



**European Commission**

Project N° 2015/362-919

**Support to implementing partners  
of SORUDEV, ZEAT-BEAD and  
FSTP**

**Workshop Report:  
5<sup>th</sup> QRM Rumbek**

**Period covered:  
26 to 28 January 2016**

Prepared by Angus Graham  
and Omotayo Alabi  
on behalf of

**Cardno Emerging Markets (UK) Ltd  
Lead Member of Cardno Consortium**



This TA is funded by  
The European Union



TA implemented by  
CARDNO

## KEY DATA

<b>Name of Project:</b>	<b>Support to implementing partners of SORUDEV, ZEAT-BEAD and FSTP</b>
<b>Contractor:</b>	<b>CARDNO EMERGING MARKETS (UK) LTD</b> Address Oxford House, Oxford Road, Thame, Oxon, OX9 2AH, UK Phone +44 1844 216500 Fax +44 1844 261593 Web <a href="http://www.cardno.com/emergingmarkets">www.cardno.com/emergingmarkets</a>
<b>Contracting Authority:</b>	Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of South Sudan
<b>Beneficiary:</b>	Government of the Republic of South Sudan
<b>Start/End Date:</b>	16 August 2015 to 13 February 2016
<b>Primary Location:</b>	Juba, Wau and States where projects are located

## DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR WORKSHOP REPORT

Recipient	Copies	Format
EU Delegation South Sudan	1	Electronic copy

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Technical Assistance Team wishes to acknowledge the full support of the staff of the Delegation of the European Union and the staff of the national stakeholder institutions engaged during the Inception Phase.

**Report Quality Controlled by**  
**Michael Gutteridge, Framework Contractors'**  
**Project Director**



**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

***This report has been prepared with the financial assistance of the European Union.  
The views expressed herein are those of the consultants and therefore in no way  
reflect the official opinion of the European Union***

# **Support to Implementing Partners of SORUDEV, ZEAT-BEAD and FSTP**

## **Workshop Report: 5<sup>th</sup> QRM Rumbek**

*Period covered: 26 to 28 January 2016*

---

### **Table of Contents**

---

Abbreviations and acronyms .....	ii
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Opening and Closing Remarks .....	2
3 General Discussions .....	3
4 Action Points.....	5
5 Deliberations of the Steering Committee .....	6
6 Conclusions and Recommendations .....	9

### **Annexes**

Annex 1	Letters of Invitation
Annex 2	Aide Memoire
Annex 3	Meeting Photographs
Annex 4	Agenda
Annex 5	Participants
Annex 6	Presentations
Annex 7	Revised Wau-2014 Resolution “Rumbek 2016”
Annex 8	Lessons Learnt (Day 2)
Annex 9	Update on Boma GPS data
Annex 10	Crop Areas and Production Estimates Update
Annex 11	Feeder Roads Update
Annex 12	Report on the Discussion held during the Deliberation on the Use of Coupon Presented by FAO
Annex 13	Suggested Contents of Project Presentations

## Abbreviations and acronyms

AFIS	Agriculture and Food Information System
AMTIP	Agricultural Marketing and Transformation Investment Project Programme
CFSAM	Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission
CWW	Concern Worldwide
DG	Director General
EU	European Union
EUD	Delegation of the European Union
EUR	Euro
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations
FFS	Farmer Field School
FSTP	Food Security Thematic Programme
GIS	Geographical Information System
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Cooperation)
GPS	Global Positioning System
HARD	Hope Agency for Relief and Development
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IPs	Implementing Partners
MARF	Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
PCM	Project Cycle Management
QRM	Quarterly Review Meeting
(S)MAFCRD	(State) Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development
SORUDEV	South Sudan Rural Development Programme
SSP	South Sudanese pound
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USD	United States dollar
VSF	Vétérinaires sans Frontières
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Association
WFP	World Food Programme
ZEAT-BEAD	Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation – Bahr-el-Ghazal Agricultural Development

Funded by the European Union



European Union/South Sudan  
Cooperation

Government of South Sudan



## **5<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Review & Steering Committee Meeting Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal Food Security & Rural Development Programme (ZEAT-BEAD, SORUDEV & FSTP)**

**Held at Hillview Hotel Rumbek, Western Bahr-el-Ghazal  
on 26 to 28 January, 2016**



## 1 Introduction

The Quarterly Review Meeting (QRM) was held in Rumbek, Lakes State from Tuesday 26 to Thursday 28 January 2016, hosted by the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) and attended by 44 people (including representatives of 9 non-Governmental organisations (NGOs), 5 United Nations agencies and representatives of both National and State government). The meeting was hosted by Mr Ezekiel Magkok, Director General (DG) of the Lakes State Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development (SMAFCRD) on behalf of Phillip Kot Job, State Minister of Agriculture. Mr Joseph Akim represented the national Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development and Mr Anthony Raymond and Mr Augustino Atilio represented the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MARF). The meeting was chaired by Mr Anthony Raymond, MAFCRD DG for Special Projects, and conducted by Tayo Alabi and Angus Graham on behalf of the Rural Development Programme of the Delegation of the European Union (EUD) to Juba.

This regular quarterly two-day event was preceded (day 1) by a lessons learnt workshop conducted on behalf of the EUD by Ms Sarah Gray. On day 2 of the meeting the participants gave PowerPoint presentations on progress made by the South Sudan Rural Development Programme (SORUDEV) and Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) projects and presented the work plans for the forthcoming year for comment and discussion. On day 3, presentations by 4 Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation/Bahr-el-Ghazal Agricultural Development (ZEAT-BEAD) Programme Partners were made followed by a period of debate and deliberation of the 3 days' proceedings. The projects presented included:

- SORUDEV Lakes State Projects;
- SORUDEV Western Bahr-el-Ghazal State Projects;
- FSTP and SORUDEV Northern Bahr-el-Ghazal State Projects;
- FSTP and SORUDEV Warrap State Projects;
- FAO Extension and Input Supply Strengthening Project;
- The GIZ Agricultural Marketing and Transformation Investment Project (AMTIP);
- The United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) Value Chain Project;
- The FAO Agro-Pastoral Education Project; and
- Feeder Road Projects conducted by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and the World Food Programme (WFP).

## 2 Opening and Closing Remarks

Mr Paolo Girlando, the ZEAT-BEAD task manager of the EUD to Juba, welcomed the 4 Government representatives on the Steering Committee of the 4 SORUDEV and 4 FSTP projects and formally opened the meeting, recalling that the aim was to acknowledge progress against work plans, flag challenges and make recommendations. He reiterated that the role of the Steering Committee was not to make decisions, but rather to provide directions, suggestions and policy advice in order for the Projects' implementing partners (IPs) to achieve results.

The Chair of the Steering Committee welcomed the EU representatives, DGs of the various National and State Ministries and all other participants. He pointed out that the MAFCRD is closely monitoring the EU-funded projects and acknowledged that their participants had provided important inputs into these meetings since their inception. He also highlighted the importance of working together and sharing information.

The Chair pointed out that any guidance or support to planning and coordination that may be provided by the MAFCRD depends very much on the information provided by the partners. He noted that the presentations and reports of the previous QRM meetings had not always been submitted to the MAFCRD and requested that these all be shared at each QRM so as to track progress.

The expectation of the Steering Committee is that anything talked about during the meeting is later put into practice. The Chair mentioned that over the past ten years the region has recorded a production deficit, meaning it produces less food than it needs, and that hungry people are angry people. Hoped that the workshop will strengthen the partnership between government and NGO agencies to work together to sustainably improve the production of food in the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal region.

Mr Eminio Sacco briefed the participants on the food and agricultural situation in the country and drew the attention of the meeting to the press releases issued in October 2015 by the Government and UN partners, which included policy actions to respond to the food security situation. He started by pointing out that much of Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal (primarily Northern Bahr-el-Ghazal and Warrap States) is presently classified as phase 3 according to the most Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) survey, reflecting a poor situation as regards food security and nutrition. He highlighted that a real restart to the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement is needed if the problems of declining food availability and access are to be addressed.

Since 2012 the December post-harvest situation has got progressively worse each year. The UN Country team is very concerned about Phase 3 IPC classified areas in Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal. The net cereal balance in 2016 is likely to show a much larger deficit than in 2015 due to a poorer harvest and a likely increase in the trade deficit, considering the slow pace and volumes of cargo movements (including humanitarian supplies) and the effects of: i) the devaluation of the SSP; and ii) shortages of currency in USD. It will be very important to monitor food prices over the coming year.

In view of the fact that the food deficit is likely to prolong if not intensify the problems facing the country, the government is set to show political will to invest actively in agriculture and to develop the sector to become a net exporter. This will require the unlocking of interest and investment across the Government and its partners, along with policy review. At time of writing the Government is reducing import taxes on food.

Mr Ezekiel Magkok, Lakes State DG Agriculture, closed the meeting. He concluded that the meeting had been very useful toward establishing who is doing what, where and with whom. He reiterated the importance of capacity building and revitalisation of the extension system,

recalling the establishment of the extension centre in Kadougli in 1928, and concluded that “if we teach people to cultivate, we can feed ourselves”.

### **3 General Discussions**

Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) groups are increasingly being used to access food. There is a trend of declining savings among VSLA groups in some areas as priorities shift to placing food on the table. This is expected to affect the procurement of inputs for the coming season. Only a small number of loans have been provided to farmer groups so far by the projects and these have mostly been used for labour (and to a lesser extent) food for petty trade and agricultural inputs. Of the total amount loaned out only 20% has been repaid. This is roughly consistent with the level of forfeiture experienced in 2015 by the South Sudan Agricultural Development Bank.

The community conversation approach to community-managed disaster risk reduction (DRR) is increasingly seen as essential to efforts to reduce aid dependency. Community ownership of this process is important, as is the engagement of youth. In addition to the seemingly inevitable cycle of flooding and drought, pests and diseases of plants are a major problem. Monthly community conversation groups, including women’s groups, are effective at raising awareness among farmers of evolving problems in order that they may identify locally appropriate solutions, such as the diversification of crop production, the multiplication of drought-resistant crops and the application of effective cultural practices to grain storage.

There is a general gender imbalance to agricultural labour that is affecting food security, with women increasingly doing all the agricultural cultivation work. In Northern Bahr-el-Ghazal the community response to the animal traction component has been good, especially among women. Animal traction training is generally conducted for a total of 3 weeks over a period of 6. Changing attitudes toward agricultural labour and increasing the involvement of men in cultivation will be essential to easing the burden on women and increasing production.

Animal traction has played a key role in opening up larger areas to cultivation. However, the availability of labour is a significant constraint to productivity and animal-drawn implements for planting and weeding urgently need to be rolled out. Less than 10% of locally made ox-ploughs have been sold to date in Lakes State. Locally made ox-ploughs are of better quality and sell at half the price of imported ones. Most farmers already own or have access to ox-ploughs due to previous efforts to diffuse this technology. At present they mainly buy spare parts for the maintenance and repair of their existing implements.

Most of the projects are endeavouring to put farmers in contact with traders. Some farmers have saved to procure inputs only to discover upon return to the market that the prices of inputs (e.g. ox-ploughs) have increased significantly. Traders are reported to be increasingly disinterested in supplying farmers as their interest shifts to NGO contracts to supply inputs. This owes partly to the more general distribution of imported items (such as vegetable seeds) by humanitarian operations. Some projects are investigating the possibility of introducing solar-powered pumps and tanked water systems for vegetable gardens.

Questions were raised as to the impact of production on local markets, and whether people are buying enough from local markets to meet their immediate needs. Markets seem not to be fully supplied at present, with many commodities missing. Farmers are storing more produce on their farms than is usual at the current time and are only selling a small portion of their harvest in order to meet their other basic needs. They are discouraged from selling produce due to the food deficit.

The establishment of viable agro-dealership and produce marketing groups is proving to be the most challenging aspect of the projects. Little progress was made in this regard during 2015, but some headway is expected in 2016. The signing of Memoranda of Understanding



(MoU) between dealers and Payam management committees on the behalf of farmers is promising. The involvement of Payam administrators, Boma Chiefs, women's associations and technical units in the identification of potential suppliers and the unification of farmer representatives with dealers has helped forge commitments. In addition arrangements that allow farmers to buy now and pay later, such as revolving funds, are being encouraged.

Marketing groups will depend on farmers bringing produce to the groups for eventual sale. These groups should effectively link farmers to bigger markets. Training in post-harvest handling will become increasingly important and should cover good practices in processing, sorting and grading, crop and grain storage and product pricing. Farmer representatives should be included in marketing groups. Possibilities of providing start-up capita should be explored, with avenues for profits to return to farmers. At present support seems to focus on farmer production and business groups, and to a lesser extent on markets or inclusive market linkages.

Questions were raised regarding production inventories at the start of the project and whether the comparison of project results (increased area under cultivation, production and income) with objective baseline figures is currently possible. It was noted that no social impact of the projects or of the 2014 Wau Resolution is being monitored and consequently there are no recorded cases of farmers being worse off than they were before.

Not all of the States have appointed focal points and not all Payams have agricultural staff in attendance (e.g. Wau). In some cases this is explained by the close proximity of Counties to State headquarters and in others it is due to staff shortages. In the case of Wau, five graduates per County were recently appointed but have not been fully engaged. This issue should be addressed by the County Commissioners.

The relevant Ministries in Juba have not consistently received project or meeting reports. A considerable number of changes in Government can be expected over the coming months and a dedicated EUD programme coordinator and information manager may be required to handle these changes. As such the establishment and maintenance of a website for posting information should be actively pursued. Some Government staff still lack working email accounts and do not have regular access to an active internet connection.

The Government is concerned to see that the EU-funded programmes are successful and is especially interested to receive all reports. At the QRM, the Government representatives on the Steering Committee pointed out that while the presenters had by and large outlined their project achievements, they had not clarified in which Counties and Bomas this had occurred. Consequently it has not been possible to determine whether there is any unmet coverage or why.

Generally, the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) projects have targeted the most vulnerable host communities and internally displaced persons (IDPs). In some cases all activities have been implemented at group level. In the case of Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF) Germany, two thirds of targeted project beneficiaries were vulnerable households and the remainder were smallholders. The smallholders were sensitised to the rationale behind the decision not to provide them with free inputs.

Questions were raised as to the roots of returnees and IDPs and the period of reference, considering that there have been various episodes of population movement since 2012 and it is unknown how many intend to return or move on to other areas.

Innovative approaches employed by FSTP projects include the integration of vegetable production demonstration plots into farmer field schools (FFS), pass-on seed multiplication, improved granaries and seed banks, the inclusion of literacy education in VSLA groups,

farmer management of the conservation and regeneration of useful trees, and the production and distribution of adapted high-production poultry.

The capital base of vulnerable groups has tended to be small and saving has tended to be less than other groups, as can be expected, and consequently any borrowing and lending has mainly been used as a safety net. Generally, very little or no borrowing is taking place for business purposes under FSTP projects and there is a need for capacity building in business development in these situations. Generally cost recovery of agriculture implements has not proceeded very well so far, and subsidy options and returns of recovered costs to community structures are being explored.

Training in vegetable production has included both Government and field staff. Shortages of labour for preparation, planting and weeding continue to be a major constraint and plant pests and diseases (especially of tomato and okra) are a persistent problem. Nevertheless the size of vegetable demonstration plots will be increased over the coming year and will be linked to food fairs and cooking demonstrations, with more emphasis on improved nutrition. There is also an emerging need for training in pricing strategies for vegetable producers.

Project activities located more than 60 kilometres from urban areas have been seen to be performing better than those closer to town. While there is a general decline in the average number of meals consumed per day, dietary diversity scores tend to improve with distance from urban centres.

## 4 Action Points

1. **The next (6<sup>th</sup>) QRM will be held in Aweil (not Nyamlell) on 27-28 April 2016** and hosted by Concern Worldwide and GIZ. All presentations to be made at the next QRM should be circulated a week before the start of the meeting. Prior to the next meeting, all IPs should be sure their presentations follow the tabular report format for basic narrative reporting on physical progress based on the logical framework structure as outlined on page 115 of the EU Project Cycle Management (PCM) guideline (attached);
2. All project managers should convene on the first Tuesday of every month with the purpose of preparing common work plans, identifying areas of complementarity and establishing the scope and sequencing of collaboration between IPs. As a matter of priority FAO, UNIDO and UNOPS should identify the common Bomas to be served by their projects;
3. All project partners should each submit to the EUD to Juba, not later than the 6<sup>th</sup> QRM in April, a complete Geographical Information System (GIS)-referenced list of Bomas that will benefit from each project, as well as a map of the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal region showing their locations (with State, County and Payam administrative boundaries clearly identified to the extent possible). They should also clearly indicate how they will collect household-level data for reporting on results. In the interim, project managers who have not already completed this process are requested to provide monthly progress updates to the EUD to Juba;
4. In the follow-up to the presentation made on the development of extension materials, participants agreed that the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) would print the jointly developed Extension Guides. IPs are advised to place their orders through NRC;
5. UNIDO, GIZ and UNOPS are required to prepare a joint proposal and MoU for the development of key infrastructure, engaging the resources already at their disposal, for the attention of the EUD to Juba;
6. Partners of the South Sudan Rural Development (SORUDEV) programme are advised to make any requests for a no-cost project extension at least six months

prior to the end dates of their projects as foreseen in the current contract arrangements with the EUD to Juba; and

7. The National Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development (MAFCRD) shall further consult with the National Ministry of Foreign Affairs with a view to signing the Cotonou Agreement and unlocking possible further EU support to key national institutions.

## **5 Deliberations of the Steering Committee**

Participants discussed the challenges they faced in obtaining GIS-referenced coordinates for Bomas and producing summaries of activities and results (e.g. crop-segregated production). The meeting agreed on the use of the feddan as the unit of measurement of area. Some farmers have moved between Bomas in response to sporadic crisis events. A one-page Boma data summary standard was discussed during the meeting. The meeting recognised that there are some broad gaps in general data management and capacities for GIS-based planning and coordination among projects. There is need for more attention and technical assistance (TA) in this regard to support IPs to plan, monitor and report on their projects.

The Government representatives highlighted that in addition to the joint efforts being made to report on project achievements and results and the sample visits of the Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM) survey of planting and production estimates, it is important to identify all Bomas in the areas covered by the projects, the population and bulk production of the main crops produced in each Boma and the number and proportion of settlements and households in each Boma that are supported by the project (for which the agricultural census could be used). They suggested that a Payam summary sheet listing all Bomas with this information should be established and pointed out that across the country as a whole, there are some 538 Payams and more than 2,000 Bomas in total.

Participants expressed concern as to how to manage their project budgets in view of the evolving scenario of high inflation. The potential risks to the projects and their beneficiaries of a scenario of hyperinflation were discussed. Participants agreed that project beneficiaries should be provided with up-to-date information on the evolving situation and its implications and advised on their options as regards management of their savings and loan risks. They agreed that Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) groups are intended to increase community resilience and that strategies should be put in place to ensure that beneficiaries do not incur more hardship than may be alleviated by such group action mechanisms.

The meeting discussed at length the merits and risks of cash- or coupon-based grants and loans. Most participants acknowledged that the widespread handling of cash by projects is highly risky under current conditions and that the cost and leakage of alternatives should be understood and appropriate measures and controls put in place to ensure the intended effectiveness of such transfers. The meeting noted that the strategy of the use of coupons proposed by FAO is different from SORUDEV which supports small holder farmers through first facilitating their formation into groups starting with the VSLAs followed by FFS or Farmer-Led training.

FAO will use both cash- or coupon-based grants approaches in the four states of Greater Bahr El Gazal. In order to avoid confusion and to ensure comparative learning, the coupon linked to direct access of input will be implemented in 2 states while the coupon linked to cash will be implemented in the 2 remaining states. FAO will implement the match funding and loan system to the groups now defined as agro dealers such as the blacksmiths, community extension agents, community animal health workers, para veterinarians, seed producers and the vet input suppliers. To this effect, FAO will interact with HARD or other SORUDEV partners including drawing from other FAO experience in the region to learn from the current loans system approach piloted. FAO will ensure proper delineation of bomas and

payams with clear GPS coordinates to aid the selection of operational areas and to ensure that there is no counterproductive approach in the areas SORUDEV partners that are already working in. In this respect, it is suggested that FAO prioritise working with the SORUDEV partners for the implementation of activities to create value for money and to build on the synergy already existing. FAO shall integrate this understanding into their revised inception report which was recently approved by the European Union Delegation.

Participants cautioned that the purchasing power of farmers is generally quite low at present and advised that the choice of conditional and unconditional social transfers should depend on the known needs and capacities of target beneficiaries.

The meeting also discussed the merits of on-going public works programmes and concluded that while these are popular and in principle increase effective demand on existing sources, it is unlikely that the targeted smallholders (who cultivate 3 to 5 feddan) or progressive farmers will participate in such activities. There is little confidence and scant local evidence that such transfers alone are being effective in developing agricultural input and product value chains or relevant market-based supplies. Preference was expressed for public works programmes that address on-farm labour constraints and directly address the main objective of the projects (i.e. to increase production), in recognition that the latter is often dependent on meeting the immediate needs and welfare of agricultural workers.

The Steering Committee reiterated that the agro-dealer enterprises that have been created or supported by the projects should continue to benefit farming households after the projects have closed. There is a need to clearly identify both artisans and local seed producers and agents who provide backward (input) and forward (product) linkage services. Participants were encouraged to look at lessons learnt from the enterprise models being implemented in countries in the East African Community (EAC) region (e.g. Tanzania, Uganda and Kenya) and to explore the possibility of attracting investors from these countries. They highlighted that the general modes of provision of aid in recent years seem to have constrained the development of specialised agro-dealers. What is now needed is a symmetrical information flow between farmers and dealers on what is needed and what can be supplied.

The Steering Committee noted that the lead farmer or farmer-to farmer extension approach is still not widely understood and that a number of different approaches exist to the Farmer Field School (FFS) model. They informed that while there is some interest to revise the National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Policy (NALEP), it is a good idea to launch it now for a period of testing. An awaited official Government letter of confirmation of this has been addressed in writing by the FAO to the MAFCRD.

The meeting reviewed and made minor revisions to the 2014 Wau Resolution, reiterating that any provision of inputs should in principle continue to be based on careful target group selection and only on the basis of full cost-recovery. In endorsing the revised Resolution, the meeting acknowledged that full cost-recovery of inputs from all project beneficiaries is likely to become increasingly ambitious given the current situation.

The Steering Committee recommended that criteria be elaborated for the provision of grants or loans to farmers and that these should be clearly spelt out in proposals that should be reviewed by the EUD to Juba and endorsed by the Steering Committee. The meeting recognised that investment in agricultural production (cereals, pulses and oil crops) tends to mitigate the impact of inflation and acknowledged that the current financial situation is likely to be a drag on imports, but a stimulus to any feasible exports.

The Steering Committee reiterated that support to farmers through FFSs and VSLAs should be geared toward preparing them to run their farming operations as commercial agricultural businesses. They also recommended that should any projects undertake direct procurement to avail assets at community level (e.g. rippers or solar fridges), this should be arranged at

Payam or lower levels of administration where Government agricultural extension staff are present to oversee their use.

The meeting discussed the sharing of information both among IPs and between IPs and the Government, including how IPs should send their presentations to the Steering Committees one week ahead of each QRM. They pointed out that while most presentations were focused on project achievements there was less than anticipated focus on project results.

The Steering Committee highlighted that the sharing of experience and lessons learnt when developing public-private partnerships (PPPs) is crucial to the success of the programme and requested that a working group be formed consisting of at least GIZ, UNIDO, UNOPS and the World Food Programme (WFP). The Committee requested GIZ to prepare a draft standard to serve as a guideline.

## **6 Conclusions and Recommendations**

The meeting recognised that there has been significant improvement in cooperation and synergy among partners and concluded that an updated field results reporting standard should be further developed. In addition to key programme indicators, this should include aspects of VSLA performance.

It recommended that the results framework and data collection arrangements of all project partners (including the feeder road projects) be reviewed and harmonised to ensure the collection of a comprehensive set of data from an integrated set of GIS-referenced locations.

In order to prepare Boma-level summaries, projects should seek to collect household-level data and prepare summaries that reflect the not only project progress but also the general agricultural situation in each Boma. IPs were advised to ensure that extension workers keep records of their visits to farmer groups.

The meeting agreed that within one month of the workshop, all IPs (including relevant Government line ministries) would submit to the EUD a list of Focal Persons including their contact details (phone and email) at national, State and County levels. This should take into account both existing and emerging offices in the 28 States of South Sudan (including the new Twic State) and should be periodically updated.

To improve the effectiveness of the QRM events, it was agreed that future meetings would allocate more time to participant presentations (possibly 30 minutes each) and that QRMs would be held over at least 3 days in order to facilitate this. Presenters were encouraged to practise their presentations in order to stay within their allocated time. They should present their main points in a limited number of slides and should dedicate roughly 3 minutes of their presentation to each slide.

## **Annex 1 Letters of Invitation**

### Letter to Stakeholders

In our role of Programme Steering Committee Secretariat on behalf of the European Union Delegation to South Sudan, it is my honour to invite you or your nominated representative to a three-day workshop to review progress of European Union (EU)-funded projects in the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal Region of South Sudan.

The workshop is scheduled to take place at the Hillview Apartments in Rumbek between 08h30 and 17h30 on 26, 27 and 28 January 2016.

Please find attached a provisional agenda for the workshop and an aide memoire on the scope of the workshop.

- 26 January will facilitate a preliminary thematic consultation in antecedence to this regular 3-month steering committee event.
- 27 January will be dedicated to the functioning of a steering committee of the EU projects related to components 1) South Sudan Rural Development Programme Smallholder Component (SORUDEV) and 2) Food Security Thematic Programme Component (FSTP) of the EU Rural Development Programme.
- 28 January will constitute a forum to discuss common issues among implementing partners of the overarching action titled “Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation – Bahr-el-Ghazal Effort for Agricultural Development (ZEAT-BEAD)”.

### Letter to Implementing Partners

On behalf of the European Union Delegation to South Sudan, it is my pleasure to invite you or your nominated representative to a two-day workshop to review progress of European Union (EU)-funded projects in the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal Region of South Sudan. As agreed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarterly review meetings, in coordination with the other partners please seek to ensure a gender balance.

The workshop is scheduled to take place at the Hillview Apartments in Rumbek between 08h30 and 17h30 on 26, 27 and 28 January 2015. Please find attached a provisional agenda for the workshop and a cover letter to stakeholders.

We would highly appreciate if you could kindly prepare, and in coordination with EUD circulate among all participants at least a week before the meeting, and deliver during the meeting event the following:

- 1) A summary brief on your organisations EU funded project covering: a) Achievements, with reference to its performance and results indicators, b) Work Plan and measures (quarterly targets) for the forthcoming 12-month period, and c) Procurement Plan, showing fund expenditure to date and quarterly forecasts, and d) State Government nominated focal points and call tree to all administrative levels;
- 2) A Presentation (10-15 minutes) covering: a) Progress made to date in implementing the project work plan, b) Areas and locations of cooperation and coordination with other EU-funded SORUDEV, FSTP and ZEAT-BEAD projects, c) Any other projects/ partners and their main activities, and d) Challenges and solutions and lessons learnt.

## **Annex 2    Aide Memoire**

An Advisory Committee will be set up to counsel on the overall direction and policy of the programme. This committee will be chaired by the beneficiary State Governments on a rotating basis and co-chaired by the Delegation of the European Union. The committee will have a counselling role and will not have any decision-making power. The committee will be composed of:

- Representatives of each of the four States targeted by the Project;
- A representative of the Federal Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development (MAFCRD) and Animal Resources and Fisheries (MARF);
- A representative of the Federal Food Security Technical Secretariat;
- A representative of the Ministry of International Cooperation;
- Representatives of Non-State Actors (in particular, producers' associations, women's unions and the private sector); and
- A representative of the EUD.

The Technical Assistance (TA) team leader will be an observer in the Advisory Committee and ensure the functioning of its secretariat, but will not be a formal Committee member.

The Advisory Committee may decide to offer membership or invite members of other public or private institutions. The Advisory Committee will meet at least twice a year.

The establishment of a joint Steering Committee for the South Sudan Rural Development (SORUDEV) and Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation – Bahr-el-Ghazal Agricultural Development (ZEAT-BEAD) programmes was discussed and agreed among participants in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarterly Review Meeting (QRM) held in Wau on 26-28 May 2015. The meeting was informed that a National Steering Committee to provide guidance and oversight is necessary for all EU-funded programmes and that stakeholders should include representatives of Government (as owners), implementing partners (IPs) and beneficiaries.

The National Steering Committee should include a representative of each of the four States targeted by the project as well as one representative of the MAFCRD and one of the MARF. Other stakeholders can be invited when relevant. Smaller committees at State level (State Steering Committees, including County, Payam and beneficiary representatives) shall also be organised. The Steering Committee will provide counsel on the overall direction and policy of the programme and will be chaired by the beneficiary State Governments on a rotating basis and co-chaired by the EUD. The committee will not have any decision-making power.

Based on what was agreed during the 3<sup>rd</sup> QRM and on EU contractual requirements, the following must be observed:

- The National Steering Committee is to convene twice a year for SORUDEV and twice a year for ZEAT-BEAD;
- The Quarterly Review Meetings will be held on a rotating basis and chaired by the beneficiary State Governments. Each will last approximately 2 days, with the first day dedicated to the National Steering Committee of either SORUDEV or ZEAT-BEAD. EU IPs must draft their reports to the Steering Committee in accordance with the EU Project Cycle Management (PCM) guidelines and circulate them at least one week in advance of scheduled Steering Committee meetings;



- The Steering Committee should conduct a 6-monthly review of i) proposed work plans for the next period; and ii) progress and performance to date and based on these, draw conclusions as to the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme. Discussions at the Steering Committee meeting should clarify whether each project is on track and whether activities have been delayed, are solving identified problems and achieving the expected results, and whether the direct beneficiaries are satisfied;
- The second day of each QRM will serve as a forum to discuss common issues, preceded by 10-minute thematic presentations (9 in total) by IPs of either SORUDEV or ZEAT-BEAD (depending on who is presenting on the first day) and the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP). The UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and the World Food Programme (WFP) will also make a presentation on roads rehabilitation;
- Relevant line ministries from the host State shall be invited with one representative from the other States (focal person) present. Ministry project focal persons should be involved in the monitoring of projects. The contact details of the selected Government stakeholders at all levels, and specification of their function within each project, shall be communicated to the EUD;
- Project monitoring reports prepared by EU TA partner agencies, non-Governmental organisations (NGOs) and national and State Government services shall be shared among all concerned parties, including focal persons; and
- A specific website will be created, to which all monitoring, inception, interim and progress reports and technical documents will be uploaded and made available to the public for viewing and downloading.



## Annex 4    Agenda

### Day 1

#### STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

#### SORUDEV & FSTP COMPONENT

08.30	Registration	Secretariat
08.45	Welcome address by Chief Guests Reiteration of the Steering Committee Constitution	
09.00	Agriculture Situational Review	Erminio Sacco, FAO/AFIS
09.15	SORUDEV Presentations	NPA, NRC, CWW, HARD
10.30	Coffee Break	
11.00	Deliberations of the Committee	
12.30	Lunch	Secretariat
13.30	FSTP Presentations	World Vision, VSFG, PIN, CWW
15.00	Tea Break	
15.30	Deliberations of the Committee	
17.00	Summation	
17.30	Close	Secretariat

## Day 2

### THEMATIC REVIEW

#### ZEAT-BEAD COMPONENT

08.30	Registration	Secretariat
08.45	Welcome address by Chief Guests	
09.30	Presentation/Discussion	FAO Project 2 (EK-P) Ezana Kassa
10:00	Presentation/Discussion	WFP, UNOPS (Feeder Roads) Million Ali Abate
10.30	Coffee Break	
11.00	Presentation/Discussion	FAO Project 1 (EIS) Nehru Essomba
11.30	Presentation/Discussion	UNIDO Project 1 (VA-VC) Charu Chandra
12.00	Presentation/Discussion	GIZ Project 1 (AMTIP) Adolf Gerstl
12.30	Lunch	
13.30	Deliberations of the Committee	
15.00	Tea Break	
15.30	Coordination Review	
16.00	Preparation of Action Plan	Secretariat
17.00	Summation	
17.30	Close	Secretariat



## Annex 5 Participants

Agency	Name	Email	Phone Number
APAD	Michael Piol	michaelpiol@gmail.com	0955475794
CARDNO	Angus Graham	angusgraham@me.com	0928788780
CARDNO	Tayo Alabi	omotayor@yahoo.com	0954889725
CARDNO	Sarah Gray	Sgray1201@aol.com	
CWW	Kennedy Robert	Po.fim@concern.net	0956910081
DIG	Lewis Aikata Nan	-	0955725501
Dutch Embassy	Hank van Trist		0912531504
EUD	Paolo Girlando	Paolo.girlando@eeas.europa.eu	0954356804
FAO	Abdal Monin Osman	Abdalmonin.osman@fao.org	0922001603
FAO	Erminio Sacco	Erminio.sacco@fao.org	0922001631
FAO	Lomena Charles	-	0955927557
FAO	Abigail Wathome	Abigail.wathome@fao.org	0955174586
FAO	Nehru B. Essomba	Nehru.essombabeugono@fao.org	0953330063
FAO	Ezana Kassa	Ezana.kassa@fao.com	0922001698
FAO	Erminio Sacco	Erminio.sacco@fao.org	0922001691
GIZ	Adi Geostl	Adolf.geostl@giz.de	0912300983
GIZ	Bonsuk Christine	Christine.bonsuk@giz.de	0954084209
GIZ	Adi Geostl	adolfgersl@giz.de	0912300983
HARD	Evans Owino	evans_agola@yahoo.com	0956198433
HARD	Dominic Albino	kparivurud@yahoo.com	0955510228
LUYDA	Gabriel Gai Majok	luydagai@gmail.com	0956818509
MAFC	Joseph Akim	akimgordon555@yahoo.com	0955509359
MTRB	Philip Thon	mabiophilip@yahoo.com	0956104008
NPA	Dawa Rose	dawar@npaid.org	0954461353
NPA	Emmanuel Lejukola	emmanuelLKo@npaid.org	0955112332
NPA	Abraham Mading	amading@npaid.org	0955206047
NPA	Samuel Deng	sdeng@npaid.org	0955575483
NRC	Taban Kaps Robert	Taban.kaps.robert@nrc.no	0923018176
PIN	Jakub Smutny	Jakub.smutny@npaid.cz	0955467379
SMAFCRD	Peter Madut	peter.amit@yahoo.com	0952220111
SMAFCRD	Simon Dut	simondut@yahoo.com	0925555591
SMAFCRD	Ezekiel Magkok	-	0923063774
SMARF	Agustino Aguot Lueth	luethagany@gmail.com	0956376781
SMARF	Anthony Raymond	anthonyraytombura@giz.de	0921307773
SMARF	Augustino Atillio	agustatillio@yahoo.com	0921307702
UNESCO	Muhammad Akram	m.aksam@unesco.org	0922403995
UNESCO	Jasper Okodi	j.okodi@unesco.org	0928004904
UNIDO	Daniel Ruben	Dengruben24@yahoo.com	0955937744
UNIDO	Charu Chandra	Charu.chandra@gmail.com	0954370127
UNIDO	Ram Kishore P Singh	r.singh@unido.org	0956718594
UNOPS	Rick Schroeder	MartinRS@unops.org	0959102701
UNOPS	Million Ali	Milliona@unops.org	0955534264
VSF Germany	Daniel Nondi	danielolang@vsfg.org	0923194652
WVI	Berhanu Wolde	Barhanu_wolde@wvi.org	0926066622

## **Annex 6   Presentations**

See attached electronic files.

## **Annex 7 Revised Wau-2014 Resolution “Rumbek 2016”**

1. SORUDEV and ZEAT ZEAT-BEAD is form a single joint programme comprising four State-level components. Close coordination between State components is vital, as is harmonisation of approaches. SORUDEV and ZEAT ZEAT-BEAD projects implementing partners (IPs) should work as one large programme and shall share a Steering Committee. They should meet together with other stakeholders on a regular basis, at least quarterly, for joint planning and networking and sharing of lessons learnt. ZEAT ZEAT-BEAD project managers will also meet monthly to discuss progress and enhance synergy. SORUDEV project managers will liaise and coordinate with the UN Food And Agricultural organisation (FAO) on areas of cooperation, including with the Agriculture and Food Information System (AFIS) and feeder road projects.;
2. Projects will focus on producers and market centres situated along selected feeder roads. SORUDEV and ZEAT-BEAD projects will seek to develop markets and market actors including smallholder producers. Supported agro-dealers will include blacksmiths, seed producers, agro-veterinary stores and community-based extension agents including community animal health workers (CAHWs);
3. Project activities should be preceded by data collection through comprehensive surveys. Approaches to data collection, surveys and research (including baseline data collection, market assessments and data presentation) should be standardised, as should project methodologies such as Farmer Field Schools, extension packages, training packages and curricula and reporting guidelines;
4. There will be no free distribution of project inputs (with no voucher systems except for where these are a tool to achieve full cost-recovery). Project inputs will be availed at a cost. Project implementers will examine delivery options per State based on careful target group selection (farmers with existing financial capacity), group-based asset ownership and credit options, such as Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLAs) and village banks, among others;
5. SORUDEV implementing agencies will work in close collaboration with the State Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development (SMAFCRD) and State Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (SMARF). Where Ministry personnel are present in sufficient numbers, project IPs will facilitate the full participation of Ministry staff as counterparts through providing transport and *per diems*/DSA (at the EU rate or at Government rate if lower, and with no payment for either sitting allowances or overtime). Full-time secondment of Government staff to agency programmes should not occur. Where Ministry personnel are NOT present in sufficient numbers, project IPs will assess other options for extension in consultation with the relevant ministries. In this context, Farmer Field Schools, Pastoralist Field Schools and other known and accepted methods described in the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Policy (NALEP) should be recognised.

*These resolutions were endorsed by all participants in the QRM held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2016 in Rumbek.*

## **Annex 8 Lessons Learnt (Day 2)**

1. In the context of a shrinking cash economy, limited availability of currency in USD and a reduction in trading activities and volumes of cargo to and across the region following devaluation of the SSP, and in addition to general insecurity and a looming food crisis in Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal, inflation is an on-going concern that directly affects project implementation. The cost of services including fuel, spare parts, training and hotels (as venues for meetings, including QRMs) is increasing. Market prices, e.g. in Rumbek, change every day;
2. The SORUDEV and ZEAT-BEAD programmes specifically target smallholder farmers who regularly cultivate 3 to 5 feddan of land. This is not often the case in practice, with many farmers cultivating only 2 feddan per year. There have been calls to raise the threshold for support to 10 hectares (about 24 feddan). Despite solid awareness among SORUDEV partners of the project design, inputs are still expected for free, for example when local government officials request free seed from agencies. Farmers tend to be cagey about their actual production due to the perception that disclosing the actual yield will result in non-delivery of relief aid. This is linked to the “well-intended” assessments conducted by agencies and followed with relief aid;
3. Most inputs are now available locally and only vegetable seeds, planting materials and fishing kits still need to be imported into the region. Ox-ploughs are still not generally available and additional animal-drawn, labour-saving implements (such as for weeding) need to be rolled out and scaled up to avoid low productivity among larger areas planted and ploughed due to the effects of weeds;
4. Local artisans and seed suppliers need support. Options should also include contracting of farmers or financing credit-worthy traders to contract farmers. There is a pressing need to conduct a rapid market assessment of the availability of inputs, to identify and map established agro-dealers and to register them for training in the development of business skills. Development of input specifications and standards and capacity building in their quality regulation and control are also needed.
5. Continued coordination among donors is needed, along with the building of synergy among UN agencies and NGOs. Also important is the need to work with local authorities in order to create better understanding of projects. Priority should be given to supporting the organisation, legalisation and registration of producers, especially those who gather and process vegetable seeds (e.g. okra and Jew mallow);
6. The Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) approach was unpopular among IPs and their counterparts; nevertheless its adoption is taking place rapidly in Lakes State. Smallholder farmers outside the original target groups are now forming VSLAs and have requested training support from Norwegian People's Aid (NPA). Smallholder farmers generally seem to have conceptualised the project better than the local authorities;
7. VSLAs have proven effective in creating group cohesion and trust among members. They tend however to be more welfare- than investment-oriented and their performance toward achieving project objectives is mixed. The constitution, laws, and structure of the groups are important. They should however comprise members of common interest, have a clear purpose and be well guided, and should receive regular training in group dynamics, supervision and monitoring. VSLAs should have well-articulated savings objectives and should receive regular training in how to conduct small business and exchange visits (e.g. chicken rearing);
8. There is a need for literacy and numeracy training to enable VSLA members to check their records and track their savings and loans. New criteria for the monitoring of VSLAs



- should be introduced (e.g. the ratio of savings to loans, to track how much is being utilised) and a basis for better understanding of how money is being used should be established. There is a general risk of losing track of VSLA funds due to limited capacity for keeping records. Eventually VSLAs should be formed into a cooperative linked to formalised banking;
9. Possibilities for the provision of capital to farmer groups should include revolving grants to VSLAs, matching grants based on business plans and the establishment of links to institutions specialised in low-rate agricultural loans, including micro-finance institutions and banks. A VSLA Union should be established. Mobile phones or cash transfers/loans are an option that should be pursued, considering that communication networks exist where micro-finance institutions cannot go. Collateral or guarantors should be obligatory for VSLA non-members;
  10. NGOs have experienced difficulties in supporting agro-dealerships. For example, land took a long time to obtain for the Matangai blacksmith group due to misconceptions among local authorities. There are virtually no agro-dealers for seed or tools in the broader Lakes region apart from existing NPA-supported producers of tools (Mabui and Matangai). Sellers of locally gathered vegetable seed (okra and Jew mallow) seen on the market sometimes deal with seed distributed by humanitarian relief and development agencies;
  11. An on-going challenge is how to develop farmers' associations and ensure they are represented at County and State level. The current State-Level Farmers' Union has a few politically selected members, but does not meet the functional needs of the sector or sub-sectors. The role of an agricultural union in market identification to support farmers' groups needs to be supported;
  12. A radio extension programme and a standard guide in local languages for extension agents and farmers is needed, with pictorial training and extension aids. These should include business guidelines for farmers (e.g. for cassava) along with well-contextualised, locally adapted and farming system-specific FFS manuals. Some aspects of the recently developed guidelines are too shallow, e.g. crop protection;
  13. There is a high turnover of trained NGO staff, who leave in order to join other partners with more promising offers, undermining the efforts of supporting State Ministries. In the past many people have been trained through various NGO programmes, but disappear after a short period of service. Trained Government personnel who work with NGOs tend to become redundant when projects end. A career development programme is needed, for which persons selected should demonstrate some entrepreneurial initiative and be supported based on their motivation and commitment;
  14. Private extension is generally absent in the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal region and the focus of programmes so far has been on other types of extension workers – those employed in Government service and those hired by NGOs. Privatisation of extension services is perceived not to be taking place partly because Government and NGOs are absorbing qualified people and partly, because extension work is not attractive to graduates (since it is not perceived as a career that provides much opportunity to prosper);
  15. The requirement that extension workers should have a primary school education should be reconsidered and agriculture should be incorporated into the primary education system. Community ox-plough trainers (COTS) are providing services but never completed primary school. A higher level of education and specialised training is necessary for some aspects of agricultural extension, e.g. use of agro-chemicals;

16. There is a need for a standard 3-month extension/training package, a formal application process and system for selecting trainees against well-defined criteria. This should target people who are settled and are doing practical farming (preferably, progressive farmers who can train other farmers);
17. There are some agro-dealers in the region who do not practise extension and of whose existence the majority of farmers are unaware. A system is needed to support the roles of private extension agents and enable sales agents to work for agro-dealers based on commission. Sub-contracting to the Government may be one way of supporting private extension providers. There are numerous certified agriculturalists in the region that are loitering in rural communities and need to be organised under a single umbrella;
18. Generally agricultural extension services should be able to provide what farmers are looking for, e.g. pest management. Where this occurs (e.g. with the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)), farmers have been willing to pay for services. Others see extension as a public function that should be supported by a fully functional operational extension service training centre. The Crop Training Centre in Yei is in crisis because of lack of employment and has resorted to doing other things;
19. The roles and responsibilities of private extension agents should be established through a process of certification and licensing, based on sound capacity development criteria. This should include the identification of new programmes, piloting new technologies, linkage of farmers to suppliers/agro-dealers and the provision of reports to Government. Private extension should be supplied to farmer cooperatives and innovative private companies specialised in certain crops. They should provide inputs, services and FFS;
20. Private extension agents should be able to market their services to networks at all levels. They should have access to start-up capital and credit and receive cost-recovery based on the payback of produce in line with current market prices;
21. Emerging options for value addition include threshing, drying, sorting, storage, flour/oil production and the flaying, defatting, preservation, processing and storage of hides and skins;
22. The FAO has established Standard Operating Procedure (SOPs) for crop assessments, but the accuracy of estimates remains dependent on the number of field observations. The FAO and WFP collect only limited field observations at planting and harvest and need the support of NGOs to improve crop forecast and production estimates. FAO has appealed to all EU-funded projects to participate in this process. So far the response of EU-funded NGOs to requests to participate in the relevant FAO training has been poor (with only the Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD) and Concern Worldwide participating);
23. FAO is also appealing for cooperation in establishing broader networks for the monitoring of markets and rainfall, satellite ground truthing and the use of the Sentinel tool. Such information should be used for decision making, e.g. to support climate-smart agriculture;
24. The local supply of cereals, oil crops and pulses is still very low compared to demand. Of the non-cereal foods, the Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM) covers cassava and groundnut. There is still no assessment of the contribution of livestock to food security. A livestock and pastoralist study was conducted by FAO in 2015 and the livestock situation will be monitored in 2016 to keep track of livestock considering the evolving food gaps;

25. A Boma-level information system is needed to determine which NGO is operating where and which extension worker is working where. Current tools for recording production at household level are disjointed and time-consuming and a better system needs to be developed; and
26. The use of cash is an option to develop the demand for inputs and thereby their supply. Avenues to consider include lending groups, merit approaches, cash for work, savings associations, contract farming and input distribution agencies. The merits of each option will likely depend on the distance from urban centres. Input provision to groups of people who are willing to work as a group and pay back at least 50% of the value of the inputs provided should be considered. Extension agents should be pre-positioned.

## **Annex 9    Update on Boma GPS data**

*Progress made by partners so far*

- CWW:
- HARD:
- NPA:
- NRC:
- World Vision International (WVI):
- VSF Germany
- People in Need (PIN):
- WFP and UNOPS:

*Progress reported at the 4<sup>th</sup> QRM*

- CWW: SORUDEV mapping coordinates have been collected and sent.
- HARD: Only 24 more Bomas need to be collected (all others have been sent).
- NPA: All coordinates were collected except for a few that were collected with wrongly calibrated GPS.
- NRC: All GPS data have now been collected. The previous data gap in Toch County has been filled and data are now available.
- WFP has helped put together the first draft map showing the Bomas. This needs to be updated.

**See attached Excel file on GPS Boma locations**

## **Annex 10 Crop Areas and Production Estimates Update**

See attached electronic files.

## Annex 11 Feeder Roads Update

### WFP

Road Name	Length in km	County	State	Funded by
Kuajok-Lunyaker	50	Gogrial East/Gogrial West	Warrap	EU
Kuajok Bridge	160 m + 6 km	Gogrial West	Warrap	EU
Kangi-Kuajok	41.25	Gogrial West/Jur River	Warrap, WBG	EU
Tharkueng-Getti	28	Jur River	WBG	EU

### UNOPS

Road Name	Length in km	County	State	Funded by
Kangi-Bar Urud	29 + 16		WBG	EU
Achol Pagong-Ayien Market	28 + 14		Warrap	EU
Gok Machar-Mayom Angok	35		NBG	EU
Aluak Luak-Mapourdit	46.6	-	Lakes	EU

NBG: Northern Bahr-el-Ghazal

WBG: Western Bahr-el-Ghazal

UNOPS is supporting the development of a total of 120 km of upgraded all-weather roads. In addition to the roads listed above, topographic survey has been completed and engineering designs are being prepared for an additional 40 km of road segments: **Ayein Market to Panilete, Warrap** (about 14 km) and **Bar Urud to Kayango, Western Bahr-el-Ghazal** (about 16 km).

Following the recent political expansion to 28 States, some of the extended road sections in Warrap traverse through the newly established Twic State. UNOPS is liaising with local government to procure a letter of endorsement from the new Twic State before funds can be committed for construction. The additional segment in Western Bahr-el-Ghazal is not affected by the new States and HARD has started community sensitisation activities along this road corridor

For the Eastern Lakes State Road (Aluak Luak to Mapourdit, 46.6 km), UNOPS is preparing a technical and financial proposal to re-activate project activities subject to endorsement by the current State governor and the National Ministry of Transport, Roads and Bridges.



## **Annex 12 Report on the Discussion held during the Deliberation on the Use of Coupon Presented by FAO**

The presentation by Nehru of FAO explains the newly proposed method of implementation for the Strengthening of Input and Extensions Services project. In the presentation FAO explained in more detail the activities proposed for the realisation of Result three. This is the result that aims to roll out a “private sector driven system for the supply of inputs and equipment, as well as the marketing of produce in the four states of Greater Bahr el Gazal (Warrap, Lakes, and Western & Northern Bahr El Gazal). The component as explained by FAO essentially has agreed on a strategy which includes the use of Coupons. The coupons will enable beneficiaries to directly access basic farm input (seeds and basic farm tools like malouda and panga). They will be presented at an Input Trade Fairs and redeemed by the vendors at FAO and implementing partners. The access to input will be complimented by direct procurement of some of the large equipment’s such as ox ploughs, solar fridges done by FAO.

The coupon system is expected to be preceded by a strong community conversation activities and the caveat is that the coupons will be linked to a very well instituted cost recovery system. Regarding rural financing mechanism, the two main tools proposed are the use of the existing VSLA methodology and a match funding (grant and loan) systems. In reacting to the presentation, the major concern expressed by participants is that the injection of funds to the small holder farmers through the use of vouchers now called Coupons by itself negates the very principle of the Wau Resolution. FAO pointed out that the system is supported by the Wau Resolution which allows for the use of vouchers as long as it is used to facilitate full cost recovery.

But more importantly is the fact that other SORUDEV implementing partners who are in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of operation began supporting the farmers through first facilitating them into a strong cohesive groups starting with the VSLAs. In the Payams and Bomas where this is implemented, FAO is going to implement a near counter strategy that will again bring the farmers to access seeds and tools using the coupons.

Against the concerns above, in a session led by Paolo, the participants at the QRM were encouraged to debate the feasibility of the strategy of using coupon 1) linked to direct access to input through input fairs and 2) coupons linked to cash through which the farmers could purchase the input they require. To this there was first the show of hands followed by the grouping of people based on their decision. The group supporting the direct access of input are in the majority (in contrast this group is mostly made up of people who themselves are inexperienced in the implementation of voucher method). Each group was required to justify their decisions for opting for one method over the other.

The group supporting the distribution of coupons as a means to directly access input explained that the coupons will ensure that farmers are compelled to purchase the farm inputs they require. It gives them no room to divert the coupon to other uses other than that of purchase of the farm input they need and that the input suppliers will be at hand to provide the needed quality seeds and the farm tools. In the counter, the group supporting coupons linked to cash explained that in reality the coupon-to-dealers approach as bred corruption in the past and there is no evidence that it will be different this time. Farmers and traders always collude; farmers will on the day of input trade fairs collect the inputs but will return them to the same dealers to access cash at a discount. This group though less in number comprised of people with more experience in vouchers systems, they also argued that the input coupons gives farmer the freedom to decide what to buy and more important the power to negotiate better prices and value for money. The freedom to choose input and



to choose vendors is empowering and less restrictive besides the fact that it is open and transparent.

Though the exercise was deemed long but it provoked very fundamental debate. As a result, the following agreement was reached that:

1. FAO will use both approaches in the four states of Greater Bahr El Gazal. In order to avoid confusion and to ensure comparative learning, the Coupon linked to direct access of input will be implemented in 2 states while the coupon linked to cash will be implemented in the 2 remaining states.
2. FAO will implement the match funding and loan system to the groups now defined as agro dealers such as the black smiths, community extension agents, community animal health workers, para veterinarians, seed producers and the vet input suppliers. To this effect, FAO will interact with HARD or other SORUDEV partners including drawing from other FAO experience in the region to learn from the current loans system approach piloted.
3. FAO will ensure proper delineation of bomas and payams with clear GPS coordinates to aid the selection of operational areas and to ensure that there are no counterproductive approach in the areas SORUDEV partners are already working. In this respect, it is suggested that FAO prioritise working with the SORUDEV partners for the implementation to create value for money and to build on the synergy already existing.

FAO shall integrate this understanding into their revised inception report which is awaiting approval by the European Union Delegation.

## Annex 13 Suggested Contents of Project Presentations

Tabular report format for basic narrative reporting on physical progress based on the logical framework (Logframe)

Ref No.	Result description and indicators	Planned target/achievements for the reporting period	Progress/issues	Action required
1.1	Increased coverage of sewerage network No. of households and factories connected	800 households and 10 factories	400 households (50%) have been connected to mains sewerage and all 10 factories (100%).  Primary constraints have been (i) willingness/ability of households to pay the connection fee; and (ii) some delays to engineering works in residential areas due to labour disputes.	Investigation required into householders ability/willingness to pay. To be conducted as matter of urgency by water board and local government.  Labour disputes require action by management of construction contractor. Contract penalty clauses to be applied.
	Etc			