these states (estimated CSAC beneficiaries of 14,800 in SKS & CS).

**Outcome Statement 2:** Build or strengthen national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict.

**Rate the current status of the outcome: on track**

<p>Indicator 1:</p> <p>SDDRC's ability to implement programme in all states increased</p>	<p>Baseline: Basic capacity (material and human resources) in place and limited sense of ownership and understanding on DDR.</p> <p>Target: Project being implemented by national partners with a sense of national ownership of the DDR programme.</p> <p>Progress: SDDRC ability to implement programmes in all states continues to be supported. Technical support is provided by UNDP on a regular basis to ensure effective and efficient programme delivery. The Commission has acquired capacity in various areas particularly in preparing results frameworks, preparing strategy papers, monitoring activities and presenting results. Field offices have continued with structured Technical Reintegration Committee (TRC) meetings.</p>
<p>Indicator 2:</p>	

<p># of workshops delivered to the DDR Commission</p> <p>Indicator 3:</p>	<p>Baseline: 0  Target: Five  Progress: Eight (8) workshops in addition to a number of training sessions were delivered to the DDR Commission and include: two contract management workshops, one project management workshop, two lessons learned workshops on results, gaps and best practices, one workshop on the community-based approach, one workshop focusing on strategic program planning, and one workshop entitled "Community Security and Reintegration."  Trainings include: seven training sessions on knowledge management and document archiving and ten sessions on Joomla content management system were provided to SDDRC staff to customize and maintain the SDDRC joint website. Customized trainings were also held for SKS and CS MIS staff to support verifying IP tracking sheets and the DREAM database.</p> <p>Baseline:  Target:  Progress:</p>
---	--

**Output progress**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

UNDP continues to work alongside the SDDRC, at both the federal and state levels. The Commission has continued to develop their capacity, particularly in the realm of planning, implementation, monitoring and overall management of the DDR programme, with technical support from UNDP. At the state level, the Commission has a number of staff who have received training in monitoring and are able to provide support to various IPs. UNDP continues to facilitate linking IPs with crucial line-departments such as the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Animal Wealth which provide technical support, at the implementation level. Pilot initiatives are also being pursued jointly with the SDDRC under reintegration and livelihoods which merges lessons from the CSAC community-based approach as part of capacity building (see under innovation section).

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

Strengthening the capacity of the SDDRC played a significant role in peacebuilding. This was evident in the manner SDDRC lead TRC meetings, in the field, with all stakeholders (ministries and IPs as well as with international partners). The TRC meeting encouraged knowledge sharing and early identification and mitigation of challenges faced. As a result, it has expedited the approval processes and clearances submitted by IPs to conduct their activities.

In SKS, partnerships in reintegration has succeeded in strengthening The Ministry of Education due largely to their engagement with SOLO’s (a local NGO) on adult learning project and the distribution of start-up material kits for food processing business (cooking sets).

PBF supported building of the capacities of the Sudan DDR Commission (SDDRC) which enabled the commission to develop an appreciation for other initiatives such as CSAC that aim at social cohesion and peacebuilding. These efforts are in line with the SDDRC mandate as indicated in the presidential decree.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**Outcome Statement 3:**

**Rate the current status of the outcome: on track**

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

**Output progress**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**Outcome Statement 4:**

**Rate the current status of the outcome: on track**

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

**Output progress**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**1.2 Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender in the reporting period**

<b>Evidence base:</b> What is the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What	The information in this report was provided through a variety of reporting and monitoring and evaluation tools, these include: Community Satisfaction Surveys (CSS), Community Perception
--	---

<p>consultation/validation process has taken place on this report (1000 character limit)?</p>	<p>Surveys (CPS), MIS reports, IP data and monitoring, referrals, IP reports, field reports and SDDRC reports.</p>
<p><u>Funding gaps</u>: Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Yes, definitely the project filled a critical funding gap with regards to the reintegration of 2100 ex-combatants in South Kordofan State and Central Sector. This created an environment where former fighters were able to establish livelihoods, which helps to decrease a tendency to rejoin ongoing conflict. This further contributes to peacebuilding as they become positive advocates - for peace and stability - as they sustain their return to civilian life. Communities and its native leaders have even called for unemployed youth with conflict carrying capacity to be targeted as they are also the most at risk of being recruited in the current conflicts in "Two Areas" - South Kordofan and Blue Nile.</p>
<p><u>Catalytic effects</u>: Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The PBF funding helped fill a funding gap on reintegration and thus enabled the programme to implement reintegration support to former fighters. This in turn, has allowed the programme to generate success stories and lessons, specifically sharpening of focus towards livelihoods for people with "conflict-carrying capacities". A remarkable two fold effect was visible in the aftermath of the success of the "sheep rearing" group reintegration venture where, 1) the community opted to join the initiative with their own investment where they did not request for UNDP support, and 2) the microfinance institution were initially reluctant to enter into post conflict zones were encouraged by the result and that has thus brought insurance. Hence, the current project is transitioning to a more contextual programme, "stabilization programme" that would be supportive of creating a conducive environment for peace processes. This will be done by providing tangible peace dividends that communities appreciate. It should be noted that the "stabilization programme" takes into consideration the consultation with beneficiaries and communities (including those from South Kordofan and Central Sector which are areas that PBF had supported). International partners to the programme have likewise shared their inputs in this transition process (partners such as Japan, Norway, Spain among others).</p>
<p><u>Risk taking/ innovation</u>: Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The project supported the launching of three pilot projects in South Kordofan State which are successfully progressing, especially in areas where community management committees (CMCs) have been formed. It succeeded in managing the reintegration projects and also aiding in the recovery and stabilization of the area by including diverse actors within the pilots. The approach has been a combination of lessons learned from working with micro-finance, value chains, and business development services (under reintegration and livelihoods) and a community-based approach (from the Community Security and Arms Control initiatives). It has also adopted components pertaining to natural resource management, gender, social</p>

	cohesion and peacebuilding. Most notable in microfinance was that Micro finance institutions were reluctant to enter conflict /post conflict zones. After the successful reintegration sheep rearing group venture which took place in North Kordofan, the institutions were encouraged by this result, as it brought insurance to the sector. This was evident in one of the South Kordofan pilot projects, specifically at Diling.
<u>Gender marker</u> : Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Briefly justify. (1500 character limit)	Gender considerations is one of the strongest advantage of the project. In fact, women were prioritized for reintegration support and other support were organized for women beneficiaries. This included psycho-social, civic education, and literacy/numeracy trainings. These support are vital so that women beneficiaries of the programme can make better use of their reintegration support. In terms of the reintegration support, 17% were women. However, considering all the female participants to the programme, 72% have received their support - which is a similar ratio (71.6%) for men who have received support (that is % of men demobilized by the program who received reintegration support)

## PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

### 2.1 Lessons learned

*Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the project. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the project or the project processes and management.*

Lesson 1 (1000 character limit)	Maintaining good communication and coordination with the SDDRC and other national stakeholders at federal and state level - which is unique to the programme - (i.e. state level ministries, federal ministries, NGOs/CBOs) is necessary in order to receive positive support for programme implementation. This includes the facilitation of activities of implementing partners, i.e. continuously expediting approval processes and clearances so that partners move forward with project activities. This has been a new reality after conflicts broke out in SKS and BNS in 2011 - which are basically access constraints.
Lesson 2 (1000 character limit)	Strengthening national capacities proved effective as the DDR and CSAC delegations of Sudan and South Sudan as well as the Ministries of Interior and Defence lead the "Cross-border Workshop on DDR and CSAC: Lessons Learned from Sudan and South Sudan and the Road Ahead." This workshop was the first meeting between the countries of Sudan and South Sudan, at a technical level. The workshop culminated with the signing of a joint communiqué which agrees upon the need to coordinate on topics including: information sharing, increasing effectiveness, and strengthening cooperation. The agreed points in the communiqué are in line with the Cooperation Agreements signed between Sudan and South Sudan, and in fact appreciated by international partners as a positive step (such as Norway, a major

	stakeholder that is supportive of stability between the two countries).
Lesson 3 (1000 character limit)	The project has pursued initiatives that tap into the private sector and microfinance. These initiatives were pursued following the success and sustainability of reintegration projects which had positive experience(s) with the microfinance sector. The successes of these projects were also evident based on how it spread throughout the community at large, as it now seeks to adopt similar means. The approach is being replicated in Blue Nile State with the establishment of a fishery center. This fishery center (while not in South Kordofan and Central Sector) builds on the lessons that were from these areas. Thus, there is a component on livelihoods making use of value chains and microfinance along with women and youth empowerment.
Lesson 4 (1000 character limit)	
Lesson 5 (1000 character limit)	

## 2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)

*Provide one success story from the project implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter as well as the Annual Report on Fund performance. Please include key facts and figures and any citations (3000 character limit).*

Sudan DDR interventions seek to stimulate local economic recovery, address poverty dimensions which impact conflicts, and build trust among former fighters and community members. Reintegration sustainability is central for peace-building. With this view, initiatives along the concept of “Private Sector Development in Post-Conflict Settings” linked to livelihoods was pursued within the existing project framework. A starting point was conducting value-chains analyses that are relevant for DDR participants, and which can improve their access to micro-finance (an untapped opportunity in rural Sudan), insurance and markets. Results of the study identified dairy, livestock, food processing, fisheries and building blocks for the construction industry as potential value chains.

In North Kordofan, a group of ex-combatants and community members agreed to pursue a sheep rearing value chain, with support from UNDP DDR, Vet-Care Organization, PACT Sudan, the North Kordofan State government and SDDRC. The venture was promising, and the beneficiaries (former fighters and the community members) felt empowered as it was the first time they have accessed micro-loans. UNDP DDR and SDDRC conducted a joint monitoring mission in January 2013 and observed positive effects on the attitudes and behaviors of former fighters engaged in the project. For example, Abdelrahman Hussein Ali, a beneficiary, remarked “We are ready!....We feel that we are qualified now to teach others, anywhere in Sudan, about livestock management. We want to share our experience.” He further added, “If Sudan focuses on agriculture and animal resources, we will be able to benefit the country with our skills. We want to make a contribution to the country’s economy”.

In fact by February 2013, all beneficiaries were able to re-pay their first micro financing installments. And, by the end of December 2013 they had successfully paid back 80% of their second installment. The pilot project initiative continues to build

momentum and participants are all committed to it as a means of guaranteeing a source of income and stability. What makes this initiative even more fruitful is that not only are former fighters seeing the success from this project but so are other community members. Other community members are intrigued and are now inquiring from the groups to learn how they can also start a similar endeavor.

## **PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

### **3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure**

*Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, slightly delayed, or off track: delayed*

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters maximum):

A total of US\$ 4,447,156 had already been spent (95% out of total contribution). A slight delay was experienced in the implementation of the scheduled Client satisfaction surveys for Central Sector. This delay largely stems from the insecurity in the Central sector where fresh attacks were launched in Um Rawaba, North Kordofan in the end of April.

### **3.2 Comments on management and implementation arrangements**

*Please comment on the management and implementation arrangements for the project, such as: the effectiveness of the implementation partnerships, coordination/coherence with other projects, any South-South cooperation, the modalities of support, any capacity building aspect, the use of partner country systems if any, the support by the PBF Secretariat and oversight by the Joint Steering Committee (for PRF only). Please also mention if there have been any changes to the project (what kind and when); or whether any changes are envisaged in the near future (2000 character maximum):*

The lessons learned during the implementation of the reintegration projects has paved the way for the design of the new stabilization project. The aim of the stabilization project is to build on those lessons and reduce the growing insecurity in the country, while specifically targeting people at risk, i.e. youth with conflict carrying capacities.

Some of the lessons learned during implementation include the importance of partnerships, capacity building of national counterparts, and aiming for group reintegration rather than individual reintegration.

Partnerships played a significant role in achieving the outputs and outcomes of the DDR programme. It helped overcome many of the challenges faced by the programme, such as inaccessibility, and also helped innovation such as tapping into the private sector and microfinance. These partnerships include but are not limited to, the government at the federal and state levels (SDDRC, HAC, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Agriculture, etc.), UN (UNEP, UNAMID), CSOs, and NGOs.

The capacity building remains a strength of the programme as it allowed better implementation by the national partners and allows provides as an exit strategy. DDR has to date built the capacity of more than 50 CSO/NGO.

Finally, targeting groups proved to be more effective than individual reintegration, in addition to being more sustainable. It allows for better co-existence between former combatants and the communities they reside in, thus making it more sustainable.