



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
END OF PROJECT REPORT
COUNTRY: Sudan
REPORTING PERIOD: 01 JANUARY 2011-31JULY2014**

<p align="center">Programme Title & Project Number</p> <p>Programme Title: PBF/IRF/29 Consolidating Peace through DDR in Southern Kordofan State and Central Sector State Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i> MPTF Office Project Reference Number:¹ 00077920</p>

<p align="center">Recipient UN Organizations</p> <p>List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: UNDP - Sudan Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Programme.</p>
--

<p align="center">Implementing Partners</p> <p>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..</p>
--

<p align="center">Programme/Project Budget (US\$)</p> <p>PBF contribution (by RUNO) US\$ 4,680,010</p> <p>Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p>Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p>TOTAL: US\$ 4,680,010</p>
--

<p align="center">Programme Duration</p> <p>Overall Duration <i>(months)</i> 41</p> <p>Start Date² <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 01.03.2011</p> <p>Original End Date³ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 31.07.2014</p> <p>Final End date⁴<i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 31.07.2014</p>

<p align="center">Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.</p> <p>Mid-Term Evaluation / Review - if applicable <i>please attach</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Date: June 2012 & June 2014</p>

<p align="center">Report Submitted By</p> <p>Name: Srinivas Kumar Venkumahanthi</p>
--

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.

End of project Evaluation– *if applicable please attach*

Yes No Date:

Title: Programme Manager

Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP

Email address: srinivas.kumar@undp.org

PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Assessment of the project implementation status and results

For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project has contributed:

<p><i>Priority Plan Outcome to which the project has contributed. Outcome 1: Respond to imminent threats to the peace process and initiatives that support peace agreements and political dialogue</i> <i>Outcome 2: Build or strengthen national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict.</i> <i>Outcome 3: Stimulate economic revitalization to general peace dividends</i></p>
<p>Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project has contributed. Outcomes 1, 2 and 3. Indicator 1.1. # of XCs who completed reintegration training and received support-South Kordofan Indicator 1.2. % of XCs who report sustainable income (or successful individual reintegration support) - South Kordofan. Indicator 2.1. SDDRC’s ability to implement programme in all states increased. Indicator 2.2. # of workshops delivered to the DDR Commission. Indicator 3.1. # of XCs who completed reintegration training and received support- Central Sector Indicator 3.2. % of XCs who report sustainable income (or successful individual reintegration support) - Central Sector. <i>From 2011-2014, about 15,638 XCs in Southern Kordofan State and Central Sector (4,365XCs) has received reintegration support. PBF’s contribution was critical and timely as it addressed a gap in funding and facilitated confidence-building of beneficiaries that DDR is able to deliver support which aim to contribute to security and stability.</i></p>

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: Respond to imminent threats to the peace process and initiatives that support peace agreements and political dialogue;

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

<p>Indicator 1: # of XCs who completed reintegration training and received support</p>	<p>Baseline: By end of 2011, 36,251 combatants were demobilized in the protocol areas Target: 21,171 (registered with IPs) Progress: 20,003</p>
<p>Indicator 2: 1.2. % of XCs who report sustainable income (or successful individual reintegration support).</p>	<p>Baseline: % XCs with no or very little income opportunities Target: 70% of the XCs. Progress: More than 70% has been achieved- Client satisfaction survey conducted in July</p>

<p>Indicator 3:</p>	<p>2013 in South Kordfan State show that 85% deemed the reintegration support useful, and 59.7% started generating income from reintegration benefits.</p> <p>The community perception survey conducted in 2013 in SKS showed that XCs were accepted into the Communities.</p> <p>Baseline: Target: Progress:</p>
---------------------	---

Output progress at the end of project

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

Provide reintegration services and follow up for 1,400 XCs in South Kordofan:

All reintegration activities supported by PBF were completed in South Kordofan in 2012. The SKS client survey however was completed in 2013 due to the security situation. The survey has reached 1,500 direct beneficiaries, in addition to 35 focus group discussions with communities which proved vital in informing lessons for future programming.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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)?

DDR participants revealed that through the reintegration trainings of the programme, they have received knowledge and skills which make them more capable of handling their small businesses and livestock. Results of Client Satisfaction Surveys in 2012 and 2014 also reveal that about 73% have sustainable livelihoods. This, in turn, contributes to long-term reintegration of ex-combatants into civilian life and help lessen likelihood of a relapse into high-intensity and widespread conflicts. Therefore, ex-combatants who have successful ventures are less likely to re-engage in conflict. Communities have echoed the same in perception surveys, which have readily accepted ex-combatants in their communities and who also advocate for peaceful resolution and dialogue to resolve conflicts.

Public information activities were also rolled out across Central Sector States (CSS) and in Kadugli, South Kordofan State by local NGOs Labena and Sudia. Approximately 45,000 individuals were estimated to have been reached by messages about DDR which is a key provision in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. Additionally the sensitization focused on Community Security and Arms Control (CSAC), peace-building, peaceful coexistence and prevention of violence against women. The methods employed in these outreach campaigns included radio programmes, community leaders’ training and awareness, community mobilization, focus group discussions, face-to face events,

<p>Indicator 3:</p>	<p>were provided by UNDP and SDDRC to 75 representatives from civil society organizations. One project management workshop was provided to select SDDRC staff members in Khartoum. Two Lessons learnt workshops were conducted to brief the SDDRC to understand the results, gaps and best practices. One workshop on the new approach was conducted to familiarize SDDRC on community-based approach. These workshops and trainings assisted SDDRC in formulating policy documents and programme interventions for the government led DDR in Darfur.</p> <p>Baseline: Target: Progress:</p>
---------------------	--

Output progress at the end of project

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

Strengthen capacity of SDDRC to implement all aspects of the programme:

SDDRC has acquired capacity in certain areas especially preparing strategy papers, work plans, annual reports, monitoring activities and presentation on the results. Two contract management workshops and project management workshop resulted in formulating contract management group between DDRC and UNDP. Which assisted in smooth contract implementation of reintegration projects in the field. Further, seven trainings sessions on knowledge management and document archiving were provided to the SDDRC to enhance their knowledge management tools. Ten sessions on Joomla content management system were provided to SDDRC staff to customize and maintain the SDDRC joint website. Finally, customized trainings were held for SKS and CS MIS staff to support verifying tracking of ex-combatants - IP tracking sheets and the DREAM-MIS database.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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)?

A crucial achievement was the reinforcement of the role of the Sudan DDR Commission, especially at the state level, who has subsequently managed to assume a leadership role in the field implementation, allowing UNDP to adapt in the current situation of a reduced presence. SDDRC has played an important role in mobilizing support from national government bodies to ensure UNDP’s DDR implementing partners are able to deliver their work in SKS and CSS, especially at such a complex period. At the community level, social reintegration activities that involved dialogue and discussions with community leaders, trainings and advocacy on peace-building, and other Community Security initiatives (funded by other donors) has contributed to strengthening national capacities to promote peace at the grass roots level. These community leaders have expressed that they have a role in DDR and CS interventions. Hence, the SDDRC has recognized and have accepted that communities indeed need to be part of the DDR processes.

Implementing partners, mostly local NGOs and CBOs, have expressed their appreciation of the DDR Programme for helping build their capacities as highlighted in workshops, bi-lateral meetings and briefings with donors. In fact, DDR implementing partners were automatically “pre-qualified” by other UN agencies (especially in the humanitarian sector), which stands as a testimony to the results in the area of capacity building. This means that they no longer need to undergo a thorough review of their capacities by UN agencies before submitting bids and offers. Implementing Partners have also shared that they were able to secure additional funding from other donors for other project activities outside of DDR due to the trainings conducted and experience gained within the DDR programme. The Commissioner for the Humanitarian Aid Commission has also placed appreciation on record, mentioning that DDR programme singularly engaged many local NGOs and helped build their capacity. Lastly, the partners have said that through the DDR Programme, they were able to venture into communities that used to be unwelcoming even to the government institutions, implementing partners or other UN bodies (i.e. Northwest of South Kordofan bordering Darfur) and viewed that DDR has opened gates for other recovery and development in these communities . Therefore, these outcomes reinforce the programme’s credibility to gather confidence from both former fighters and communities to deliver tangible results in support of peace and stability.

Overall, the national authorities have shown a firm political and financial commitment to the DDR programme and stakeholders have appreciated the results. The Commission started presenting key results to the government and other stakeholders systematically demonstrating the fact that capacity is being enhanced on account of UNDP’s efforts. In turn, UNDP is able to deliver because of the flexible and responsive financial support from donors.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

Achieved but efforts will continue to reinforce national capacity (especially in gathering consensus of transitioning and envisioning a merged DDR and Community based DDR approach to address stabilization in Sudan.

Outcome Statement 3: Stimulate economic revitalization to general peace dividends.

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

<p>Indicator 1: # of XCs who completed reintegration training and received support.</p>	<p>Baseline: By end of 2011: 6,500 combatants were demobilized in the Central Sector states Target: 700 under PBF contribution Progress:700 XCs supported under PBF have completed trainings and received reintegration support in 2012. In total, 4,365 XCs have completed training and received reintegration support in the Central Sector in 2012. (No further</p>
--	--

<p>Indicator 2: % of XCs who report sustainable income (or successful individual reintegration support).</p> <p>Indicator 3:</p>	<p>reintegration activities in 2013). For more information please refer to Annual report 2013.</p> <p>Baseline: XCs with no or very little income opportunities Target: 70% report successful reintegration support Progress:80% reported sustainable income as a result of the reintegration support.</p> <p>Baseline: Target: Progress:</p>
--	---

Output progress at the end of project

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

Provide reintegration services and follow up for 700 XCs in Central Sector (this componenet is reflected under output-1):
4,365 in Central Sector have completed trainings and also received reintegration support in 2012.Reintegration projects for 15,638 were implemented till 2014 in South Kordofan. There were obstacles to obtain permits and approvals due to the security situation but two rounds of Client Satisfaction Surveys conducted in South Kordofan and Central Sector states (CSS).

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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)?

Reintegration support has infused resources into poor local economies in SKS and the Central Sector, especially that at least 73% of those reintegrated are with functioning livelihoods in the rural areas. This in turn helped revitalize local economies and transform the role of former fighters into “agents of recovery” for their communities. All of these will help foster peaceful co-existence between ex-combatants and host communities. Also noteworthy was the support of line ministries, like the Ministry of Animal Resources and academic institutions in facilitating some training for former fighters. Their active participation enhanced national ownership of the programme and is useful in guiding a DDR Programme exit strategy. It was also reported by IPs that such institutions helped ‘change the military mindset’ of ex-combatants and boosted their confidence and self-worth, thereby aiding their transition to civilian life. The estimated value of all the goods and the related services under the socio-economic reintegration support going into the local economy of South Kordofan and Central Sector is estimated at 65 million SDG (around 23 million USD ,as of January 2013). In this sense, the programme has a measurable contribution in revitalizing the rural economies. In fact, implementing partners explain that due to the volume of ex-

combatants targeted, they have had to rely and engage several sectors in the rural economy such as traders, transporters and other small businessmen. The socio-economic reintegration activities, trainings, and outreach campaigns (including advocating for peace) are all important tangible “peace-dividends” that community people can feel and see. In this regard, the Commission has been strongly advocating that the programme in the current context is an important “peace-driver” by providing people viable economic livelihood alternatives to conflict.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?
 Although the survey was completed successfully, there were some limitations to the survey, such as: (1) Early rainfall in visited states which deemed some areas inaccessible. (2) Inability to locate nomads and pastoralists in the surrounding areas. (3) Searching for people during Ramadan season and between Eid periods, also was difficult.

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 at the end of project

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

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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 was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

1.2 Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender at the end of the project

<p><u>Evidence base</u>: What was the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report (1000 character limit)?</p>	<p>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 Surveys (CPS), MIS reports, IP (NGOs) 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>The project filled a critical funding gap with regards to the reintegration of 2,100 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 community based 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</p>

	<p>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 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.</p>
<p><u>Gender marker:</u> How have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Briefly justify. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p><u>Other issues:</u> Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that should be shared with PBSO? This can include any cross-cutting issues or other issues which have not been included in the report so far. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>N/A</p>

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)	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 2 (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 3 (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 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).

Changing perceptions and lives

Osman Musa Adam is a young man from Darfur; the One Man Can(OMC) helped him to roll a gender lens through his culture. He shares some of his reflections and questions:

“In Darfur violence against women is perpetuated by the culture, and especially after the war violence is becoming everyday reality for women and men”. In Darfur due to gender roles, as well as the harsh economic situation, women are forced to work longer hours to earn living, in addition to their role performing domestic chores.... “Even if the husband and wife work in the market, or the farm, the husband come to the house to rest and the wife have to continue working, to cook the food, clean the house, bath the children, and prepare for tomorrow, men does not help in the house because it is shameful in the culture”.

OMC training helped me to reflect on my value as a man, a father and a husband; “If women are equal to men, why they are the sole responsible for household maintenance? And why not men can participate in raising their children? Why men are considered less masculine if they are emotional, kind and loving? I think it has nothing to do with natural biological construction of me, but cultural perception, and it can be changed”. The training is very important to change attitudes. And for me I’m learning to become a better man."

Such testimonies make us believe that the DDR efforts to combat GBV and enhance gender equality through targeting men and boys in post conflict communities is very important, it worthwhile duplicating in a wider scale.

PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

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

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

Please provide an overview of project expensed budget by outcome and output as per the table below.⁵

Output number	Output name	RUNOs	Approved budget	Expensed budget	Any remarks on expenditure
Outcome 1: Respond to imminent threats to the peace process and initiatives that support peace agreements and political dialogue					
Output 1.1	Provide		3,360,400	3,387,905.00	These expenses

⁵ Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent.

	reintegration services and follow up for 1,400 XCs in South Kordofan				are excluding GMS, contribution to common security and expenses relating to monitoring activities
Output 1.2					
Output 1.3					
Outcome 2: Build or strengthen national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict.					
Output 2.1	Strengthen capacity of SDDRC to implement all aspects of the programme.		271,400	244,633.74	The expenses are excluding the GMS
Output 2.2	Monitoring		50,000	94,929.82	These expenses are higher because the 2014 ASL was granted to complete the remaining monitoring activities.
Output 2.3					
Outcome 3: Stimulate economic revitalization to general peace dividends					
Output 3.1	Provide reintegration services and follow up for 700 XCs in Central Sector.				This component is reflected under output-1
Output 3.2	Public Informaion		58,049.00	22,206.44	The expenses are excluding the GMS
Output 3.3					
Outcome 4:					
Output 4.1	Operational Support		518,400	395,327.25	
Output 4.2	GMS @7%		294,014	405,756.58	Some of these GMS were posted due to migration of PBF data from project # 00063343 to a

					new project 00084215 which was created to match MPTTF project on the gateway
Output 4.3	Security cost @3%		127,747	129,207.00	
Total			4,680,010	4,679,965.83	

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) (2000 character maximum):

On human resources of the project, it has been scaling down its staff every year since 2011 when the CPA ended. Overall, the project has reduced staffing by 61% (international and national positions) between 2010 and 2012 for Sudan. Core positions have been retained to ensure phasing out of current project while retaining responsiveness when conditions permit for a new phase for DDR and CSAC.

Apart from PBF, the SDDRP is currently funded by Spain, Japan and Norway. Non-traditional donors have also expressed keen interest to collaborate with the programme (such as Brazil, India, Turkey, South Korea and African Development Bank). Traditional donors like DfID, EU, Italy, Sweden are engaged with the programme and recognize it as a vital peace driver but will consider further support depending upon the outcome of the talks between the parties to the conflict.

The lessons learned during the implementation of the reintegration projects have informed 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, refugees, IDPs. 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, et), UN (UNEP, UNAMID), CSOs, and NGOs. The capacity building remains strength of the programme as it allowed better implementation.