

THE EUROPEAN UNION EMERGENCY TRUST FUND FOR STABILITY AND ADDRESSING THE ROOT CAUSES OF IRREGULAR MIGRATION AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN AFRICA

**Action Fiche for the implementation of the Horn of Africa Window
T05-EUTF-HOA-SD-14**

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Greater Stability in Eastern Sudan through better and more informed Decision-Making in Food Security		
Total cost	Total estimated cost: EUR 6, 000,000 Total amount from the EU Trust Fund: EUR 6, 000,000		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Project Modality: Indirect management with the Food and Agriculture Organisation		
DAC-code	52010	Sector	Food Aid/Food Security Programmes

2. RATIONALE AND CONTEXT

2.1. Summary of the action and its objectives

The project contributes to **EU Trust Fund objective (2)** strengthening resilience of most vulnerable communities, and the **cross-cutting output** to "improve policy and practice". The project is also aligned with the **Valletta Action Plan priority domain (1)** development benefits of migration and addressing root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement. The project is also based on the **objectives and indicative intervention priorities of the Short Term Strategy 2016/17** for the implementation of a special support measure in favour of the people of the Republic of Sudan.

The **geographical scope** of the project focuses on the following states: Blue Nile, Gedaref, Kassala, Red Sea, White Nile and Sennar.

The **intervention logic** is based on the hypothesis that if the proposed project is able to strengthen systems that are able to generate, collate and analyse successfully quality supporting evidence and data on food security, and promote its use by decision makers and practitioners, then policy and practice will become more effective in reducing food insecurity. Equality, if the proposed project can promote improved coordination and strategic planning, then public authorities will be more effective in fulfilling their mandates. The main assumptions are that the research is based on the correct issues, there is sufficient demand for and use of research findings, and partner institutions are open to change.

The **overall objective** of the proposed project is to contribute to a more conducive and sustainable living environment for vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons, refugees and host communities, hence contributing to greater stability and reducing factors at the root of irregular and forced migration.

The **specific objective** of the proposed project is to strengthen food security information systems that are able to generate, collate and analyse reliable and accurate information for

policy and decision-making, as well as to strengthen capacities for better food security coordination and strategic planning.

2.2. Context

2.2.1 Country context

Sudan is at the centre of the Eastern African migration route, towards North Africa and Europe. Hundreds of migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees are transiting through Sudan every month, with only a minority choosing to settle in the country. Traffickers and smugglers are operating in the country. About 3,1 million people are internally displaced (IDPs) and almost 367.000 are refugees and asylum seekers (UNHCR 2015).

Eritreans are the largest group of refugees with 108,075 persons, of which 90,806 are residing in 9 camps in the East of Sudan, in the Kassala and Gedaref region¹. Around 80 per cent of the Eritreans that are registered by UNHCR move onwards within two months after their arrival, to Khartoum, Libya and possibly to the EU. In fact, the chances of them risking onward migration is increasing due to the fact that the majority of the Eritreans coming to Sudan now are young urban people, who are unwilling to stay in enclosed camps without access to higher education or employment and do not have the same social networks in Sudan as the old generation used to have.

Sudan is considered a fragile State, suffering long lasting internal conflicts, high social and economic disparities and unequal allocation of public resources. With an annual growth rate of 2.8%, the total population was around 39 million in 2014 (World Bank 2016). Sudan is at the bottom of the UN Human Development Index 2014, ranking 167 out of 188 countries, with about 46,5% of population living below poverty line, while 8% living in extreme poverty. In particular, in the East the population living below the poverty line in Red Sea (57.7%) and Gedaref (50.1%) is higher compared to the national average.

Sudan is a lower middle income country, in a transition period. It has a weak economy with soaring inflation due to steep increase in fuel prices coupled with a high fiscal deficit in the face of continuing sanctions, and the binding domestic and international borrowing constrains. That translates in reduced socio-economic development, worsened by internal conflicts and political tension with South Sudan. Sudan's economy has worsened after South Sudan secession with the loss of the 75% oil revenue, resulting in a significant GDP contraction, more than offsetting the loss of 21% of the population, compounded by lack of external investment, economic and financial sanctions and an unsustainable external debt of over \$45 billion.

In particular, significant economic, social and cultural disparities between states are reported, with States in the Eastern Sudan, Darfur and Kordofan regions being particularly disadvantaged. Access to safe drinking water and basic services in these regions is limited, and extreme poverty is widespread. Moreover, these states do not receive federal resources proportionate to their needs.

¹ South Sudanese represent the largest group of Displaced People (DPs) in Sudan, and a great percentage of them are concentrated in White Nile and Sennar States. They are not considered refugees by the Sudanese Government.

2.2.2. Sector context

The food insecurity situation in Sudan is due to several factors which contribute to what is known as a “complex emergency”. Key drivers are continued unrest and its attendant displacement, climatic variability resulting in recurrent droughts and floods, inadequate investment in small-holders (especially rain fed) farming. In addition, weak food security policies, poor rural infrastructure, lack of access to land and to income-generating opportunities, and rising fuel and food prices (for instance food prices are estimated at 150 per cent higher than the average of the last five years) have resulted in an estimated 4.5 million people in Sudan facing food insecurity. According to the 2009 National Household Baseline Survey (NHBS), one out of three Sudanese suffered from food deprivation and over 46 per cent are classified as poor. Limited access to basic public services coupled with the above-mentioned chronic and transient factors has resulted in more than three million people requiring humanitarian assistance every year. As a result, households’ food insecurity is one of the primary underlying causes of malnutrition in Sudan.

The situation might also be further exacerbated by the effects of El Niño-driven changes in the rainfall pattern, contributing to reduced water and grazing land availability as well as lower agricultural production raising crisis-level food insecurity in these regions.

Limited understanding of food insecurity as a rather multidimensional phenomenon coupled with limited capacities to formulate long-term policies/ plans as well as to follow up on their implementation have resulted in decades of low prioritisation of the sector both at the Federal and State levels. In addition, lack of timely and reliable data, its analysis and dissemination, which would help decision makers to prioritize their decisions and allocate resources wisely, has often been cited as a chronic problem. Government policy related to food security have always focused primarily on stimulating agricultural production (e.g., through the Agricultural Revitalisation Programme²), especially cereal production, not addressing the different aspects of food insecurity.

In the States, decades of instability have negatively impacted on their capacities to plan, budget, formulate and implement sector policies defined at central level. Current State Government Sector Policies and Strategic Plans are replicas of federal Government policies and not necessarily based on the states’ and localities’ contexts. However, there are encouraging signs of Government’s intention to start addressing the multi-dimensional nature of food insecurity in a more effective way. For instance, the ongoing EU-funded Sudan Food Security programme (SFSP) has assisted in the creation of a Food Security and Nutrition Technical Secretariat (FSNTS) at State levels and the authorities have manifested a strong commitment to provide the FSNTS with permanent and qualified staff. Moreover, the Government has recently discussed the draft of the National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP). The Plan is a five-year investment plan including initiatives to address some of the most significant challenges to agriculture development in the country as well to increase access to local food, reduce poverty and malnutrition and boost income generation for rural families, especially for smallholders.

² The four-year Agricultural Revitalization Programme was launched in 2008 with a high level of political support. It has been a very ambitious programme that identified policy related gaps to agricultural development including financial, marketing, investment and land use policies as well as institutional reform. The programme has fallen short at the implementation stage for reasons related to capacity to implement the policies required.

2.3. Lessons learnt

The evaluation of European Union (EU) and other major donors' programmes in Sudan has shown some successes, and has also provided useful lessons to improve effectiveness in the future.

The most significant lessons that have been taken into account in preparing SFSP are detailed below:

- Need to enhance policy dialogue with the relevant government authorities and line ministries is essential to translate the collected information into action plans and implementation. For instance, the existence of a policy dialogue with the Government under the SFSP (Phase 1) has resulted in the establishment of a Food Security and Nutrition Technical Secretariat (FSNTS) at the State level.
- Need to further focus on the regional level: In Sudan's Federal constitutional system, the responsibility of applying policies and providing rural services lies with the lower institutional entities. However, past donors' programmes such as the Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA) or, the Sudan Productive Capacity Recovery Programme (SPCRP) focused on training programmes and extension packages designed at central level and therefore being only partially effective. There is a need to strengthen lower institutional entities resulting in the authorities being committed to the provision of permanent and qualified staff to the Food Security and Nutrition Technical Secretariat (FSNTS) at State levels.
- Need to move from information systems into policy implementation and strategic planning based on the available food security information: The proposed project will therefore continue to balance data gathering and analysis activities with capacity building activities on policy making in order to ensure that food security policies are evidence based and do not remain idle policy documents. In this regard, the successful implementation of the project will allow the collection of reliable data to be used by decision makers to define strategies and appropriate action plans.
- Need to link long-term food security efforts with on-going humanitarian interventions where possible, as the latter alone cannot tackle the underlying causes of food insecurity.

2.4. Complementary actions

The proposed project builds on the outputs achieved by the on-going EU funded project *Sudan Food Security Programme* (SFSP). It will complement it and complete its achievements. In this regard, the on-going SFSP project has been able to a) establish an effective cross-sectoral Food Security Institutional Framework; b) enhance review, planning, budget and monitor Food Security policies and strategies and c) strengthen the regional Food Security information system.

The SIFSIA, the Sudan Productive Capacity Recovery Programme (SPCRP) and the Eastern Recovery and Development Programme (ERDP) programmes are also particularly relevant.

- SIFSIA has built institutional capacities to establish an information-based decision-making system that provides food security policy and strategic guidance. Key among its

achievements has been the establishment of the Food Security Technical Secretariat (FSTS), which will provide federal guidance, coordination and technical backstopping to most of the outputs of the policy support component of SFSP.

- SPCRP is building the capacities of key emerging institutions in the areas of Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan to provide agricultural services to rural areas. SPCRP has laid a foundation on which the current project can build: physical infrastructure has been established, transportation provided and human capacities strengthened. In addition, it has developed valuable models on irrigated agriculture, horticulture and especially livestock production that could be adopted and replicated in the future.
- ERDP has provided, in the eastern region, initial capacity building in procurement, contract management, supervision of implementation and monitoring and evaluation of projects and investments. ERDP has also done interesting work in different fields related to smallholder livelihoods, including livestock development, training on vocational income generating activity, horticulture and water harvesting for rain-fed agriculture.

The EU-funded Food Security Thematic Programme currently supports a number of projects in the four selected areas. The focus is on food security of poor rural smallholders, mainly on horticulture and livestock, which are expected to improve household consumption and increase the income particularly of women and other vulnerable groups.

There are also projects funded by other donors such as IFAD, World Bank, WFP or GIZ aimed to redress land degradation, increase production of small-scale farmers and pastoralist communities, demarcate livestock routes, increasing access to credit facilities to farmers or providing increase opportunities for technical vocational and education training.

2.5. Donor co-ordination

In the food security sector, there is a donor coordination group composed of the EU, the Netherlands, Canada, Japan and Italy. Areas of concentration are South Kordofan and Kassala. Most of the projects are aimed at improving smallholder's production in traditional rain fed areas, except for Japan, which is more interested in providing technical assistance to improve the performance of the irrigation sector (rice).

At regional level, institutional weaknesses in policy implementation and strategic planning have made it difficult to put in place proper sector coordination, which is often organised in an informal manner.

Reinforced coordination amongst donors must be seen as part of the on-going broader European Union's dialogue and cooperation with African countries on migration and mobility at bilateral, regional and continental level. At national level, the Migration Working Group composed of the EU, EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland will oversee the implementation of the Action in as much as it aims to address root causes of irregular migration and displacement.

The Action Plan approved at the EU-Africa Valletta Summit on migration and the *EU Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing the root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa* identified domains and priorities which will guide donor coordination and interventions.

The Short Term Strategy 2016/17 for the implementation of a special support measure in favour of the people of the Republic of Sudan provide clear orientations to the EU and the EU Member States on how to better join efforts in order to address more effectively their development cooperation.

At the project level, donor coordination will be ensured through the establishment of State Advisory Committee (SAC).

3. DETAILED DESCRIPTION

3.1 Objectives

The **overall objective** of the proposed project is to contribute to a more conducive and sustainable living environment for vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons, refugees and host communities, hence contributing to greater stability and reducing factors at the root of irregular and forced migration.

The **specific objective** of the proposed project is to strengthen food security information systems that are able to generate, collate and analyse reliable and accurate information for policy and decision-making, as well as to strengthen capacities for better food security coordination and strategic planning.

3.2. Expected results and main activities

The expected results of this programme are:

1. **Result 1 at Federal Level:** Food security policy coordination and strategic planning is improved at Federal level.

This result will be achieved by strengthening the capacity of Federal level stakeholders to respond to identified food insecurity situations (shocks) in an appropriate fashion.

This result will be achieved through the implementation of the following activities:

- 1.1 Based on the existing assessments, the project will provide Technical Assistance (TA) to the Ministry of Agriculture in food security coordination and strategic planning. The successful implementation of this activity will enhance the capacity of the Federal level stakeholders to formulate their sector policies, strategies, plans and budgets. It will be ensured that the gained capacity will be utilised through mentoring and coaching.
 - 1.2 The project will provide on the job training to the relevant parties on food security data management and analysis. The gained capacity will be utilised to provide reliable, integrated and evidence based data to the Relevant Authority for coordination and strategic planning.
 - 1.3 The project will provide backstopping to the activities carried out at the State level with field mission and daily remote back up both at the inception and implementation phase.
2. **Result 2 at State Level:** Food security related actions are more inclusive, better informed, implemented and monitored.

This result will be achieved primarily by strengthening capacity of state level stakeholders to prioritize and formulate food security policies and strategies. Policies will be based on information gathered through inclusive and consultative mechanisms in which lower level

governance structures and major non-state actors become part of the prioritizing and decision making processes.

In particular, the following activities will be carried out:

21. Effective cross-sector Food Security Institutional set up established and/or effectively operating within the Institutional Framework. After assessing the existing Food Security institutional setup in the States targeted by the on-going FAO implemented programme (SFSP), the project will enhance the capacity of inter-sectoral (agriculture, livestock, fisheries, health and nutrition, marketing, agro-meteorology and natural resources) food security secretariat, and support it to develop coordination mechanisms with other development actors and operational linkages, including with the Localities. In the White Nile and Sennar States, a cross-sector Food Security Institutional set up will be established and technical and material support will be provided for the data collection and analysis.
22. Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor food security (FS) policies and strategies are developed. This activity will bolster capacity of the state level stakeholders to formulate their sector policies, strategies, plans and budgets.
23. Functional regional level Food Security Information System strengthened and supporting decision making. This activity will strengthen key components of existing and newly established inter-sectoral (see above) food security information system paying special attention to issues of poverty and vulnerability, beyond food production. These will include, agro-climatology and livestock/pasture monitoring, market information, health and nutrition monitoring, and integrated food security analysis. The development of these features will be user-led and effective mechanisms will be established for their integration with the Food Security institutional set ups.
24. Capacity of food security oriented NSAs strengthened. The project will provide support to NSAs groups (producer associations, professional bodies, Women Union's and Local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) so that their knowledge and resources are effectively integrated in food security information gathering and decision making processes.
25. Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and integrated into decision making. Through this activity, the project will improve the understanding of policy and decision makers about the nature and magnitude of food security issues so that they can design evidence-based policies and strategies.

3.3 Risks and assumptions:

The main risks are as follows:

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
<i>Reduced support from the Government of Sudan to project activities/ food security</i>	H	The involvement of Federal and State authorities in the elaboration and implementation phase will ensure commitment to provide support to the project (in kind/logistic).
<i>Major Natural disasters</i>	M	The establishment/strengthening of cross-sector Food Security Institutional set up will ensure data gathering and analysis allowing for a timely provision of early warning information and quick response to help people recover quickly from shock, and to prevent further deterioration.
<i>Political instability and insecurity</i>	M	If the project areas become destabilized, it might become necessary to put the action on hold and continue when things become more stable.
<i>Reduced access to project areas</i>	H (Blue Nile) and L (other States)	The project will involve Federal and State Government Authorities in issuing the travel permits. The project will rely on national staff stationed in the project areas.

The main assumptions of the proposed project are as follows:

- The Federal and State authorities are committed to tackle food security issues
- The Federal and State authorities are engaged to provide in-kind contribution and logistic support to the project activities.
- Political and security situation in the project areas remain stable
- Adequate human resources are available for the on the job training activities.
- No Major natural disasters

3.4. Cross-cutting issues:

The crosscutting issues related to the project are as follow:

- *Climate change* has a heavy impact on food insecurity and malnutrition, and Sudan has been affected by El Niño. Therefore, the collection of reliable and updated information on food security situation in the target areas, will provide the government institutions with evidence to formulate appropriate food security policies and strategies that take into consideration climate change impacts and enhance the implementation of adaptation and

mitigation measures (in line with Rio markers: Climate change adaptation and Climate change mitigation).

- *Environmental sustainability:* The observed decreasing yields of rain-fed agriculture is caused by, amongst others, a sharp decline in soil fertility because of the practice of shifting cultivation, and leaving long fallows due to the increasing pressure on land. The current extent of degradation of the soils will certainly have a negative impact on the environment. Poor soils, that are low in nutrients and low in organic matter content, are more prone to erosion by water and wind and may ultimately be irreversibly damaged.
- *Gender equality:* Gender equality considerations will be built into the detailed project design. Gender criteria will be considered in the selection of the personnel to be trained both at State and Federal level. Moreover improved and evidence-based food security and nutrition policies will address food security and nutrition needs of vulnerable populations including women.
- *Conflict prevention:* A more consistent and reliable data gathering about the food security situation in the target areas will ensure a more comprehensive analysis of food sources and sources of income as to prevent/diminish potential conflicts over land and natural resources control between different communities, particularly farmers and pastoralists.
- *Adoption of good governance principles and human rights:* The first component of the project puts good governance at the centre of its focus. It aims at facilitating appropriate mechanisms for governance in the food security sector.

3.5. Stakeholders

The project will establish dialogue with:

- Government authorities, both at the Federal and State Level particularly with the Ministry of Agriculture and other line ministries;
- Private sector suppliers, in order to improve the status of rural shops as to become effective extension agents providing technical advice as well as demonstrations of equipment and technologies.
- Non State Actors, which will benefit from support for more effective policy engagement and better access to services. NSAs groups (producer associations, professional bodies, Women Union's and Local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) will be integrated in the food security information gathering system and benefit from better informed and targeted sectoral actions. In particular, the collection of reliable and updated information will ensure that timely advice can be provided to farmers and pastoralists to adopt preventive/mitigating measures to protect their food security.
- Development partners with which the project will coordinate activity implementation include the WFP, United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), Canada International Development Agency (CIDA), European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), Italy, the Netherlands and the World Bank.

All stakeholders mentioned have been extensively consulted during the formulation of the project.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Financing Agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement referred to in Article 17 of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

4.2. Indicative operational implementation period

The period of implementation will be 90 months, whilst the overall execution period (including a closure phase of no more than 12 months) will not exceed 102 months from the date of approval of this Action Document by the Operational Committee of the EU Trust Fund.

4.3. Implementation components and modules

The project will be implemented in indirect Management through a PAGODA Delegation Agreement with the Food and Agriculture Organisation.

The project will be implemented in indirect management with FAO in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 322/2015. This implementation entails to manage and be responsible for the execution of the programme (activities described in section 3.2), for the budget made available by the Commission. This implementation is justified because the FAO has strong expertise and capacities on the food security sector in Sudan; as the FAO carried out the EU-funded Sudan Food Security programme (SFSP), which the current action complements.

The entrusted entity will undertake budget implementation tasks, such as concluding and managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering moneys due.

The entrusted international organisation is currently undergoing the ex-ante assessment in accordance with Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 323/2015. The Commission's authorising officer responsible deems that, based on the compliance with the ex-ante assessment based on Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1605/2002 and long-lasting problem-free cooperation, the international organisation can be entrusted with budget-implementation tasks under indirect management.

The Agreement is expected to be signed in September 2016.

4.4 Indicative budget

Categories	Type of contract	EU contribution (EUR)
Result 1 – Food security policy coordination and strategic planning improved at Federal level	Delegation Agreement (PAGODA) with FAO	940 000
Result 2 – Food security related actions are more inclusive, better informed, implemented and monitored		4 940 000
Monitoring, Evaluation and Audit		120 000
TOTAL		6,000,000

4.5. Monitoring, evaluation and audit

It is important to establish monitoring and evaluation arrangements that can measure progress towards the intended results in a consistent and regular manner. Efforts will be made to set up a single monitoring & evaluation and lessons learned framework for all EUTF-funded projects in the Horn of Africa. Each of the projects in the Horn of Africa will pool resources by setting aside 1.5-2% of their EU Trust Fund allocations to establish a single monitoring and evaluation framework with a dedicated team of experts. The single M&E framework will help ensure consistency in progress reporting by using the project baselines and undertaking regular monitoring, evaluation and reviews of on-going projects in the region. It will also serve as a tool for compiling documentation and sharing experience in a structured manner.

Ad hoc audits or expenditure verification assignments will be contracted by the European Commission. Audits and expenditure verification assignments will be carried out in conformity with the risk analysis in the frame of the yearly Audit Plan exercise conducted by the European Commission. Evaluation and audit assignments will be implemented through service contracts; making use of one of the Commission's dedicated framework contracts or alternatively through the competitive negotiated procedure or the single tender procedure.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU. This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in the procurement contracts. The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan and the appropriate contractual obligations.

EU Trust Fund Strategy	Valletta Action Plan	United Nations Sustainable Development Goals
Four main areas of intervention	Five priority domains, and 16 initiatives	17 goals
<p>1) Greater economic and employment opportunities</p> <p>2) Strengthening resilience of communities and in particular the most vulnerable, as well as refugees and displaced people</p> <p>3) Improved migration management in countries of origin and transit</p> <p>4) Improved governance and conflict prevention, and reduction of forced displacement and irregular migration</p>	<p>1) Development benefits of migration and addressing root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. enhance employment opportunities and revenue-generating activities 2. link relief, rehabilitation and development in peripheral and most vulnerable areas 3. operationalise the African Institute on Remittances 4. facilitate responsible private investment and boost trade <p>2) Legal migration and mobility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. double the number of Erasmus scholarships 6. pool offers for legal migration 7. organise workshops on visa facilitation <p>3) Protection and asylum</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Regional Development and Protection Programmes 9. improve the quality of the asylum process 10. improve resilience, safety and self-reliance of refugees in camps and host communities <p>4) Prevention of and fight against irregular migration, migrant smuggling and trafficking of human beings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. national and regional anti-smuggling and anti-trafficking legislation, policies and action plans 12. strengthen institutional capacity to fight smuggling and trafficking 13. pilot project in Niger 14. information campaigns <p>5) Return, readmission and reintegration</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. strengthen capacity of countries of origin to respond to readmission applications 16. support reintegration of returnees into their communities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) End poverty in all its forms everywhere 2) End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture 3) Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages 4) Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all 5) Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls 6) Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all 7) Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all 8) Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all 9) Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation 10) Reduce inequality within and among countries 11) Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable 12) Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns 13) Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts 14) Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development 15) Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss 16) Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels 17) Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development

Appendix I: Indicative Logical Framework

Performance and progress monitoring will be an integral component of the project design. The indicators specified in the logical framework will serve as a starting point for performance measurement. They will be adapted and further elaborated during the inception phase.

Description	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
OVERALL OBJECTIVE			
To contribute to improved Food Security in target states in Sudan	Increase (%) in the state food production	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project baseline and post implementation reports 2. Reports from concerned line Ministries (MoA and MoARF). 3. FAO and other international Organisations reports 	
	Decrease (%) in malnutrition level among children less than 5 years old	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project baseline and post implementation reports 2. MoH/Directorate of Nutrition's periodic bulletins on nutrition. 	
	Increase (%) in purchasing power	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project baseline and post implementation reports 2. BS report on household income and expenditures 	
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE			
To improve the effectiveness of responses to food insecurity and to increase rural smallholders' livelihoods in the targeted areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least three food security policies, strategic plans and programmes are reviewed and revised by each state, disseminated and feedback must be generated • M&E system of technical line ministries, included food security indicators. • Percentage of sector ministries budget reflects food security priorities and investments. • Number of food security decisions, policies and strategies taken by the Government and NSAs, based on Food Security Information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project progress report • Periodical report from the targeted Ministries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State and national government are committed to support the development and implementation of food security policies, strategic plans and investment programmes • State and non-state actors are committed to participate in planning and implementation of state food security plans.

Description	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
Results			
Federal Level: Food security policy coordination and strategic planning improved at Federal level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of food security strategic plan prepared by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture in a coordinated fashion with other relevant federal stakeholders. • Number of coordination meetings related to food security policies or strategies attended by the Federal Stakeholders • Number of persons on- the-job-trained on data management and analysis • Number of backstopping missions organized by Federal FSTS in each target state. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project baseline and Project Progress and final reports • Periodical reports from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture • Backstopping mission reports • Needs assessment reports - on the capacity of the staff of the Federal stakeholders • Training’ reports including pre and post test results, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of competent staff at state and federal level to provide technical supports to the members of the institutional framework • Adequate human resources available to participate in the training/technical assistance activities • Trained members of the institutional framework will not relocated to another state or another department within the state • State government will provide all the required resources for sustaining the activities of the food security institutional framework in the state by the end of the project cycle • Office space will be offered by federal and state government for the project activities
State Level: Food security related actions are more inclusive, better informed, implemented and monitored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of food security reports produced and shared with State and Federal level decision makers • Number of quarterly reports developed by each state and submitted to the Federal level • Number of food security decisions, circulars, policies and strategies developed and revised with direct and indirect participation of localities. • Number of training workshops and on- the-job-training sessions supported by the project in each state. • Regular data and information is shared between the FSTS and localities • Number of monitoring trips organized by each state FSTS to the localities. • Number of coordination meetings and training workshops related to food security policies or strategies attended by NSAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project baseline and Project Progress and final reports • Periodical reports from the concerned state line Ministries • Needs assessment reports - on the capacity of the staff of the state stakeholders • Training’ reports including pre and post test results • Minutes of the meetings 	

Activities	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
<p>1. Federal level</p> <p>1.1. Based on the existing assessments, the project will provide TA to the Ministry of Agriculture in food security coordination and strategic planning.</p> <p>1.2 The project will provide on the job training to the relevant parties on food security data management and analysis.</p> <p>1.3 The project will provide backstopping to the activities carried out at the State level with field mission and daily remote back up</p> <p>2 <u>State Level</u></p> <p>2.1 Effective cross-sector Food Security Institutional set up established/effectively operating within the Institutional Framework</p> <p>2.2. Capacity to review, plan, budget and monitor food security (FS) policies and strategies are developed</p> <p>2.3. Functional regional level Food Security Information System strengthened and supporting decision making</p> <p>2.4. Capacity of food security oriented Non-State Actors (NSAs) strengthened</p> <p>2.5 Key food insecurity drivers are better understood and integrated into decision making.</p>		<p>Reports prepared by the Implementing Agency</p> <p>Estimated budget total budget 6M EUR, broken down as follows:</p> <p>a) Federal level: 1,MEUR</p> <p>b) State Level: 5 MEUR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peace and stability prevail in target states • Funds are made available for the project activities in a timely fashion