



European Commission

Project N° 2015/362-919

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

**Workshop Report:
4th QRM Wau**

**Period covered:
29-30 September 2015**

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

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

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR INCEPTION 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: 4th QRM Wau

Period covered: 29-30 September 2015

Table of Contents

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

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	Update on SORUDEV Boma GPS data
Annex 8	Update on Areas Under Crops
Annex 9	Update on WFP Feeder Roads
Annex 10	Suggested Project Report Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms

AFIS	Agriculture and Food Information System
AFOD	Action for Development
AMTIP	Agricultural Marketing and Transformation Investments Programme
CAD	County Agricultural Department
CAHW	Community Animal Health Worker
CBEW	Community-Based Extension Worker
CORP	Community-Owned Resource Person
DfID	Department for International Development (UK)
CTC	Crop Training Centre
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
FAO	UN Food and Agricultural Organisation
FFS	Farmer Field School
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Cooperation)
GPS	Global Positioning System
HARD	Hope Agency for Relief and Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MARF	Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries
MoE	Ministry of Education
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental organisation
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
(S)MAFCRD	(State) Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development
SORUDEV	South Sudan Rural Development Programme
SSP	South Sudanese pound
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Association
WBG	Western Bahr-el-Ghazal
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



4th Quarterly Review & Steering Committee Meeting Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal Food Security & Rural Development Programme (ZEAT-BEAD, SORUDEV & FSTP)

**Held in Amarula Lodge Wau, Western Bahr-el-Ghazal
on 29-30 September, 2015**



1 Introduction

The meeting was held in Wau, Western Bahr-el-Ghazal (WBG) State from Tuesday 29 – 30 September 2015, hosted by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) and the Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD), and attended by 56 people (representatives of 13 non-Governmental organisations (NGOs), 5 United Nations agencies and representatives of both National and State government). Mr Louis Alkata, Director General (DG) of the WBG State Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development (SMAFCRD) on behalf of Michael Madut Chan, State Minister of Agriculture, chaired the meeting. Dr Leju Lugor and Mr Anthony Riwa represented the national Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development and the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (MARF) respectively. Tayo Alabi and Angus Graham on behalf of the Delegation of the European Union (EUD) to Juba Rural Development Programme conducted the meeting.

PowerPoint presentations covering the inception period (mostly from February to July 2015) of the 4 Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation/Bahr-el-Ghazal Agricultural Development (ZEAT-BEAD) Programme Partners were made on day 1 of the meeting followed by a time of comment and conversation by the participants and Steering Committee. On day 2, partners of the South Sudan Rural Development Programme (SORUDEV) and the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) made presentations on their progress to date and their work plans for the forthcoming year. These included:

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

2 Opening and Closing Remarks

Mr Alkata and Dr Leju Lugor made a welcome and opening address on the first day of the meeting, extending greetings from both the National Minister of Agriculture and their two Undersecretaries (all of whom are out of the country during this period). Mr Paolo Girlando, European Union Programme Manager, reiterated the decisions made at the last Quarterly Review Meeting (QRM), which were circulated in the form of an Aide Memoire together with the invitations to the meeting. He pointed out that the holding of Steering and Advisory Committee meetings twice a year is a requisite outlined in the Programme's technical and administrative provisions (TAPs) and Action Fiche. Their function is to provide counsel on the overall direction and performance of the programme. The Advisory Committee will be chaired by the beneficiary State Governments on a rotational basis and co-chaired by the EUD. (See attached Aide Memoire).

The second day of the meeting was opened with an appeal by Government representatives for greater communication and coordination with Government agencies in the planning and monitoring of activities, and for more detailed regular reporting on the use of project funds. The day started with a brief reflection on the proceedings of the first day. They appealed to the need for NGOs to work within a jointly established coordination framework in their State of operation and to assist with the improvement of information flows among Government

departments. A representative of Government should attend all operational meetings called by the NGOs. It was also pointed out that it is essential that NGOs ensure the participation of their Programme Managers in all Steering Committee and Review meetings.

The meeting was closed on the second day with remarks from Mr Paolo Girlando, Dr Leju Lugor and Mr Alkata. They concluded that overall, the meeting was very well attended and successful, highlighting that the meeting is technical and that transparency is very important considering that all stakeholders (EU, National and State ministries) are interested to follow progress made during implementation. They pointed out that a technical committee should guide this meeting seeing as the Ministers have insufficient time for detailed discussions. They requested that presentations be circulated before the meeting and that more time be allocated for moderated technical discussions in order to facilitate a process of consultation, critical review and performance assessment.

Mr Girlando, Dr Leju and Mr Alkata pointed out that considering that these meetings include representatives of Ministers and are attended by senior Ministry staff (DGs at both national and State level), implementing partners (IPs) should take these meetings very seriously and ensure that their senior representatives and project managers are in attendance. They also highlighted the continued critical need for training and retraining of agricultural extension staff. Support to the employment and capacity building of State extension staff is a priority. The MAFCRD is working closely with the Ministry of Education (MoE) at the University of Juba to ensure that all training institutions are proficient and accredited as such. Linkages between the SMAFCRD and the MAFCRD need to be strengthened, particularly with regard to reporting from State to national level and the compilation of information for the National Minister's attention.

3 General Discussions

Coordination and cooperation between County Agricultural Departments and implementing organisations needs to be improved and properly strengthened. A general lack of qualified NGO and Government staff and poor inclusion (cooperation) of County- and Payam-level Government extension staff in field operations is a cause for concern. Monitoring visits in some areas (e.g. Northern Bahr-el-Ghazal) found that training and demonstrations are being poorly conducted. It is vital that Government and implementing agencies work together amicably and in a non-confrontational manner and that they serve the interests and real needs of South Sudanese farming communities.

National and State-level Ministry authorities are very aware of the need to build the capacity of extension staff across all levels. To fully function they anticipate a need for 513 County Extension Officers, 2565 Payam Extension Officers and 12,825 Boma Community Extension Officers in the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal (GBG) region. ZEAT-BEAD, SORUDEV and FSTP partners were requested to make provisions to support the training of Payam and Boma extension officers by supporting and utilising the training centres being developed across the country. Partners are being encouraged to send at least one or two of their national staff each to the Crop Training Centre (CTC) to participate in a 9-month certification programme, which could benefit the nation beyond the implementation of the current programmes and projects. State Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives and Rural Development have been requested to make provisions within their budgets to employ all trainees and include them on their payrolls. They are seeking initial support from implementing partners.

A number of common challenges were observed, including:

- Insecurity;
- Fluctuations in the exchange rate and volatility of prices (which affect project budgets and farmer savings and coping strategies);

- Late rains and a dry spell following planting (which is expected to have a downward impact on production potential);
- The need for resources to support the growing demand of Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) groups, which is affecting the quality of their supervision;
- The presence of different relief versus development intervention approaches among partners, leading beneficiaries to adopt a “wait and see” approach instead of actively investing in their productive activities where they can;
- Problems with accessibility due to bad roads;
- Sceptical and predatory agro-dealers; and
- Slow adoption of new farming techniques.

The agricultural input supply development activity should not be focused on providing agro-dealers with loans but rather on forging linkages across the whole input supply value chain, i.e. linking agro-dealers directly to vetted, trusted larger suppliers and financial institutions capable of providing them with loans. Agro-dealers should be treated as businesspeople and business standards should apply. The Wau Declaration of June 2014 has been very well discussed and agreed in principle by partners and Government representatives from all four of the GBG States. The national MAFCRD has 13 sector policies developed and approved for use, including national Pest Control and Fertiliser Policies. Currently, inorganic fertiliser may not be imported into the country unless it is for research and demonstration purposes.

Partners and Government counterparts formed a working group during the meeting and discussed both i) how coordination mechanisms are working; and ii) opportunities for the strengthening of communication. They agreed that a call tree and contact list of nominated focal points should be developed by each State for presentation at the next meeting. IPs pointed out that Government staff are their counterparts and currently require operational support for fieldwork.

There is no common value chain development training curriculum used by all partners, but all have simple enterprise training guides currently in use. Partners and UNIDO agreed to cooperate in the review and consolidation of existing materials. Loan mechanisms need to be included in these guidelines. At present some loans given to seed producers, artisans and marketing groups are coordinated at County level with NGOs acting as secretariats and assisting in the development and review of group Business Plans. A committee appraises the plan based on set criteria while NGO staff provide technical support and follow up.

The development of national integrated phase classification (IPC) reports and crop and food supply estimates is on-going. SORUDEV partners are participating in these processes. It was noted that the FAO Sudan institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA) project, which preceded the Agriculture and Food Information System (AFIS) project, by and large collapsed when it closed. It was explained that this was because the personnel involved were employed directly by the FAO with no established transfer arrangements to Government, which was complicated by salary differences. A common pay scale and staffing strategy for national staff was discussed. Government staff need to be realistic in their demands for salary increases in the face of limited funding conditions. It was pointed out that a Letter of Agreement signed between the FAO and the Government for the collection of data worked well until recently. The current economic situation and a rapid rise in inflation have disrupted this arrangement and data collectors have since requested to be paid in US dollars. Until this is resolved, field staff will be managed and paid directly by the AFIS team on a case-by-case needs basis.

4 Action Points

This session was chaired by Mr Sebit Ibrahim, Director Extension, Western Bahr-el-Ghazal SMAFCRD. The following points of action were agreed:

1. Each State Ministry should appoint focal persons (their staff) for each of the projects;
2. ZEAT-BEAD partners should join existing State coordination mechanisms and should ensure that their revised inception reports (including an updated strategy and detailed operational plans) are sent to the EUD by the end of October, followed by a meeting with the EUD in Wau on 4 November to review the revised reports;
3. All partners should: i) finalise their crop estimates in collaboration with Government counterparts and the AFIS project ii) provide the accurate (Trindle) Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates of their target Bomas (if they have not already finished doing so); iii) ensure to collect relevant project information against their baselines; iv) continue planting and harvesting forecasts and crop production estimates; v) address any gender imbalance among their staff and direct beneficiaries; vi) ensure efforts are made to raise EU visibility in all project activities; and vii) continue coordination meetings jointly with the SMAFCRD. These meetings should serve as forums at which the participants establish and regularly update a number of working briefs in the fields of:
 - GIS-referenced registration of activities by various partners;
 - Human resource development;
 - Producer group and cooperative formation;
 - Value Chain points of leverage;
 - Post-harvest production, management and marketing; and
 - Crop and food supply forecasts.
4. **The next (5th) QRM will be held in Rumbek on 27-28 January 2016** and hosted by the Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) and FAO Agro-Pastoralist Projects. 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 to include in their presentations:
 - A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework;
 - A detailed work schedule with quarterly targets;
 - A breakdown of funding expenditure to date;
 - A Procurement Plan and quarterly expenditure forecasts; and
 - A list of other projects/partners and their main activities.
5. There is a need for a consolidated training needs assessment. Dr Sebit Peter informed that the CTC in Yei is now qualified to provide accredited courses and will begin a Diploma curriculum in June 2016. All partners are encouraged to support this initiative through seconding staff and funding candidates from their areas of operation;
6. In order to launch the updated Extension Guide prepared together with IPs over the past six months and validated by several institutions (including Universities, the MAFCRD and MARF), partners and Government are requested to make financial commitment from their available budget for the joint printing of these documents;
7. Action for Development (AFOD), which is implementing for WFP, should coordinate with the SORUDEV IPs in their operational areas in order to strengthen synergy and enhance proper understanding of the agreed implementation approach;
8. Public-Private Partnership (PPP) development agreements (e.g. for slaughterhouses) should be counter-signed by the relevant Ministers.

5 Deliberations of the Steering Committee

The purpose of the inception period is to conclude contracting arrangements, mobilise resources, establish working relationships with stakeholders, hold inception workshop(s), review and revise the project plan, collect information and data and establish M&E systems.

The purpose of the inception report is to review the project design in consultation with stakeholders, to update the first annual work plan to ensure its relevance and feasibility and to build commitment to and management/ownership of the project among stakeholders.

FAO

The meeting acknowledged that the FAO baseline assessment was not yet complete, that agreements with partners were not yet concluded and that a very clear M&E plan still needs to be elaborated. They noted that criteria for the selection of Bomas to be supported are still needed and an input supply development strategy is outstanding. Thorough assessment of i) the status of the extension system; ii) the capacity and capability of agro-dealers to deliver services; and iii) the demand for inputs of different types across the region is needed.

The Steering Committee reiterated the importance that FAO prepare a clear strategy for expenditure of the some 8 million EUR intended to strengthen input supply value chains, including rural finance. A strategy on how private extension agents will be developed and sustained also needs to be elaborated, together with criteria for the selection of private extension operators and artisans for support.

Three ministries are involved in the FAO Agro-Pastoral Education project (MAFCRD, MARF and the MoE). The latter, along with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), is implementing the formal education component targeting children (6-8 years) living in cattle camps. This is different from the literacy classes planned for adults in pastoral field schools. Nutrition and hygiene are also essential aspects of the pastoral field schools. Care for children should include care for mothers and adolescent girls in the cattle camps. There are plans to introduce vocational training and life skills training.

The project will need to explain how it will address the issues of peace building and conflict mediation (cattle raiding and land disputes) within a framework for risk reduction.

UNIDO

The meeting highlighted the importance of selecting and prioritising feasible value chain segments, taking into consideration resource limitations (a project budget of EUR 2 million). UNIDO should clarify the locations they will be supporting and the partners they will be working with. Broad consultation and joint planning with direct beneficiaries (rural people) and with partners and Government in the Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal region will be necessary.

Any facilities installed must adhere strictly to standard operating procedures (SOPs) for quality and hygiene. Possibilities for improving community nutrition, developing blended and fortified foods, and developing links to universities and human resources development should be considered. Value chain feasibility studies currently underway (Sorghum, Rice, Groundnut, Sesame, Hides/Skins and Fisheries) will need to be presented at a stakeholder validation workshop. The project also needs to elaborate a strategy for the development and operation of mobile value addition training units foreseen under this action.

GIZ

It is important that facilities supported by the EU do not end up unused or falling into disarray and decay. Thorough consultation and clear agreements for the operation and maintenance of these facilities must take place during project inception and before any significant

commitment to expenditure is made. GIZ should actively provide assistance to the relevant States to ensure the development of appropriate and relevant legal frameworks. The meeting requested GIZ to ensure that any local agreements for the development of facilities under PPP arrangements are countersigned by the relevant national Ministers.

The meeting questioned: i) the reason behind the transfer of anticipated support from the slaughterhouse in Rumbek Town to Yirol; and ii) why it had been decided to build a new slaughterhouse in Wau. Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF) Belgium is already renovating a slaughterhouse in Rumbek. The State Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (SMARF) recommends the relocation to Yirol as this area lacks a decent-quality facility. The reason for building a new slaughterhouse in Wau is because the present one in use is derelict and unhygienic.

The meeting suggested that any old facilities that are being substituted by new ones should be demolished as soon as the new ones become operational. There should be a clause in the agreement with the Private Operators that requires them to agree to repair and maintain the slaughterhouses. They should be told to return the slaughterhouses in the same shape in which they received them as and when they give them up. The project should also make plans for waste management and by-product processing. GIZ is already in discussion with UNIDO on the development of a “Hides and Skins” value chain around the slaughterhouses.

UNOPS

The UNOPS feasibility study was conducted well and UNOPS consulted and worked with all SORUDEV partners in the four States in much the same way that WFP has done. UNOPS and WFP have established specific project Steering Committees in Juba, co-chaired by the EUD and the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure (MTI).

The EU pointed out that the focus of the feeder roads project is to improve farmer access to markets. Community sensitisation and engagement in road maintenance is an important aspect. HIV/AIDS awareness is equally important since roads open up increased interaction and can expose otherwise isolated communities to higher risk of contact. Implementation arrangements have been made with SORUDEV partners and AFOD.

The escalating cost of construction of the Kuajok Bridge in Gogrial West by WFP (meant to link WBG and Warrap) is a source of concern that may have an impact on the food security activities of the SORUDEV partners tasked with targeting Bomas and communities along the Tharkueng-Getti Road.

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

The Steering Committee agreed that in view of i) the generally slow/weak progress observed to date in the development of the ZEAT-BEAD projects funded by the EU; and ii) the fact that the Inception Reports submitted were by and large incomplete and did not satisfactorily reflect an adequate level of planning and preparedness (with the operational readiness of the projects not clearly demonstrated), IPs should further their preparations, resubmit their completed Inception Reports by the end of October and present them again at a meeting in Wau on 4 November. More information is also required from the sub-contracted agencies engaged to undertake community sensitisation and mobilisation for road maintenance.

The Inception Report should include all the elements of the standard form illustrated on page 115 of the EU Project Cycle Management (PCM) manual. It should also include the following chapters:

- Review of project design, e.g. the Description of the Action and budget (relevance, feasibility) and any changes required to the design;

- A detailed work plan for the first year (narrative), and
- Annexes (including an updated Logframe Matrix, a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, (including revised overall targets), an updated annual work plan for the first year (in tabular format) and an updated annual resource schedule and budget.

FAO

The Steering Committee recognised what FAO has achieved considering the challenges and demands of the working environment. It noted however that key personnel are not yet in place and that there is still much to do before implementation by FAO can start in earnest. The following staff with substantial International experience in rural development should have been recruited and should have supported the development of this complex Inception Report: i) a Project Manager; and experts in ii) Rural Finance and iii) Extension and Training.

Unfortunately the absence of the above expertise did not allow the proper finalisation of the Inception Report. Some significant gaps still remain, not the least of which is a serious lack of capability and capacity to carry this initiative forward where it counts on the ground. The mission expected the FAO project team to have achieved a more complete and operational plan by now.

A realistic work plan to match the ambitions of the programme has not yet been fully elaborated. The “State annual work plans” have not been fully developed and lack both the rationale of the intervention and a strategy informed by survey and assessment. The design lacks much-needed detail, and aspects of feasibility, stakeholder commitment and synergies with programme partners remain unresolved. Result 3 “A private sector-driven system for the supply of inputs and equipment, as well as the marketing of produce is rolled out in the four States” is almost completely omitted from the Inception Report: only a section on rural financing has been somewhat developed, which is not the result expected.

The following assessments/works which should have been done during the inception period are not yet complete or available:

- The definition and adoption of principles and criteria for the targeting of areas, households, community-based extension workers (CBEWs) and community based animal health workers (CBAHWs);
- The assessment of extension service delivery capacity and practice in the four States of Greater Bahr-el-Ghazal (following recruitment of the international Extension and Training expert);
- Assessment in the four States of private sector supply and service delivery systems, smallholder demand for inputs and equipment, marketing systems and structures for rural produce (following recruitment the Value Chain and Rural Finance expert);
- The design, modalities, management and supervision of the whole LC (Letter of Credit) aspect as well as the roles and responsibilities of the involved partners and stakeholders. What has been proposed in the three documents needs to be further developed in detail;
- Institutional analysis and planning with local private sector stakeholder groups in order to identify roles and responsibilities, institutional weaknesses and professional organisational structure;
- A comprehensive monitoring matrix that includes clear indicators (result-orientated and detailed by State), deliverables and data to be monitored (which should have been developed on the basis of the baseline surveys and data collected during the inception phase to develop linkages between data established at Boma, Payam, County and State level);

- The exit strategy.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of components that are omitted from the overall plan and State plans:

- The development of curricula, accreditation and licensing requirements for extension and animal healthcare service providers;
- The identification and strengthening of training expertise for future accreditation;
- The development of a licensing system for trained CBEWs and Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs);
- The selection of wholesalers and agro-dealers through a competitive process that complies with FAO rules and regulations;
- The selection of local artisans for the maintenance and repair of equipment; as well as for the manufacture of spare parts and/or equipment;
- The launching of an information campaign for local communities in the targeted areas on the opportunities and conditions of the programme and the support, formation and establishment of approximately 800 VSLAs (this has been reduced to 400 without justification);
- The selection and training of CAHWs to deliver treatment services at full cost-recovery (poorly developed in the Inception Report, though more detail is given in the Description of the Action);
- The provision of support to communities to establish and run approximately 400 Farmer/Pastoralist Field Schools and learning groups in the four States, including the training of CBEWs/facilitators (poorly developed in the Inception Report, though more detail is given in the Description of the Action).

The mission is also concerned with the lack of elaboration of some of the amendments suggested by the FAO Project Proposal Review Committee and their linkages within the approach of the Project. According to the design of the programme, the project should:

- Promote local production in term of seeds and tools;
- Develop curricula for use by local agricultural extension services for the transfer of knowledge, skills and technology,
- Ensure all interventions are embedded (i.e. not pilot interventions) and that they are environmentally sound, encompassing agricultural practices that are environmentally friendly and economically sustainable; and
- Ensure that the demonstration of these practices is foreseen in the Action and carried out by the licensed CBEWs and CBAs in their role as extensionists.

UNIDO

The Steering Committee agreed that it is not clear what activities UNIDO is actually going to implement and noted that the work plan and recommendations in the 3 reports submitted are not consistent. They recommended that UNIDO submit a detailed work plan, a revised logframe (with revised indicators) and a revised description of the Action (including a budget if needed).

Overall the proposal seems very ambitious considering what is involved and taking into account the resources available. More time and resources than are actually available may well be necessary if all of what has been studied and proposed is to be operationalised.

Implicit in some of the activities is a lot of farmer organisation and extension work around product preparation for storage and other processes. This will require some very effective partnerships if it is to be successful in the short time available. Linkages to FAO and GIZ need to be spelt out, while those with the DfID/German Government-funded value chain projects with GIZ and with the DfID-funded Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED) project need exploration.

The poultry feed and egg production chains may be beyond the reach of the current programme. There is no link in the value chain plan for fisheries to that of feed production. It is not clear how FAO and UNIDO could enhance their relative advantages by working together in the fishery value chain project.

The importance of waste reduction, solid waste management and effluent treatment should not be overlooked and indeed this is highlighted in the value chain study for hides and skins. The extensive sets of activities outlined comprehensively in the hides and skins value chain report are more suited to a dedicated programme. The resources required are very likely far beyond the capacity of the current ZEAT-BEAD programme unless alternative arrangements can be made. A considerable number of surveys and assessments are also scheduled, which are required to further inform decisions on the proposed development activities before operations can start. Proposals for tariff protection should be well analysed against the proposed recommendation.

As presented it seems that UNIDO may be overstretched to implement all of the proposed activities and some strategic choices need to be made in order to be effective in the time available. A finalised strategy and more detailed planning seems to be in order, although this may yet take some time as the results of on-going and planned studies and assessments materialise. Prioritisation of a few key aspects may be a useful start. This should be done jointly by UNIDO, FAO and GIZ, each of which can provide relevant specialised technical experience and knowledge.

GIZ

GIZ should submit a more useful detailed work plan to assist with the management of the project (planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation). The work plan currently presented is too general and is basically the same 4-year plan presented in the Description of the Action. The logframe does not really seem to have been revised and the indicators are not well quantified. Assuming increased production by 10% without baseline data is insufficient, as is the mere agreement from the DGs on certain aspects of the project. State Ministers and/or Governors should also be involved as well as representatives at National level, who should at least be an Undersecretary.

The rationale behind the change of location from Rumbek to Yirol is unclear. GIZ should, in coordination and agreement with the local authorities, analyse this problem and produce a technical and financial proposal for the upgrading of the existing slaughterhouse. If this is not viable, another location in Rumbek should be selected (utilising if possible the equipment provided by the EU to a slaughterhouse that is no longer functioning).

The GIZ Inception Report mentions that “at least one warehouse will be constructed and operating”. The revised Description of the Action mentions that actual implementation will be done on the basis of studies by other partners active in the value chain in terms of location and dimension, who will provide training and backstopping to warehouse operators and lead the monitoring and backstopping of value chain activities. This is based on assumption, without an agreement with the partners. GIZ shall design and implement all of the necessary steps to set up a sustainable and functioning warehouse system. A warehouse ticket system shall be put in place in coordination with WFP and UNIDO.

GIZ shall ensure and provide evidence that the location of the new slaughterhouses is well accepted by all relevant stakeholders in order to avoid repeating the mistakes made by other agencies in Rumbek and Wau. The chosen location should be legally, socially, economically and environmentally viable.

The existing slaughterhouse in Wau should be decommissioned as soon as the new one becomes operative. Regarding the rehabilitation of the two slaughterhouses, it is advisable not to repair what has been neglected during the former utilisation of the plant (due to a lack of care/maintenance by the operators and a lack of control by the Government). Part of the costs of rehabilitation shall instead be borne by the Government or operator. A system that allows for the recovery of the funds necessary for the repairs at the end of any PPP lease agreement shall be put in place (in the form of an initial guarantee deposit, monthly retention mechanism etc.).

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 two-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 Amarula Lodge in Wau between 08h30 and 17h30 on 29 and 30 September 2015.

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

- Day 1 will be dedicated to the functioning of a steering committee of the EU projects under the overarching action entitled 'Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation - Bahr El Ghazal Effort for Agricultural Development (Zeal-Bead)'.
- Day 2 will constitute a forum to discuss common issues among implementing partners of the above-mentioned action and related components 1.) South Sudan Rural Development Programme Smallholder Component (Sorudev), and 2.) Food Security Thematic Component (FSTP).

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 3rd quarterly review meeting, in coordination with the other partners please seek to ensure a gender balance.

The workshop is scheduled to take place at the Amarula Lodge in Wau between 08h30 and 17h30 on 29 and 30 September 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 deliver on the occasion of the 2nd day of the meeting event the following:

- 1.) A summary brief on your organisations EU funded project achievements, with reference to its performance and results indicators, and
- 2.) A Presentation (10 to 15 minutes) on the:
 - a.) Progress made to date in implementing the project work plan,
 - b.) Work plan and measures for the forthcoming 12 month period,
 - d.) Critical paths and bottlenecks, and
 - e.) Challenges and solutions, and lessons learned.

Annex 2 Aide Memoire

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

- Representatives of each of the four States targeted by the project;
- A representative of the Federal Ministries of Agriculture and Animal Resources;
- 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);
- A representative of the EU Delegation.
- The TA team leader will be an observer in the Advisory Committee, ensuring its secretariat functions, 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.

On the occasion of the 3rd QRM in Wau (26-28 May, 2015) the establishment of a SORUDEV and ZEAT-BEAD joint programme steering committee structure was discussed and agreed among participants. 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 government, implementing partners and the beneficiaries. Government should own it, and beneficiaries need to be represented.

A representative of each of the four States targeted by the project and one each from the National Ministries of Agriculture and Animal Resources should be part of the National Steering Committee. Other stakeholders can be invited when relevant. Smaller committees at State level, State Steering Committee, including County, Payam and beneficiary representatives shall be also organised. The Steering Committee will 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 EU Delegation. This committee will not have a decision-making responsibility.

Considering what has been agreed during the meeting (3rd QRM in Wau) and the EU contractual requirements, the following features have to be followed:

- The National Steering Committee is to be held twice a year for SORUDEV and twice a year for ZEAT-BEAD.
- The Quarterly Review Meeting will be held on rotating basis, chaired by the beneficiary State Governments. Each will be approximately two days in duration. The first day will be dedicated to the National Steering Committee of either SORUDEV or ZEAT-BEAD. EU IP Agencies must draft their reports to the steering committee according to the EU Project Cycle Management (PCM) guideline and circulate them at least a week in advance of scheduled steering committee meetings.
- The steering committee should conduct a six monthly review of proposed work plans for the next period (Annual Plan) and of progress and performance to date, and draw conclusions on the programme's efficiency and effectiveness. Discussions during the steering committee meeting should clarify whether each project is on track or if any activity has been delayed, is solving the problems identified and achieving the expected results, and whether the direct beneficiaries are satisfied.

- The second day of each Quarterly Review Meeting will constitute a forum to discuss common issues, preceded by 10-minute thematic results presentations (9 in total) by each of the SORUDEV or ZEAT BEAD (depending on who is presenting on day 1) and FSTP Implementing Partners. UNOPS and WFP will also make a presentation on roads rehabilitation;
- Relevant line ministries from the host state shall be invited while only one representative from the other states (focal person) will be present. Ministry projects focal persons should be involved in projects monitoring. The contact details of the selected Government stakeholders at all levels, and specification of their function within the Programmes, shall be communicated to EUD.
- Project monitoring reports by EU TA partner Agencies, NGOs and national and state government services shall be shared among all concerned parties, including focal persons.
- A specific website will be created, where all the monitoring, inception, interim and progress reports and technical documents will be uploaded and made publicly available for viewing and downloading.

Annex 3 Meeting Photographs



Annex 4 Agenda

Day 1

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

ZEAT-BEAD COMPONENT

08.30	Registration	
09.00	Welcome address by Chief Guests	Louis Alkata, WBG SMAFCRD Dr Leju Lugor and Mr Anthony Riwa, MAFCRD
09.10	Constitution of Steering Committee	Paolo Girlando, EUD to Juba, Rural Development Programme Manager
09.30	Presentation/Discussion	FAO – project 1 (EIS) Isaac Bazugba
10.30	Coffee Break	
11.00	Deliberations of the committee	Louis Alkata, WBG SMAFCRD DG Agriculture
11.30	Presentation/Discussion	GIZ – project 1 (AMTIP) Adolf Gerstl
12.30	Lunch	
13.30	Deliberations of the committee	Goseph Garang, NBG SMAFCRD DG Agriculture
14.00	Presentation/Discussion	UNIDO – project 1 (VA-VC) Ramkishor Singh
15.00	Tea Break	
15.30	Deliberations of the committee	Martin Madut Chan, Warrap SMAFCRD DG Agriculture.
16.00	Presentation/Discussion	FAO – project 2 (EK-P) Ezana Kassa
17.00	Deliberations of the committee	Benjamin Makoi, Lakes SMAFCRD Director Livestock
17.30	Closure	

Day 2

THEMATIC REVIEW

SORUDEV & FSTP COMPONENT

08.30	Registration	EU
09.00	Welcome address by Chief Guests	
09.10	Presentations WBB	Hope Agency for Relief and Development
09.30	Presentations NBB	Concern Worldwide, People In Need Emmanuel Bida, Jakub Smutny
10.30	Coffee Break	
11.00	Presentations Warrap	Norwegian Refugee Council, VSF, World Vision Berhanu Wolde
12.00	Presentations Lakes	Norwegian People's Aid Samuel Deng
12.30	Lunch	
13.30	Discussion WBG and NBB	Sebit Ibrahim, WBG SMAFCRD Director Extension
15.00	Tea Break	
15.30	Presentation	FAO – project 3 (AFIS) Erminio Sacco
16.00	Presentation	WFP, UNOPS (Feeder Roads) Million Ali Abate
17.00	Discussion/Action Plan	Thon, Lakes SMAFCRD, Director Agriculture
17.30	Closure	

Annex 5 Participants

See attached file.

Annex 6 Presentations

See attached files.

Annex 7 Update on SORUDEV Boma GPS data

Progress made by partners so far

- Concern Worldwide: SORUDEV mapping coordinates have been collected and sent.
- Hope Agency for Relief and Development: Only 24 more Bomas need to be collected (all others have been sent).
- Norwegian People's Aid: All coordinates were collected except for a few that were collected with wrongly calibrated GPS.
- Norwegian Refugee Council: All GPS data are now 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.

Annex 8 Update on Areas Under Crops

1. Warrap State (Norwegian Refugee Council) Average land under cultivation:
 - Sorghum: 3.2 feddan (5.664 feddan cultivated)
 - Groundnut: 3.5 feddan (3,230 feddan cultivated)
 - Maize: 0.5 feddan (162.5 feddan cultivated)
 - Simsim: 1 feddan (500 feddan cultivated)
2. Western Bahr-el-Ghazal (Hope Agency for Relief and Development)
 - 298 farmers (168 men and 130 women) received agricultural loans on a pilot basis totalling 255,275 SSP. The 298 loanees cultivated a total 933 feddan averaging 3.13 feddan per farmer.
3. Northern Bahr-el-Ghazal (Concern Worldwide)

County	Payams	# of groups	Membership	Feddan cultivated	Main crops grown
Aweil North	Malual Centre	12	300	216	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
	Malual North	12	300	804.75	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
	Malual West	12	300	1,057.50	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
	Ariath	12	300	538	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
Aweil West	Achana	6	114	179.5	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
	Ayat West	12	255	729.68	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
	Gumjuer East	12	299	362.59	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
Aweil Centre	Awada	12	300	632.5	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
	Aroyo	12	271	1,623	Sorghum, Groundnut, Sesame
Total		102	2,439	6,143.52	

Annex 9 Update on WFP Feeder Roads

Road Name	Length in km	County	State	Funded by
Karich - Amok Piny - Panyijar	118.8	Rumbek East/Rumbek Centre/Panyijar	Lakes & Unity	SSRF
Aluak Luak-Akuoc Cok	46.6	Yirol West	Lakes	SSRF
Kuajok-Lunyaker	50	Gogrial East/ Gogrial West	Warrap	EU
Kuajok Bridge	160m + 6km	Gogrial West	Warrap	EU
Kangi-Kuajok	41.25	Gogrial West/Jur River	Warrap & WBG	EU
Tharkueng-Getti	28	Jur River	WBG	EU
Mundri-Bangolo	67.25	Mundri West	Western Equatoria	KoN
Pageri-Magwi	65	Magwi	Eastern Equatoria	KoN
Ame-Ame Juba junction	14	Magwi	Eastern Equatoria	KoN
Kworijik-Tendere-Buko	56.125**	Juba	Central Equatoria	IFAD
Juba-Kajo Keji	~9 structures	Juba/Kajo Keji	Central Equatoria	IFAD
Terekeka-Muni-Tombek	~18 structures	Terekeka	Central Equatoria	IFAD
Fargacika-Ngisa-Mboro-Ngobagari (-Bagari Jedid)	~89	Wau	WBG	DFATD Canada

Annex 10 Suggested Project Report Contents

Inception Report (First Annual Plan)	Progress Report and Annual Plan	Completion Report
Table of contents and list of abbreviations	Table of contents and list of abbreviations	Table of contents and list of abbreviations
1. Introduction 1 page that summarises (i) basic project data (name, location, duration, value, key stakeholders, purpose and key results, etc) (ii) the status of the project at the time of reporting; and (iii) who has prepared the report, why and how	1. Introduction 1 page that summarises (i) basic project data (name, location, duration, value, key stakeholders, purpose and key results, etc) (ii) the status of the project at the time of reporting; and (iii) who has prepared the report, why and how	1. Introduction 1 page that summarises (i) basic project data (name, location, duration, value, key stakeholders, purpose and key results, etc) (ii) the status of the project at the time of reporting; and (iii) who has prepared the report, why and how
2. Executive summary and recommendations Concise summary (i.e 2 pages) of the main issues and recommendations for the attention of key decision makers	2. Executive summary and recommendations Concise summary (i.e 2 pages) of the main issues and recommendations for the attention of key decision makers	2. Executive summary and recommendations Concise summary (i.e 2 pages) of the main issues and recommendations for the attention of key decision makers
3. Review of project design/financing proposal (relevance, feasibility and any changes required to design) (up to 10 pages) 3.1 Policy and programme context, including linkage to other ongoing operations/activities 3.2 Objectives to be achieved (Overall Objective, purpose, results) 3.3 Activities 3.4 Resources and budget 3.5 Assumptions and risks 3.6 Management and coordination arrangements 3.7 Financing arrangements 3.8 Monitoring, review and evaluation arrangements 3.9 Key Quality/Sustainability issues (update)	3. Review of Progress and Performance to date (comparing against plan – efficiency and effectiveness) (up to 10 pages) 3.1 Policy and programme context, including linkage to other ongoing operations/activities 3.2 Progress towards achieving objectives (Overall Objective, purpose, results) 3.3 Activities undertaken 3.4 Resources and budget used 3.5 Assumptions and risks – status/update 3.6 Management and coordination arrangements 3.7 Financing arrangements 3.8 Key Quality/Sustainability issues	3. Review of Progress and Performance at completion (comparing against plan – efficiency, effectiveness and impact) (up to 10 pages) 3.1 Policy and programme context, including linkage to other ongoing operations/activities 3.2 Objectives achieved (Overall Objective, purpose, results) 3.3 Activities undertaken 3.4 Resources and budget used 3.5 Assumptions and risks – status/update 3.6 Management and coordination arrangements 3.7 Financing arrangements 3.8 Key Quality/Sustainability issues
4. Workplan for the next period (Annual Plan) 4.1 Results to be delivered – quantity, quality and time 4.2 Activity schedule – including any key milestones and lead responsibilities 4.3 Resource schedule and budget 4.4 Updated risk management plan 4.5 Special activities to support sustainability	4. Workplan for the next period (Annual Plan) 4.1 Results to be delivered – quantity, quality and time 4.2 Activity schedule – including any key milestones and lead responsibilities 4.3 Resource schedule and budget 4.4 Updated risk management plan 4.5 Special activities to support sustainability	4. Lessons learned 4.1 Policy and programme context – including institutional capacity 4.2 Process of project planning/design 4.3 Project scope (objectives, resources, budget, etc) 4.4 Assumptions and risks 4.5 Project management/coordination arrangements and stakeholder participation 4.6 Project financing arrangements 4.7 Sustainability
Annexes • Updated Logframe Matrix • Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, including revised overall targets • Updated Annual Workplan for first year • Updated Annual Resource Schedule and budget • Other	Annexes to the Annual Plan • Updated Logframe Matrix • Summary performance data (results, milestones and expenditure – for reporting year and cumulative to date) • Updated Annual Workplan for next period • Updated Annual Resource Schedule and budget for next period • Other	Annexes • Updated Logframe Matrix from last Annual Report • Summary performance data (purpose, results and expenditure – cumulative to date) • Other

Tabular report format for basic narrative reporting on physical progress based on the Logframe structure

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			