

**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-SS-21**

**1. IDENTIFICATION**

|                                       |   |        |                   |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------|-------------------|
| Title/Number                          | Strengthening the Livelihoods Resilience of Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Communities in South Sudan’s cross-border areas with Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda |        |                   |
| Total cost                            | Total estimated cost: EUR 27 730 000<br>Total amount drawn from the Trust Fund : EUR 27 730 000   |        |                   |
| Aid method / Method of implementation | Indirect management with the Food and Agriculture Organisation  |        |                   |
| DAC-code                              | 43040   | Sector | Rural Development |

**2. RATIONALE AND CONTEXT**

**2.1. Summary of the action and its objectives**

This action will contribute to **objectives 2 and 4 of the EU Trust Fund** on strengthening resilience of communities, particularly the most vulnerable; improving governance and conflict prevention, and reducing forced displacement and irregular migration. The action is aligned with the first domain of the **Valletta Action Plan** on: *development benefits of migration and addressing root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement*. This project is part of the global EU response to the El Niño phenomenon.

The implementation of this project, and the wider EU’s development response to el Niño in the Horn of Africa, under the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa is consequent with the effects of climate change on forced migration. Alongside armed conflict and insecurity, **droughts and other climate-change events are a major driver of displacement in the region**, particularly in Somalia, Ethiopia, Sudan and South Sudan. A disaggregation of natural hazards versus conflict related displacement (World Bank, 2015) shows that **nearly 30% of forced migration in the region is due to climate change**. Indeed, the latter threatens to undermine development gains and future opportunities, as it increases the vulnerability of households, ethnic and resource-based conflict, and consequent dispossession and forced displacement.

**The geographical coverage** of the project focuses on cross-border areas shared between South Sudan with its neighbours: Sudan (Abyei Cluster and Renk Cluster), Ethiopia (Gambella Cluster), and Uganda and Kenya (Karamoja Cluster). The action will be implemented through a sustainable landscape approach along cross-border areas dominated by pastoral and agro-pastoral communities and along livestock migration corridors.

**The intervention logic** of this project is that (1) by strengthening systems that are able to generate, collate and analyse comprehensive food security information and to provide better profiling of vulnerability, current interventions to promote resilience and prevent food security crises can become more effective and thus reduce the incidence of forced displacement; and (2) improving conditions for pastoral and agro-pastoral livestock living in specific cross border areas will alleviate the tensions arising from the traditional trans-boundary nature of pastoralism and livestock trade in the region, exacerbated by the impact of the political and insecurity crisis that started in December 2013.

The **overall objective** of the action is to contribute to strengthening resilience of communities, improving governance and conflict prevention, and reducing forced displacement and irregular migration in the region.

**The specific objective** is to enhance the food security, income and resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, and particularly in selected cross-border areas of South Sudan.

## **2.2. Context**

### **2.2.1. Country context.**

South Sudan is mired in internal conflict since December 2013, and faces a grave man-made humanitarian crisis. In addition, the global oil crisis at the end of 2014 resulted in a budget and balance of payment crisis that is still on-going, adding to already reduced oil output as a result of the conflict. Oil exports constituted 95% of total Government revenues, therefore the country is facing a massive fiscal crisis. Public sector wages are increasingly paid late, and recourse to central bank borrowing has triggered triple digit inflation and a rapid depreciation of the currency. While a peace agreement was signed in August 2015, implementation to date remains slow, due to a massive trust deficit among the different factions, which stands in the way of actions to improve economic governance. The resumption of violence in July 2016 among in-government and in-opposition factions put the peace agreement at risk of collapse.

The conflict has devastated the lives of millions of South Sudanese and displaced more than 2.5 million people, mostly internally in South Sudan but over 700,000 have sought refuge in neighbouring countries (Ethiopia, Sudan, Uganda and Kenya), putting additional strain on these countries and having a destabilising effect on the entire region. 120,000 new arrivals in Uganda have been counted in 2016 as of August.

Chronic food-insecurity is persistent in South Sudan, driven by poverty, low levels of access to social services such as health and water, poor hygiene practices, lack of diversified livelihood opportunities and weak local economies affected by fragmented markets as a result of low levels of infrastructure. Large parts of the economically productive areas in the country are isolated from markets and are vastly underutilized. While a majority of the population is dependent on subsistence farming and pastoralism as sources of livelihoods, a considerable number of people continue to rely on humanitarian relief assistance to meet their needs. For some groups, lack of a shared political vision, or at the grassroots level simply hope for a better future is failing to provide an alternative to traditional practices of cattle raiding (and abduction of children), which, with the proliferation of weapons, has become associated with high levels of violence.

### **2.2.2. Sector context: policies and challenges**

Over 95% of the total area of South Sudan (658,842 km<sup>2</sup>) is considered suitable for agriculture, 50% of which is prime agricultural land where soil and climatic conditions allow for production of a variety of crops and livestock. Cattle-based pastoralism is the customary livelihood of many groups in the country.<sup>1</sup> With a national herd estimated to outnumber people, cattle are central to the country's economy, and to the sociocultural life of many communities. Pastoralism, based on seasonal migration in pursuit of pasture and water, is usually combined with small-scale, rain-fed cultivation of staple crops, including sorghum. At the same time, cattle are much more than a source of food. They signify status and wealth, and serve as the main livelihood asset for pastoralist communities. Livestock are sold for cash, slaughtered for cultural practices, bartered for grain, used as payment for penalties, and given for dowry.

The Government of the Republic of South Sudan (RSS) has identified food security and agricultural development as key priorities, which are reflected in several Policy and Planning documents.<sup>2</sup> However, the oil shutdown in 2012 and a civil war from 2013 to 2015 have put implementation of these plans on hold.

The conflict that erupted in 2013 caused countrywide insecurity, massive displacement of men, women and children and loss of livelihoods assets. Crisis-induced factors have worsened the situation of livestock-dependent populations and significantly affected livestock mobility and traditional migration routes and patterns – the most critical element of any pastoral production system.

The dislocation of massive numbers of livestock into areas outside their traditional domains, has led to dramatic rises in disease outbreaks and mortality posing a grave threat to the livelihoods and food security of pastoralist communities across the country.

The displacement of pastoralist populations is also creating further conflict due to competition for limited natural resources, something which is occurring in an environment where the capacity of formal and informal institutions to promote peaceful interaction and dialogue between host communities, internally displaced persons and migrating herders is limited.

A large part of the extensive cross-border area of South Sudan is inhabited by pastoral and agro-pastoral communities whose livelihood and lifestyle are centred on livestock rearing. These communities have long adopted a wide range of cross-border activities to manage their livelihoods and livestock production systems, including the joint management and sharing of grazing land and water, the strategic use of natural resources through seasonal cross-border mobility and the sharing of information on rainfall, pasture and water availability. The area encompasses also major trading hubs for voluminous cross-border trade in livestock, livestock products and fish. Cross-border trading centres have become major importers of livestock and

---

<sup>1</sup> The country has the sixth largest livestock herd and the highest livestock per capita holding in Africa with an estimated livestock population of 11.7 million cattle, 12.4 million goats and 12.1 million sheep.

<sup>2</sup> The overall direction is outlined in the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP) 2011-2013, supported by the South Sudan Development Initiative (SSDI) which constitutes a kind of investment plan to accompany the SSDP. Due to the oil shutdown, implementation of the SSDP has been scant, and in 2013 the Government has extended the duration of the plan to 2016. An important policy to note is the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Policy (NALEP), which provides directions for both the management and the organization of a pluralistic extension system with both public and private extension service providers. The country is also in the process of developing the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) compact.

livestock products into South Sudan from Uganda, Kenya, Sudan and the Central Africa Republic. Nevertheless, these borderlands are distant from the political and economic centres, resulting in the marginalization of these territories and, therefore, contribute to regional and global instability.

Within this overall context of crisis-induced displacements, large herds of livestock have been pushed to the periphery of traditional production domains and increasingly into cross-border regions. This is further exacerbating pre-existing inter-community tensions and pressures on the existing natural resources in these cross-border areas, which are now facing intense grazing pressure by greater-than-normal livestock numbers and extended presence in areas that were previously only used seasonally. This is leading to deterioration both in terms of natural resources and of animal health. The national veterinary services and agriculture/livestock/food security information systems remain very weak due to a lack of means and adequate human resources, resulting in an inability to inform policy and humanitarian response.

### **2.3. Lessons learnt**

A recent study commissioned by FAO in 2015 to assess how conflict has impacted the livestock sector since the hostilities of December 2013 highlighted that livestock have been the direct target of insurgency and counterinsurgency warfare, with large scale losses of livestock, severe disruptions to trade and markets, and massive increase in disease prevalence and outbreaks. The overall economic impact is estimated at several billion USD. Nevertheless, the perceptions of communities regarding the relative importance of different livelihood strategies before conflict and the current period ranked livestock production as the livelihood of first choice (31.2 percent) because of the 'ability to flee with livestock'. The main issue identified by the assessments is that the conflict has profoundly affected the livestock sector in South Sudan and pushed production to the periphery of core production areas, including to most cross-border regions. The impact of the conflict in the livestock sector highlights the pressing requirements for animal health interventions, for additional measures to cushion communities against cattle raiding, as well as the need for compensation for raided livestock directly or indirectly by supporting alternative livelihoods. It further underscores a need, in a post-conflict era, for strategies to improve the economic and social viability of livestock sector through market-based approaches as key for household food and nutrition security as well as a driver of resilience for a diversified, non-oil dependent economy.

The importance of the livestock sector notwithstanding, its real impact on food security remains poorly understood, and as such remains a major gap in overall food security assessments, including the work done currently on the IPC (International Food Security Phase Classification) by the current EDF-funded Food Information System for Decision Support (AFIS) project, which is underpinning much of the current humanitarian response. The creation of a robust livestock information system should address this gap. Similarly, recent efforts to better align humanitarian and development efforts within a resilience context analysis framework have brought out the need to better understand the risks that are facing vulnerable groups. A better profiling of vulnerability would help to improve the targeting of the (humanitarian and development) response strategy. Important work has already been initiated under the ongoing AFIS project, but needs to be taken forward.

More generally, this action relies on two fundamental assumptions, on which there is an increasing body of evidence. The first assumption is that enhancing resilience is more cost-effective than providing late humanitarian response. Food aid still prevails when it comes to

emergency aid responses in a country like South Sudan. Risk-based approaches to managing disasters (both natural and man-made) have not been institutionalized. This action aims to promote risk management rather than emergency response for livestock keeping communities found in cross-border areas. A range of specific livestock interventions (e.g. veterinary care and water management - storage, wells-) are necessary investments to improve the resilience of the livelihoods of livestock keepers. The second assumption is that the pastoralists' mobility is a key factor for efficient use and protection of rangelands, and a key strategy for the pastoralists to adapt to climate change and conflicts. Given the cross-border nature of many of the pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities, these communities have a unique potential to benefit from approaches that focus on cross-border issues and utilization of resources. This action relies on a cross-border approach to programming and aims to secure access to rangelands for pastoralists and agro-pastoralist communities. By supporting cross-border peacebuilding initiatives, the project will also enable cross national movements and livestock trade that integrates South Sudan into the regional economy. This is particularly timing considering that South Sudan has recently become a member of the East Africa Community (EAC).

#### **2.4. Complementary actions**

Several complementary actions are ongoing. Over the past 5 years, **the EU** has committed about EUR 153 million to rural development and food security in South Sudan, including EUR 120 million under the EU's two flagship programmes financed from the EDF: "South Sudan Rural Development Programme" (SORUDEV) and "Enhanced local value addition and strengthened Value Chains" (ZEAT-BEAD).

Implementation of SORUDEV started in 2012 and includes the Agriculture and Food Information System for Decision Support (AFIS), which aims at improving food security through evidence-based decisions. The AFIS programme has extensive experience in the development of information and early warning systems for development and humanitarian responses in close collaboration with the government and other partners. This action will build on the AFIS achievements by strengthening the evidence for livestock policy, early warning and overall agricultural and food security information, as well as by contributing to the enhanced value chain and livestock market information.

This action will also build on the ongoing "Improving livelihoods, social peace and stability in the Abyei Area" project, funded under the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace.

Other complementary actions include the African Union Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) and Inter Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) project on Surveillance for the Trade-Sensitive Diseases Project (STSD), which is a regional component of the Supporting the Horn of Africa's Resilience (SHARE) Project. This European Union-funded 3-year project aims to strengthen technical and institutional capacities of the IGAD member states to protect livestock assets, enhance the resilience of the livestock-based livelihoods and promote livestock trade. It also aims to reduce the impacts of transboundary animal diseases (TADs) and of zoonoses on trade through improved disease surveillance, animal identification and traceability, as well as health certification systems in all eight member states of the IGAD region. STSD equally aims to harmonize regional sanitary measures, while specifically supporting the development of regional traceability and certification schemes, which will help reduce the impact of the specified trade-significant

TADs by developing an umbrella programme, jointly coordinated at the AU-IBAR/IGAD levels and subscribed to by all the participating countries, to provide a regional uniformity. The project intends to enable better coordinated responses against many recurrent TADs, especially Peste des Petits Ruminants (PPR) through ensuring early detection capabilities and development of PPR regional control strategy and coordination mechanism. All these objectives are in congruence with proposals in this action fiche.

**The UK** Department for International Development (DfID) supports several livelihoods and resilience programmes, three of them being implemented in the three states of Northern Bahr El Ghazal, Western Bahr El Ghazal and Warrap, i.e. Building Resilience through Asset Creation and Enhancement - Phase Two (BRACE II, £20 million); Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED, £5 million); and Urban Food Security, Livelihoods and Markets (UFSLM, £9m). These three programmes aim at enhancing food security and resilience of vulnerable households through supporting local production, income generation and community assets creation, improving natural resources management whilst enhancing social cohesion, as well as strengthening the linkages between urban and rural areas through the development of market value chains. The BRACE-II programme will be extended in the two States of Lakes and Eastern Equatoria. Under its large Humanitarian Assistance and Resilience in South Sudan (HARISS) programme (£443 million for 2015-2020), DfID will support three projects aiming at saving life, protecting livelihoods and enhancing resilience of agro-pastoralists communities living in conflict-affected areas, which will also include a contribution for Food Security Information Systems.

**The World Bank** has provided funding to the countries in eastern Africa region towards the implementation of the Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP). The RPLRP aims to enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought-prone areas of Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and additionally South Sudan and Somalia, and improve the capacity of these countries' governments to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergencies. The first phase of the project has begun with investments for pastoralists' livelihood resilience in Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia. RPLRP is now embarking on extending this programming to South Sudan and the country is at an advanced stage to begin project activities under this project. This 5 years (January 2015 – December 2019) project has the following components: Natural Resources Management, Market Access and Trade, Livelihood Support and Pastoral Risk Management. These areas of activities of RPLRP neatly match up both in scope of activities and geographical context (Cross border areas of Gambella and Karamoja cluster) with the action proposed in the current proposal. The RPLRP in each of the countries operate independently but are connected at IGAD level to provide a Regional context of the project.

## **2.5. Donor co-ordination**

Several fora have been created to ensure donor coordination and adherence to government policies and strategies. In the framework of the Government of South Sudan/Development Partners' Forum, the Natural Resources Sector Working Group, co-chaired by the EU Delegation, is the highest level platform dealing with natural resources and related economic growth policies. Following the outbreak of the crisis, formal consultations between the Government and development partners have largely be brought to a halt, but is now set to resume following the establishment of a Transitional Government of National Unity. The donor group has continued to meet on a regular basis. The Food Security and Livelihoods Cluster for South Sudan, is another important platform with the objective of discussing and coordinating humanitarian interventions in the sector of food security and nutrition.

### **3. DETAILED DESCRIPTION**

#### **3.1. Objectives**

**The overall objective of the action** is to contribute to strengthening resilience of communities, improving governance and conflict prevention and reducing forced displacement and irregular migration in the region.

**The specific objective is** to enhance the food security, income and resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities particularly in selected cross-border areas of South Sudan.

#### **3.2. Expected results and main activities**

The expected results of the project are:

##### **Result 1: Pastoral and agro-pastoral livestock and food security early warning information is strengthened**

This first result will essentially provide an extension of the current EDF-funded AFIS project, a 4-year project implemented by the FAO which supports the institutionalization of robust food security information systems at both national and state levels, and is due to end in December 2016, but with increased emphasis to include information on Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Livestock to provide comprehensive Food Security and Early Warning Information in South Sudan and its Cross-Border Areas. It aims at enhancing evidence-based policy and institutional capacity, hazards preparedness, prevention and management and humanitarian response.

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

##### **1.1 Establish an agricultural information system for food security:**

The project will support GRSS and partners in: collecting, analysing and disseminating information on crop production, food security, markets and biophysical indicators of livestock production, e.g. pasture and water, and socio-economic/impacts indicators, livestock migration, terms of trade, and pastoral/agro-pastoralists coping strategies among others.

##### **1.2 Improve vulnerability and risk analysis:**

This action will enhance and broaden the existing AFIS capacity to provide decision makers with food and nutrition security information. Additional data from field surveys and remote sensing will allow a more comprehensive risk analysis and understanding of the sources of vulnerability, to inform decisions addressing humanitarian, resilience and development objectives.

##### **1.3 Establish pastoral and agro-pastoral risk early warning and response system:**

Monthly Livestock Early Warning System (LEWS) information will be consolidated and disseminated; Climate Information Services (CIS) at state levels will be established and climate information sharing and use at county & community levels strengthened. The animal health disease outbreak reporting and surveillance system will be developed. Moreover, the early warning systems and response mechanisms at the national level will be strengthened, harmonized and aligned to existing regional systems within IGAD.

## **Result 2: Livestock disease and vector surveillance and control services in cross-border areas are strengthened and harmonized**

This includes the development and implementation of harmonized animal health approaches for the prevention and control of TADs, animal disease surveillance and reporting on the cross-border areas. Some of the activities foreseen are:

- 2.1 Support the development and implementation of harmonized animal health approaches for the prevention and control of trade-related TADs through the establishment of a cost recovery system and public and private collaboration in the delivery of animal health services;
- 2.2 Strengthen/build the capacity for prevention, control and emergency preparedness of TADs through the establishment of a cold chain system in cross border areas;
- 2.3 Improve the animal quarantine centers standards, laboratory, testing and procedures, and technical coordination capacity of the State levels Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries staff in the border areas of South Sudan with Sudan, Ethiopia and Uganda;
- 2.4 Establish a community Based Animal Health service in the cross border areas;
- 2.5 Strengthen the livestock owners' capacity to provide better animal health and husbandry care
- 2.6 Conduct regional workshops and exchange visits to other countries sharing border with South Sudan for experiential learning and social cohesion.

## **Result 3: Livestock market access and trade in cross-border regions are enhanced**

The goal is to enhance Livestock Market Access and Trade and provide Livestock based livelihood support in cross-border areas. This result focuses on facilitating the international and intra-regional trade of livestock and livestock products along South Sudan's cross-border regions by improving the market access of agro-pastoralists and pastoralists.

The following activities are foreseen:

- 3.1 Establish a market information system and undertake studies/assessments to address the current information gap on some aspects of the livestock production system. This would aim to improve knowledge and understanding of the different aspects of livestock and on livelihoods on cross-border lands to inform sensitive policy and planning decisions e.g.:  
i) value chain and socio-economic impact assessments/studies to map the cross-border market and the status of the facilities and services in these markets, and livestock mobility and directions; ii) Establishment of a Livestock Market Information Systems.
- 3.2 Establishment of physical market infrastructures and processing facilities (Auction yards, slaughterhouses, etc.) in selected towns along strategic cross-border livestock routes.
- 3.3 Promote and strengthen enterprises and market systems targeting female and vulnerable livestock traders by providing support for livelihoods and small and medium-sized enterprises involved directly and indirectly e.g. butchers, skins and hides processors etc.

Investments in facilities and information systems under this result will represent key aspects of developing and strengthening value chains. Investments will enhance physical market infrastructures, including processing facilities, in selected towns along strategic cross-border livestock routes. The result will strengthen the integration of regional and national market information systems, and explore technological options for collecting and sharing market knowledge, including information on diseases, grading and certification, taxation, and export



procedures. Capacity building will target pastoral and agro-pastoral populations and relevant stakeholders on information utilization.

**Result 4: Natural resources management in cross-border regions is improved**

Promote community stability by supporting and promoting community-based reconciliatory and peacebuilding dialogue and enhancing access of different groups to natural resources. This would include the promotion of local governance and dialogue within and between different communities based on the shared interests of different groups and on improved access to grazing and water resources. As such, activities under this objective will focus on livelihoods and peaceful access to local resources by the different communities rather than on the wider political issues.

It will support the following activities:

- 4.1 Secure access to natural resources in cross-border areas and promoting community-based reconciliatory and peacebuilding dialogue;
- 4.2 Development of water resources, including (i) the update and refinement of available regional mapping of water points along cross-border migration routes, and (ii) coordinate identification of sites for development of water infrastructure;
- 4.3 Development of pasture and other land resources, including (i) the rehabilitation of rangeland ecosystems with trans-boundary implications for livestock movements, and (ii) the spatial and temporal monitoring of rangeland resources of transboundary nature;
- 4.4 Strengthen the capacity of traditional institutions to better mediate cross border access to pastoral resources and manage conflicts;
- 4.5 Strengthen positive interactions between traditional and formal institutions within South Sudan and across its borders;
- 4.6 Support policy and institutional development for cross-border livestock mobility - specifically supporting the adoption and implementation of the National Land Policy and the Land Act to integrate imperatives of the Voluntary Guidelines on the responsible Governance of Tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of National Food Security (VGGT), and the AU Pastoral Policy Framework.

**3.3. Risks and assumptions**

The main risks and mitigating measures are as follows:

| Risks   | Risk level (H/M/L) | Mitigating measures  |
|---|--------------------|--|
| The implementation of the peace agreement breaks down following the resumption of violence in July, leading to a full-scale resumption of hostilities that will impede the EU Delegation and the implementing partners to be present in the country | H                  | All political efforts of the EU and the wider donor community are geared towards continued implementation of the peace agreement |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| The transitional government fails to tackle the fiscal and monetary issues underpinning the economic crisis, thereby leading to further economic disintegration of the country and increased insecurity | H | Practically, increased insecurity may reduce access to project areas, which may require a re-assessment of project activities   |
| Climatic shocks significantly impact people's livelihoods and food security   | L | 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. |

Overall, the programme operates under the major assumption that the peace agreement will be resumed, and that the operating environment for UN agencies allows for their continued operation in the field.

### 3.4. Cross-cutting issues

Under this action, concrete steps will be taken to involve **women** in livelihoods enhancement, to improve natural resource management (result 4) and to reduce malnutrition not only in the cross border areas but nationwide thanks to the Food Security Information System (result 1). In particular, under this action, greater focus will be put on enhanced market systems of livestock and livestock products that stimulate commercialisation by women smallholders' production that is market targeted (result 3). Traditionally, small stock is considered the responsibility of women while large livestock and fishing is considered the responsibility of men. By not only focusing on cattle and other large stock but also on small livestock such as sheep, goats and chickens, gender equality can be addressed. Furthermore, female-headed households, known to be particularly vulnerable, will be targeted through social protection measures and by the mobile livelihood markets approach, thus contributing to their further empowerment.

### 3.5. Stakeholders

The stakeholders involved under this action are:

- i. Rural communities vulnerable to natural and man-made disasters will be the main target beneficiaries of the programme. The majority are illiterate and are in need of services (among other things). These smallholder producers are eager to benefit from the enhanced security situation in the country as well as from the opportunities for crop and livestock production, marketing and processing. High mortality rates among livestock and declining crop yields are just among the challenges that they face and whereby no appropriate solutions are readily available. Women and female-headed households, in marginalised communities, will be specifically targeted along with youth and internally displaced persons.
- ii. GRSS and neighbouring states. This will also include GRSS staff at the local county/state and national levels whose capacity will be strengthened to become

effective regulators, supervisors and facilitators during the programme implementation.

- iii. Other development partners and NGOs who implement activities on the ground in South Sudan.
- iv. Regional bodies such IGAD and the African Union.

#### **4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

##### **4.1. Financing agreement**

It is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country

##### **4.2. Indicative operational implementation period**

The implementation period will be 66 months. The overall execution period (including a closure phase of no more than 24 months) will not exceed 90 months from the date of approval of this Action Document.

##### **4.3. Implementation components and modules**

The envisaged implementation modality is indirect management with an international organisation.

Result 1 and result 2 of the project will be implemented in **Indirect Management** with the Food and Agriculture Organisation in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 323/2015. This implementation modality entails the implementing partner 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 FAO has a strong expertise and capacities on the food security sector in South Sudan; with the AFIS project providing crucial information for humanitarian response planning, as well as building essential data streams – e.g. crop production, food markets, agro-meteorology, nutrition.

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 December 2016.

#### 4.4. Indicative budget

| Component / Result Areas         | Type of contract              | Amount in EUR |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Result 1                         | Delegation Agreement with FAO | 7 000 000     |
| Result 2                         |                               | 7 000 000     |
| Result 3                         |                               | 6 780 000     |
| Result 4                         |                               | 6 800 000     |
| Monitoring, Evaluation and Audit |                               | 150 000       |
| Total                            |                               | 27 730 000    |

#### 4.5. Evaluation and audit

Ad hoc audits or expenditure verification assignments could 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.

A mid-term review of the project will be conducted between 18 and 22 months after the beginning of the implementation.

#### 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, to be elaborated at the start of implementation.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner countries and entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be entered into the Agreements concluded by the Commission with the entrusted entities and the partner countries.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

A **logical framework** showing targets and indicators is attached.

### LOGFRAME MATRIX OF THE ACTION

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the action document. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

Please note that baselines and indicators will be defined during the inception phase.

|                           | <b>Intervention logic</b>   | <b>Indicators</b>   | <b>Baseline (incl. reference year)</b>  | <b>Target (incl. reference year)</b>   | <b>Sources and means of verification</b>  | <b>Assumptions</b>  |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Overall objective</b>  | To contribute to strengthening resilience of communities, improving governance and conflict prevention and reducing forced displacement and irregular migration in the Region (objectives 2 and 4 of the EU Trust Fund) | 1) Number of people in Phases 3, 4 & 5;<br>2) FAO's Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA)<br>3) number of displaced people   | 1) X in year Y<br>2) X in year Y<br>3) X in year Y  | 1) X-x in year Y+y<br>2) X+x in year Y+y<br>3) X-x in year Y+y   | - Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)<br>-FAO's Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA)<br>-Regional Food Security Classification maps and reports<br>-EU and International Organizations press-releases<br>-Programmes baseline post report |   |
| <b>Specific objective</b> | To enhance<br>1) the food security,<br>2) income and<br>3) resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities and particularly in cross-border areas of South Sudan   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1) (%) in malnutrition level among children less than 5 years old</li> <li>• 2a) HH income</li> <li>• 2b) livestock productivity</li> <li>• 3) Number of direct project beneficiaries, that have improved access to integrated services delivery disaggregated by sex</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1) X% in year Y</li> <li>• 2a) X in year Y</li> <li>• 2b) X in year Y</li> <li>• 3) X in year Y</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1) X-x% in year Y+y</li> <li>• 2a) X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 2b) X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 3) X+x in year Y+y, disaggregated by sex (a specific target for female beneficiaries may be reported)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Progress reports</li> <li>• Early Warning Reports, Household Survey</li> <li>• Annual Project Report</li> <li>• Markets' reports</li> <li>• Livestock Marketing Information System</li> </ul>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased and sustained political commitment to improve food security by the GRSS</li> <li>• Adaptation and application of adequate measures is not outweighed by other factors</li> <li>• Political will and commitment exists to advance and implement Food Security agenda</li> <li>• Security situation allows access to target areas</li> </ul> |

|                |  |   |   |   |  |   |
|----------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|                |  |   |   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disaster preparedness platforms' reports</li> <li>• Quantitative survey</li> <li>• Household Survey</li> </ul>  |   |
| <b>Results</b> | Result 1: Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Livestock and Food Security and Early Warning Information Strengthened                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.1 Extent to which stakeholders use evidence for policy decisions to address food insecurity</li> <li>• 1.2 Extent to which food security, agriculture and livestock sectors are prioritized in government and DPs' policy, plans and budgetary allocations</li> <li>• 1.3 Degree of prioritization of Pastoral and Agro-pastoral communities in government and DPs' policy, plans and budgetary allocations</li> <li>• 1.4 Time lapse between early warning information and response</li> <li>• 1.5 Degree of contribution of livestock in the national food security assessments</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.1 X in year Y</li> <li>• 1.2 X in year Y</li> <li>• 1.3 X in year Y</li> <li>• 1.4 X in year Y</li> <li>• 1.5 X in year Y</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.1 X+x in year Y</li> <li>• 1.2 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 1.3 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 1.4 X-x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 1.5 X+x in year Y+y</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Progress reports</li> <li>• Early Warning Reports, Household Survey</li> <li>• Annual Project Report</li> <li>• Markets' reports</li> <li>• Livestock Marketing Information System</li> <li>• Disaster preparedness platforms' reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government authorities are stable, line ministries functioning with technical staff and committed to fulfilling their mandate;</li> <li>• Security situation allows for capacity building to be undertaken</li> <li>• Requisite human resources with basic skills are available</li> </ul> |
|                | Result 2: Livestock Disease and Vector Surveillance and Control Services in Cross Border Areas Strengthened and Harmonized | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1 Number of suspicions of outbreaks of selected diseases of regional importance (PPR and FMD) reported and tested in central laboratories</li> <li>• 2.2 Percentage households targeted by the project satisfied with livestock health services</li> <li>• 2.3 Percentage death rate of livestock kept by agro-pastoral and pastoral households targeted by the project (cattle, goats)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1 X in year Y</li> <li>• 2.2 X% in year Y</li> <li>• 2.3 X% in year Y</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1 X-x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 2.2 X+x% in year Y+y</li> <li>• 2.3 X-x% in year Y+y</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Laboratories Annual reports</li> <li>• External Satisfaction Survey</li> <li>• Project Progress report</li> <li>• Government sector reports</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government authorities are stable, line ministries functioning with technical staff and committed to fulfilling their mandate;</li> <li>• Security situation allows for capacity building to be undertaken</li> <li>• Requisite human resources with basic skills are available</li> </ul> |

|  |   |   |  |  |  |   |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
|  |   |   |  |  |  |   |
|  | <p>Result 3: Livestock Market Access and Trade in Cross-Border Regions Enhanced</p>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1 Number of regional or cross-border market infrastructures rehabilitated or newly built under the project that are operational and sustainably managed</li> <li>• 3.2 Regional marketing information (price, diseases) disseminated agencies and communities in a timely manner</li> <li>• 3.3 Number of stakeholders trained on Value-Chain enhancement</li> <li>• 3.4 Number livestock traded in selected project markets</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1 X in year Y</li> <li>• 3.2 X in year Y</li> <li>• 3.3 X in year Y</li> <li>• 3.4 X in year Y</li> </ul>                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 3.2 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 3.3 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 3.4 X+x in year Y+y</li> </ul>                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Progress report</li> <li>• AFIS CLIMIS Website</li> <li>• State and County Government reports</li> <li>• Stakeholder survey report</li> <li>• Training evaluation report</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trainees with potential capacity to analyse CLiMIS can be identified</li> <li>• SCPRP communication facilities still functional</li> <li>• Requisite human resources with basic skills are available</li> <li>• Government staff and stakeholders willing to provide accurate information on markets</li> </ul>  |
|  | <p>Result 4: Natural Resources Management in selected Cross-Border regions Improved</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1 Number of platforms solving cross-border natural resources management conflicts formed and operational.</li> <li>• 4.2 Number of natural resource use agreements signed</li> <li>• 4.3 Land area (hectares) where sustainable land management practices have been adopted as a result of the project in shared rangelands</li> <li>• 4.4 Number of water infrastructures along cross-border migration routes rehabilitated or newly built under the project that are that are operational and sustainably managed</li> <li>• 4.5 Percentage of pastoral households with improved access to water through project infrastructures rehabilitation and development</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1 X in year Y</li> <li>• 4.2 X in year Y</li> <li>• 4.3 X in year Y</li> <li>• 4.4 X in year Y</li> <li>• 4.5 X% in year Y</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 4.2 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 4.3 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 4.4 X+x in year Y+y</li> <li>• 4.5 X+x% in year Y+y</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Household Survey</li> <li>• Project progress reports</li> <li>• State and County Government reports</li> <li>• Stakeholder survey report</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff available in the states to undertake agricultural statistics data collection</li> <li>• Trainees have potential to absorb training</li> <li>• Williness among different pastoralist agro-pastoralist and farmers groups to find agreement for better use of natural resources</li> <li>• Security situation allows for capacity building to be undertaken</li> </ul> |

| Activities  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1.1 Establish an agricultural information system for food security:<br/> 1.2 Improve vulnerability and risk analysis:<br/> 1.3 Establish pastoral and agro-pastoral risk early warning and response system:</p> <p>2.1 Support the development and implementation of harmonized animal health approaches;<br/> 2.2 Strengthen/build the capacity for prevention, control and emergency preparedness of TBDs<br/> 2.3 Improve the animal quarantine centers standards,<br/> 2.4 establish a community Based Animal Health service in the cross border areas;<br/> 2.5 Strengthening the livestock owners' capacity to provide better animal health and husbandry care<br/> 2.6 Conduct regional workshops and exchange visits to other</p> <p>3.1 Establish a market information system and undertake studies/assessments to address the current information gap on some aspects of the livestock production system.<br/> 3.2 Establishment of physical market infrastructures and processing facilities (Auction yards, slaughterhouses, etc.) in selected towns along strategic cross-border livestock routes.<br/> 3.3 Promote and strengthen enterprises and market systems targeting female and vulnerable livestock traders</p> <p>4.1 Securing access to natural resources in cross-border areas and promoting community-based reconciliatory and peacebuilding dialogue;<br/> 4.2 Development of water resources, including (i) the update and refinement of available regional mapping of water points along cross-border migration routes, and (ii) coordinate identification of sites for development of water infrastructure.<br/> 4.3 Development of pasture and other land resources, including i) the rehabilitation of rangeland ecosystems with trans-boundary implications for livestock movements, and (ii) the spatial and temporal monitoring of rangeland resources of transboundary nature<br/> 4.4 Strengthening the capacity of traditional institutions to better mediate cross border access to pastoral resources and manage conflicts<br/> 4.5 Strengthening positive interactions between traditional and formal institutions within SS and across its borders<br/> 4.6 supporting policy and institutional development for cross-border livestock mobility</p> |  |  |  |