



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
END OF PROJECT REPORT
COUNTRY: SOUTH SUDAN
REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY 2014 - 31 DECEMBER 2014**

<p align="center">Programme Title & Project Number</p> <p>Programme Title: Assessment of water harvesting structures for sustainable livelihoods and peacebuilding in South Sudan Programme Number (if applicable) PBF SSD D-4 MPTF Office Project Reference Number:¹</p>

<p align="center">Recipient UN Organizations</p> <p>List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)</p>
--

<p align="center">Implementing Partners</p> <p>List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations: Ministry of Electricity, Dams, Irrigation and Water Resources/Republic of South Sudan (MEDIWR); Ministry of Environment/Republic of South Sudan (MoE)</p>
--

<p align="center">Programme/Project Budget (US\$)</p> <p>PBF contribution (by RUNO) FAO = USD 370 323 UNEP = USD 187 137</p> <p>Government Contribution (if applicable) N/A</p> <p>Other Contributions (donors) (if applicable) N/A</p> <p>TOTAL: USD 557 460</p>
--

<p align="center">Programme Duration</p> <p>Overall Duration (months) 12 months</p> <p>Start Date² (dd.mm.yyyy) 01.01.2014</p> <p>Original End Date³ (dd.mm.yyyy) 31.08.2014</p> <p>Final End date⁴(dd.mm.yyyy) 31.12.2014</p>
--

<p align="center">Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.</p>

<p align="center">Report Submitted By</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 Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of the final financial report to the Administrative Agent.

Mid-Term Evaluation / Review - if applicable *please attach*

Yes No Date:

End of project Evaluation- *if applicable please attach*

Yes No Date:

Name: Abdal Monium Osman

Title: Head of Programmes

Participating Organization (Lead): FAO

Email address: AbdalMomium.Osman@fao.org

Arshad Khan (UNEP)

Officer in Charge

Arshad.Khan@unep.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:

Priority Plan Outcome to which the project has contributed. Lay economic foundations and reduce economic marginalization and competition over scarce resources, implement measures to create economic opportunities and improve access to resources.

Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project has contributed. Target communities confirm that the hafirs have eased the access to water for their livestock and that this has decreased tension with other water consumers.

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: Contribute to a reduction in competition over scarce resources, implement measures to create economic opportunities and improve access to resources.

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

<p>Indicator 1: Target communities confirm that the hafirs have eased access to water for their livestock and and that has decreased tensions with other water consumers</p>	<p>Baseline: Zero Target: N/A Progress: The findings and recommendations of the water harvesting assessment and capacity building (training, guidelines and knowledge sharing) are expected to assist the Government and development partners in the planning and implementation of appropriate livestock water harvesting projects, thus reducing conflicts and tension between various water users.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: Best practice guidelines developed on four thematic areas</p>	<p>Baseline: Zero Target: Four guidelines Progress: Four guidelines were developed (Planning, Construction and Operations Guidelines; Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines; Natural Resource Management Guidelines and Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Guidelines).</p>
<p>Indicator 3: Training delivered to South Sudan and state stakeholders on water harvesting best practices</p>	<p>Baseline: Zero Target: 30 participants Progress: 32 participants from national and state ministries were trained on various aspects of water harvesting best practices,</p>

	including: operation and maintenance of water harvesting structures, gender mainstreaming, management of water harvesting structures and natural resources, and environmental and social impact assessments.
--	--

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.

Output 1: A socio-economic study of past and present water harvesting interventions was conducted between March and May 2014 by a team of multidisciplinary experts from FAO, UNEP, MEDIWR and MoE.

Output 2: Guidelines were developed on four thematic areas, including: planning, construction and operations, gender mainstreaming, natural resource management and environmental and socio-economic assessment. The design and layout of the guidelines was completed in March 2015, publishing and distribution to stakeholders is planned for April 2015.

Output 3: Capacity of stakeholders was strengthened through the training of 32 technical staff from eight state and national ministries on water harvesting best practices conducted from 28-30 October 2014.

Output 4: Knowledge of stakeholders was enhanced through a water harvesting workshop held on 28 October 2014 and documents shared with stakeholders, Government policy-makers and donors.

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)?

Hafirs have contributed to reducing conflicts in areas where they were built in appropriate locations. For example, in Jie, Eastern Equatoria, the Toposa community confirmed that because of the hafirs that were built there, they did not migrate in search of water in 2012 and 2013, thus reducing violence with the neighbouring communities. The hafir in Lokoges has reduced the migration period from five to two months, thereby limiting the opportunity for conflicts and enhancing peacebuilding. The knowledge generated from the assessment of water harvesting structures for livestock will be used by the Government and development partners in future planning and implementation of hafirs so that their contribution to peacebuilding is maximized. The findings of the assessment, as well as technical and policy recommendations, were shared with Government stakeholders at the national and state levels, policy-makers, donors, United Nations agencies, Non-governmental Organizations and academia. In addition, national- and state-level stakeholders were trained on water harvesting best practices to enhance the knowledge of technical staff on planning and implementation of conflict-sensitive water harvesting interventions that will effectively contribute to peacebuilding.

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)?

At the start of the project, there was a more than two-month-long delay as a result of the conflict that erupted in South Sudan in December 2013, but once implementation began, the project was fast-tracked. In the risk matrix, political conflict was foreseen as possible with the expectation that travel to target areas would be constrained due to insecurity. Due to the conflict/insecurity it was not possible to conduct an assessment in Jonglei State, which was originally selected due to the large number of hafirs in the state. As a result, activities that were to be implemented in Jonglei State were implemented in Western Equatoria State following consultations with relevant Government partners. In Eastern Equatoria State, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan provided armed protection to the study team and United Nations Department for Safety and Security provided the necessary security information and clearance for areas visited during the assessment.

Outcome Statement 2: N/A

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)?

Outcome Statement 3: N/A

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)?

Outcome Statement 4: N/A

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>Preliminary findings from the assessment were presented to Government stakeholders and the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Secretariat in Juba. On 28 October 2014, a water harvesting workshop was conducted to share the findings with various stakeholders. Thirty-two technical staff from various ministries from the national and state Government were trained on various aspects of water harvesting from 28 to 30 October 2014. An assessment report and four guidelines were compiled in 2014. The deliberations from the workshop and training also contributed the development of the guidelines. The guidelines will be published and distributed to stakeholders in April 2015.</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 provided the first comprehensive assessment on livestock water harvesting structures and the linkage with peacebuilding in South Sudan. This study paves way for further assessments and analysis on policies, strategies and actions required for effective water harvesting that will contribute to peacebuilding in South Sudan.</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 findings of the assessment, recommendations, training and the four guidelines will guide the Government and development partners in planning and executing conflict-sensitive water harvesting interventions. The project also contributes to knowledge on sustainable management of natural resources (water and pasture) to reduce incidences of conflict.</p>
<p><u>Risk taking/ innovation</u>: Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve</p>	<p>The project generated critical knowledge required for innovative and conflict-sensitive livestock water harvesting with greater impact on peacebuilding. The challenges associated with existing</p>

<p>peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>water harvesting structures (hafirs) were clearly identified and recommendations provided for cost-effective, gender-sensitive, environmentally sound and technically appropriate livestock water development in South Sudan.</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>A gender assessment was conducted for the existing water harvesting structures. Gender mainstreaming guidelines were also compiled to guide stakeholders in promoting gender equity in access to and control over water harvesting structures and to ensure that women and men and boys and girls benefit from such interventions. Stakeholders were trained on gender mainstreaming as part of water harvesting best practices. The study and training team had a female team member. The original Gender Code 1 should be swapped with Gender Code 2A since gender is reflected in the project's activities and outcomes.</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>	

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.

<p>Lesson 1 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>Hafirs have contributed to reducing conflicts in areas where they were built in appropriate locations. For example, in Jie, Eastern Equatoria, the Toposa community confirmed that because of the build hafirs built there, they did not migrate in search of water in 2012 and 2013, thus reducing violence with the neighbouring community. The hafir in Lokoges has reduced the migration period from five to two months, limiting the opportunity for conflicts and enhancing peacebuilding. This is evidence of a positive trend towards the reduction of conflicts and contribution to peacebuilding. Nevertheless, hafirs in South Sudan have sustainability challenges (like other water harvesting structures in the Horn of Africa), which must be taken into consideration. Furthermore, the construction of hafirs is an expensive undertaking. Therefore, hafirs should not be considered the only source for livestock water.</p>
<p>Lesson 2 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>It is evident that a gender approach is needed throughout the implementation of water harvesting interventions to ensure all members of the community can benefit. Recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognizing women as important water users, taking their needs into consideration in the design of water harvesting structures by ensuring provisions for the collection of potable domestic water. - Taking gender needs into consideration during the siting water harvest interventions has great potential in improving the livelihoods of target communities, particularly for women, by reducing the distances they have to walk to collect water, resulting in more time for other productive activities. - Encouraging the participation of women in management committees, e.g. through affirmative action, minimum quotas for membership and organizing separate meetings for women. - Providing women with appropriate labour-saving devices to free up time to enable them to actively participate in committee meetings.
<p>Lesson 3 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>There is a huge technical and administrative capacity gap in tackling issues of natural resource management in water harvesting in South Sudan. Overcrowding of livestock around hafirs has resulted in the shrinking of grazing areas and subsequently in the degradation of surrounding resources. Therefore, it is essential to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated Water Resources Management is adopted in future water harvesting interventions. - Training of communities and local government in sustainable natural resource management. - Existing traditional structures are engaged in managing natural resources around hafirs where there are no Natural Resource Management Committees.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future hafir planning should consider planting multipurpose tree species for both fodder and fruit production. - Conflict resolution mechanisms are integrated into all water harvesting interventions from planning phase through to the implementation phase.
Lesson 4 (1000 character limit)	<p>There are some limitations in the implementation of water harvesting projects in South Sudan, which mostly stem from environmental and socio-economic constraints that eventually hamper the successes and desired benefits of hafir construction projects. It is important to ensure future hafir interventions are planned in such a way that they avoid/minimize adverse effects/impacts from already known socio-economic and environmental risks and hazards to maximize their contribution towards peacebuilding. Hafir site selection should consider equity and optimal interspacing with other related facilities (to avoid overcrowding) while always being cognisant of the environmental and socio-economic effects by avoiding/minimizing damages or significant influences on the ecosystem, as well as socio-economic components. National and state Government bodies need to introduce an integrated approach to the management of grazing land and water resources in pastoral areas.</p>
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).

Honourable Isaac Liabwel is the Undersecretary of MEDIWR. The Ministry is responsible for the planning, construction and supervision of water harvesting facilities in South Sudan, including hafirs financed by PBF, the Multi-Donor Trust Fund and bilateral donors. He considers human resource development as a critically needed input for the development of the country. At the closing of the three-day training, delivered by FAO and UNEP, given for 32 technical staff from national and state ministries directly involved in water harvesting, the Undersecretary said, “this project contributes to peacebuilding through building the capacity of technical staff that are directly engaged in water harvesting. Livelihoods can only be achieved if there is peace and for peace to prevail there is a need to provide water for livestock, especially in the drier parts of the country”. He added, “the four water harvesting guidelines developed through this project and used in this training should be developed into curriculum for the AMADI Rural Development Training Centre”. The AMADI Rural Development Centre is a facility recently renovated by MEDIWR for the training of technical staff in water resource development and other related fields.

In the training evaluation, 96 percent of the participants confirmed that the training was directly relevant to their work. They recommended that similar training should also be delivered at the state level to reach more staff who are engaged in livestock water development at the field level.

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: To contribute to a reduction in competition over scarce resources, implement measures to create economic opportunities and improve access to resources.					
Output 1.1	Socio-economic assessment and analysis of water harvesting facilities for enhanced impacts on conflict reduction and peacebuilding		FAO:216 636.48 UNEP:78 631 Subtotal:295 267.48	FAO: 226 472.94 UNEP: 70 522 Subtotal:296 995	This value includes the Water Harvesting and Hafir Assessment. It also counts the cost of the Team Leader, the Gender Specialist and the general operating expenses of field missions.
Output 1.2	Guidelines developed for effective water harvesting project design and management		FAO:75 460.68 UNEP:47 768 Subtotal:123 228	FAO: 60 027.62 UNEP: 50 198 Subtotal:110 225	This value includes a water harvesting workshop organized in October in the aim of gathering experiences and best practices for the developed

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

					guidelines.
Output 1.3	Stakeholders' capacity built for effective planning and implementation of the water harvesting project.		FAO:78 225.56 UNEP:13 388 Subtotal:91 613.56	FAO: 59 511 UNEP: 6 307 Subtotal:65 818	This value includes trainings covering various aspects of water harvesting practices and techniques.
Outcome 2:					
Output 2.1	Output 4: Knowledge management on water harvesting enhanced, best practices and lessons learned shared with stakeholders.		UNEP:47 350	UNEP: 47 821	This value includes peer review, editing,/ proofreading, layout and printing of 1 000 hard copies of guidelines and assessment documents covering aspects of water harvesting practices and techniques with a focus on livestock.
Output 2.2					
Output 2.3					
Outcome 3:					
Output 3.1					
Output 3.2					
Output 3.3					
Outcome 4:					
Output 4.1					
Output 4.2					
Output 4.3					

Total			FAO:370,322 UNEP:187,137 Total:557,459		
-------	--	--	--	--	--

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):

The project was essentially an assessment of water harvesting structures (hafirs) with knowledge sharing and capacity building components, which were implemented as per the project plan. The PBF Office in South Sudan was regularly updated on the developments of the project through progress reports and meetings with members of the PBF. There were no major changes to the project except the change of one of the states selected for field assessment due to insecurity as a result of the conflict which erupted in South Sudan in December 2013. FAO and UNEP technical teams established and maintained strong linkages with Government line ministries at the national and state levels. The Steering Committee chaired by the national MEDIWR provided the required strategic guidance and oversight.