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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Anti-Retro Viral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Anti-Retro Viral Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>Clean Development Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Peace Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRMA</td>
<td>Crisis/Risk Mapping Assessment project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAC</td>
<td>Community Security and Arms Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVE</td>
<td>Civic Voter Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Demobilization, Disarmament, Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPA</td>
<td>Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSW</td>
<td>Female Sex Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFATM</td>
<td>Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTC</td>
<td>HIV testing and counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDU</td>
<td>Injecting Drug User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>International Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMWG</td>
<td>Information Management Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>Justice and Confidence Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Ministry of International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>National Elections Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHDR</td>
<td>National Human Development Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAA</td>
<td>National Mine Action Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAC</td>
<td>National Mine Action Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCE</td>
<td>North South Consultants Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMTCT</td>
<td>Preventing Mother-to-Child Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAC</td>
<td>Political Parties Affairs Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reduction of Emission from Deforestations and Forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoL</td>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAID</td>
<td>Sudan Aid Information Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Service-Delivery Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>Suspected Hazardous Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRC</td>
<td>Southern Sudan Referendum Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>The Carter Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRM</td>
<td>Threat/Risk Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRMA</td>
<td>Threats/Risk Mapping and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIS</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in Sudan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Introduction

The Government of National Unity and the Government of South Sudan, in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Sudan, developed a four-year framework for the period 2009-2012 in 2008 entitled the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP; GNU/GOSS/UNDP, 2009). In order to ensure the highest standards in programme and project management towards the delivery of national development results, UNDP has put in place a rigorous monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to track development results at the country level. Part of this M&E system is supported by an independent assessment implemented by North South Consultants Exchange (NSCE) (Egypt), in association with Sanad, a Sudanese consultancy firm. The purpose of the assessment is to establish CPAP outcome and, when appropriate, output indicator values over the period 2009-2012.

To conduct this assessment, a multi-step approach was followed to track UNDP Sudan’s project activities to the desired outcomes. Based on this approach, a system was designed whereby UNDP projects would be analysed in terms of their objectives, target groups, timeframes, locations, and outputs. The projects would then be classified by desired outcome to be able to track UNDP project activities to the higher level of CPAP outcomes. A desk review of all ongoing UNDP projects in Sudan was conducted and this review helped to determine the sampling methodology and field instruments. Indicators were assessed through secondary data as well as quantitative and qualitative primary data. Fieldwork took place in eight states across Northern Sudan comprising Khartoum, Eastern Sudan, the Three Protocol Areas, and the Darfur Region.

Outcome 1

Findings under Outcome 1 “Enhanced national and sub-national capacities to plan, monitor, evaluate and implement the MDGs and related national development policies and priorities” point to an increase in government pro-poor spending, but at a rate that is still below the CPAP target. In interviews with government officials at central and state levels, interviewees noted weak information systems and the lack of research capacities and accurate statistics as some of the main challenges they faced in determining the pro-poor nature of spending.

Outcome 2

Findings under Outcome 2 “Improved impact of available resources to fight HIV&AIDS” show that many of the relevant ministries currently have HIV/AIDS units or are engaged in HIV/AIDS related planning and activities. Interviewees from central government noted that while there has been an improvement in HIV/AIDS health services, there remains a lack in medical equipments and preparations, and a lack of awareness among the population in a considerable part of the targeted areas, especially rural areas. Interviews also show that while minimum standards have been developed by the Ministry of Health, and the staff have been trained, there are no mechanisms through which the government can monitor the application of such standards in the field. This makes the success or failure of such initiatives difficult to assess.
Outcome 3

Findings under Outcome 3 “Institutions, systems and processes of democratic governance strengthened” point to a serious lack in political confidence by citizens. This is not particularly surprising given that most election monitors are in consensus that the recent elections suffered from major “irregularities”. Many governance institutions such as the NEC and PPAC received significant support prior to the elections which strengthened their capacity to participate actively. However, given that the focus was placed so strongly on the elections, the sustainability of such support is in question.

Outcome 4

Findings under Outcome 4 “Capacity Enhancement of Local Government” indicate that local government still has a long way to go before citizens’ rights to adequate public services are fulfilled. The majority of citizens interviewed rated their satisfaction with public services as “average”. A positive point is that findings indicate that services are affordable, and most citizens state that they do not have to pay an extra tip to access such services. The problem lies in the quality of public services, particularly health and education. Perhaps a cause for optimism is that the state governments of South Kordofan (Abyei), Kassala, Red Sea, Ghedaref have completed and begun implementing locality strategic plans and urban management policies/frameworks. However, when state officials were interviewed about their satisfaction with the level at which they have been allowed to participate in the planning and management of local governance, the majority of interviewees described themselves as only somewhat satisfied and hoping for more participation in the future.

Outcome 5

Findings under Outcome 5 “Access to Justice and Rule of Law” indicate that citizens are still more aware of how to access traditional justice systems than official ones. Many citizen interviewees noted that they have confidence in government justice systems with one major exception: cases that have any political connotations. Regarding rule of law institutions, many respondents see the police as competent but severely lacking in sufficient equipment and training, and that many militias are better armed and organized than the police. Confidence in the fairness of police was lower than confidence in their competence. While the overwhelming majority of respondents reported that crime levels have decreased, a large percentage say it is still a serious problem in their communities.

Outcome 6

Findings under Outcome 6 “Strengthened capacity of national, sub-national, state and local institutions and communities to manage the environment and natural disasters to reduce conflict over natural resources” show that while threat/risk mapping activities are taking place in several states, budgets allocated to environmental management remain insufficient for states to adequately integrate mapping assessments into their planning and activities. State government interviewees suggested that if an in-depth assessment of the impact threat/risk mapping on preventing conflict were carried out and presented to central government, this might increase the budgets allocated to natural resource management.

Outcome 7

Findings under Outcome 7 “Post-conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived, and employment generated” indicate that a large percentage of citizens still feel threatened by the existence of weapons in their areas. As for mines, since they tend to be concentrated in particular areas that are more or less known to the locals, residents simply do their best to avoid these areas. When asked about their socio-economic situation, respondents to the citizens questionnaire pointed to many factors affecting their
livelihoods such as armed robbery, migration, increases in the prices of medical supplies, and rising poverty and unemployment. The majority of respondents agree that the situation for both mines and weapons has improved in recent years, but much work still needs to be done before they can feel safe. The technical and functional capacities of the NMAA have been developed regarding mine clearance, but it is not yet leading the de-mining activities. Regarding reintegration, most of those who received reintegration packages reported a degree of success, but many respondents complained about significant delays in receiving support.

**Issues Arising**

The indicator tracking activity has six objectives:

1. Provide baseline values and monitor a set of key indicators to inform UNDP programming and stakeholders on the status of development results and factors influencing them;
2. Monitor and track over a multi-year period progress towards the achievement of CPAP-based development results at the outcome and where appropriate the output level;
3. Provide evidence-based data as a basis for management decisions in relation to fine-tuning programme development and strategy;
4. Create an information base relating to programme results, which can be utilised to inform substantive final evaluation exercises and subsequent programming.
5. Provide information to national counterparts, UN Agencies and other national stakeholders and create an evidence-based platform which can promote policy dialogue and debate on the UNDP’s support to Sudan’s national development goals
6. Capture lessons learned and analyze issue through monitoring trends in programme development.

This is sub-section, summary conclusions are drawn for each of these specifically related to information needs and gaps. Where relevant, this also includes comments about the utility of the information specifications.

**Status of Development Results**

Using a mix of approaches that included soliciting opinion data from key informants as well as members of the public in areas reached by programmes in the CPAP, on the one hand, and a careful review of existing documents on the other, served an important triangulation function. For most indicators information from both of these sources was available, and this helped increase the level of confidence when interpreting data. Nevertheless, in some cases the absence of project data in reports, the absence of original databases, or contradictory information across sources, meant that baseline values could sometimes not be provided (e.g., 6.3a ‘% of supported national and sub-national institutions adopting and implementing environment and natural resource management frameworks’, 5.1a ‘rule of law institutions assisted to provide quality legal services to population through infrastructural support and strategic and operational planning’).

In other cases, only part of the output indicator information has been collected (e.g., for 7.1b ‘number of national deminers trained/equipped/field deployed for clearance of mines/ERW affected areas’, reports indicate the number trained and deployed, but does not indicate issues arising around equipment provided nor why there is a gap between the number trained and the number deployed).

There were also cases where denominators would have been more useful that a simple numerical goal. For example, Output Indicator 5.1d is ‘number of prisons at state level applying Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners’, where the number of prisons in total expected to need these standards applied is not stated. As another example, Output Indicator 2.1a is the ‘number of service delivery points providing
counselling and testing in accordance with determined minimum standards, disaggregated by type of service provided’, without specification of the total number of service delivery points that would need to be reached.

There were also cases where only output, or even input, level data were available, and no information was available from which to establish outcomes. End-of-training participant evaluations, for example, do not appear to be routinely collected or, if they are, are not routinely compiled as part of project documentation. Training impact assessments were also lacking, as were client satisfaction surveys.

For most of the output level indicators, it was possible to include these as part of the discussion about the status of outcome indicators, suggesting reasonable alignment between the two. Output 1.3 for Outcome 1 on small enterprise development proved especially difficult to link to the Outcome indicator, suggesting a need to further elaborate the link between the outputs and the intended outcome, while there were other cases where indicator alignment remains difficult.

Monitor and Track Process

There are a few cases where baseline values could not be established due to the absence of relevant data. In some of these cases it is due to an absence of sub-national data (e.g., Output Indicator 4.3a is ‘level of expenditure by State targeted towards education and health’ where education data are not available at all and health data are for the year 2006), while in other cases data were found to be contradictory (e.g., Output SP Indicator 3.2c ‘number of supported political parties with political parties platforms developed’). In the case of indicators where values are unavailable or well dated, Tracking such data over time, when even the original data point is a problem, would suggest that such indicators may not be measurable for the course of CPAP implementation.

There are cases where output level indicators may be overly-ambitious and actually focus at ‘use of outputs’ level, such as the inclusion of the term ‘functional’ when describing HIV/AIDS Units (Output Indicator 2.1b), or using the phrase ‘launch’ rather than ‘engage in’ advocacy (Output SP Indicator 3.2e), or including implementation for Output Indicator 4.1a rather than just completion (‘number of states empowered to complete and implement locality strategic plans and urban management policies/frameworks’). Tracking use of outputs of this nature is a useful activity, but the output indicators themselves should be more specifically focused on outputs and not their use.

Evidence for Programmatic Fine-Tuning

Given that project and programme officers work with project/programme data on a regular basis, and considering that evaluations have been conducted of a number of these, it is uncertain what value-added a broader assessment such as this one can have at a specific operational level. For this particular objective, therefore, it may be more worthwhile for UNDP and GNU to consider progress at a meta level using this report, where the relative ‘fit’ of projects and programmes can be considered in light of the overall CPAP. In some cases, such as Outcome 2 associated with the impact of HIV&AIDS-related activities, this would extend towards an assessment of the relative fit of projects focused on this Outcome in the context of important developments in the national response (e.g., new Global Fund monies, policy shifts in terms of testing, newly available information about levels of stigma and what this might imply for testing services, etc.).
Inform Final Evaluation

Baseline values have been included in the report where information is available. There are deficiencies in this regard associated with the lack of data, gaps which therefore weaken the utility of the indicators tracking system. Given that these gaps are now known, gap filling for the second round of data collection should be further considered on an indicator-by-indicator basis, including adjustment of primary data collection tools and strategies as appropriate.

This report does not consider project and programme adaptation, something that is especially important to consider in any evaluation. Adaptation to circumstances is often a key strength of effective management, and in this regard is important for evaluation. The same holds true for unintended consequences of specific actions, which often have important impacts at use of output, outcome, and results levels.

Where the indicators tracking report has particular value is associated with having a single location where one can gain insights into progress made towards the CPAP.

Promote Policy Dialogue and Debate

In trying to establish baseline values for the CPAP indicators, questions arose around the utility of these indicators, as specified, in terms of promoting policy dialogue and debate. For example, for Outcome 4 ‘Capacity Enhancement of Local Government’, Outcome Indicator 4b refers to the ‘number of laws which seek to devolve power being implemented by the central government’. As currently stated a value can be specified for the indicator (in this case 1), but the utility of this information from a policy point of view is limited. Further, in the absence of a denominator (that is, the number of laws desired or expected, which may well be 1), the policy utility of the indicator value is especially limited.

In looking further at Outcome Indicator 4b as an example, no baseline value is available for the indicator, meaning that the policy context of the reform is not clear. The utility of the report for purposes of policy dialogue and debate is therefore constrained.

Data constraints encountered during preparation of the indicators tracking report underline the need for caution when making policy recommendations. For example, Outcome Indicator 3b refers to knowledge and awareness among citizens, but the indicator was only measured at sub-national level in locations reached by the UNDP project. A careful understanding of the context around indicator values is therefore key to effective policy dialogue.

Lessons Learned

The complexity and diversity of programmes and projects falling under the CPAP underline the difficulty of assessing progress at the CPAP level, even in cases where baseline values can be provided. This would suggest the need to strengthen monitoring at project and programme level to better inform an assessment of use of outputs, outcomes, and results. Given the challenges facing M&E, particularly in difficult situations and with large and diverse programmes such as Sudan, such strengthening is a continuous need and is not something that can be resolved in the short-term. At this juncture, it should simply be recognised that these limitations compound themselves in any assessment of CPAP status, and will continue to do so throughout the course of indicator tracking.
A second lesson learned relates to the need to better specify indicators and, as possible, include denominators in cases of numerical targets. In some cases this may require substantial indicator deepening in any new CPAP. As an example for the latter, Outcome Indicator 4a is ‘percentage of citizens satisfied with local public services in the target areas’. Given the diversity of inputs across a number of services, progress on such an indicator may well be undermeasured if one service lags behind.

A third lesson learned derives from the need to incorporate a diverse set of projects under a small number of outcomes, which the fit may not be good, and the output contributing little or nothing to the outcome, even with successful programmes. In these cases links between outcome indicators and outcomes, on the one hand, and outcome indicators and outputs on the other may be tenuous.

Recommendations

Based on these summary observations and conclusions, the following recommendations should be considered:

- **Status of Development Results:** The triangulation of information collection approaches served to enhance the level of confidence in findings and conclusions drawn. There were nevertheless gaps in available information that mean that some findings should be treated with due caution. Beyond this, it is specifically recommended that a status assessment be carefully informed by those officers involved in implementation and oversight. It is also recommended that UNDP and Government carefully review indicator alignment between output and outcome levels.

- **Monitor and Track Progress:** While a number of indicators could be measured, others could not. In part this is due to overly-ambitious outputs or inadequately refined indicators. It is recommended that some of these be reviewed during the mid-term review with an eye to revision, and further that specific attention be given to the development of more precise and realistic measures for the next CPAP.

- **Evidence for Programmatic Fine-Tuning:** It is recommended that this indicators tracking report only play a back-up role for programmatic fine-tuning, given that more precise information is available elsewhere.

- **Inform Final Evaluation:** The ability of the report to inform the final evaluation depends in large part on being able to fill information gaps identified during the baseline. It is therefore recommended that these information needs be reassessed prior to the second year of measurement and tools adapted in this regard. The utility of the report for the final evaluation is also dependent on the evaluators recognising the specific role of the indicators tracking report compared to other information sources.

- **Promote Policy Dialogue and Debate:** The extent to which the indicators tracking report can promote policy dialogue and debate is constrained by the quality of the indicators and the information available to measure them. Both highlight the need to proceed with care when considering the policy implications of findings contained in this report.

- **Lessons Learned:** There is a clear need to improve monitoring, in part through better specification of indicators and in part through enhanced data collection and utilisation. Weaknesses in the system are understandable given the size and complexity of the CPAP, and demands on monitoring should not be overly ambitious in this regard. This would suggest that attention be devoted to better indicator specificity and less ambitious outputs for the next CPAP.

In addition to these recommendations, in each section of this report comments are made about recommended changes to some of the indicators, and suggests on how they should be measured. Here overall recommendations are made that apply across a number of these indicators:
• **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?

• **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Overall Utility:** A review of the indicators suggest that most indicators are useful towards informing outputs and outcomes. Where there are deficiencies, this generally relates to an indicator trying to serve multiple purposes, requiring instead disaggregation. The overall recommendation is that the Client review the specific recommendations included section by section for each indicator in this report, and consider relevant modifications.

**Overall Functionality:** Similar to utility, the main problems are associated with indicators that are trying to measure multiple aspects of a programme/set of programmes, muddling the practicality of the indicators. A second problem is associated with overly ambitious expectations of programme impact based on the formulation of the indicator. The overall recommendation is that the Client review the specific recommendations included section by section for each indicator in this report, and consider relevant modifications.
Section 1: Introduction

The Government of National Unity and the Government of South Sudan, in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Sudan, developed a four-year framework for the period 2009-2012 in 2008, and issued in 2009 entitled the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). Guided by the CPAP, itself developed from the 2009-2012 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), a series of activities were elaborated for the four year period designed to support a human rights based approach to programming in Sudan in a time of rapid change.

Purpose and Objectives

The purposes of the assignment are:

1. To provide an independent and regular means to measuring progress towards UNDP’s development outcomes of the CPAP
2. To provide evidence-based data for future monitoring and evaluation activities including mid-term and terminal evaluations
3. To strengthen UNDP’s accountability mechanisms in relation to Sudanese authorities and the donor community through enabling the use of objective and independently verifiable data

The immediate objectives of the assignment are:

1. To provide baseline values and monitor a set of key indicators in order to inform UNDP programming and stakeholders about the status of development results and factors influencing them
2. To monitor and track over a multi-year period the progress towards the achievement of CPAP-based development results, at the outcome and, where appropriate, the output level
3. To provide evidence-based data as a basis for management decisions in relation to fine-tuning program development and strategy
4. To create an information base related to program results, which can be utilized to inform substantial final evaluation exercises and subsequent programming
5. To provide information to national counterparts, UN agencies and other national stakeholders as well as create an evidence-based platform which can promote policy dialogue and debate UNDP’s support to Sudan’s national development goals

Background

In order to ensure standards in programme and project management towards the delivery of national development results, UNDP has put in place a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to track development results at the country level.

This is supported by an externally-implemented independent assessment at use of output and outcome levels, implemented by North South Consultants Exchange (NSCE) (Egypt), in association with Sanad, a Sudanese consultancy firm. The purpose of the NSCE-led M&E portfolio is to establish CPAP outcome and, when appropriate, output indicator values over the period of the current UNDP programming cycle (2009-2012).
This study is one of a set of inputs that UNDP and the Government of Sudan employ to assess progress towards the achievement of CPAP outcomes. The proposed portfolio will be made up of three periodic studies which will be sequenced throughout the CPAP period 2009-2012, constituting one baseline study and two follow-up indicator tracking studies. The results of this exercise will provide both quantitative and qualitative data, which are based on rigorous objective assessment standards.

**Outputs of the Assignment**

As per the Terms of Reference (TOR), there are two main outputs of the assignment:

a) To deliver baseline values in 2009/2010 for CPAP *outcome* indicators to inform UNDP programming and stakeholders on the status of development results and factors influencing them

b) To monitor and track *progress towards the achievement* of CPAP-based development results over a multi-year period (2011-2012) at the *outcome* and where appropriate the *output* level

After a comprehensive desk review and analysis of UNDP’s activities (projects, programmes) in Sudan, and based on data collection through quantitative and qualitative approaches, CPAP contributions to national development (or more specifically, UNDAF outcomes) can be grouped into three areas:

1) **Institution-Building & State Capacity**: This includes institutional interventions such as designing policies and legal frameworks, as well as capacity building of State actors at different levels.
   a. Policy-level actors
   b. Planning-level actors
   c. Delivery-level actors

2) **Civil Society Strengthening and non-State Capacity**: This includes activities to strengthen civil society, such as building the capacities of NGOs and citizen groups, as well as non-State governance institutions such as political parties.

3) **Poverty-Reduction and Improved Living Conditions**: This area primarily includes activities that seek to improve citizen access to basic services, infrastructure of local communities, and livelihoods in general.

**Methodology**

**The Tracking System**

To evaluate CPAP outcome indicators, a system was put in place to track UNDP Sudan’s project activities to the outcomes. Measures focus on outcome and, as appropriate, output indicators. In order to assign value to said indicators, the approach followed the “outcome-output-project nexus” outlined in the UNDP M&E handbook, and reproduced as follows:
Based on this approach, a system was designed whereby UNDP projects would be analysed in terms of their objectives, target groups, timeframes, locations, and outputs. The projects would then be classified by CPAP outcome to be able to track UNDP project activities to the higher level of CPAP outcomes.

The Desk Review

After the tracking system was designed, a desk review of all ongoing UNDP projects in Sudan was conducted. The information from this review was used to determine which projects feed into which CPAP outcomes and outputs which would later feed into the sampling methodology and field instruments.

Information was extracted from project documents, annual workplans, and progress reports. This information was then synthesized and placed in the context of the tracking system which provided a clear vision of how to track project activities to CPAP indicator values. This information combined with an analysis of the nature of each indicator led to the next step of determining what type of data would be used to measure each indicator. Data gaps were identified and further information sought to fill these gaps as possible. Most indicators were measured through a combination of secondary and primary data, the latter including both quantitative and qualitative data collection approaches.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Collection

A description of data collection approaches and procedures has been included in Annex H.
Geographic Scope

The review covered regions where UNDP has a programme presence. Geographically, they are all located in the internationally recognised borders of North Sudan as follows:

- West Darfur
- South Kordofan (Abyei)
- Kassala
- Red Sea
- North Darfur
- Blue Nile
- Ghedaref
- Khartoum

Figure 2: OCHA Sudan General Planning Map
Data are presented at the national level in cases where disaggregation is not possible due to sample size or other limitations, or where the indicator is at the national level. Sub-national interventions are reported at the sub-national level. Regional findings are only reported when required by the indicator or when there is a deviation from findings at the national level.

**Structure of the Report**

This report is organized around each of the seven outcomes in the CPAP, comprising the following:

- **Outcome 1** Enhanced national and sub-national capacities to plan, monitor, evaluate and implement the MDGs and related national development policies and priorities
- **Outcome 2** Improved impact of available resources to fight HIV&AIDS
- **Outcome 3** Institutions, systems and processes of democratic governance strengthened
- **Outcome 4** National/sub-national/state/local levels of governance expand their capacities to manage equitable delivery of public services
- **Outcome 5** Rights upheld and protected through accountable, accessible and equitable Rule of Law institutions
- **Outcome 6** Strengthened capacity of national, sub-national, state and local institutions and communities to manage the environment and natural disasters to reduce conflict over natural resources
- **Outcome 7** Post-conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived, and employment generated.

Each section begins with a summary table elaborating the status of the indicator. Thereafter, indicator values are discussed, followed by comments on the indicators themselves.
## Section 2: Outcome 1 - Implementation Capacity to Plan and Monitor Development Priorities

Table 1: Values of Indicators under Outcome 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhanced national and sub-national capacities to plan, monitor, evaluate and implement the MDGs and related national development policies and priorities</td>
<td>Output 1.1: MDG reports and National Human Development Report (NHDR) produced and disseminated to inform policy processes</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 1.1.a:</strong> Number of MDG reports and NHDRs produced</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: MDG progress report produced and household poverty survey conducted 2010: First NHDR produced 2011: MDG progress report produced 2012: Second NHDR production initiated. <strong>Current Value:</strong> 2009 MDG report produced but not yet published NHDR not yet produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 1.2: Strengthened aid management and coordination to implement Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 1.2.a:</strong> Database/analytical capacity for development aid coordination strategies and alignment to MDG-based national and sub-national development strategies in place and used.</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: Aid Information database used in monitoring and tracking development aid 2010-2012: Increased donor compliance with government priorities and reporting systems <strong>Current Value:</strong> Aid Management &amp; Coordination Unit established in MIC Aid Management systems established in 5 states, findings suggest systems still weak Aid Information Database completed &amp; operational but not yet available online, utility felt to be low at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 1.3: Policy and regulatory reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises strengthened and social and economic opportunities for poor and vulnerable groups broadened</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 1.3.a:</strong> Number of regulatory policy and reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises developed and implemented</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: Policies and laws amended to enable the establishment of innovative microfinance services 2010: Policies and laws amended and/or enforced to enable the improvement of value chains for poor suppliers 2011-2012: Comprehensive policies and regulatory reforms for micro, small and medium scale enterprises in place <strong>Current Value:</strong> Most policies have been amended, but many have not yet been enforced. Not clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Indicator 1.a:** Change in allocation of government budgets towards MDGs and pro-poor spending related activities, policies and priorities

**CPAP Baseline:** 5.5% (World Bank report 2006) of state budgets being allocated to MDGs related activities

**CPAP Target:** 15% of state budgets being allocated to MDGs (Pro-poor spending) related activities and all targeted states having gender sensitive MDG based plans and budgets.

**Current Value:** Pro-poor spending = 10.3% of total expenditure for all Sudan, 9% for North Sudan (2009 data)
Outcome 1 is “enhanced national and sub-national capacities to plan, monitor, evaluate and implement the MDGs [Millennium Development Goals] and related national development policies and priorities”. Measurement of the indicator (outcome indicator 1.a) at outcome level refers to a “change in allocation of government budgets towards MDGs and pro-poor spending related activities, policies and priorities”.

Output 1.1 is “MDG reports and National Human Development Report (NHDR) produced and disseminated to inform policy processes”, with the measurement of the indicator (output indicator 1.1a) comprising the “number of MDG reports and NHDRs produced”.

Output 1.2 is “Strengthened aid management and coordination to implement Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness”, with the measurement of the indicator (output indicator 1.2.a) reflecting whether “Database/analytical capacity for development aid coordination strategies and alignment to MDG-based national and sub-national development strategies in place and used”.

Output 1.3 is “Policy and regulatory reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises strengthened and social and economic opportunities for poor and vulnerable groups broadened”, with the measurements of the indicator (output indicator 1.3.a) comprising the “Number of regulatory policy and reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises developed and implemented”, and the measurements of the other indicator (output indicator 1.3.b) reflecting the “Number of micro-entrepreneurs accessing microfinance and business development services through UNDP (disaggregated by gender)”.  

**Outcome Indicator 1a: Change in Allocation of Government Budgets Towards MDGs and Pro-Poor Spending Related Activities, Policies and Priorities**

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “5.5% (World Bank report 2006) of state budgets being allocated to MDGs related activities”, while the target is: “15% of state budgets being allocated to MDGs (Pro-poor spending) related activities and all targeted states having gender sensitive MDG-based plans and budgets”.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 1.3.b: Number of micro-entrepreneurs accessing microfinance and business development services through UNDP (disaggregated by gender).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> 65,293 active clients of Microfinance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **CPAP Target:**  
2009: UNDP Micro-finance and Microbusiness Support programme is set up  
2010: In addition to other Microfinance Programs in Sudan, at least 5,000 entrepreneurs accessing microfinance and business development services, through the support by UNDP, equally representing females and males  
2011: at least 20,000 clients (cumulative)  
2012: at least 50,000 clients (cumulative)  
**Current Value:** Unable to measure due to lack of data. |

whether sufficient policies and laws are in place
Pro-poor spending is defined as by the Sudanese government as "spending that benefits the poor more than the non-poor; spending that actually reaches the poor and spending to have an impact on the welfare of the poor over time" (Ministry of Finance and National Economy, 2007). The 2010 Sudan Millennium Development Goals Progress Report (Ministry of Welfare & Social Security National Population Council General Secretariat, 2010), drawing from Ministry of Finance and National Economy data, showed improvements in pro-poor spending from 2004-2009 (covering all of Sudan, not just the north):

Table 2: Pro-Poor Spending As Percentage of Total Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for all of Sudan, not just northern Sudan

The Country Integrated Fiduciary Assessment (World Bank, 2010) reported that pro-poor spending in the north was 5.5% in 2006, while the 2010 Sudan MDG report states that pro-poor spending in the north was 9% in 2009, both figures lower than those noted above. Unfortunately trend data are not separately available for the north.

In interviews with government officials at central and state levels, interviewees noted some of the challenges they faced in determining the pro-poor nature of spending, including:

- Weak information systems
- Poorly designed and poorly functioning monitoring and evaluation systems
- Lack of robust statistics
- Inadequate research capacity

Some of the national level key informants from central government noted that the federal and state ministries lack an effective monitoring and evaluation system in general and particularly in fields related to MDGs’ activities. The main problems facing MDGs monitoring and evaluation processes are a lack of unified measurement indicators, and an absence or weakness in the relevant information management systems. The interviewee also noted that considerable attention was still required to enhance the capacity of human resources at the sub-national level.

Nevertheless, some achievements were noted particularly at central level, including an increased awareness about the different aspects of poverty and improved capacities to conduct poverty-related research, as well as improving monitoring and evaluation capacities. But much work is still needed. At the national level several poverty-related policies have been adopted, especially by Ministry of Social Welfare which developed various policies to be implemented at state level. The most important of which are:

- Poverty Alleviation Policy
- Social Solidarity Policy
- Program of Zakat Fund (Zakat is an Islamic social solidarity system)
- Women Empowerment Policy
- Disabled Empowerment Policy
- Seniors Care Policy
At state level, interviewees from all eight states included in this study noted some of the challenges they faced, which include weak human capacities, particularly when it comes to research, poor information systems, and lack of accurate statistics and databases.

According to the April 2010 progress report for the UNDP project “Enhanced National Capacities to Plan, Implement and Monitor the Achieved MDGs” the project is currently in the process of consulting with government counterparts to establish current capacities and their needs, but implementation of capacity-building has not yet begun. This is consistent with findings from interviews with government officials at central and state levels who said that although current capacities were limited, there are capacity-building initiatives for government officials that are underway. Further, progress was noted by a number of key informants at both national and sub-national levels in terms of networking between government authorities and civil society.

Most of the sub-national interviewees noted that the MDGs have now been adopted by all states as strategic goals, and thus been included in planning at state level. However, they added that the consideration of MDGs is more visible at the planning level than at the implementation level. Activities in this regard include staff training programs, a focus on networking and partnerships, and introducing a participatory planning approach in many states. When asked about UNDP’s contribution in this regard, interviewees noted that the UNDP has conducted several important interventions especially related to capacity-building programs for government employees, as well as information management systems. It also supported the establishment of planning units at state level and built their capacities to monitor MDG activities. However, much work still needs to be done.
For monitoring of activities that could be compiled to establish pro-poor allocations specifically, key informants noted that there was often a lack of agreed indicators to measure various aspects of implementation, a lack of functioning management information systems to handle data, and a lack of systems to collect these data at sub-national level, despite improving monitoring systems at the national level. One consequence was a perception of unrealistic data expectations from development partners, including UNDP. State-level key informants noted serious constraints in terms of technical skills, equipment, effective structures, and information systems overall that seriously constrained the ability of states to use the MDGs for implementation purposes.

Discussion of Indicators

Current Outcome Indicator

Outcome Indicator 1.a at outcome level refers to a “change in allocation of government budgets towards MDGs and pro-poor spending related activities, policies and priorities”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicator

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

Use the 9% figure for northern Sudan for comparison for 2012.

**Utility Recommendation:** Keep the indicator as is, but clarify that the indicator is measuring the percentage of the total budget allocated to sectors that have a pro-poor bias.

**Functionality Recommendation:** Measure policy issues at the output level until policy reviews are conducted.

Current Output Indicators

Output Indicator 1.1.a is the “number of MDG reports and NHDRs produced”.

Output Indicator 1.2.a is “database/analytical capacity for development aid coordination strategies and alignment to MDG-based national and sub-national development strategies in place and used”.

Output Indicator 1.3.a is the “number of regulatory policy and reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises developed and implemented”. Output Indicator 1.3.b is the “number of micro-entrepreneurs accessing microfinance and business development services through UNDP (disaggregated by gender)”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicators

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility Recommendation:** Keep Output Indicator 1.1.a as it is.
Functionality Recommendation: Keep Output Indicator 1.2.a as is, but measure functioning of Aid Management Coordination Unit in MIC in future.

Utility Recommendation: For Output Indicator 1.3.a, recommend that the indicator shifts from measuring the number of initiatives to the nature of these reforms. Recommend that the key types of regulatory reforms required be specified under the indicator.

Functionality Recommendation: If utility recommendations are taken into consideration for 1.3.a, no functionality issues apply.

Utility Recommendation: Keep Output Indicator 1.3.b as is, but strengthen monitoring systems to measure progress.

Functionality Recommendation: If utility recommendations are taken into consideration for 1.3.b, no functionality issues apply.
Section 3: Outcome 2 - Fighting HIV&AIDS

Table 3: Values of Indicators under Outcome 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Improved impact of available resources to fight HIV&AIDS | Output 2.1: Better delivery/usage of the GFATM funds for response to HIV/AIDS and other diseases | **Output Indicator 2.1.a:** No. of services delivery points (SDPs) providing counselling & testing in accordance with determined minimum standards, disaggregated by type of service provided | **CPAP Target:**
2009: 64 points providing VCT services; (clients for the centers 50% fem, 50% male)
2010: 100 points providing VCT services (clients for the centers 50% fem, 50% male)
2011: 122 points providing VCT services (clients for centres 50% female, 50% male)
2012: 128 points providing VCT services (clients for the centers 50% fem, 50% male)

|                  |                  | **CPAP Baseline:**
38 points are currently providing VCT services. |

**Current Value:**
137 HTCs
32 ART Centres
27 PMTCT Sites
Gender disaggregated data unavailable.

**Output Indicator 2.1.b:** Number of Ministries with a functional HIV/AIDS unit and with strategic plans and budget for HIV/AIDS in place (3 ministries specified)

|                  |                  | **CPAP Baseline:**
None |

**Current Value:**
Ministry of Social Welfare, Women and Children, and Ministry of Labor have units.

The Ministry of Finance does not yet have a unit.

**Extent to which the Units are functional remains uncertain.**

Outcome 2 is “Improved impact of available resources to fight HIV&AIDS” Measurement of the indicator (Outcome Indicator 2a) at outcome levels refers to the “percentage of eligible clients enrolled on ARV combination therapy disaggregated by gender”.

Output 2.1 is “better delivery/usage of the GFATM funds for response to HIV/AIDS and other diseases”, with the measurement of the indicator comprising Outcome Indicator 2.1a “number of service delivery points providing counseling and testing in accordance with determined minimum standards, disaggregated by type of services provided”, and Output Indicator 2.1b “number of ministries with a functional HIV/AIDS unit and with strategic plans and budget for HIV/AIDS in place”. All data is presented for Northern Sudan only.
Outcome Indicator 2a: Percentage of Eligible Clients Enrolled on ARV Combination Therapy Disaggregated by Gender

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is 10% of eligible clients enrolled for 2008, while the target is 50% of those eligible enrolled.

It is estimated that Sudan has the largest number of HIV infections in the Middle East & North Africa Region (MENA), with 320,000 to 350,000 persons estimated to be living with HIV, of which an estimated 120,000 are living in northern states. This accounts for some 60% of all HIV infections in the broad definition of the MENA region (Abu-Raddad et al, 2010). The HIV seroprevalence rate for northern Sudan was 0.67% in 2009, which reflects a pre-epidemic level, but which is projected to rise to 1.2% by 2014, exceeding the epidemic level of 1% (Federal Ministry of Health, 2010).

As Abu-Raddad, Hilmi, Musa (2009) note, North Sudan is pre-epidemic, with HIV largely concentrated among men who have sex with men (MSM) and their partners, injecting drug users (IDUs) and their partners, and female sex workers (FSWs) and their clients; Government’s response to UNGASS notes that available evidence suggests that there are few injecting drug users (Federal Ministry of Health, 2010). Concentrated epidemics are defined as HIV epidemics in sub-populations with known high-risk behaviours where HIV prevalence is consistently above 5% in at least one high-risk group. At present HIV prevalence among FSWs appears to still be at or below the concentration threshold (less than 5%) (Abu-Raddad, Hilmi, Musa, 2009). A 2008 survey of female sex workers in northern Sudan found an HIV seropositive rate of 0.91%, below the epidemic level (Federal Ministry of Health, 2010). There are no trend data among high-risk groups.

Unfortunately no nationwide data are currently available for the percentage of Sudanese aged 15-49 who have been tested at least once for HIV, although data are expected to be available sometime in 2011 from the 2010 Sudan Household Health Survey (being conducted by Sudan’s Ministry of Health) (see discussion in Federal Ministry of Health, 2010).

According to the Sudan Millennium Development Goals Report for 2010 (Federal Ministry of Health, 2010), in Northern Sudan there were a total of 18,423 adults as well as 2,981 children living with HIV who were in need of antiretroviral therapy (ARV or ART) in 2009. Comparing this to the 122,216 estimated as HIV positive in the north, these figures would represent a high 17.5% of all those in the north living with HIV in need of ARVs. Of these, in 2010 a total of 2,835 (13.2%) were currently receiving these services. Unfortunately, the available data is not disaggregated by gender, but the 2010 Sudan MDG report measures the female-to-male ratio of HIV prevalence at 0.5%. This is somewhat confusing, as the number of pregnant women in need of PMTCT is high relative to the total number of persons living with HIV overall (6,715 versus 18,423). As the latter was determined from a general population model, there is some overlap between the two categories, but the overlap is uncertain, and would appear to suggest that two-thirds of all females with HIV are pregnant, a likely over-estimate. Unfortunately, no data are available to clarify whether there are divergent rates of seroprevalence or not.

Discussion of Indicators

Current Outcome Indicator

Outcome Indicator 2a refers to the “percentage of eligible clients enrolled on ARV combination therapy disaggregated by gender”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicator
Utility: How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?

Functionality: How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

Utility and Functionality: No changes are recommended for the indicator.

Current Output Indicator

Output Indicator 2.1a is the “number of service delivery points providing counseling and testing in accordance with determined minimum standards, disaggregated by type of services provided”.

Output Indicator 2.1b is the “number of ministries with a functional HIV/AIDS unit and with strategic plans and budget for HIV/AIDS in place”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicator

Utility: How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?

Functionality: How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

Utility: Service quality and achievement of minimum standards could instead be secured via facility surveys of a subset of sites, including the possible use of mystery client surveys.

Functionality: For Output Indicator 2.1a, securing quantitative data on the quality of services for each location may be overly ambitious. Instead attention should be focused on establishing both a numerator and denominator, with the latter comprising the total number of sites which should be offered overall across the country; the current denominator is the annual target, which is fine for annual planning but not for the five year plan.

Functionality: For Output Indicator 2.1b, the indicator actually refers to three ministries, not all ministries. If this is what is of interest, then the indicator should specifically refer to 3 ministries. The term ‘functional’ should be removed from the indicator, with the functionality dealt with separately.

Utility: The extent to which the units are resourced and functioning, of course, is the key issue, but not at output level. Instead, the focus would be on whether the units exist and have budget support.
## Section 4: Outcome 3 - Democratic Governance Strengthened

Table 4: Values of Indicators under Outcome 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutions, systems and processes of democratic governance strengthened</td>
<td>Output 3.1: Support to free and fair elections and referenda based on international standards provided</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 3.1.a</strong>: Number of institutions (elections and referendum authorities) strategic planning, oversight, training, logistical support through the elections project</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline</strong>: Elections project currently being established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline</strong>: Electoral law passed in 2008</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target</strong>: 2009: Strategic planning, organizational development strategy, and institutional infrastructure completed for NEC and SSHCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline</strong>: Elections conducted as planned, and assessed as free and fair by domestic and international observers; Referendum conducted as per CPA</td>
<td>2010: Logistics and strategic planning for 2011 referenda supported, capacity development activities completed, and establishment of legal framework for the referenda supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Current Value</strong>: Elections conducted but not assessed as free and fair. South Sudan Referendum conducted as per CPA</td>
<td>2011: Logistics and operations for the conduct of the referenda supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 3.1.b</strong>: Change in the level of political knowledge and understanding of political system among citizens</td>
<td><strong>Current Value</strong>: Operational planning for NEC for registration and polling, and for civic and voter education. Operational planning for PPAC to develop capacities of political parties. Capacity-building and staff training for NEC, PPAC, judiciary, and domestic observation groups. Logistical and/or infrastructural support for NEC, PPAC, and judiciary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline</strong>: No civic and voter education programme in place</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 3.1.b</strong>: Comprehensive civic and voter education programme developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target</strong>: 2009: Civic and voter education programme developed, with defined coverage targets and approved by the government</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline</strong>: No civic and voter education programme in place North: 3 states Darfur, Three Protocol Areas, Red Sea State, Kassala, Khartoum State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2012: Civic and voter education programme implemented in target areas</td>
<td><strong>Current Value</strong>: Civic and voter education programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North: 3 states Darfur, Three Protocol Areas, Red Sea State, Kassala, Khartoum State</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target</strong>: 22 additional political parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Current Value</strong>: Civic and voter education programme developed and implemented, but assessed as insufficient.</td>
<td><strong>Current Value</strong>: 24 were supported to participate, of which 12 participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Outcome</td>
<td>Expected Outputs</td>
<td>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</td>
<td>Values (Output Indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political system and understand their rights and obligations as citizens, and 48% ‘somewhat understand’</td>
<td>Output SP Indicator 3.2.b: Number of parliamentarians with increased knowledge of their role and responsibilities in a democratic process</td>
<td>CPAP Target: None</td>
<td>Current Value: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 3.c: Level of public confidence in media, political parties and other civil society leaders in holding government accountable</td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: None</td>
<td>Current Value: 270 overall, with 54 of them women. No information on impacts of intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP Baseline: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP Target: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Value: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media: 35.5% agree that they can access media that helps hold government accountable for its actions in the area</td>
<td>Output SP Indicator 3.2.c: Number of supported political parties with political parties platforms developed</td>
<td>CPAP Target: None</td>
<td>Current Value: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties: 47.4% feel that political parties in the area were strong enough to hold government accountable</td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: None</td>
<td>Current Value: There are no specific political parties platforms developed with the support of UNDP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society: 23.8% feel that civil society organisations in the area were strong enough to hold government accountable</td>
<td>Output SP Indicator 3.2.d: Number of journalists with strengthened capacities for reporting on government decision-making</td>
<td>CPAP Target: None</td>
<td>Current Value: At least 350 journalists received support from UNDP, in addition to media houses and vote monitoring stations. Media monitoring generally rated as successful but suffering important constraints related to press freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP Baseline: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output SP Indicator 3.2.e: Number of CSOs which launch advocacy initiatives on government related issues</td>
<td>CPAP Target: None</td>
<td>Current Value: At least 102 Sudanese CSOs trained to spread information on the electoral process. Information on how many launched advocacy initiatives was not available, nor were reports on impacts. Key informants suggest impacts limited.</td>
<td>Values (Output Indicators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 3 is “institutions, systems and processes of democratic governance strengthened”. Measurement of the indicator (outcome indicator 3a) at outcome level refers to ‘elections conducted and deemed free and fair by domestic and international observers; referendum conducted as per [the Comprehensive Peace Accords] CPA’. Outcome indicator 3b is “change in the level of political knowledge and understanding of political system among citizens disaggregated by gender”. Outcome indicator 3c is “level of public confidence in media, political parties and other civil society leaders in holding government accountable”.

Output 3.1 is “support to free and fair elections and referenda based on international standards provided”. Output indicator 3.1a is “number of institutions (elections and referendum authorities) strategic planning, oversight, training, logistical support through the elections project”. Output Indicator 3.1b is “comprehensive civil and voter education programme developed and implemented”.

Output 3.2 is “capacities strengthened of national, sub-national and state assemblies”. Output Indicator 3.2a is “number of national/sub-national legislative assemblies with capacities strengthened for standard parliamentary procedures and oversight functions”. 16
Output 3.3 is “capacities strengthened of political parties, media and civil society, including women, to play their mandated roles in the democratic process”. Output Indicator 3.3a is “number of diverse geographical and/or constituencies based political parties prepared (strategic planning, organizational development strategy, and institutional infrastructure completed) to participate in democratic elections disaggregated by region”. Output Indicator 3.3b is the “percent of supported media entities regularly reporting on electoral processes and percent of supported governance-related CSOs engaged in civil and voter education”.

**Outcome Indicator 3a: Elections Conducted and Deemed Free and Fair by Domestic and International Observers; Referendum Conducted as per CPA**

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “Electoral law passed in 2008”. The target is: “Elections conducted as planned, and assessed as free and fair by domestic and international observers; Referendum conducted as per CPA and meeting accepted standards”.

In October 2010 UNDP issued an independent assessment of the 2010 elections entitled “Lessons Learned from Sudan Elections Project” (Al-Alaily and Eicher, 2010). The report concluded that voter turnout, including among women, was high, that the quota system resulted in the election of a significant number of women, that the election days were generally peaceful, and that civil society groups participated actively in the process. However, a number of concerns were raised associated with the process of voter registration, the lack of transparency in the operations of the National Electoral Commission (NEC), media imbalance in favour of the ruling party, poor quality voter education, and inaccuracies in the tabulation of voting results. This combination of heavy turnout and irregularities is corroborated by local and international media which reported “chaos and confusion” (quoting a local news service Al-Rakoba, 2010). There is a specific quota for women in the assembly, called the “women’s list” which was introduced in 2008 and implemented for the first time in the 2010 parliamentary elections. One study by Sara Abbas (Abbas, 2010, The Sudanese Women's Movement and the Mobilisation for the 2008 Legislative Quota and its Aftermath. IDS Bulletin, 41: 100–108) notes the following:

> The main achievement of the quota was the extent to which it mobilized women to engage in politics, rather than the increased representation of women in parliament. The form the quota took however, has not significantly challenged political parties to put forth women candidates in core geographic constituencies, restricting them instead to separate women's lists. The need for revisiting the quota, healing divisions within the women's movement and negotiating a robust common programme in the next phase are all critical for translating numbers into positive changes in Sudanese women's lives.

The Carter Center was less optimistic about the election process, noting that overall it was “highly chaotic, non-transparent, and vulnerable to electoral manipulation” (Carter Center, 2010). Violence and intimidation was also noted by the Carter Center, particularly in South Darfur. Local media also reported violence in Red Sea and South Kordofan. The European Union’s Election Observation Mission (EU, 2010) noted the importance of the first multiparty elections in a quarter century, not least because of its contribution to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. However, it raised particular concerns about the factors that led to the withdrawal of opposition parties over voting irregularities.

Overall, most local and international media and observers report roughly the same levels of high turnout, irregularities and violence, but vary in their assessment of whether the elections should be declared fraudulent or merely suffering some errors. The Arab League, on the other hand, declared the elections successful (as noted by the local news service Al-Akhbar, 2010).
Questions were included in the questionnaire on attitudes towards the success, or lack thereof, of the elections. Survey findings are largely consistent with the findings noted above in terms of voter turnout. Almost all (95.7%) respondents had registered to vote for the 2010 election, 54.6% of those are male respondents, and 45.4% are female respondents.

When asked about disadvantages faced by women when voting, half reported that women are not disadvantaged noted by both male and female respondents), while 42% felt that women were somewhat disadvantaged (62% of whom are female respondents, and 38% of whom are male). A minority (4%) reported that women are strongly disadvantaged (split evenly among men and women). The remaining 4% were unable to answer the question. Few felt that young people were disadvantaged in voting.

Respondents were more ambivalent with regard to the extent to which people were allowed to freely express their views during election time, with only 14.7% believing that such freedom existed, and the majority (46.3%) believing that freedom of expression was only somewhat respected during election time. Again, this appeared to be consistent with findings from observer missions.

Figure 3: Quantitative Responses Regarding Freedom of Expression during Elections

Concerning the referendum, fieldwork took place before the referendum took place. While initial reports have noted that the referendum was accurate and well implemented, official reports from observer missions were not available at the time of writing this report. A press release on 17th January 2011 by the EU Observation Mission for the Southern Sudan Referendum had the following to say: “Southern Sudan Referendum voting process credible, well organized and with overwhelming participation by Southern Sudanese voters”. The African Union had a similar opinion in its “Preliminary Statement of the African Union Observer Mission on the Southern Sudan Referendum” on January 16th by saying: “In conclusion the AU Observer Mission is therefore of the view that the Referendum was organized and conducted in accordance with the CPA and the SSRC guidelines. It was also consistent with AU Guidelines on Standards for the Conduct of Democratic Elections in Africa. It is therefore the opinion of the AU Mission that Southern Sudan Referendum was free, fair and credible, and indeed a true reflection of the democratically expressed will of the people of Southern Sudan”. According to the “Statement of the League of Arab States’ Mission to Monitor the Self-Determination Referendum of Southern Sudan (Unofficial Translation)” on January 17th noted some drawbacks in the voting process, including that some voters were underage and that there was a discrepancy between the number enrolled in some centers and the number registered on the lists of the NEC. However, it stated that despite these drawbacks, the Arab League Mission confirms that they “did not affect the veracity of the process which was characterized by a high degree of transparency and integrity in line with international standards, eliciting respect for the outcomes produced by the ballot box”. The Carter Center in its press release on January 17th
described the referendum as “peaceful and credible”, while the Japan Referendum Observation Mission to Sudan released a preliminary assessment on January 18th stating the following:

...the overall referendum process was generally carried out in a free, fair, and peaceful manner without any major disturbances. It has yet to be noted that the Mission witnessed several cases where some people without a Southern Sudan Referendum Commission (SSRC)-issued identification card were present in the referendum center, and where confidentiality of voting was not sufficiently guaranteed. The Mission also observed some technical issues such as the poor circulation of the SSRC’s directions, lack of transportation for voters living in remote areas, insufficient food and water supply for the staff. Notwithstanding those cases and technical problems mentioned above, the Mission considers that they will not affect the fairness of the referendum.

Regarding the Referendum on the Status of Abyei, although it was originally planned to be conducted simultaneously with the Southern Sudan referendum, it was postponed indefinitely and has not yet been conducted.

**Outcome Indicator 3b: Change in the Level of Political Knowledge and Understanding of Political System Among Citizens Disaggregated by Gender**

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “Low level of knowledge (less than 30%) on political systems among citizens” and the target is: “Over 60% of adult citizens knowledgeable of political system”.

The UNDP contributed to enhanced political knowledge among citizens through mass media campaigns, civil and voter education programmes, and training events around the country. According to the “Lessons Learned from Sudan Elections Project” (Al-Alaily and Eicher, 2010) report, UNDP’s civic voter education component received primarily negative reviews while UNDP’s mass media campaign prior to election time was considered successful. The EU Election Observation Mission had the following to say in this regard:

“Education efforts, while worthy, were insufficient to meet the needs of an electorate unfamiliar with elections, dealing with a particularly complex electoral process” (Preliminary Statement,’ EU Election Observation Mission, p. 10).

The Arab League Observation Mission listed CVE as a shortcoming of the election, concluding that lack of knowledge and awareness of the election process by voters was evident in the ballot casting in wrong boxes (League of Arab States Observation Mission Statement, p. 2). The domestic monitoring group Tamam asserted “The NEC failed to conduct a proper voter education programme for the whole nation about the electoral process. When the Commission finally launched its education campaign, it came too little too late” (Tamam statement, point 5).

Respondents who participated in UNDP’s activities related to enhanced political knowledge were asked a series of questions about democracy and governance. Findings are broken down by male and female respondents, noting differences and similarities. When asked whether the rights and obligations of citizens in terms of democracy were well-known and understood in their community, 38% of the respondents agreed that they were somewhat well-known and understood, and 10% agreed that they were very well-known and understood, and half disagreed, with little variation across male and female respondents. Most (56%) respondents, both male and female, argued that people tended to avoid politics, perhaps due to disillusionment with the political process (discussed below). Most (71%) respondents noted an awareness of the various political parties engaged in the elections, but only 24% felt that they had a ‘great deal’ of
information in this regard, while the remaining 5% felt they did not have any awareness of this issue. When asked about their knowledge of the political system of Sudan, 41% of respondents felt they had a strong understanding.

Figure 4: Quantitative Responses Regarding Knowledge of Political Rights and Obligations

While the overwhelming majority of respondents (both male and female) have received information about voting, only 31.9% (30.3% of men and 33.8% of women) have received information explaining Sudan’s political system. Aside from UNDP trainings, the means through which most respondents received this information is through television adverts and shows (70%) while 60% of respondents (65.8% for men compared to a much lower 53.4% for women) had attended some sort of public meeting where this information was given. Just over half (55%) of the respondents stated that this information had a significant impact on their lives, with one-in-five male and female respondents stating that this information better prepared them for voting and 25-30% stating that it encouraged them to seek more knowledge on the subject.

When asked how their participation in such activities impacted their lives, impacts were associated with a desire for more information and a desire to learn more, greater political awareness and an understanding of political issues, and a perception that they could make informed choices when voting. Many reported using their training to engage in political discussions, holding for both males and females, with peer discussions most commonly mentioned, followed by some distance by discussions with family members. Only 24-25% felt they are ‘fully aware’ of the different political parties in Sudan, with the majority of respondents choosing “somewhat aware”.

Overall, there were no significant regional or gender-based variation, except gender variation where noted above.

Perhaps most striking is that only 2.8% of respondents (3.9% of men 1.5 % of women) stated that the information helped them gain higher confidence in democracy. This sentiment is supported and further explained through the results of the FGDs.

Government officials raised concerns that, while the elections yielded a process of external review of one aspect of the democratic process (including consideration of the period leading up to the elections), there were no mechanisms to establish over time whether political knowledge and understanding of rights and obligations
had improved. Concerns were noted regarding the continuance of armed conflicts in some parts of the country, an almost total absence of political awareness raising activities aside from information about the elections themselves, and structural constraints related to lack of communications and physical infrastructure, low education status, and high levels of poverty. These problems were felt by the interviewed officials to persist, but many noted that the situation was improving slowly based on momentum from the 2010 election process and the strengthening of local authorities.

Some raised concerns that the emphasis had largely been on voter education because of the overwhelming needs associated with the election, and that there had been less of a focus on civil education that would support institutional and systems strengthening for the long-term. There were some activities that had the potential to set the groundwork for future success, notably programme activities associated with the political party strengthening, including focusing on developmental objectives and how these could be attained and strengthening the role of women in political parties, but by in large the focus was on the 2010 elections.

Virtually all focus group discussion participants reported having received information on political matters, including specific information on the elections, voter registration and how to vote, as well as information on the political party system in Sudan and the various political parties who were registered for election. Participants noted exposure to this information through a variety of media. Quantitative survey respondents who had been reached by UNDP training on political matters noted that this has covered voting itself, as well as more general information on elections and the referendum. Less commonly mentioned, by less than half the respondents, was education about political parties, and one-third noted ‘Sudan’s political system’. Findings did not vary across males and females.

Despite relatively high levels of exposure and, as noted above, high levels of voter turnout, the majority of focus group discussion participants noted a disillusionment with the political process and the absence of any ‘real opposition’, with one party effectively holding all power. As a result of this disillusionment, only a minority of FGD participants had any hope for real change. This disillusionment also came through when FGD participants were asked about the effectiveness of the multi-party system vis-a-vis the government in power. There was some concern about the sincerity of some of the newer political parties, while others noted a concern about government’s intentions towards multi-party democracy overall.

Respondents in South Kordofan and the three states in Darfur all noted a frustration with politics and its ineffectiveness in being able to prevent conflict, but reported themselves as actively interested in current political changes, with the hope that this would be able to help resolve problems in their areas.

One area where there was general agreement was that women’s involvement in political activities had improved in recent years. However, this only referred to voting, with involvement as candidates, as organizers, and as activists still felt to be limited. The number of young people who came out to vote was also noted to be high, with FGD participants noting that there was an air of optimism in terms of youth involvement in future.

In terms of UNDP’s activities in supporting political awareness, most of the FGD participants argued that UNDP’s involvement was important in helping ensure that people voted, holding for most states except for parts of West Darfur, where there were numerous suspicions about UNDP’s activities and intent. A few volunteered that, with the support of agencies including UNDP, Sudan would be in a position to hold elections in future with less external support.

Finally, while respondents indicated a general satisfaction with the trainings they have received from UNDP in increasing their political knowledge, 47% believe that the content of these trainings can be improved, while 43% believe that the frequency of these trainings should be increased. Other suggestions for improvement include a stronger focus on citizen rights and responsibilities, including a more diverse range of people in such activities, and more diligent support for political parties and CSOs.
Outcome Indicator 3c: Level of Public Confidence in Media, Political Parties and Other Civil Society Leaders in Holding Government Accountable

Government interviewees argued that the media in Sudan was both ‘strong and free’, and continued to improve. However, assessments of the 2010 elections specifically note a bias towards the ruling party during the election period. Practical constraints were noted as low levels of literacy, poor communications infrastructure, lack of internet penetration outside of urban areas, self-censorship, a difficult legal environment, weak technical capacities, and restricted independent financial resources. Opportunities were noted in particular related to increased civil society activity in recent years, the advent of opposition parties operating in the open, and institutional strengthening related to legislative bodies, state and non-state media, and non-state actors. Key informants for all nine states argued that the strengthening of institutions involved in governance was a specific objective of each state’s plans.

Responses by those who were interviewed using the citizens questionnaire reflected this mixture of concern and optimism. Respondents noted high levels of media exposure, particularly via television and radio, and the majority felt that local media was providing useful information on events in Sudan, but many of these respondents felt that this did not yet mean that government was more accountable as a result.

Regarding confidence in media, only 25% of respondents stated that they strongly believe that citizens can depend on the media to obtain impartial information, while 41% chose “somewhat” and 32% disagreed. Attention needed to be focused on media content in terms of quality and the issues the media was willing to discuss openly, and the means of dissemination of media content needed particular attention. Regarding the role media plays in holding government accountable, only 14% of respondents “strongly agree” that media increases government accountability, while 21% “somewhat agree”.

Responses were mixed when asked whether opposition parties could help ensure government accountability, with half the respondents agreeing and half disagreeing. 54% of respondents strongly agree, and 25% somewhat agree, that political parties contribute to increasing government accountability.
Regarding civil society, responses tended towards low confidence in its ability to hold government accountable. Three-quarters felt that, at this juncture, civil society was not able to hold government to accountable.

Figure 6: Quantitative Responses Regarding Confidence in Civil Society
Discussion of Indicators

Current Outcome Indicator

Outcome Indicator 3a is ‘elections conducted and deemed free and fair by domestic and international observers; referendum conducted as per [the Comprehensive Peace Accords] CPA”.

Outcome Indicator 3b is “change in the level of political knowledge and understanding of political system among citizens disaggregated by gender”.

Outcome Indicator 3c is “level of public confidence in media, political parties and other civil society leaders in holding government accountable”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicators

- **Utility**: How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality**: How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes recommended for Outcome Indicator 3a.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes recommended for Outcome Indicator 3b.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes recommended for Outcome Indicator 3c.

Current Output Indicators

Output Indicator 3.1a is “number of national/sub-national legislative assemblies with capacities strengthened for standard parliamentary procedures and oversight functions”.

Output Indicator 3.1b is “comprehensive civil and voter education programme developed and implemented”.

Output Indicator 3.2a is “number of national/sub-national legislative assemblies with capacities strengthened for standard parliamentary procedures and oversight functions”.

Output Indicator 3.3a is “number of diverse geographical and/or constituencies based political parties prepared (strategic planning, organizational development strategy, and institutional infrastructure completed) to participate in democratic elections disaggregated by region”.

Output Indicator 3.3b is the “percent of supported media entities regularly reporting on electoral processes and percent of supported governance-related CSOs engaged in civil and voter education”

Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicators

- **Utility**: How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality**: How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Functionality:** For Output Indicator 3.1a, consider adding a denominator of the total desired number of institutions supported.
**Utility**: If functionality recommendations are taken into consideration for 3.1.a, no utility problems are expected to arise.

**Utility and Functionality**: For Output Indicator 3.1b, no changes recommended.

**Functionality**: For Output Indicator 3.2a, consider adding a denominator for the total number of entities in need of such support.

**Utility**: If functionality recommendations are taken into consideration for 3.2a, no utility problems are expected to arise.

**Utility and Functionality**: For Output Indicator 3.3a, no changes recommended.

**Utility**: For Output Indicator 3.3b, the indicator should be revised focusing specifically on the percentage of supported governance-related CSOs engaged in civic and voter education. Ideally the denominator would be the percentage of supported CSOs and the numerator the percentage engaged in civic and voter education.

**Utility**: A separate sub-indicator should be considered to measure the extent of civic and voter education activities.

**Functionality**: If utility recommendations are taken into consideration for 3.3b, no utility problems are expected to arise.
### Section 5: Outcome 4 - Capacity Enhancement of Local Government

#### Table 5: Values of Indicators under Outcome 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity Enhancement of Local Government</td>
<td>Output 4.1: Capacities developed of regional state and local governments to plan, budget and manage expenditure, accelerating progress towards the MDGs</td>
<td>Output Indicator 4.1a: Number of states empowered to complete and implement locality strategic plans and urban management policies/frameworks</td>
<td>CPAP Target: 2009: 3 states with locality plans prepared through technical advisory support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: 13 states with 5 year completed state level strategic plans provided with technical advisory support</td>
<td>2010: 6 states (cumulative) 2011: 8 states (cumulative) 2012: 12 states (cumulative) Current Value: 1 state: Red Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 4a:</strong> Percentage of Citizens Satisfied With Local Public Services in the Target Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> To be defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> At least 60% of citizens in target areas satisfied with public services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> 56% rated their satisfaction with public services as ‘average’ while 28% rated it as ‘poor’, 15% rated it as ‘high’ and only 1.5% rated it as ‘very high’. Overall, only 16.5% rated satisfaction as high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 4b:</strong> Number of Laws Which Seek to Devolve Power Being Implemented by the Central Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> To be defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> Trend should be increasing and observable though at a slow pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> 1 law: the Local Governance Law (it is not certain whether any bills have been drawn up but have yet to be passed into law, nor is the extent to which the law passed has influenced the role of local government)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.2:</strong> Dialogue established between federal and state levels of government regarding the implementation of the Interim National Constitution’s provisions relating to decentralisation</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 4.2a:</strong> Level of satisfaction of state-level officials in relation to their participation in the process</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None <strong>Current Value:</strong> 35% of the interviewees responded that they are highly satisfied with their participation. 50% responded that they are somewhat satisfied, and 15% indicated that they are not yet satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.3:</strong> State strategic plans and budgets adopted and implemented with a focus on promoting socio-economic development at local level</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 4.3a:</strong> Level of expenditure by State targeted towards education and health</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None <strong>Current Value:</strong> 4% for health, data not available for education (2006 data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 4 is “national/sub-national/state/local levels of governance expand their capacities to manage equitable delivery of public services”. Measurement of the outcome is via Outcome Indicator 4a “percentage of citizens satisfied with local public services in target areas”, and Outcome Indicator 4b “number and percent of laws which seek to devolve power being implemented by the central government”.

Output 4.1 is “capacities developed of regional state and local governments to plan, budget and manage expenditure, accelerating progress towards the MDGs”. Output Indicator 4.1a is the “number of states empowered to complete and implement locality strategic plans and urban management policies/frameworks”.

Output 4.2 is “dialogue established between federal and state levels of government regarding the implementation of the Interim National Constitution’s provisions relating to decentralization”. Output Indicator 4.2a is “level of satisfaction of state-level officials in relation to their participation in the process”.

---
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Output 4.3 is “state strategic plans and budgets adopted and implemented with a focus on promoting socio-economic development at local level”. Output Indicator 4.3a is “level of expenditure by state targeted towards education and health”.

**Outcome Indicator 4a: Percentage of Citizens Satisfied With Local Public Services in the Target Areas**

The CPAP does not provide a baseline value for this indicator. The target is “at least 60% of citizens in target areas satisfied with public services”.

Respondents living in locations where UNDP’s capacity-building activities for local government were implemented were asked a series of questions about their satisfaction with local public services. Respondents were asked primarily about healthcare, education, and infrastructure, and most respondents indicated that they use these services on a daily basis. Respondents were asked about accessibility, reliability, affordability, transparency of related information, quality equitability, and overall satisfaction.

When asked about the reliability of the service, the majority of respondents (87%) described the services as somewhat reliable, while only 7% chose “excellent” and a 6.5% chose “not reliable”.

When asked about the affordability of the services, 41% responded that the services were ‘free of charge’ and 36% responded that they were ‘affordable. Almost one-quarter (23%) of respondents indicated that they faced difficulty in affording the services and 24% described the services as ‘overpriced’, while 33% described them as ‘reasonably priced’ and 30% noted that the services were ‘accessible to everyone’. Only 2.5% stated that they have to pay extra tips to the staff ‘every time’ they want to access the service, while 23% said they ‘sometimes’ have to pay extra tips. Three-quarters (75%) of respondents stated that they never had to pay tips.

Three-quarters (76%) indicated that information about how to access the service is ‘available and transparent to all users’ while 12% described such information as only available to ‘privileged or well-connected users’ and 12% described it as ‘not available and not transparent’.

Regarding quality of the service, only 14% described it as ‘excellent’ while 34% described it as ‘very good’, 41% indicated that the service quality is ‘good’ and meets their expectations of public services, and 11% described it as ‘poor’.

Over two-thirds (70%) of respondents said there was a means for users to file complaints against service-providers, and that most users are aware of the way to file a complaint.

However, 63% of respondents stated that accessibility to these services has increased over the past two years due in large part to the government (87%). But only 7% described the response to complaints as ‘excellent’ and 16% as ‘good’. When asked about local government responsiveness to service requests, only 5% chose ‘very responsive’ while 32% chose ‘somewhat responsive’ and 44% chose ‘not very responsive’. When asked about local government responsiveness to complaints about service quality, responses were similar. Only 3.5% chose ‘very responsive’ while 21% chose ‘somewhat responsive’ and 45% chose ‘not very responsive’. When asked specifically about responsiveness to complaints about government employees, 33.2% chose ‘not very responsive’ and 24% chose ‘not at all responsive’, while 21% chose ‘somewhat responsive’.
When asked about the fairness and equitability of service delivery, 9.5% responded that service-deliverers are biased towards men, 11.1% said they were biased towards women, and 67.3% said men and women have equal access. One-third (34.7%) said service-deliverers are biased towards the rich/privileged, while 50% said the rich and poor have equal access. 43% said that poor neighbourhoods have less access to services than wealthier ones, while 38% said that poor and non-poor neighbourhoods have equal access. 66% responded that there was no age-based bias.

As for overall satisfaction, 56% rated their satisfaction as ‘average’ while 28% rated it as ‘poor’, 15% rated it as ‘high’ and only 1.5% rated it as ‘very high’.

Figure 7: Quantitative Responses Regarding Satisfaction with Local Services

In focus group discussions, almost all groups highlighted improved health care as the most urgent service needing expansion and improvement. A few groups noted that access to health insurance had meant that access had improved because cost was not such a barrier, but that distance remained a key concern. Nevertheless, the majority felt that nothing had changed in years. Education was also noted, with the problem more one of quality instead of access. According to the World Health Statistics report (World Health Organization, 2010), government expenditure on health averaged around 4% of Gross Domestic Product across years up to 2006 (the last year of data availability).
Outcome Indicator 4b: Number of Laws Which Seek to Devolve Power Being Implemented by the Central Government

The CPAP does not provide a baseline for this indicator, and for the target gives the following statement: “Trend should be increasing and observable though at a slow pace”.

Based on interviews with government officials in the central government in Khartoum, the current number of laws related to decentralization currently being implemented is one law called the “Local Governance Law”. Key informants also mention that based on the national constitution, State governments have the authority to decide about administrative setup and processes according to their specific circumstances. Ministries have also been set up in the States to assist in local governance and local development.

Interviewees indicate that the contribution of UNDP in this area has been major, especially related to training and capacity-building of local government.

Discussion of Indicators

Current Outcome Indicator

Outcome Indicator 4a is the “percentage of citizens satisfied with local public services in target areas”.

Outcome Indicator 4b is the “number and percent of laws which seek to devolve power being implemented by the central government”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicators

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility and Functionality:** For Outcome Indicator 4a, the grouping together of various services means that the indicator measures a variety of services, some of which are supported by UNDP and some of which are not. It also means the assessment of a basket of services where attitudes may be quite negative in some cases and positive in others. It is recommended that the types of services supported be specified as part of the indicator.

**Utility and Functionality:** For Outcome Indicator 4b, it is recommended that specific areas of devolution be specified as part of the indicator, and that this be tracked. The indicator would therefore not be the number of laws, but rather the development of specific bills and their passage into law. As outcome measures, passage of the laws is only part of what needs to be measured. The indicator, or a sub-indicator, should therefore focus on implementation progress.

Current Output Indicators

Output Indicator 4.1a is the “number of states empowered to complete and implement locality strategic plans and urban management policies/frameworks”.

Output Indicator 4.2a is “level of satisfaction of state-level officials in relation to their participation in the process”.

Output Indicator 4.3a is the “level of expenditure by state targeted towards education and health”.
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Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicators

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility:** The current Output Indicator 4.1a extends beyond output measures to use of outputs, but this is not inherently a problem, other than it requires greater effort to measure.

**Functionality:** If 4.1a is retained, it will need to separate out state-level and sub-state-level factors, as the current indicator has both.

**Utility:** If the Client wishes to measure to the ‘use of outputs’ level, the distribution of expenditure across basic education and primary health care versus higher education and curative services, respectively, should also be considered.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes recommended for Output Indicator 4.2a.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes recommended for Output Indicator 4.3a.
Section 6: Outcome 5 - Access to Justice and Rule of Law

Table 6: Values of Indicators under Outcome 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Access to Justice and Rule of Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 5.a:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Citizens who know how to Access Justice Systems and/or Respond that they have Confidence in the Rule of Law Institutions to Provide Effective and Quality Services</td>
<td>Output 5.1: Capacities strengthened of Rule of Law institutions</td>
<td>CPAP Target: 2009 - 2012: Training and operational, planning and infrastructure support provided to 4 prisons, 4 police stations annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to measure quantitatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of knowledge (less than 30%) among citizens on access to justice systems and confidence in rule of law institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50% of citizens know how to access justice systems; At least 60% of surveyed individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: 43% aware of how to access government justice systems 19% report easy access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence: 46% respond that they have high confidence. 29% respond that they have medium confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 5.b:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion/Percentage of Citizens indicating confidence in fair treatment if arrested, or if they file a complaint with the local law and order institutions (e.g., Police/Courts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80% report crime has decreased 48% report crime still a problem 32% describe crime “very high”/“high”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 5.1 b:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of crimes decreased in IDP camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 5.1 c:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% decrease in the backlog of court cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 5.1 d:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of prisons at state level applying standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners (Personal Hygiene)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to measure due to lack of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Outcome</td>
<td>Expected Outputs</td>
<td>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</td>
<td>Values (Output Indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 5.1.e:</strong></td>
<td>Increase in level of confidence of local communities in police disaggregated by gender and region</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> Fairness: 21% high confidence, 22% medium confidence, 43% low confidence, 14% no confidence Competence: 30% high confidence, 39% medium confidence, 19% low confidence, 12% no confidence Responsiveness: 26% very responsive, 38% somewhat responsive, 36% not responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output SP Indicator 5.1.f:</strong></td>
<td>Number of Courts Rehabilitated and Equipped</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output SP Indicator 5.1.g:</strong></td>
<td>Number of Community Police Posts Established</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 5.2 Access to justice, particularly for vulnerable groups, improved</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 5.2.a:</strong></td>
<td>Number of functioning JCCs Disaggregated by Region</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: 3 additional JCCs fully functional; and case tracking pilot in 6 JCCs 2010: Case tracking system piloted in 8 JCCs; annual access to justice report produced 2011: Case tracking system established in 11 JCCs; annual report produced 2012: Annual case tracking report produced in all supported JCCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output SP Indicator 5.2.b:</strong></td>
<td>Increase of number of cases presented to JCCs disaggregated by Region</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output SP Indicator 5.2.c:</strong></td>
<td>Number of Legal Aid Centres Providing Services to Communities in IDP Camps</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Current Value:</strong> 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 5 is “rights upheld and protected through accountable, accessible and equitable Rule of Law institutions”. Measurement of the outcome is via Outcome Indicator 5a “percentage of citizens who know how to access justice systems and/or respond that they have confidence in the rule of law institutions to provide effective and quality services disaggregated by gender and age”. Outcome Indicator 5b is the “proportion/percentage of citizens indicating fair treatment if arrested, or if they file a complaint with the local law and order institutions (e.g., police/courts).”

Output 5.1 is “capacities strengthened of Rule of Law institutions”. Output Indicator 5.1a is “rule of law institutions assisted to provide quality legal services to population through infrastructural support and strategic and operational planning”. Output Indicator 5.1b is “level of crimes decreased in IDP camps”. Output Indicator 5.1c is “percent decrease in the backlog of court cases”. Output Indicator 5.1d is “number of prisons at state level applying Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of prisoners (personal hygiene)”. Output Indicator 5.1e is “increase in level of confidence of local communities in police disaggregated by state and gender”.

This particular outcome has a strong regional focus. Thus, the findings for most indicators will be disaggregated per the three regions included in the study: Eastern Sudan (comprising Kassala, Red Sea and Ghedaref), the Three Protocol Areas (comprising South Kordofan, Abyei, and Blue Nile and Darfur (although only West and North Darfur were included in the fieldwork). Findings are preceded with an introduction to the situation of justice and rule of law in each region.

**Eastern Sudan**

According to the UNDP Sudan Mid-Year SP Progress Report (1 January – 30 June) (UNDP, 2010), notes that Eastern Sudan, particularly Kassala state, is inhabited by a diverse range of ethnicities such as the Rashaida, Arab and Nubian tribes. It also hosts a large number of refugees from Eritrea and Ethiopia as well as IDPs from across Sudan. This complex environment coupled with the limited capacity of justice and law institutions is said to pose several challenges to the ability of such institutions to protect people’s rights. The poverty rate is said to be over 80% according to the State Ministry of Social Welfare, and it has faced several natural disasters as well as civil conflicts. After years of conflict the Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement (ESPA) was signed in 2006 by the GoNU and the Eastern Front. However, several challenges remain including the lack of people’s knowledge of their rights, the limited capacities of institutions, and the ubiquitous exclusion of women from the process.

**Three Protocol Areas**

Like Eastern Sudan, justice and rule of law institutions in South Kordofan, Abyei, and Blue Nile have been severely compromised due to decades of war and conflict. Operational and institutional capacities are very limited, both among formal and traditional justice and conflict-resolution mechanisms. This is further exacerbated by the widespread presence of arms and continued low-intensity conflicts in some areas. Justice and rule of law institutions also suffer from a bad relationship with the people over several years, which has resulted in a stigma against them.

**Darfur States**

The Darfur states have long suffered from conflicts over natural resources as well as droughts and desertification. This has resulted in violent conflicts between nomads and farmers, often along ethnic lines. These ongoing conflicts coupled with poverty, underdevelopment, and weakness in local institutions has led to an erosion in the capacities of justice and rule of law mechanisms, both formal and traditional.

**Outcome Indicator 5a: Percentage of Citizens who know how to Access Justice Systems and/or Respond that they have Confidence in the Rule of Law Institutions to Provide Effective and Quality Services Disaggregated by Gender and Age**

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “Low level of knowledge (less than 30%) among citizens on access to justice systems and confidence in rule of law institutions” and the target is: “Over 50% of citizens know how to access justice systems; At least 60% of surveyed individuals”.

This indicator is comprised of two components: citizen knowledge of, and access to, justice systems, and citizen confidence in rule of law institutions to provide effective and quality services. Findings are disaggregated by gender and age.

Through the “citizens questionnaire” people who had received training through UNDP on justice-related issues were randomly selected to answer relevant questions. Half of the respondents were male and half female.
Citizen Knowledge of/Access to Justice Systems

Of the quantitative respondents, 70% stated that they are aware of government systems of justice that exist in their area, but only 43% described themselves as completely aware of how to access those systems; while 91% were aware of traditional justice mechanisms and all reported a complete awareness of how to access them. Over half (57%) of the quantitative respondents noted that they had discussed issues related to accessing justice systems with their peers or family members, while 9% had discussed these issues with local religious authorities and 3% had discussed such issues with local government officials. There was no significant variation across sex or age.

While most noted that the services were proximate, only 19% responded that the service is easy to access, while 73% responded that accessing the service is ‘somewhat hard’, but only 6.2% described accessing the service as ‘very hard’. Among women, 18% responded that service is easy to access, while the majority (76%) responded that it is ‘somewhat hard’; only 5.5% described accessing the service as ‘very hard’. A similar distribution is seen among youth respondents, with 20% responding that accessing the service is ‘easy’, while 75% described access as ‘somewhat hard’ and 4% chose ‘very hard’.

Figure 7: Quantitative Responses Regarding Access to Justice Systems

Over half (56.1%) of total respondents had never accessed justice-related services while 42.1% had themselves had directly accessed such services with very similar responses among women and youth. Of those who had accessed such services, 20% said they were satisfied with the service they received, while 35% said they were somewhat satisfied, and 45% said they were not at all satisfied. Over two-thirds (69%) of respondents said that they knew of local NGOs that provided legal advice, but 64% described this service as ‘somewhat hard’ to access, and 57% had themselves accessed such services or someone in their household had.

Quantitative responses are corroborated by results of the focus group discussions in which interviewees were asked about access to justice services. Most of the participants described government systems of justice as fairly easy to access. However, there was a difference in this regard between residents of urban and rural areas, as well as within rural areas themselves. This difference stemmed from the distance between the community and the service unit, as some respondents mentioned that they had to travel a distance to access such services. However, even those participants that had to travel a distance to access these services said that access itself is not difficult, especially since they consider the domestic informal justice councils as part of the system. According to the participants, these councils are capable of solving a significant part of daily life conflicts.
Citizen Confidence in Rule of Law Institutions to provide effective and quality services

There was a high level of confidence in how the system of justice functioned in their area, with almost half of the respondents indicating that they had ‘high confidence’ in the system, with similar percentages among women, and youth. When asked about their confidence in the ability of local rule of law institutions to fairly and equitably protect people’s rights, 46% stated that they had ‘high confidence’, while 40% of women and 43% of youth reported the same. The percentage of total respondents that reported ‘medium confidence’ is 29%, with similar percentages among women and youth. 16% of total respondents reported ‘low confidence’, with 18% of women and 20% of youth reporting the same. 3.5% reported ‘no confidence’ with men showing the highest percentage, as only 1.8% of women and 2.2% of youth reported the same.

There was some concern expressed about the extent to which women are disadvantaged in terms of fair access to justice, with half of the respondents who answered the question (55%) indicating that women were ‘somewhat’ or ‘considerably’ disadvantaged. Among women, 24% reported that women are disadvantaged “a great deal” in terms of access to justice, 35% reported that women are ‘somewhat’ disadvantaged, and 25% reported that they are ‘not at all disadvantaged’.

As for possible disadvantages faced by youth, 20% of the respondents chose ‘a great deal’ and 11% chose ‘somewhat’. Among youth, 25% reported that youth are ‘a great deal’ disadvantaged, 20% reported they are ‘somewhat disadvantaged’, and 41% reported that they are ‘not at all disadvantaged’.

Respondents were less able to comment on the effectiveness of non-governmental organisations providing legal services in the area, but of the 60% who indicated that they were aware of such services in their area, almost all of them rated the services as having a positive impact. When asked about whether legal advice had had positive impacts on protecting people’s rights, most of the respondents argued that the impacts were positive. Regarding non-governmental agencies offering legal advice, only 15% of respondents reported a very positive impact of such services on their lives, while 49% reported a somewhat positive impact. Almost one-in-five (18%) reported a very positive impact on protecting people’s rights, while 40% reported a ‘somewhat positive’ impact.
FGD participants noted that, in most cases, justice systems comprised local systems of justice involving local and religious authorities, although some also noted that non-governmental organisations provided relevant support as did Women’s Juristic Support Organisations, especially in urban areas. Access was not felt to be a problem, indeed three-quarters of the quantitative respondents had at least one household member who has accessed these services at least once. In over two-thirds of all cases, non-state actors were noted as being available to provide these services, presumably in many cases religious authorities that most felt were relatively easy to access. FGD participants highlighted a high level of satisfaction with the functioning of these local legal services, and a perception that, in most cases, all parties were treated fairly.

A point made by many FGD participants is that they trust the fairness and equitability of justice systems with one key exception: political issues. Interviewees indicated that in any political issues the justice systems almost uniformly side with the government whether directly or indirectly, regardless of the details of the case at hand. One group in West Darfur adopted a similar but slightly more cautious attitude. They trust the justice system, therefore, only if the power of the conflicting parties is somewhat equal and if the other party does not involve a government official or institution.

At state level, key informants noted that resources had been allocated towards improving access to justice, including civil society support, and that the resources devoted to this purpose were increasing over time, but that these resources remained inadequate for the task at hand.

Regarding the relative importance of UNDP support, the support was felt by those directly reached with legal support interventions to have been specifically important in terms of their own capacity enhancement. When asked whether the UNDP intervention could be improved, 80% of respondents answered yes, and almost all respondents identified the content of the trainings as a potential area of improvement, as well as a larger focus on youth as they are the future.

**Outcome Indicator 5b: Proportion/Percentage of Citizens Indicating Confidence in Fair Treatment if Arrested, or if they File a Complaint with the Local Law and Order Institutions (e.g., Police/Courts)**

Most of the quantitative respondents had moderate to low levels of confidence in fair and equitable treatment by local police officers in their community; this finding is consistent with FGD findings. Among all respondents, 16% indicated high confidence that they would receive fair treatment if arrested or when filing a complaint, while 36.4% reported moderate confidence, 47.6% reported low confidence. Responses among women and youth are similar. Almost one-in-five (18%) of women reported high confidence, while 40% reported moderate confidence, and 42% reported low confidence. Among youth, 15% reported high confidence, 32% reported moderate confidence, and 53% reported low confidence.
FGD participants noted that, while local law and order institutions in many locations were felt to be helpful, in some areas capacity remained limited. In some remote areas, particularly in Darfur and South Kordofan, there was particular concern that police were not effective in places where ‘illegal armed groups’ were active and often impact the fairness of local law and order institutions. Interviewees noted that they were confident that local law and order institutions were “doing their best” in their ability to keep the community safe with their limited resources, but were more cautious in their responses about fairness. Almost all participants had had some experience or interaction with such institutions, and many reported a positive experience. However, almost all participants agreed that fairness only exists when the crime is apolitical. But when the crime is political the police automatically takes the side of the government. One participant also pointed out that many police officers are biased to certain races/ethnicities, especially Arab officers from the North when dealing with Southerners.

Discussion of Indicators

Current Outcome Indicator

Outcome Indicator 5a is “percentage of citizens who know how to access justice systems and/or respond that they have confidence in the rule of law institutions to provide effective and quality services disaggregated by gender and age”.

Outcome Indicator 5b is the “proportion/percentage of citizens indicating confidence in fair treatment if arrested, or if they file a complaint with the local law and order institutions (e.g., police/courts).”

Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicators

- **Utility**: How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality**: How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility and Functionality**: No changes recommended for Outcome Indicator 5a.
Functionality: For Outcome Indicator 5b, it is recommended that either the first and second parts of the indicator be separated and measured separately, or only retain the first half (‘proportion/percentage of citizens indicating confidence in fair treatment if arrested’). The first half of the indicator should be sensitive to change.

Utility: For the second part of the indicator, if retained and separated, it may be best to consider whether complaints are filed at all, and monitor trends in this regard.

Current Output Indicators

Output Indicator 5.1a is “rule of law institutions assisted to provide quality legal services to population through infrastructural support and strategic and operational planning”.

Output Indicator 5.1b is “level of crimes decreased in IDP camps”.

Output Indicator 5.1c is “percent decrease in the backlog of court cases”.

Output Indicator 5.1d is “number of prisons at state level applying Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of prisoners (personal hygiene)”.

Output Indicator 5.1e is “increase in level of confidence of local communities in police disaggregated by state and gender”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicators

- **Utility**: How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality**: How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility and Functionality**: No changes recommended for Output Indicator 5.1.a.

**Utility and Functionality**: No changes recommended for Output Indicator 5.1.b.

Functionality: For Output Indicator 5.1.c, the current indicator should be retained, but the absolute value of the denominator also considered to establish levels of court cases.

Utility: If functionality recommendations are taken into consideration for 5.1.c, no functionality problems are expected to arise.

Utility: It is recommended that Output Indicator 5.1.d either specifically measure the adoption of and use of personal hygiene standards, or it should be broadened to accommodate other inputs.

Functionality: If utility recommendations are taken into consideration for 5.1.d, no functionality problems are expected to arise.
Section 7: Outcome 6 - Natural Resources Conflict Reduction

Table 7: Values of Indicators under Outcome 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Strengthened capacity of national, sub-national, state and local institutions and communities to manage the environment and natural disasters to reduce conflict over natural resources</td>
<td>Output 6.1: National and sub-national, state and local institutions and communities capacities for effective environment and natural disaster management</td>
<td>Output Indicator 6.1.a: Natural resource management system for disaster, risk and conflict reduction available and operational.</td>
<td>CPAP Target: 2009: Capacity needs assessment and training of government institutions involved in disaster risk management (management, monitoring, planning for effective oversight functions, infrastructural and equipment) conducted. 2010: Roles, mandate and functions of the various ministries and institutions involved in disaster risk management clearly defined and appropriate. 2011: Disaster risk reduction integrated into the national and targeted at-risk states strategic planning and budgeting processes. 2012: Integrated disaster risk management plans at national and targeted at-risk states developed, approved and mainstreamed into the strategic planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: Natural resource management, and disaster risk reduction and management systems are relatively weak and need strengthening; Inadequate of equitable access to resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Value: 2 of the 9 states note improvements in risk mapping over the past two years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 6.2: Socio-economic threat and risk mapping and analysis conducted by state governments to reduce conflict through prioritized planning and spending</td>
<td>Output Indicator 6.2.a: Number of states covered with threat/risk mapping assessments.</td>
<td>CPAP Target: 2009: 9 states in the North. 2010: 9 states in the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: 6 states (North) covered with threat and risk mapping assessments.</td>
<td>Current Value: 5 states in the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output Indicator 6.2.b: Number of states integrating social threat/risk mapping recommendations endorsed, implemented and analysis used in planning and decision making</td>
<td>CPAP Target: 2009: At least 50% of the states covered with threat/risk mapping integrating analysis in planning and decision-making. 2010: At least 90% of the states covered with threat/risk mapping integrating analysis in planning and decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: 0 threats and risks identified and integrated into state analysis and planning</td>
<td>Current Value: 3 states.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 6 is “strengthened capacity of national, sub-national, state and local institutions and communities to manage the environment and natural disasters to reduce conflict over natural resources”. Outcome Indicator 6a is “change in government commitments and resource allocations for the environment and natural disaster management”.

Output 6.1 is “national and sub-national, state and local institutions and communities capacities for effective environmental governance, natural resource management, conflict and disaster risk reduction enhanced”, with the Output Indicator 6.1a comprising “natural resource management system for disaster, risk and conflict reduction available and operational”.

Output 6.2 is “socio-economic threat and risk mapping and analysis conducted by state governments to reduce conflict through prioritized planning and spending”, with Output Indicator 6.2a being the “number of states covered with threat/risk mapping assessments”, Output Indicator 6.2b being the “number of states integrating social threat/risk mapping recommendations endorsed, implemented and analysis used in planning and decision-making”.

**Outcome Indicator 6a: Change in Government Commitments and Resource Allocations for the Environmental and Natural Disaster Management**

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “National environmental plans and strategies are not adequately integrated and implemented due to inadequate resources and awareness”. The target is: “Sufficient, timely resources allocated and environmental and natural disasters mainstreamed into national planning with observable increase in resource allocation”.

This indicator looks at two things: government commitment to environmental & natural disaster management, and government resource allocation towards this goal. For the former we have look at the national laws and regulations committed to by the government, drawn from secondary data. For the latter we asked officials from central and state governments about the resources available to them in this regard.

**Government Commitment at National and State Levels**
At the national level, the response to environmental issues in Sudan is governed by the 2001 Government of Sudan’s Environmental Framework Act. The most recent UNEP environmental assessment of Sudan (UNEP, 2007) noted that the Act had “… many deficiencies: it is obsolete, incomplete and unclear in parts, and as a result, difficult to enforce”. As a result the Act is under review, and UNEP noted that the Act needed considerable deepening and clarity. The Sudan Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment (UNEP, 2007: 306) had the following to say about the Act:

GONU officials are already aware of the deficiencies in the existing legislation and are starting to work on a revision of the Environmental Framework Act of 2001. This work needs to be strongly supported and followed through with a substantive programme of legislative development that tackles underlying details, such as the provision of statutory guidance and integration into different economic sectors, like industry and agriculture.

By 2009, the GoNU had adopted a number of environmental policies/strategies, most importantly the National Management Plan for Environment and the National Adaptation Plan of Action (Sudan MDG Report, 2010).

A National Information Centre for Early Warning on Natural Resource Conflicts has been established, and UNDP was noted as having been involved in the development of early warning systems to support this Centre’s work. UNDP is assisting with the finalisation of the South Kordofan Natural Resources Management Council which will be mandated to co-ordinate the state’s drylands management, with the Council expected to be launched in early 2011. UNDP also supported a process of capacity development associated with the Clean Development Mechanism and the Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, with carbon trading expected to start in 2011.

UNDP also initiated a capacity development initiative, targeting both public and private sectors, for accessing the carbon market such as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and Reduction of Emission form Deforestations and forest degradation (REDD). Three Project Idea Notes are under finalization intended to be submitted for interested carbon buyers.

Interviewees from central government described UNDP’s contribution in this area as somewhat significant along with other significant contributions from other actors. Interviewees singled out the development of early warning systems as among the most effective contributions of UNDP in this area.

At the state level, with the 2005 National Constitution, states were enabled to resolve natural resource disputes and initiate a process of natural resource management designed to lessen conflicts. In 2005 Red Sea State was the only state to develop a State Environmental Law, but other Northern States were following by formalising their own state-level environmental laws, as they all have a legal mandate for natural resource management that extends beyond their current capacities (UNEP, 2007). Government capacities are particularly limited when it comes to financing, staff capacity-building, and development of legislation, especially at state level. According to the 2010 Sudan MDG report, by 2009 a number of state level environmental units and councils had been established to oversee environmental management issues.

With support form the UNDP Dryland Center, UNDP is assisting in the establishment of the South Kordofan Natural Resources Management Council which will be mandated with coordination of the state’s dryland management. The state is currently finalising discussions around its structure and mandate. Official launching of the council is expected by early 2011.

Key informants tended to regard UNDP’s involvement as significant in terms of capacity development, the strengthening of information systems, and awareness raising.
Many activities have also taken place at the national and state levels. At the national level, the National Information Center for Early Warning on Natural Resources Conflicts has been established. According to state government officials that were interviewed, three of the eight states included in this study (Ghedaref, North Darfur, South Kordofan) currently have an administrative structure for environmental and disaster management and crisis prevention, with an additional state (Red Sea) currently establishing such a structure, but is yet to set a budget for it.

Based on progress reports for the Crisis/Risk Mapping Assessment project (CRMA) as well as interviews with state government officials in the eight states, threat/risk mapping activities have taken place in South Kordofan (Abyei), Blue Nile, Kassala, Ghedaref, and Red Sea. But the degree of progress varies across states (see Annex F for more information). In the Darfur states, basic information has been collected but information indicates that the maps have not been produced. However, a threat/risk mapping specific to the nomadic community has been conducted and finalized for the three Darfur states.

Only two of the nine states noted that risk mapping had improved in the past two years. Some of the challenges noted by interviewees include the lack of an effective management information system that can provide the necessary data to carry out such mapping activities, the lack of financial resources, and the lack of skills required to conduct the mapping itself.

Government interviewees from Blue Nile, South Kordofan (Abyei), and Kassala stated that they are currently integrating and using the results of threat/risk mapping in their planning and decision-making. Interviewees from Red Sea and Ghedaref indicated that the mapping results have “sometimes” been integrated into their planning, but can generally be said to have been more utilized by UN agencies and other donors than by government entities. The interviewees from the Darfur states indicated that they had not yet benefited from mapping activities, which is consistent with CRMA reports (see Annex F for more information).
Government Resource Allocation

The interviewee from the central government in Khartoum (a supervisor for one of the team’s responsible for risk mapping) noted that there is currently an administrative unit dedicated to environmental management. The central mandate of that unit is overseeing the conflict-prevention through the management of natural resources, with a special focus on water resources and grazing areas. This unit has a separate budget, as well as some other non-environmental programmes and entities that implicitly allocate some of their resources to environmental issues related to their core mandate. Other activities at the national level include establishing the National Information Center for Early Warning on Natural Resources Conflicts, as well as various institutional development and capacity-building activities in relevant entities. However, the interviewee stated that more financial resources are needed.

According to state government officials that were interviewed, three of the eight states included in this study (Ghedaref, North Darfur, South Kordofan) had an administrative structure for environmental and disaster management and crisis prevention, with an additional state (Red Sea) currently establishing such a structure and yet to set a budget for it.

State government officials interviewed, including those from Kassala, Blue Nile, Ghedaref noted that the budget for environmental management is very tight and insufficient. The interviewee from Blue Nile described state-level environmental management projects but pointed out that the current allocated resources were nowhere near sufficient. Only the interviewee from North Darfur seemed satisfied with the current budget for environmental management. The interviewee from West Darfur’s government corroborated this and added that there is currently no state-level structure dedicated to environmental management.

In all cases, however, state-level key informants noted that the services were extremely underfinanced, but that financing had been increased in recent years. Reasons for the increase in financing include the signing of the CPA, increased government and public awareness on the importance of environmental issues, as well as the stronger participation of CSOs in the field of environmental management.

Several state official interviewees recommended a focus on impact assessments of the mapping activities that have taken place in order to increase central government commitment and resource allocation.

Discussion of Indicators

Current Outcome Indicator

Outcome Indicator 6a is “change in government commitments and resource allocations for the environment and natural disaster management”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicators

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

*Utility and Functionality:* No changes to Outcome Indicator 6a are recommended.
Current Output Indicators

Output Indicator 6.1a comprising “natural resource management system for disaster, risk and conflict reduction available and operational”.

Output Indicator 6.2a is the “number of states covered with threat/risk mapping assessments”.

Output Indicator 6.2b is the “number of states integrating social threat/risk mapping recommendations endorsed, implemented and analysis used in planning and decision-making”.

Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicators

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility:** For Output Indicator 6.1.a, it is recommended that the indicator be reconsidered and possibility divided into sub-indicators relevant to activities and inputs.

**Functionality:** If utility recommendations are taken into consideration for 6.1.a, no functionality problems are expected to arise.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes to Output Indicator 6.2.b are recommended.

**Utility:** For Output Indicator 6.3.a, it is recommended that the indicator be reconsidered and possibility divided into sub-indicators relevant to activities and inputs.

**Functionality:** If utility recommendations are taken into consideration for 6.3.a, no functionality problems are expected to arise.
## Section 8: Outcome 7 - Post-Conflict Socio-Economic Infrastructure Restored, Economy Revived, and Employment Generated

### Table 8: Values of Indicators under Outcome 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Post-conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived, and employment generated</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 7.a:</strong> Change in human security (mines, small arms, socio-economic) of crisis-affected groups. National mine action management and technical expertise in place to address social/economic impacts of mines and explosive remnants of war</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) and Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDC) established through presidential Decrees.</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009-2010: Knowledge of concerned NMAA, NMAC and SSDC staff developed at the technical (mine clearance) and functional level 2011: National authorities capacitated to finance and lead the mine action coordination activities 2012: National authorities capacitated to assume full responsibility of mine action process <strong>Current Value:</strong> Knowledge of relevant NMAA staff developed at the technical (mine clearance) and functional level. But NMAA not yet leading activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/sub-national capacities strengthened to manage the national mine action programme</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 7.1.a:</strong> National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) capacitated to implement its mandate and lead the mine action activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) and Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDC) established through presidential Decrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 7.1.b:</strong> Number of national de-miners trained/equipped/field deployed for clearance of mines/ERW affected areas</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> 240 JIUde-miners trained/equipped &amp; 110 deminers field deployed; 446 km of Babanusa-Wau railway line and 234 km of roads in Kassala state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009-2010: Knowledge of concerned NMAA, NMAC and SSDC staff developed at the technical (mine clearance) and functional level 2011: Knowledge of 130 national de-miners developed to conduct mine action activities 2012: 130 JIU de-miners equipped and deployed. <strong>Current Value:</strong> 560 trained, 370 deployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Post-conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived, and employment generated</td>
<td><strong>Output 7.2:</strong> Reintegration of ex-combatants completed in accordance with the national DDR strategy with support of UNMIS</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 7.2.a:</strong> Number ex-combatants, associated groups, demobilized &amp; reintegrated, disaggregated by age, gender and disability</td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: -2,900 participants, including 200 disabled, disarmed, demobilized and reintegrated in East; -30,000 participants in CPA areas, including 1900 women and 2000 disabled, participating or completing reintegration -Preparatory support provided to parties in Darfur, DDR of participants, pending political negotiations; 2010: -60,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration -DDR of candidates in Darfur, pending political process. 2011: -45,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration -DDR of candidates in Darfur, pending political process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> 1,700 ex-combatants disarmed and demobilized in ESPA areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPAP Baseline:** National Mine Action Authority (NMAA), National Mine Action Center (NMAC) established through presidential Decrees. Head offices of NMAC-Khartoum and SSDC-Juba and six field offices staffed, equipped and functional. Interim DDR Programme active in the North, South and East. MYDDR programme pilot launched in Blue Nile State, Support to livelihoods of 800,000 Sudanese nationals, by Increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stimulating economic activity and contributing to improvement in health and quality of life. <strong>CPAP Target:</strong> At least 80% of high priority roads/routes cleared by national de-miners and handed to public for productive use. National Institutions technically supported for development of joint DDR policies and strategies and enabled to manage the DDR process. Improve livelihoods of 1,200,000 Sudanese nationals, by increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity, stimulating economic activity and contributing to improvement in health and quality of life. Expected outcomes to cover three macro-sectors of Capacity Development and Institutional Strengthening; Improved Livelihoods; and Support to Basic Services. <strong>Current Value:</strong> 64% feel weapons pose a security threat in their area. 40% feel landmines are a problem in their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 7.3: Proliferation and circulation of small arms reduced</td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 7.2.b:</strong> Percentage of participants who report successful individual reintegration projects in client satisfaction surveys. <strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys 2010: -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys 2011: -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys 2012: -70 % per cent of participants report sufficient household income in client satisfaction surveys <strong>Current Value:</strong> 54% report successful reintegration 43% report moderate success 2.9% report no success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator 7.3.a:</strong> Number of state level community security and arms control action plans developed and implemented. Number of communities benefitting from CSAC activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Baseline:</strong> No community security and arms control action plans developed. Five small CSAC projects being implemented in BNS, SKS, KRT, RS and Kassala.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPAP Target:</strong> 2009: 5 sub-projects developed and implement community security and arms control action plans 2010: 10 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans 2011: 20 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans <strong>Current Value:</strong> 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 7 is “post conflict socio-economic infrastructure restored, economy revived, and employment generated”. The Outcome Indicator 7a is “change in human security (mines, small arms, socio-economic) of crisis-affected groups. National mine action management and technical expertise in place to address social/ economic impacts of mines and explosive remnants of war”.

Output 7.1 is “national/sub-national capacities strengthened to manage the national mine action programme”. Output indicator 7.1a is “National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) and Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDC) capacitated to implement their mandate and lead the mine action activities”, and Output Indicator 7.1b is the “number of national de-miners trained/equipped/field deployed for clearance of mine/ERW affected areas”.

Output 7.2 is “reintegration of ex-combatants completed in accordance with the national DDR strategy with support of UNMIS”. Output Indicator 7.2a is “number of ex-combatants, associated groups, demobilised and reintegrated, disaggregated by age, gender and disability”, and Output Indicator 7.2b is “percentage of participants who report successful individual reintegration projects in client satisfaction surveys”.

Output 7.3 is “proliferation and circulation of small arms reduced”. Output Indicator 7.3a is “number of state level community security and arms control action plans developed and implemented. Number of communities benefitting from CSAC activities”.

Output 7.4 is “post-conflict recovery accelerated in strategic areas to ensure peace dividends are visible and tangible to conflict-affected populations”. Output Indicator 7.4a is “number of recovery projects established and/or people benefiting, including returnees and ex-IDPs from recovery and development initiatives through strengthening CBOs/civil society and local government authorities”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Output Indicators and Annualized Targets</th>
<th>Values (Output Indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area 80.4% of them argued that the problem had declined in the previous two years.</td>
<td>Output 7.4: Post-conflict recovery accelerated in strategic areas to ensure peace dividends are visible and tangible to conflict-affected populations</td>
<td>Output Indicator 7.4.a: Number of recovery projects established and/or people benefiting, including returnees and ex-IDPs from recovery and development initiatives through strengthening CBOs/Civil Society and Local Govt. Authorities.</td>
<td>CPAP Baseline: 10 community-based integrated recovery &amp; rehabilitation projects running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP Target: 2009: Rural livelihood initiatives in 10 states; 100,000 beneficiaries: 30% female; 30% youth 2010: 200,000 beneficiaries (cumulative): 35% female; 35% youth 2011: 300,000 beneficiaries (cumulative): 40% female; 40% youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Value: Rural livelihood initiatives in 10 states across Sudan (North and South). Approximately 214,826 individuals benefiting from recovery initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome Indicator 7.a: Change in human security (mines, small arms, socio-economic) of crisis-affected groups. National mine action management and technical expertise in place to address social/economic impacts of mines and explosive remnants of war

The CPAP gives several baselines for this indicator, which are:

Baseline 1: “National Mine Action Authority (NMAA), National Mine Action Center (NMAC) established through Presidential Decree. Head offices of NMAC-Khartoum and six field offices staffed, equipped and functional”, for which the target is: At least 80% of high priority roads/routes cleared by national deminers and handed to public for productive use.

Baseline 2 and 3: Interim DDR Programme active in the North, South and East. MYDDR programme pilot launched in Blue Nile State, for which targets 2 and 3 are: National Institutions technically supported for development of joint DDR policies and strategies and enabled to manage the DDR process.

Baseline 4: Support to livelihoods of 800,000 Sudanese nationals, by increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity, stimulating economic activity and contributing to improvement in health and quality of life, for which target 4 is: Improve livelihoods of 1,200,000 Sudanese nationals, by increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity, stimulating economic activity and contributing to improvement in health and quality of life. Expected outcomes to cover three macro-sectors of Capacity Development and Institutional Strengthening; Improved Livelihoods; and Support to Basic Services.

This indicator is a complex one that contains several components, which are: mines, small arms, socio-economic situation, and the technical capacity of the national mine action programme. Since the capacity of the NMAA/NMAC is covered in Output Indicator 7.1.a, it will not be included under this indicator.

Overall Human Security

The CPAP does not provide a baseline and target for human security specifically, but specific questions were included in this study anyway. IDPs and ex-combatants were asked questions on security matters and recovery directed specifically to crisis-affected groups. Of concern, 30% of respondents had personally had at least one household member whose security was threatened in the past two years. Despite this, some 80% felt that the situation had somewhat improved in the past two years, but 77% indicated that they were not yet satisfied with the sense of security in their community.

Perhaps an indication of improvement is that over 80% of respondents noted that there were non-governmental organizations providing services in their communities aimed at improving community security, and almost 50% of these noted that they were satisfied with the activities of these NGOs. Almost half (46.7%) of all respondents had attended a meeting on community security matters including issues of mines and arms.

Reintegration, Mines & Small Arms

The related CPAP baseline is: “Interim DDR Programme active in the North, South and East. MYDDR programme pilot launched in Blue Nile State”, for which the target is: “National Institutions technically supported for development of joint DDR policies and strategies and enabled to manage the DDR process”.

A total of 78% of respondents (mostly concentrated in Eastern Sudan, the Three Protocol Areas, and North Darfur) noted that landmines were a problem in their areas, but even in these cases the threat was felt to have declined in these areas (with 80.4% noting that the problem had declined). Respondents explained the way
mines affect their lives in different ways, with responses including general feelings of fear and insecurity, loss of life and/or property, economic impacts due to limitations placed on commercial activity (especially grazing), and lack of mobility. A total of 72% of respondents stated that the existence of mines undermined their own or their household’s sense of security. Notable is that 61% stated UNDP interventions have improved the situation, specifically with regard to demining, mine-awareness campaigns, and helping wounded individuals.

Figure 10: Quantitative Responses Regarding if Mines Undermine Sense of Personal Security
Two-thirds of respondents felt that weapons posed a security threat in their areas (64%). Virtually all of these (91%) felt personally threatened by these weapons and 92% said it affected their livelihoods in some way. Over half (58%) felt that the UNDP’s contributions had improved the situation, specifically related to disarmament, rehabilitation of ex-combatants, and campaigns to promote peace.

Figure 11: Quantitative Responses Regarding if Weapons Undermine Sense of Personal Security

FGD responses vary across states. Respondents from West Darfur stated that mines do not pose a problem in their lives. Respondents from Ghedaref and Kassala said that mines pose a significant problem in the whole eastern region in general. But they are mostly concentrated in specific areas that the residents know about and thus avoided. However, it represents a serious economic problem in rural areas, since the mined areas represent non-utilizable economic resources. Respondents from South Kordofan and North Darfur said that mines pose a significant problem and that more demining and awareness-raising is needed so that people can learn to avoid the areas with mines. One respondent had lost several of his cattle due to mines, while another had lost her leg. Another respondent, when asked about the impact of mines, stated the following: “Mines have a very negative impact as the agriculture activity and animal grazing take place in areas that are very near the mines, so how can we work in a forest of mines?”

Socio-Economic Situation

The related CPAP baseline is: “Support to livelihoods of 800,000 Sudanese nationals, by increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity, stimulating economic activity and contributing to improvement in health and quality of life”, for which the target is: “Improve livelihoods of 1,200,000 Sudanese nationals, by increasing agricultural and livelihood productivity, stimulating economic activity and contributing to improvement in health and quality of life. Expected outcomes to cover three macro-sectors of Capacity Development and Institutional Strengthening; Improved Livelihoods; and Support to Basic Services”.

This covers a complex set of activities. Outputs comprise the following:

**Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building**

- People trained in public administration: 2,664
- Village development committees established/reorganised: 180
- People receiving training in peace-building/human rights/gender issues: 2,431
- Training events in peace-building/human rights/gender conducted: 81
- Youth associations established: 37
Improving Livelihoods

- Farmers/vets trained: 2,831
- Farmers/vet associations trained and provided with agricultural inputs/tools: 540
- Households provided with agricultural inputs/tools to start food production: 34,198
- Animals vaccinated/treated: 217,660
- Women received handcrafts, agricultural, or skills/business training: 1,405

Basic Services

- Water systems refurbished or built: 652
- Water use committees formed/trained: 314
- Sanitation equipment/facilities distributed or refurbished: 3,444
- Health administrators/outreach workers trained: 1,580
- Health awareness/outreach workshops held: 328
- Health workers trained: 1,354
- School classrooms rehabilitated or built: 166
- Teachers trained: 1,505
- School PTA formed/administrators trained: 871
- Adults receiving literacy education: 6,829

Mine Risk Education

- People trained in mine risk education: 52,475
- Mine risk education training events held: 609

Unfortunately the manner in which activity and output data have been collected is not fully consistent with measuring reach. For example, under ‘school classrooms rehabilitated or built’, 166 facilities were affected. However, the total number of schoolchildren who will have benefited is not recorded.

When asked about their socio-economic situation, respondents to the citizens questionnaire pointed to many factors affecting their livelihoods such as armed robbery, migration, increases in the prices of medical supplies, and rising poverty and unemployment. 86% of respondents reported that they are not satisfied with their current socio-economic situation, and 58% reported that the existence of mines, small arms, and general lack of security strongly negatively affects their livelihoods. One respondent, speaking of his family, said the following: “It led to our decision to migrate to the capital even though we can’t be sure we’ll find food or work, but at least we will feel more secure”.

When asked about the standard of living in their communities, only 1% rated it as excellent, while 29% rated it as very good, 49% rated standards as medium, 19% rated standards as poor and 3% rated standards as very poor.

Almost one-third (30%) of respondents were unemployed and 44% described themselves as self-employed. Of the 26% that were employed at the time of the field survey, 24% credited UNDP assistance with helping them find employment, but only 32% of these were satisfied with their current employment as most respondents (55%) saw the employment as temporary and not suiting their skills and interests. Of those that are self-
employed, 55% did not register their business because the procedures were too difficult or too expensive. Of those unemployed, 33% stated that they were prevented from finding employment due to their disabilities.

**Discussion of Indicators**

**Current Outcome Indicator**

Outcome Indicator 7a is “change in human security (mines, small arms, socio-economic) of crisis-affected groups. National mine action management and technical expertise in place to address social/economic impacts of mines and explosive remnants of war”.

**Recommendations Regarding the Current Outcome Indicators**

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
- **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

_Utility:_ It is recommended that Outcome Indicator 7a be divided into its two component parts. For human security, the indicator needs to be reformed to allow its measurement (e.g., ‘change in perceptions of human security’), and either an overall measure be established or aspects of human security broken down into its component parts.

_Functionality:_ If utility recommendations are taken into consideration, no functionality problems are expected to arise.

**Current Output Indicators**

Output indicator 7.1a is “National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) and Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDC) capacitated to implement their mandate and lead the mine action activities”,

Output Indicator 7.1b is the “number of national de-miners trained/equipped/field deployed for clearance of mine/ERW affected areas”.

Output Indicator 7.2a is “number of ex-combatants, associated groups, demobilised and reintegrated, disaggregated by age, gender and disability”.

Output Indicator 7.2b is “percentage of participants who report successful individual reintegration projects in client satisfaction surveys”.

Output Indicator 7.3a is “number of state level community security and arms control action plans developed and implemented. Number of communities benefiting from CSAC activities”.

Output Indicator 7.4a is “number of recovery projects established and/or people benefiting, including returnees and ex-IDPs from recovery and development initiatives through strengthening CBOs/civil society and local government authorities”.

**Recommendations Regarding the Current Output Indicators**

- **Utility:** How useful are the indicators towards informing the outputs and outcomes?
• **Functionality:** How practical are the indicators in terms of the ability to measure them, and how well can they be operationalised?

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes to Output Indicator 7.1a recommended.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes to Output Indicator 7.1b recommended.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes to Output Indicator 7.2a recommended.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes to Output Indicator 7.2b recommended.

**Utility and Functionality:** No changes to Output Indicator 7.3a recommended.

**Functionality:** For Output Indicator 7.4a, it is recommended that it be clarified that both the number of projects and the number of project participants, broken down by sex, be measured.

**Utility:** Should the functionality recommendation be considered for 7.4a, no utility recommendations are required.
Annex A: Outputs under Outcome 1

Output 1.1: MDG reports and National Human Development Report (NHDR) produced and disseminated to inform policy processes

Output Indicator 1.1.a: Number of MDG reports and NHDRs produced

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “MDG report produced in 2004; NHDR has never been produced”. The target for 2009 is: “MDG progress report produced and household poverty survey conducted”, for 2010 is: “First NHDR produced”, for 2011 is: MDG progress report produced”, and for 2012 is: “Second NHDR production initiated”.

The 2010 MDG report for Sudan has been produced in draft. It has not yet been officially published but is expected to be finalized and publicly announced soon.

According to the UNDP HDR website, draft HDR reports for Sudan were prepared in 1998 and 2003. The UNJOBS website (UNJOBS, 2010) notes that the “Preparation of National Human Development Report Project” is currently underway which aims at releasing the first National Human Development Report by April 2010 and to start development of the second National Human Development that will be released by the year 2012”. Despite the April 2010 deadline, however, no NHDR report for Sudan has yet been posted on the HDR website, although HDI (Human Development Index) estimates for Sudan are available via the international human development report.

Central government official interviewees also stated that the NHDR report has not yet been produced.

Output 1.2: Strengthened aid management and coordination to implement Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

Output Indicator 1.2.a: Database/analytical capacity for development aid coordination strategies and alignment to MDG-based national and sub-national development strategies in place and used

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “Aid information database established”, and the target for 2009 is: “Aid information database used in monitoring and tracking development aid”, and for 2010-2012 is: “Increased donor compliance with government priorities and reporting systems”.

Based on UNDP 2009 Progress Report for the project “Capacity-Development for Aid Management” (no 2010 report has yet been issued), as well as an interview with an MIC official, the Aid Management and Coordination Unit has been established in the Ministry of International Cooperation and fully equipped. A large number of staff at central and state levels have been trained on various topics including project management, monitoring and evaluation, and other areas. In addition, considerable progress is reported in terms of relevant databases for tracking aid funds. Aid management systems are in place in North Kordofan, South Kordofan, Ghedaref, Kassala and Red Sea states and aid management and coordination units are being established in the respective ministries, meaning that five states remain. The Sudan Aid Information Database (SAID) has been completed and is now operational and is said to be fairly complete, and has been released on the Ministry’s intranet, but it is not yet accessible through the MIC website.
The government, through a task force, is formulating an Aid Policy that includes a regulatory and legal framework to guide and facilitate humanitarian and development partner strategies and operations, but this activity has faced delays and has not yet been completed; no timeline has been indicated for its completion.

Regarding MDG-focused development strategies, the intention was to support progress and monitoring associated with poverty alleviation strategies at state and local level in a manner that would align activities with MDG objectives. These activities have been delayed, and to date no progress has been reported. With regard to the ‘Enhanced National Capacities to Plan, Implement and Monitoring the Achieved MDGs’ project, the 2010 report covering the first four months of the year (UNDP/Sudan, 2010) notes that, with regard to Output 2 (Enhanced national partners’ capacity to monitoring MDGs and prepare the MDGR), some progress has been made associated with the identification of capacity needs and the appointment of an MDG Project Policy Advisor to support the work of thematic working groups.

**Output 1.3: Policy and regulatory reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises strengthened and social and economic opportunities for poor and vulnerable groups broadened**

**Output Indicator 1.3.a: Number of regulatory policy and reforms for micro, small and medium-scale enterprises developed and implemented**

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “No comprehensive policies and regulatory reforms for micro, small and medium scale enterprises developed”. The target for 2009 is: “Policies and laws amended to enable the establishment of innovative microfinance services”, for 2010 is: “Policies and laws amended and/or enforced to enable the improvement of value chains for poor suppliers”, and for 2011-2012 is: “Comprehensive policies and regulatory reforms for micro, small and medium scale enterprises in place”.

A set of recommendations were provided and publicly discussed with CBOs and state governments on improving microfinance regulations and procedures as part of the Microfinance Darfur and Eastern Sudan assessments. It is not known if or to what extent these recommendations were implemented. Two related reports on Darfur and Eastern Sudan were produced but have not yet been published on the UNDP website.

As part of UNDP’s Darfur value chain activities, the North and South Darfur state governments agreed to exempt the UNDP-supported project ‘farmers producing groundnuts and hibiscus’ from the requirement to sell through the crop auctions, which is reported as a necessary condition for any value chains programming, and a milestone to the abolishment of the crop auction system which is reported to be very detrimental to small-scale farmers livelihoods in Sudan. The hibiscus value chains initiative is understood to have been included in the Ministry of Agriculture’s 2011 agricultural support fund budget.

In an interview with a central level government official, the interviewee was asked about policies related to small and medium enterprises. He noted that policy development in terms of the banking sector was underway to improve access to finances by small enterprises. He also noted that a number of existing regulations hampered small enterprise development, and that this consequently limited production and sector expansion but that these were also being modified. When asked about the contribution of UNDP, the interviewee stated that UNDP’s focus went mostly to political issues because of the 2010 elections, and this detracted from the focus on SME-related issues temporarily.

When asking state-level government officials about the SME environment, most respondents were ambivalent. Interviewees acknowledged that there have been improvements in the national policy framework, especially the development of regulations that allow Zakat resources to finance SMEs. This led to the establishment of
microfinance institutions in the states such as state microfinance councils, and conducting SME-related capacity-building programs which led to the success of some pioneer enterprises and encouraging more entrepreneurs to do the same. They also noted that there has been a “partial decentralization” of the SME finance process, as the projects are suggested and primarily approved at state level, but they must obtain the final approval at central level.

They also stated that the banking and finance service systems are unnecessarily complicated and that the relationship between credit providers and recipients was unfairly unbalanced in the interests of the bank. They also noted that there are social and cultural obstacles regarding the receipt of credit and paying interest, especially when it comes to women and youth. When asked about UNDP’s contribution interviewees agreed that it has been helpful, but that the limited budgets related to SME enhancement has somewhat hampered their effectiveness in this area.

It should be highlighted that progress reports overviewing progress made towards this indicator are lacking, so important data remain unavailable.

**Output Indicator 1.3.b: Number of micro-entrepreneurs accessing microfinance and business development services through UNDP (disaggregated by gender)**

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “65,293 active clients of Microfinance”. The target for 2009 is: “UNDP Micro-finance and Microbusiness Support programme is set up”, for 2010 is: “In addition to other Microfinance Programs in Sudan, at least 5,000 entrepreneurs accessing micro-finance and business development services, through the support by UNDP, equally representing females and males”, for 2011 is: “at least 20,000 clients (cumulative)”, and for 2012 is: “at least 50,000 clients (cumulative)”.

During interviews with government officials, none of the interviewees were able to give us even rough estimates of micro-entrepreneurs, nor did they have any publications or data they were willing to share. We were also unable to find any data on this through secondary sources or UNDP progress report. Thus, this indicator cannot be measured at this juncture.
Annex B: Outputs under Outcome 2

Output 2.1 Better delivery/usage of the GFATM funds for response to HIV/AIDS and other diseases

Output Indicator 2.1.a: No. of services delivery points (SDPs) providing counseling & testing in accordance with determined minimum standards, disaggregated by type of service provided

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is that 38 points are providing VCT services, while the target for 2009: 64 points providing VCT services; for 2010 is “100 points providing VCT services”, for 2011 is: “122 points providing VCT services”, and for 2012 is: “128 points providing VCT services”.

It is interesting to note that, while the indicator requires disaggregation by the type of service provided, the baseline and target values do not reflect this. Rather, the baseline and target values only reflect VCT services, despite the fact that the indicator reflects all types of HIV/AIDS services and VCT is just one type. Furthermore, the indicator states that counseling and testing should be in accordance with minimum standards, while the baseline and targets only reflect the number of points providing the service.

According to the UNGASS 2008-2009 report, there are currently 137 HIV testing and counseling (HTC) centres in Northern Sudan. The Sudan National AIDS Program (SNAP) Annual Report cited in the 2010 Sudan Millennium Development Goals Report states the same number. According to SNAP, the number of HCTs was 40 in 2006 and increased to 60 in 2007 and 120 by 2008.

According to the SNAP 2010 report, the total number of anti-retroviral therapy (ART) centres in the 15 states of North Sudan have increased from 21 in 2007 to 32 in 2009. It also notes that a study conducted in select ART centers in Khartoum and Ghedaref shows “noticeable improvement on the proportion of PLHIV who discontinue treatment or lost to follow-up (56.54% in 2008 compared to 42% in 2007 are on ART after 12 months)”. The 2010 Sudan MDGs report also states that there are 27 “Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission” centers in Northern Sudan. The report states that “HIV treatment and care services have been introduced in all the 15 States in North Sudan. The below table is taken from the 2010 SNAP report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of VCT Centres</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of ART Centres</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of PMTCT sites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of People Tested in HTC</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>28,376</td>
<td>52,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Pregnant Women Tested</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>7,515</td>
<td>19,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of PHHIV on Treatment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewees from central government commented on some of the successes of SDPs in Sudan by noting the increasing number and geographical distribution of SDPs, their spread particularly in rural areas, and the increasing awareness and acceptance in certain communities. Among challenges they noted a lack in the
required medical equipments and preparations, and a lack of awareness among the population in a considerable part of the targeted areas, especially rural areas.

Regarding minimum standards, the UNGASS report includes a questionnaire that was administered to representatives from civil society organizations, bilateral agencies, and UN organizations. Most respondents agree with the statement “the majority of people in need have access to HIV testing and counseling”. However, respondents disagreed with the statement “Performance indicators or benchmarks for compliance with human rights standards in the context of HIV efforts”.

In interviews with central-level government officials, interviewees stated that the Ministry of Health has developed minimum standard regulations and monitors adherence of all HIV counseling and testing services to these standards. A training programme on the application of these regulations has been developed and has commenced. However, interviewees pointed out that there are currently no mechanisms in place for them to receive feedback from the people targeted by HTC services to give them an indication of how successful such interventions are. Therefore, the extent to which minimum standards are actually adhered to is unknown, and the quality of services is also unknown.

Output Indicator 2.1.b: Number of Ministries with a functional HIV/AIDS unit and with strategic plans with budget for HIV/AIDS in place

The CPAP does not give a baseline, but the target is as follows: By 2012, 3 Ministries (Ministry of Finance and Economics, Ministry of Social Welfare, Women and Children, and the Ministry of Labour).

According to the Sudan 2010 MDG report, most GoNU and state ministries currently have HIV structures in place. The Sudan National AIDS Control Programme (SNAP) is the technical department with the responsibility for national level policy, planning and coordination. According to the 2010 UNGASS report, SNAP is currently liaising and working with the Ministries of Defense, Interior, Education, Higher Education, Information and Communication, Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports; and Ministry of Social Welfare, Women and Child Affairs. The report also states that the health, education, labor, transportation, military/police, women and youth sectors are all included in the national HIV strategy and all have budgets that have been earmarked for HIV interventions.

Based on available evidence, it appears that the Ministry of Finance and Economics does not have an HIV&AIDS Unit, and it is noticeably absent from any discussion on national HIV response.
Annex C: Outputs under Outcome 3

Output 3.1: Support to free and fair elections and referenda based on international standards provided

Output Indicator 3.1.a: Number of institutions (elections and referendum authorities) strategic planning, oversight, training, logistical support through the Elections Project

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “Elections project currently being established” and the targets are as follows: 2009 “Strategic planning, organizational development strategy, and institutional infrastructure completed for NEC”, 2010 “Logistics and strategic planning for 2011 referenda supported, capacity development activities completed, and establishment of legal framework for the referenda supported”, and 2011 “Logistics and operations for the conduct of the referenda supported”.

This indicator looks at institutions, both governmental and non-governmental, that received support from UNDP through the Elections project. Both governmental and non-governmental authorities are considered.

The types of institutions considered consist of governmental authorities such as:

- The Judiciary
- The National Elections Commission (NEC): An independent body formed in 2008 responsible for organizing the elections and has the authority to determine geographical constituencies, prepare the electoral register and issue the election rules and procedures. The NEC is composed of nine members and has a Secretariat General.
- The Political Parties Affairs Council (PPAC): A body formed in November 2008 responsible for registering political parties according to the Political Parties Act. The Council is an independent body consisting of nine members and has a General Secretariat.

Data are disaggregated by type of support provided. Based on the nature of the indicator and its specificity to the Elections project, measurement relies on secondary data retrieved from the project’s progress reports. The types of support provided by UNDP consist of:

Planning and Coordination

- The Judiciary

No UNDP support planned.

- The National Elections Commission (NEC)

UNDP supported the NEC in developing its operational plan for the registration and polling period in coordination with the MIC, Ministry of Finance, and international advisors. UNDP also supported the NEC in developing a plan for civic and voter education for the polling period.
The Political Parties Affairs Council (PPAC)

UNDP supported PPAC with technical advice to formulate its operational plan and budget needed to be able to develop political party capacities in the long term.

UNDP and UNMIS advisors also worked with the PPAC to develop a comprehensive budget for council activities to the end of 2010. During discussions on various different budget lines, the PPAC was able to reflect on their mandate, to identify needs, and to clarify the operational plan for the institution. This exercise proved to be very effective for the capacity development and team building within the PPAC.

Domestic Observation Groups

UNDP did not provide any “planning and coordination” support for the domestic observation groups.

Training & Capacity-Building

Judiciary

UNDP provided training to over 100 judges throughout Sudan on various topics related to the legal framework for elections, procedures for registration and polling, activities of the judiciary and civil society, and security concerns.

The National Elections Commission (NEC)

A total of 50 NEC committee members (NEC, “Elected Members to the Council of the States”, 2009) from the 25 states received training supported by UNDP on the electoral process and their large operational role in the following months. Related to this, a total of 1,121 Constituency Electoral Officers were also trained, as well as over 100,000 polling staff at constituency level.

The Political Parties Affairs Council (PPAC)

UNDP in collaboration with UNMIS provided capacity-building an unspecified number of newly-recruited PPAC staff to develop its workplan and budget. They also provided the PPAC with advice on the content of the Code of Conduct for Political Parties, including a Code of Conduct for Campaigning which was facilitated by the African Union and signed by political parties.

UNDP also supported PPAC with technical advice on training political party agents and increased the capacity of the council to conduct its election-related activities, including the printing and distribution of a training manual for the State High Committees in the North and the South. The training supported by UNDP included topics such as Sudan’s electoral framework, polling regulations, the importance of monitoring, parallel vote tabulation, and basic principles of voter contact.

Domestic Observation Groups

UNDP supported the training and coordination of 500 persons from Sudanese NGO and CSO networks to accurately monitor and report on election activities through the Carter Center. They were trained and deployed throughout Sudan to observe the registration process. Two public statements which report on the findings were released in late 2009 (see Support to Elections and Democratic Processes Project Progress Report January-December 2009, UNDP Sudan, 2009). Three NGOs were specifically trained to improve their reporting skills on electoral processes (see also UNDP Sudan 2010, ‘Elections Assistance Bulletin’).
Logistical Support

- **Judiciary**

UNDP assisted in the production of a manual entitled “Elections Legal Issues Guideline” that was printed and distributed in all Sudan states.

- **The National Elections Commission (NEC)**

UNDP supported the NEC by providing material support as well as infrastructure support comprising the rental warehouse space in all 25 states, office space rental in Khartoum, provision of office equipment, furniture, computers and vehicles in all 25 states, as well as with the production and delivery of registration kits to all voter constituencies in Sudan, and equipment support such as procurement of office equipment and transportation. It also provided technical advice on main electoral processes such as determine polling procedures and materials.

- **The Political Parties Affairs Council (PPAC)**

The UNDP supported the Political Parties Affairs Council (PPAC) through technical advice, material support, infrastructure support, and equipment support. In terms of materials support, UNDP has procured requested furniture for the PPAC headquarters in Khartoum.

UNDP organised a celebratory Ramadan Iftar to commemorate the 2nd International Day of Democracy which was attended by several Sudanese political parties, the UNDP Country Director, and other dignitaries. During the event, PPAC presented leaders present with a draft Code of Conduct for Political Parties during the elections. Drafted in consultation with various political parties in Sudan, leaders were invited to discuss the code and provide feedback to the Council. Once the code of conduct was developed, workshops were conducted for 291 people representing 24 political parties and members of the NEC on the code of conduct (see progress noted in both the February 2010 report on the project from UNDP and the July 2010 report also from UNDP for the period January-June 2010. UNDP procured office, IT equipment, furniture, and cars for the establishment of a Training and Democracy Resource Centre (TDRC) in Khartoum. It also supported the establishment of the PPAC headquarters in Khartoum and Juba through rental of office space, equipping the offices with furniture and ICT equipment.

UNDP also procured 8,000 copies of the Political Parties Act for distribution by PPAC.

- **Domestic Observation Groups**

UNDP did not provide any support for the domestic observation groups.

Output Indicator 3.1.b Comprehensive Civic and Voter Education Programme Developed and Implemented

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “no civic and voter education programme in place”. The target for 2009 is: “Civic and voter education programme developed, with defined coverage targets and approved by the government”, and for the 2009-2012 period is “Civic and voter education programme implemented in the 3 states of Darfur, Three Protocol Areas, Red Sea State, Kassala, Khartoum State”.

UNDP developed a comprehensive civic and voter education programme and implemented it in 25 states across Sudan. This programme consisted of several components including the following.

**Media Campaigns and Forums**

30 voter education forums and 10 events were held across all 10 states of the South. In the North, 48 workshops were held across all 15 states.

UNDP, in close cooperation with the NEC and UNMIS, conducted a widespread media campaign covering all 25 states for the polling period.

**Outreach Materials**

Civic education materials were produced and disseminated as part of a campaign targeting increased public awareness of the registration process. Materials were produced in English and Arabic and included training handbooks, posters, stickers, factsheets, and leaflets.

Materials were distributed to local NGOs, CSOs, citizen groups involved in civic education, the National Elections Commission (NEC), government officials, local authorities, regional leaders.

**Training CSOs and Giving Grants**

According to the 2010 progress report for the “Support to Elections Project” (UNDP Sudan, 2010) nine medium grant proposals totaling USD 909,732 were approved for NGOs/CSOs that applied. The geographic coverage of civic education activities by grantee recipients was mapped to identify gaps. In regions which were not covered by medium grants, a small grant application process was launched. Small grants were offered in the following states in the north: Khartoum, White Nile, Northern Kordofan, North Darfur, South Darfur, West Darfur, and in the south: Jonglei and Lakes. For small grants, the original application deadline due to the poor quality of proposals received and the absence of proposals from the three Darfur states. The activities commenced on 1 November 2009, and were implemented in all States including the three States of Darfur.

UNDP administered over 1.2 million USD of small grants to 41 civil society organisations working in all 25 states in Sudan through its implementing partner the International Organization for Migration (IOM). These grantees were trained on the voter education methodology for the registration process, and then successfully carried out registration education to raise awareness on the elections using the materials printed with the support of UNDP.

Planning workshops were held in both Khartoum and Juba in December 2009 with local NGO representatives to decide on the key civic education messages for the public campaign. The finalised plan was approved by the basket fund steering committee in January 2010 and the messages are to be used during the campaign and polling period on posters, stickers, flipcharts, and in media messages using public service announcements on television and radio.

**Youth Forums**

UNDP developed a plan to support youth forums to advocate participation of first-time voters by training youth leaders in the forum on registration requirements, the election systems, electoral conflict prevention, civic education strategies and the polling procedures. The training was designed for 180 youth leaders with 60 each from Khartoum, northern states, and the south. Participants were nominated by local NGO forums and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (international NGO).
This indicator does not reflect the actual success of the programme, only that it was developed and implemented. However, to the document “Lessons Learned from Sudan Election Project” (Al-Alaily and Eicher, 2010: 15) noted the following:

Most domestic and international stakeholders and observer groups were uniformly negative in their assessments of [civic and voter education] CVE and its impact. Overall, the major criticism of the CVE programme was its late start, which meant (for example) that public service announcements were not aired until just a month before polling days. The late start can be explained in part by UNDP’s close adherence to the NEC’s timetable for conducting CVE activities.

However, it is important to note that while UNDP’s CVE efforts have been commended, assessments have been slightly more ambivalent. The EU Election Observation Mission noted that the UNDP’s voter education efforts were “worthy” but “insufficient to meet the needs of an electorate unfamiliar with elections, dealing with a particularly complex electoral process” (Preliminary Statement, EU Election Observation Mission, p. 10). The Arab League Observation Mission listed CVE as a shortcoming of the election, concluding that “lack of knowledge and awareness of the election process by voters ... was evident in the ballot casting in wrong boxes” (League of Arab States Observation Mission Statement, p. 2). The domestic monitoring group Tamam asserted that “The NEC failed to conduct a proper voter education programme for the whole nation about the electoral process. When the Commission finally launched its education campaign, it came too little too late” (Tamam statement, point 5).

The main “lessons learned” extracted from secondary sources include:

- The need to increase the use of the national broadcasting facilities as well as private advertising companies.
- Increased targeting of NGOs and CSOs to carry out education activities, with a focus on face to face activities.
- A stronger focus on civic education rather than merely the specifics of voter education.
- Not tying the CVE programme to NEC’s timetable.
- Carrying out substantive baseline and impact assessments of the CVE programme.

Output 3.2 Capacities strengthened of political, parties, media, and civil society, including women, to play their mandated roles in the democratic process

Output Indicator 3.2.a: Number of political parties prepared to participate in democratic elections disaggregated by region

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is 6 political parties, while the target for 2009 is 22 additional political parties.

The total number of parties supported by UNDP to participate in elections is 24. The list of political parties supported by UNDP is as follows:
Table 9: Political Parties Supported by UNDP Sudan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United Democratic Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>United Democratic National Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>United Democratic Salvation Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sudan African National Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Union of Sudan African Party 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Union of Sudan African Party 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Southern Sudan Democratic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Muslim Brothers Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Al Umma Collective leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Al Umma Federal Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Al Umma Alwatani Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Al Umma Reform and Modernization Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ansar Alsunna Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Democratic Union Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>National Sudanese Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New Sudan Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wassat Islamic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sudanese Alliance Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Al Baath Alarabi Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Al Baath Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nasirist Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sudanese Democratic new Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hag Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Aladalla Political Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNDP supported 24 political parties in refining their schedules for the period preceding, during and following the 2010 election.

Apart from the above list, below is a list of an additional 6 political parties that have been included in some of the current project’s activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Congress Party (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sudanese People Liberation Movement (SPLM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Umma National Party (UNP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Popular Congress Party (PCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Democrat Unionist Party (DUP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sudanese Communist Party (SCP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UNDP provided support to a number of political parties primarily through training workshops. A number of workshops and training sessions took place to build the capacities of political parties leading up to the 2010 elections.

A training workshop for 27 participants from 24 political parties on Media Centres in Political Parties was also conducted. A total of 54 members, including men and women from 24 political parties and media, were trained on media tools and electoral campaigning.

UNDP in collaboration with the PPAC conducted trainings for political party agents in all 25 states. Political party agents were trained using an interactive power point presentation, covering all the techniques and tools a party agent would need to effectively serve as a monitor during the polling and counting process. Presentations during the training included: The Purpose of Monitoring Elections, Parallel Voter Tabulation, Overview of the Polling Process, NEC Rules and Procedures, Recruiting and Training Party Agents, and The Practical Tools for Election Monitoring. IRI also produced a short movie that was shown during the training, demonstrating the polling and counting process and the party agent’s duties and responsibilities. Three simultaneous workshops for Political Parties’ Agents and Candidates on Poll Watching were conducted at Khartoum Localities level. 291 participants representing the political parties and the National Elections Commission participated in the workshops. PPAC held a workshop for 200 representatives from 76 registered political parties where attendees were briefed on upcoming electoral events and procedures. During the workshop, party representatives discussed the Political Parties Act and the Elections Act. 413 members, including men and women from 24 political parties trained in party organization and management. The trained political parties are in the process to establish their own documentation centers at the level of their parties.

UNDP supported the PPAC to hold information sessions for 200 representatives from 76 registered political parties on the election process. The sessions included discussion of the Political Parties Act, 2008 and the Elections Act, 2008. Inter-party dialogue was also supported, and the development of political parties’ code of conduct initiated.

Three publications based on the papers presented on the previous workshops were finalised. A committee was formed of three editors and a coordinator to issue the publications, which are now in the final stage at the printing company. Themes for these publications were identified as follows:

- Politics and Political Parties in Sudan
- Political Party Organizational System; Internal and External Set Up of Political Parties
- Political Parties and Elections

In addition to the workshops/trainings generally related to participation in the elections, a number of trainings were held that had a strong gender dimension.

A workshop to build the capacities of female candidates standing for election from the 24 political parties was conducted on 29 March 2010. 54 females participated. 477 party members, including men and women from 24 political parties, were trained on the role of political parties in elections. Ten workshops were held at the headquarters of ten different political parties for the purpose of educating women on the elections process. The events were held at the headquarters of the different political parties. The workshops assisted towards achieving gender-sensitive policy reforms on improved political participation and the education of women on the elections process.

Aside from the training on political issues, basic computer training was provided for the interested members of the Women in Political Parties forum. Sixteen members of the Women in Political Participation forum were given computer training and completed the course successfully. The computer training was based on basic
computer skills which would enable them to use internet services and software programmes. The skills and knowledge of political parties were raised on history of libraries, types of libraries and their objectives, types and modes of keeping information, both conventional and non-conventional, specialised information centers, the most important services provided by specialised centres (awareness and selective dissemination of information). The participants worked out integrating the millennium development goals and the gender dimension into their parties’ programmes.

UNDP also assisted in the formation of the Political Parties Coordination Committee serving the purpose of coordinating the training needs of the political parties, as well as the Political Parties Resource Centers which was established to provide information for the political parties. The Political Parties Coordination Committee established the Unity Forum which composed of several. This forum aims at supporting Sudan’s unity and raises the community awareness about the coming referendum; the consequences and the possible scenarios.

No training evaluation reports were available for consideration.

**Output SP Indicator 3.2.b: Number of parliamentarians with increased knowledge of their role and responsibilities in a democratic process**

UNDP has provided support to 270 parliamentarians (of whom 54 were female) in Sudan through capacity-building and training, including the following:

- 30 members of National Assembly (20 women and 10 men) were trained on the basis of legislative work. The training has received media coverage.
- UNDP organised the First Forum of Legislative Leaders on the Legislature Coordination in a Federal System for 270 parliamentarians from the different states in partnership with the Council of States and the Federalism Research and Capacity Building Centre. The Forum discussed the Role of the Council of States in the Legislative Coordination, Decentralization and Human Development, States Experiences, Federalism in Sudan According to CPA and the National Interim Constitution.
- The areas/themes of partnership framework to achieve the objective of increasing the skills and knowledge of women parliamentarians on their expected role had been identified.
- Held a seminar on bi-cameral models in federal systems with the participation of 75 parliamentarians from the NA and the Council of States. The aim of the seminar was to make parliamentarians aware, through discussions, of the powers of the respective chambers and the means to improve the relationships of the two chambers.
- Organized the first consultative meeting between the NA, the Council of States, and state legislatures to discuss legislative developments and needs at the state level. Participants included 2 representatives from each of the 15 states from Northern Sudan. The aim of the meeting was to strengthen the relationships between the respective national and state legislative institutions and provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and lessons learnt in legislative development.
- Sent three leading Members of Parliament to participate in a two-day international seminar on the Role of Parliament in Peace-Building. The seminar was held from 18-20 September 2006, in Ethiopia’s Parliament in Addis Ababa, with the participation of parliamentarians from Ethiopia, Sudan and Liberia. Participants were briefed on the role of parliament in peace-building and were able to observe a well-functioning parliament with a number of responsibilities in addition to the legislative role.
- In January 2007, organized a seminar on the Darfur conflict, with the participation of over 40 MPs, in addition to representatives of the media, civil society, and academia. The workshop gave the
opportunity to MPs to become more familiar with the Darfur conflict and to discuss with experts and concerned parties the role of parliament in bringing peace to the region.

- In April 2007, organized a second seminar on the role of the CPA in achieving peaceful coexistence between religions. The objective of the workshop was to discuss challenges in assembling political and social support for reconciliation and peace.

- In May 2007, organized a strategic planning exercise for 100 MPs from the Economic Affairs Committee; Peace and National Reconciliation Committee; Legislation and Justice Committee; and the Information, Data and Communication Committee. The strategic planning exercise helped formulate a mission and set the strategic objectives necessary to give the target committees direction, coherence, and a more forward-thinking orientation within the CPA framework. As well as establishing a common purpose, the exercise stimulated dialogue among committee members about how best to achieve their mandate.

- A workshop to build the capacities of female candidates standing for election from the 24 political parties was conducted on 29 March 2010. 54 females participated.

**Output SP Indicator 3.2.c: Number of supported political parties with political parties platforms developed**

No information is available on this sub-indicator.

**Output SP Indicator 3.2.d: Number of journalists with strengthened capacities for reporting on government decision-making**

UNDP supported capacity-building for journalists through a number of different activities including trainings, workshops, and mentorship programmes, with some activities dedicated to youth journalists. An overview of the activities is as follows:

- UNDP contracted International Media Services (IMS) to provide media training and monitoring support. IMS trained journalists throughout Sudan’s 25 states to accurately report on election events; and to establish media monitoring mechanisms to assess media coverage of the elections. UNDP also worked with IMS and the Sudan Media and Elections Consortium (SMEC), a consortium of 6 national and international CSOs, to support journalist training and media monitoring activities for the elections. The consortium, led by the International Media Support (IMS), trained journalists on effective election reporting, and established media monitoring stations focusing on media coverage of elections campaigning.

- IMS initiated a 4 journalist mentorship programme with prominent international journalists from Arab and African countries invited to Sudan to provide media professionals in-house support and on-the-job advice for an extended period of time.

- Youth and junior journalists have been given the chance to publish their discussions and views on one page, once a week in 4 different regular daily newspapers throughout the month. The discussions were based on the political and electoral process. In addition, junior journalists were given the chance to be trained on journalism skills. UNDP also supported training young journalists in partnership with Teeba Press, a national NGO based in Khartoum. The young journalists received an overview of electoral processes and basic principles of election reporting. These journalists are encouraged to write on elections and democracy in the upcoming months until polling.
• A total of 13 journalist training workshops on elections reporting techniques were conducted for over 350 journalists and editors-in-chief throughout Sudan.

• UNDP in collaboration with Teeba Press and the Parliament’s Journalists Association have successfully completed training for 25 journalists anchored to the Parliament, representing most of the daily Sudanese newspapers. The two-month training consisted of three modules; English for Media and Communication Purposes, Computer Skills and Journalism Editing with a focus on Parliamentarian coverage.

In October 2010 UNDP issued an independent assessment of the 2010 elections entitled “Lessons Learned from Sudan Elections Project” (Al-Alaily and Eicher, 2010). Regarding, UNDP’s support for media monitoring of the elections, the report concluded that the media “played a key role in raising public awareness about the importance of voting, and devoted enormous space and air time to covering the political campaigns, polling days and the election results” (p!18). However, the report pointed out the severe restrictions on freedom of expression in Sudan that hinder the media’s ability to operate freely and exacerbate their technical weaknesses. Thus, UNDP focused its media support on training of around 350 journalists to report professionally and neutrally on the elections, in addition to establishing a mentorship programme for “local media professionals within their media outlets” (p!18), building the capacity of 40 Sudanese journalists specifically to monitor voting, and setting up two monitoring stations. It also noted, however, that female candidates and politicians received limited media coverage. The report evaluated this support as follows:

Most national and international stakeholders gave relatively good marks to the media portion of the project. The donors responding to UNDP’s post-election survey rated output two on media as the most successful of the project’s six outputs in terms of timely and reliable policy advice, logistical and operational support, and programme planning and implementation. In a broader lessons learned survey of stakeholders conducted by UNDP, output two on media was given the second highest marks of the project’s six outputs, in terms of meeting the project’s objectives.

Output SP Indicator 3.2.e: Number of CSOs which launch advocacy initiatives on government related issues

UNDP supported local CSOs to launch advocacy initiatives related to government activities and policies. Below is a brief overview of these efforts:

• The “Face-to-Face” activities campaign managed by IOM, which disbursed funds to 102 Sudanese civil society organisations, was conducted. The organizations were trained and empowered to spread information on the electoral process through a variety of activities through the community meetings, drama presentations and the broadcast of information through traveling vehicles. IOM distributed 10 medium sized grants, 83 small grants, and 9 innovative grants.

• The Carter Center (TCC), the implementing partner for domestic observation identified and partnered with civil society organisations, including: Al Khatem Adlan Center for Enlightenment and Human Development (KACE-Tamam) network, and the National Civic Forum (NCF) in the North; and the Sudan Domestic Election Monitoring and Observation Program (SuDEMOP) in the South. Prior to deployment, TCC staff assisted the CSOs networks to develop registration observation plans through five training sessions on election observation methodology. Following training, KACE and NCF deployed a total of 152 observers across 10 of the 15 states in the North, while SuDEMOP deployed a total of 160 observers across all 10 states in the South. Following the observation missions, TCC conducted debriefing sessions with each partner to assist in the analysis of collected data. Each organisation produced observation reports detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the registration process.
However, it seems that most CSO activity has been focused on monitoring of the elections and referendum, and has not yet moved towards launching advocacy initiatives.

Annex D: Outputs under Outcome 4

Output 4.1: Capacities developed of regional state and local governments to plan, budget and manage expenditure, accelerating progress towards the MDGs

Output Indicator 4.1.a: No. of states empowered to complete and implement locality strategic plans and urban management policies/frameworks

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “13 states within 5 year completed state level strategic plans provided with technical advisory support”. The target for 2009: “3 states with locality plans prepared through technical advisory support”, for 2010: “6 states (cumulative)”, for 2011: “8 states (cumulative)”, and for 2012: “12 states (cumulative)”. Almost all state-level key informants in the relevant states (state-level officials were interviewed on this topic in each of the 8 states included in this study), argued that recent innovations had improved the ability of states to design and implement strategic plans, with state councils for strategic planning established.

Nevertheless, capacity constraints for a majority of these states remained severe. In these circumstances, support for planning was needed, but implementation capacity for plan implementation would remain lacking. It was reported that state councils for local governance and administrative reform were planned for the next two years, with capacity enhancement especially important. When asked about the relative contribution of the UNDP support, key informants at the national level noted that the UNDP support was ‘one piece of the puzzle’, and that it was not possible to assess its independent impact.

Unlike the focus group discussion participants, state-level key informants tended to feel that services had been improving consistently in recent years. Where they did agree with the focus group discussion participants was noting that quantitative improvements tended to be favored over improvements in the quality of service delivery, and that the gap between access and quality of service would likely widen in the future.

The majority of state level key informants argued that their working situation had improved in the past two years. The most important innovations comprised reforming institutional structures of state governments (including the introduction of the unified Governmental Management System), the rationalization of local government structures, learning how to implement a participatory planning approach to strategic and operational planning, and enhanced retention of local government officers and increased security of tenure overall. In terms of the broader environment, the peace agreement, the elections, and increased discussions with development partners and communities were all noted as offering more support to effective planning and implementation.

Concerns remained regarding state budget management, with a majority of key informants concerned that the budgeting process was ill-informed, unrealistic (that is, not accounting for implementation capacity within state institutions but also with regard to any contracting), and lacking transparency. Fairness concerns were raised, with the rationale for budget allocation compared to requested amounts remaining unclear. There was some
optimism with the strengthening of finance units, auditing administrations, and the General Auditor’s Authority, and growing moves towards more transparency.

In reviewing progress reports on UNDP activities covering the five states of South Kordofan, Abyei, Red Sea, Kassala and Ghedaref, progress was noted as follows:

1. South Kordofan is in the process of procuring equipment for the State Strategic Council, and in training civil servants on local government financial management.
2. Abyei has drafted an urban planning framework as well as finalized the Public Financial Management and Accountability Act as well as the Public Procurement Regulations/Guidelines. Abyei also submitted terms of reference for the recruitment of consultants to train civil servants on strategic planning.
3. Red Sea has prepared development plans for each locality. Once the full set has been finalized, this will feed into the State Strategic Plan. In addition, a State Strategic Planning Council was established to accurate planning activities and improve the quality of planning.

In light of this information, only Red Sea state has completed locality strategic plans.

Output 4.2: Dialogue established between federal and state-level of government regarding the implementation of the Interim National Constitution’s provisions relating to decentralization

Output Indicator 4.2.a: Level of satisfaction of state-level officials in relation to their participation in the process

Interviews on this topic were conducted with state-level government officials in each of the eight states included in this study. Greater involvement in planning is reflected in high levels of satisfaction with state participation in the national planning process to promote decentralization and local decision-making, with nine in ten arguing that they were satisfied with the process.

In addition, the majority of respondents to the citizens questionnaire found the contribution of UNDP to be an important element in helping to achieve the desired outputs. One-third (35%) of the interviewees responded that they are highly satisfied with their participation. Half responded that they are somewhat satisfied, and 15% indicated that they are not yet satisfied.

The interviewees described specific areas as the most significant contribution of UNDP support, and also the areas that need the most focus to increase their satisfaction with the process in the future.

- More training and capacity-building at state and community levels
- Stronger support for the strategic planning process
- Knowledge and information dissemination
- Support for improvement of State infrastructure which enables local government to better do their jobs.
Output 4.3: State strategic plans and budgets adopted and implemented with a focus on promoting socio-economic development at local level

Output Indicator 4.3.a: Level of expenditure by State targeted towards education and health

Unfortunately state-level expenditure data on education and health were not available, reflecting severe constraints on budgetary monitoring and reporting. The 2010 Sudan MDG Report states the following:

15% of public expenditure is consistent with prioritization of education. Estimated per student recurrent public spending on education is currently SDG 153 (5 percent) per year for primary and 953 SDG (30 percent) for secondary. However, the distribution varies across states.

The 2010 MDG report for Eastern Sudan states that “the degree of the investment in education is not matching the increases in the growth of population at school age in the region”. In Red Sea state 348 schools were under construction out of which 82 have been completed in 2010.

Health

State-level data on health expenditures in Sudan were also unavailable. According to the World Health Organization (WHO website), the total health expenditure per capita was USD 61 in 2006 and 40 in 2007. The WHO 2010 World Health Statistics report states that general government expenditure on health as % of total government expenditure in Sudan in 2007 was 6.1 and per capita government expenditure on health at average exchange rate (US$) in 2007 was 15. The total health expenditure as % of GDP is as follows:

Table 10: Sudan Total Health Expenditure as % of GDP (WHO, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on interviews with users of services in Eastern Sudan, it is evident that healthcare services are greatly lacking, especially in certain specialties such as maternal health, neurology, cardiac, and liver diseases such as hepatitis, which is highly prevalent in Sudan (Mudawi, Hatem. “Epidemiology of Viral Hepatitis in Sudan” Faculty of Medicine University of Khartoum, 2008). The quality of health services is very low, however it has slightly improved after health insurance has started to be more prevalent. Education has improved in terms of covering and outreach but not in terms of quality and options, mainly due to a lack in human capacities. Good education is often not available and always very expensive.

Unfortunately, little data are available towards measurement of this indicator in terms of education. For health, most recently available data pre-date the UNDP support.
Annex E: Outputs under Outcome 5

Output 5.1: Capacities strengthened of Rule of Law institutions

Output Indicator 5.1.a: Rule of Law institutions assisted to provide quality legal services to population through infrastructural support and strategic and operational planning

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “infrastructural support provided to 3 police stations in the Three Protocol Areas, 2 community police aid posts in Khartoum and 1 prison in Blue Nile State; Training and operational planning support provided to police and prison staff in Kassala, Khartoum and Three Protocol Areas”. The target for 2009 – 2012 is: “Training and operational, planning and infrastructure support provided to 4 prisons, 4 police stations annually”.

This indicator looks at assistance provided to RoL institutions (the Police, the prosecutors, the judges and the prison officers) specifically through two means: 1) Infrastructural support, and 2) Training on Strategic and operational planning. The data will also be disaggregated by region, type of institution, and by type of support provided.

**Khartoum**

**Judiciary**

*Infrastructural Support*

UNDP has supported the central judiciary through assisting with the printing of legal texts and law reports, as well as supplying courts with video conferencing equipment.

**Police**

*Training & Capacity-Building of Staff*

Four workshops were conducted on the principles of community policing for popular police in Soba-Aradi and Haj Yousif Albaraka IDP camps, including 47 females and 19 males.

*Infrastructural Support*

One Community Policing Post Aid was constructed and furnished. Water and electricity facilities were installed in Albaraka IDP camp and there is preparation for constructing two Community Policing Aid Posts in Jabal Aulia IDP Camp, Khartoum State, is underway. Also, a Police Development Committee (PDC) met to review the progress of the project implementation, especially at the State level and the construction of Community Aid Posts.
Eastern Sudan

Police

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff
Several workshops were held for regular and popular police officers, including over 20 females and 100 males, on topics such as the Protection of Vulnerable Persons, Medical First Responder (incident management, patient assessment, rescue breathing, choking, etc.), Human Rights and Rule of Law principles, and strategic and crisis management. However, it is not clear in which states these workshops were held. An information session on community policing principles for women and youth was held in Kassala State.

Infrastructural Support
2 information centers were established and fully furnished at police stations in Kassala.

Prosecutors

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff
1 awareness-raising workshop was conducted targeting national security intelligence, prosecutors, police and prison.

Prison Officers

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff
1 awareness-raising workshop conducted, targeting national security intelligence, prosecutors, police and prison.

Three Protocol Areas

Police

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff
In South Kordofan, over 100 (all male) police officers of varying ranks were trained on topics including Crime investigation techniques and Human rights, modern techniques of investigations and subsequent follow-ups in Kadugli, Dilling, Al Deibat, Habila and Julud. The 100 Police officers trained so far on Investigation techniques and Human Rights are ensured to be compliant with highest international standards of modern techniques of investigations by upholding Human Rights and are there contributing to peer-to-peer training of their colleagues.

A workshop on community policing, human rights, child rights and juveniles was held for police officers as well as male and female community leaders, village chiefs, teachers and students (11 female & 19 male) in Tillo locality.

In Blue Nile 166 police officers were trained on a range of topics relevant to law enforcement such as (but not limited to) the principles of community policing from in Kurmuk, Gissan, Tadamon, Rosaieris, Damazin and Bau localities, including at least 9 female.
Infrastructural Support

Furniture and office equipment was delivered to the police, and the construction of the police training-centre was completed. The training centre is now used for training events for the State Police.

Strategic and Operational Planning

A plan was developed in consultation with state prison service for the provision of good prison management to 150 prison officers in Kadugli, Dilling, Lagawa and Rashad.

Judges

Infrastructural Support

Preparations of civil works are underway. Communications with the UNDP civil engineer and field visit to the state judiciary for engineering purposes was initiated. Also, two native court forums organized.

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff

A two-month computer and English language skills training for the judges and judicial personnel was conducted, and 83 traditional judges were trained.

Darfur States

Police

Strategic and Operational Planning

In South Darfur 3 meetings were held with Police FCPU in order to agree in areas of support and priorities. In West Darfur an agreement with FCPU for female legal aid lawyer to provide legal support to survivors dealt with by unit.

Prosecutors

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff

In North Darfur Legal Administration Department Committee was established to guide reform activities. However, legal issues associated with the “Pyramid scheme” resulted in significant security issues which lead to limited availability of Legal Administration Department staff. In South Darfur meetings took place with the Legal Admin Dept to discuss state legal aid criteria and to establish a legal aid office. Capacity assessment of the department has commenced. In West Darfur In collaboration with UNAMID, a workshop on “the role of the Prosecution in strengthening the rule of law with a focus on SGBV cases” was conducted. 7 Prosecutors attended.

Judges

Strategic and Operational Planning

In South Darfur a mapping of rural courts was completed. UNDP consulted with lawyers on training and resource requirements for judiciary including rural courts.
Training & Capacity-Building of Staff

In West Darfur training was delivered on subjects including Law of evidence, Civil Procedures Act, Criminal Procedures Act, and Law of the Rural Court for 44 rural court judges from 22 courts.

Prisons

Training & Capacity-Building of Staff

Four training courses for 102 prison officers, including 22 female officers. Prison officers in each Darfur state were trained on human rights approach to prison management, and basic prison duties. In North Darfur 30 prison officers were trained, including 5 female officers. Vocational training was provided for women in Shallah women prison included in draft LoA with University of El Fasher (Faculty of Community Development). In South Darfur 27 prison officers trained, including 6 females. In West Darfur 25 prison officers trained, including 6 females in El Geneina, 20 prison officers trained, including 5 females at Zalingei, literacy classes for 11 female inmates sponsored by UNDP and the Minister of Education commenced, and a Legal Aid and Adult Literacy Programme for female inmates was organized in Adamata Prison.

Infrastructural Support and Services

In West Darfur 24 text books and 10 Korans were provided to Adamata female prison to support adult literacy programme, 40 people were provided legal assistance, and 8 cases were submitted for legal aid. In Adamata prison legal counseling was provided to 27 inmates, and 5 cases were submitted for legal aid. In West Darfur Police detention centre Adamata and El Geneina, 13 people were counseled, and 5 cases were submitted for legal aid.

Equipment and furniture for 3 prison headquarters, and 4 priority prisons is behind schedule due to capacity issues of the UNDP procurement section.

Strategic and Operational Planning

In West Darfur agreement reached with Prison authorities on regular attendance by legal aid lawyer to Adamata prison (237 male inmates) to provide legal services.

During interviews with government officials at the state level, increased resources were noted to be allocated to community security and conflict resolution, including strengthening of accountability procedures. However, state officials that were interviewed indicate that the resources currently being allocated are not enough. The contribution of civil society has been helpful in this regard through their provision of community policing and legal aid services.

Government officials from all eight states in the investigation indicated that the resources dedicated to this issue have increased and this has led to an increase in community security, with the interviewee from Khartoum’s government explaining that all states not have a separate budget for this that is part of the police budget. State officials also described a stronger focus in recent years on the integrity of judges.

Current state-level activities related to these issues include community policing and conflict-resolution. The official from Blue Nile described activities dedicated to renewing the concept of policing and the relationship between the police and the people, as well as strengthening accountability procedures. The official from Ghedaref mentioned an Eastern Rehabilitation programme and a committee for strategic planning related to security and justice in the state. The official from West Darfur described monthly seminars on justice and
human security that all sectors of the civil society participate in along with political parties and representatives from the police.

Some of the challenges faced by government officials in this regard include financing and planning, as well as the interference of “non-police entities” – a comment made by the State official interviewed in Blue Nile. However, they pointed out the positive cooperation between human rights organizations to assist people that have been arrested and give them pro-bono legal aid, and to try and guarantee the integrity and impartiality of judges.

Regarding the contribution of UNDP, state officials from all states described it as a significant contribution especially regarding capacity-building of justice and rule of law institutions, with the exception of the North Darfur official who had a more negative opinion of the impact of such activities.

**Output Indicator 5.1.b: Level of crimes decreased in IDP camps**

Levels of crime in internally displaced persons camps were felt to have improved in recent years, particularly with the signing of the peace agreement, with the exception of the three Darfur states where conflict and political instability meant that IDPs were still vulnerable to crime.

Among respondents to the questionnaire (48% of whom are female and 39% of whom are youth), 48% of respondents indicate that crime occurrence remains a problem in their communities. Among the respondents, 27% described it as high (52% of which are female) and only 5% described it as very high (56% of which are women). Looking only at female respondents, 45% described it as high and 6% as very high, while 30% described it as low. A total of 80% indicated that the crime rate has decreased over the past year (48% of which are women), while 11% (57% of which are women) said there was no change and 8% (54% of which are women) said it had increased. Responses from the female respondents are similar. Looking at the regional disaggregation shows that 67% of those who chose “very high” live in North Darfur while 22% live in Kassala and 11% in Blue Nile. Of those who chose “high” 51% live in North Darfur, 22% in West Darfur, 22% in Kassala, and 4% in Blue Nile.

Participants in focus group discussions conducted in IDP camps were split when asked to describe personal safety in their camps and their worry about being subjected to crime. Approximately 30% of participants indicated that although crimes are still higher than they should be, they believe things have been slowly improving since the CPA, while another 30% said that compared to a few years ago the crime rate has improved, but they still cannot claim to be satisfied as they still feel unsafe. 10% of participants seemed more ambivalent in their responses, fluctuating between a sense of safety during the day, but a sense of insecurity after dark and especially late at night, particularly for women. And 10% indicated that they were not at all satisfied and that more needs to be done to improve safety in their camps. Almost all participants agreed that crime rates have gone down significantly, particularly armed robbery, with the exception of the Darfur states and South Kordofan where respondents felt that it is still unsafe.

**Output Indicator 5.1.c: % decrease in the backlog of court cases**

This indicator was not included in the interviews, thus, information is extracted from secondary data. According to the report “Sudan in Figures” published in 2008, the following are the number of court cases:

- 13651 Pending Cases in courts
- 340 Pending Cases in Appeals court
- 921 pending cases in Supreme court
Output Indicator 5.1.d: Number of prisons at state level applying Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Personal Hygiene)

Prisons in several states have received support from UNDP to improve the treatment of prisoners, including awareness-raising workshops and trainings on human rights approach to prison management, basic prison duties, and literacy for prison officers in Kassala and the Darfur states. But secondary data sources point to a number of challenges faced by prisons in Sudan. A UNDP report (Governance and Rule of Law: Medium –term Policy Focus and Programme Framework, June 2009-June 2012, North Sudan) has the following to say about prisons in Sudan (p.23):

Justice sector institutions have also been affected in the delivery of services, and hence their capacity to provide access to justice. Notably infrastructure investment for prisons, police stations and the judiciary has not been prioritized. Therefore physical access to justice, such as prison and police jail conditions and the availability of courts, has been negatively impacted. In terms of human resources, massive displacement and insufficient investment in capacity development have left justice sector institutions, even where they exist, with limited capacity to deliver effective services. For example, many current staff are overstretched, working under harsh conditions and lacking in human rights awareness and approaches to effective service delivering in pursuit of their mandates. This further impedes the availability and acceptability of services.

It also says this (p.28):

According to the Ministry of Interior, the prison population in Sudan has increased exponentially - with prison overcrowding rampant in areas with a high incidence of IDPs, including Khartoum. In remote communities, including in Darfur, Damazine and South Kordofan, in addition to over-population, prisons are dilapidated and create increased health risks due to poor water and sanitation, insufficient nutrition. Prisoners are also without skills development and rehabilitation opportunities and juvenile, female and remand detainees are often mixed with convicted prisoners.

However, expectedly, state government officials interviewed about prisons in their states were reluctant to point out any specific flaws with their treatment of prisoners. Almost all respondents believe that the prisons have been neglected for a long time. According to them, in the recent years improvements occurred that can be considered more or less significant, but many changes and improvements are still needed. Only the interviewee from South Kordofan described his prisons as “in very good shape”. Most of the respondents did not respond to the issue of the treatment of the prisoners. The rest generally described it as compatible with laws and human rights. Interviewees generally described that efforts are underway to improve prison conditions and link prisoners to services, yet from a very low base.

Output Indicator 5.1.e: Increase in level of confidence of local communities in police disaggregated by state and gender

Respondents were asked about three issues concerning the local police: competence, fairness, and response to complaints. Respondents indicated a general sense of moderate or cautious confidence in the police. The data is first disaggregated by gender, and then disaggregated by region.

When asked about competence of local police, 30% reported high confidence, 39% reported medium confidence, 19% reported low confidence, and 12% reported no confidence. All responses were split more or less evenly among men and women.

When asked about confidence in the fairness of police 21% reported high confidence (45% of whom were
women), 22% reported medium confidence (46% of whom are women), 43% reported low confidence (39% of whom are women), and 14% reported no confidence (76% of whom are women). Most of those who reported low or no confidence are in West Darfur, North Darfur, and Kassala.

When asked about police response to complaints 26% described the police as “very responsive” (43% of whom are women), 38% described them as “somewhat responsive” (44% of whom are women), and 36% as not responsive (60% of whom are women). The majority of those who described the police as “not responsive” were in West Darfur, North Darfur, and Kassala.

Below is the regional disaggregation of the data.

**Three Protocol Areas**

When asked about competence of local police, 40% reported high confidence, the majority (13%) of total reported medium confidence, 47% reported low confidence.

When asked about confidence in the fairness of police, 13% reported high confidence and 60% of total respondents reported medium confidence, while 26% reported low confidence.

When asked about response to complaints 7% described a high response, while 40% described a moderate response, while 50% indicated that the police are not responsive to complaints.

Participants in focus group discussions pointed to the problem of armed militias that are often better equipped than the police forces themselves, which poses a huge challenge for the police. Participants agreed that the police need more training and equipment. Several of them had dealt with the police directly to report armed robbery or assault incidents, and they report that their experience was relatively positive. The general sentiment is that the police is doing what they can with their current resources. An important point that was made about fairness is that the police are more or less fair unless dealing with political cases. The prevailing opinion is that when it comes to political cases, fairness almost disappears.

**Eastern Sudan**

When asked about competence of local police, 15% reported high confidence, the majority (30%) of total reported medium confidence, 35% reported low confidence, and 10% reported no confidence.

When asked about confidence in the fairness of police, 17% reported high confidence and 38% of total respondents reported medium confidence, while reported low confidence 43%.

When asked about response to complaints 16% described a high response, while 45.2% described a moderate response, while 36% indicated that the police are not responsive to complaints.

Participants in focus group discussions indicated that the police are severely limited in what they can do due to the lack of resources and training. None of the participants had dealt with the police directly, but there was a noticeable stigma against the police that led to only moderate confidence in their competence and fairness. The same point made in the Three Protocol Areas about the lack of fairness in political cases was also raised in Kassala, as this seems to be a prevailing sentiment in Sudan.

**Darfur States**

When asked about competence of local police, 9% reported high confidence in their competence, 20% of total reported medium confidence, 31% reported low confidence, and 20% reported no confidence.
When asked about confidence in the fairness of police, 7% reported high confidence and 20% of total respondents reported medium confidence, while 66% reported low confidence.

When asked about response to complaints 12% described a high response, while 38% described a moderate response, while 43% indicated that the police are not responsive to complaints.

Participants in focus group discussions in West and North Darfur indicated that the police are not currently able to protect the safety of the community on their own, especially in remote areas, as armed militias are widespread and better organized, trained, and armed. They described a general lack of personal security in those areas because of this. Some in West Darfur mentioned that the police forces themselves are one of the most oppressed groups in society as they are poorly paid, poorly equipped, and poorly treated by the government. Three of the participants had dealt with the police directly when reporting crimes and all agreed that there was a sense that the police were unorganized and this led to a doubt that the crimes they were reporting might not be taken seriously. One participant in West Darfur said that she had never deal with the police because she doesn’t report crimes to them as she is not confidence that they will do anything. Regarding fairness of the police, participants indicated that if the crime is an apolitical one, then usually justice is served, but if the person is accused of something that can be perceived as anti-government, then justice becomes a rare commodity. Regarding fairness of the police, there was an overwhelming sentiment of lack of confidence in their fairness. One participant stated that one is treated by the police based on one’s colour, as most of the police are from the North of Sudan and treat Southerners badly.

**Output SP Indicator 5.1.f: Number of Courts Rehabilitated and Equipped**

Five courts were rehabilitated and equipped across the Northern States of Sudan, including Khartoum, South Kordofan, Kassala, Blue Nile and Addamar states.

**Output SP Indicator 5.1.g: Number of Community Police Posts Established Disaggregated by Region**

A total of 63 community police posts were established across Northern Sudan as follows:

- 3 in Khartoum
- 5 in South Kordofan
- 2 in Kassala
- 20 in North Darfur
- 20 in South Darfur
- 13 in West Darfur

**Output 5.2 Access to justice, particularly for vulnerable groups, improved**

**Output Indicator 5.2.a Number of Functioning JCCs Disaggregated by Region**

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “9 JCCs functioning; pilot case tracking system established for 4 JCCs”. The target for 2009: 3 additional JCCs fully functional; and case tracking pilot in 6 JCCs, 2010: Case tracking system piloted in 8 JCCs; annual access to justice report produced, 2011: Case tracking system established in 11 JCCs; annual report produced, and 2012: Annual case tracking report produced in all supported.

There are currently a total of 11 functioning JCCs in North Sudan, at least 5 of which have case-tracking
Eastern Sudan

There is currently 1 functioning JCC in Kassala state, which has a case-tracking system.

One JCC was supported to provide legal aid services to communities of rural Kassala and Kassala town. 80 cases were received, 25 were successfully settled and 55 are yet to be resolved. One JCC was supported to provide legal aid services to communities.

Three Protocol Areas

There are currently 5 JCCs functioning in the region, distributed as follows: 1 in Blue Nile, 3 in South Kordofan, and 1 in Abyei. Those in South Kordofan have a centralized tracking system in Kadugli as well as their own case-tracking documents.

UNDP provided the three JCCs in South Kordofan with technical guidance and a financial grant. It also provided technical support by reviewing their work-plans, supporting them in preparing awareness workshops, resolving in-house conflicts, preparing accountability reports, and training in managing the legal aid cases etc. It also supported in building paralegal capacity through the following 4 capacity development training courses were organized for paralegals of Lagawa, Kadugli and Dilling JCCs. The courses covered dispensation of legal aid and strategic planning, management and administration of JCC apart from training the paralegals on Sudanese legislation, International conventions, conflict resolution and CPA. A total of 105 paralegals (76 male & 29 female) participated in the training courses. The Framework for the Legal Information Centre developed, equipment & management arrangement to be put in place in the 2nd half of the year. A Legal aid case tracker has been established for all the three JCCs to keep a track on the legal aid cases for further development and accountability.

In Blue Nile 37 paralegals were trained on legal aid, conflict resolution, JCC management, organizing workshops and also received specialized trainings on human rights, child rights, women rights and domestic violence, 4 awareness-raising trainings were conducted, and the legal information centre was established at the JCC, books were identified and included in the procurement plan.

Darfur States

There are currently 7 JCCs functioning in the region, distributed as follows: 2 in South Darfur (Kass and Kalma), 2 in West Darfur (Darti and Zengilei), 3 in North Darfur (Zamzam, Abu Shouk, and Kassab). The JCC in Kalma has a case-tracking system.

Output SP Indicator 5.2.b: Increase of number of cases presented to JCCs Disaggregated by Region

A total of 182 were received in JCCs across North Sudan.

Eastern Sudan

A total of 80 cases were received by the JCC in Kassala State. It was supported to provide legal aid services to communities of rural Kassala and Kassala town. 80 cases were received, 30 were successfully settled and 50 are yet to be resolved.

Three Protocol Areas
A total of 49 were received in the region. 21 were received by the JCCs in South Kordofan, out of which 15 were resolved, and one mediation case is in progress. 28 cases were received by the JCC, 9 cases were mediated and 13 cases were successfully settled, 6 cases are still pending.

Darfur States

Increase of number of cases presented to JCCs that are dealt with by professional laywers: 16 in South Darfur, 2 in West Darfur, 35 in North Darfur.

Output SP Indicator 5.2.c: Number of Legal Aid Centres Providing Services to Communities in IDP Camps

A total of 6 Legal Aid Centres are now providing services to communities in IDP camps, distributed as follows:

- 1 in South Darfur, 2 in West Darfur, 1 In North Darfur
- 2 in South Kordofan (in Kadugli, Dilling and Lagawa)
Annex F: Outputs under Outcome 6

Output 6.1: National and sub-national, state and local institutions and communities capacities for effective environmental governance, natural resources management, conflict and disaster risk reduction enhanced

Output Indicator 6.1.a: Natural resource management system for disaster, risk and conflict reduction available and operational

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is “Natural resource management, and disaster risk reduction and management systems are relatively weak and need strengthening; Inadequate or inequitable access to resources”. The target for 2009: Capacity needs assessment and training of government institutions involved in disaster risk management (management, monitoring, planning for effective oversight functions, infrastructural and equipment) conducted, 2010: Roles, mandate and functions of the various ministries and institutions involved in disaster risk management clearly defined and appropriate, 2011: Disaster risk reduction integrated into the national and targeted at-risk states strategic planning and budgeting processes, and 2012: Integrated disaster risk management plans at national and targeted at-risk states developed, approved and mainstreamed into the strategic planning processes.

At the national level, the National Information Center for Early Warning on Natural Resources Conflicts has been established.

According to state government officials that were interviewed, three of the eight states included in this study (Ghedaref, North Darfur, South Kordofan) had an administrative structure for environmental and disaster management and crisis prevention, with an additional state (Red Sea) currently establishing such a structure and yet to set a budget for it. Interviewees from the remaining four states included in this study indicate that no such structures are currently in place.

Output 6.2: Socio-economic threat and risk mapping and analysis conducted by state governments to reduce conflict through prioritized planning and spending

Output Indicator 6.2.a: Number of states covered with threat/risk mapping assessments

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “6 states (North) covered with threat and risk mapping assessments”. The target for 2009-2012 is: “9 States covered (cumulative)”. The 2010 the Crisis and Risk Mapping Analysis (CRMA, 2010) progress report indicates that a total of 5 states have been covered with threat/risk mapping assessments, rather than the 6 indicated in the baseline. According to the report, threat/risk mapping has been completed in South Kordofan (Abyei), Blue Nile, Kassala, Ghedaref, and Red Sea. In the Darfur states, basic information has been collected but it is understood that the maps have not been produced. However, a threat/risk mapping specific to the nomadic community has been conducted and finalised for the three Darfur states. It is noted in a review of CRMA activities produced in 2010 that the difficult humanitarian situation in the Darfur states has posed an obstacle to the region benefiting from CRMA activities as much as other regions such as Eastern Sudan and the Three Protocol Areas (Nyheim and Albrecht, 2010).
Interviews with state government officials in all eight states included in this study corroborate the above information. Interviewees from Kassala, Ghedaref, Blue Nile and South Kordofan stated that they are currently involved in the process of risk mapping, although the South Kordofan official stated that while the data has been collected and analysed and inputted into the system, the maps have not yet been produced.

The only deviation from CRMA data is that the officials from Red Sea stated that no mapping activities have yet been completed in their states, while CRMA data indicates that maps have been produced for all states in Eastern Sudan. The interviewee from North Darfur indicated that a process of risk-mapping had recently begun, while the interviewee from West Darfur indicated that no such activities have yet taken place.

Only two of the nine states noted that risk mapping had improved in the past two years. Some of the challenges noted by interviewees include the lack of an effective management information system that can provide the necessary data to carry out such mapping activities, the lack of financial resources, and the lack of skills required to conduct the mapping itself.

A state-by-state briefing on the current state of CRMA activities can be extracted from the 2010 CRMA review, and is noted below.

Blue Nile

Baseline data collected for the state and Threat/Risk Mapping (TRM) workshops completed for every locality, all data processed and validated, shared with government, served as input to Situational Analysis; Situational Analysis for the State produced in collaboration with Government, conclusions of the analysis being fed into the planning process; and Built a relationship with key government officials engaged in knowledge management that is now making it possible to discuss capacity development plans.

South Kordofan (Abyei)

Baseline data collected for the states and TRM workshops completed for every locality, all data processed and validated, shared with government; 4Ws tool fully operational as RCSO information management system, providing inputs to government/NGO joint planning at Monthly Coordination Meetings; Extensive training and capacitation of the State Information Centre; Threat/Risk Mapping Assessment (TRMA) data served to identify priority areas for intervention for donors on a number of occasions (both individual information requests and contributions to collective processes like the 5+5 Committee), DDR Commission and (recently) RPCM. In Abyei Baseline data collected for the area and TRM workshops completed for every locality, all data processed and validated; and Updated baseline data collected for the area in 2009 (following the 2008 conflict) and provided in a special Arc Reader package to the Early Recovery Steering Committee.

Kassala

Red Sea


Ghedaref:

Endorsement of and engagement with CRMA data and tools; Development of Gedaref State Situation Analysis, to be signed March 2010 (at the time of the assessment, no information was available on whether this was indeed signed as planned), Mid-term Review of Gedaref State Strategic Plan 2007 – 2011, and development a Revised Gedaref State Strategic Plan, Phase II 2010 – 2011 ongoing; and Roll-out of a series of IT, GIS and information management tool training sessions for state and non-state actors.

Darfur States:

Establishment of an Information Management Working Group (IMWG) for the Darfur states; Creation of a Darfur IMWG Standardization Task Force to standardize baseline datasets to assure uniformity and interoperability of the databases used by different agencies; Completion of a regionally and sectorally-focused CRM (Crisis Recovery Mapping) Workshop in each of the three States in collaboration with FAO with participants from the Nomadic Communities; Completion of Youth Issue Mapping Workshop in Krinding IDP Camp in collaboration with Warchild Canada; IOM Environmental and Livelihoods Vulnerability Mapping (ELVM); Initial Training with UNDP staff and INGOs on the use and benefits of the 4W’s software; and Support to OCHA Camp Mapping in Al Salaam (North Darfur), Dereig (South Darfur), and Krinding (West Darfur).

Output Indicator 6.2.b: Number of states integrating social threat/risk mapping, recommendations endorsed, implemented and analysis used in planning and decision making

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “0 threats and risks identified and integrated into state analysis and planning”. The target for 2009 is: “At least 50% of the states covered with threat/risk mapping integrating analysis in planning and decision making”, for 2010 is: “At least 90% of the states covered with threat/risk mapping integrating analysis in planning and decision making”.

A total of 3 states can be said to be currently integrating and using the results of threat/risk mapping in their planning and decision-making. They are: Blue Nile, South Kordofan (Abyei), Kassala. For Red Sea and Ghedaref it seems that the mapping results have been more utilized by UN agencies and other donors, than by government entities. It is important to note that all 8 states have endorsed the use of CRMA.

According to a review of CRMA activities produced in 2010, threat/risk mapping recommendations have been used by governments of Eastern Sudan and the Three Protocol Areas, while the Darfur states “have not directly benefited” (Nyheim and Albrecht, 2010). The review states that “in the East and Three Protocol States, the strategic thinking on engaging with State government and its implementation can be considered sound”.

This is corroborated by interviews with state government officials. Interviewees Eastern Sudan, particularly Kassala, noted that the police and security forces had increasingly used risk maps to ‘assess risks and prepare for potential threats’ while the interviewee from South Kordofan credited CRMA activities with introducing a culture of strategic planning in the state civil service.
As for suggestions on how to improve state government integration of CRMA activities, interviewees strongly recommended that donors and central government put a stronger focus on engaging state government officials in the process. This is reiterated in recommendations by the 2010 CRMA review (Nyheim and Albrecht, 2010: 7) which noted that CRMA implementers should:

- Tighten focus onto State Governments and create interface with donor community

The CRMA focus should: (a) support the State Governments in their risk mapping efforts and budget prioritization; and (b) create a prioritization/targeting service for donors to help inform funding allocations.

Although interviewees did not give details about their state’s use of CRMA outputs, a state-by-state briefing on the level of integration of CRMA activities can be extracted from the 2010 CRMA review:

**Blue Nile**

Specific impacts of the CRMA now include the existence of an improved evidence base for planning (basic services, land use, returnee populations) collated and available to government. Furthermore, community perceptions have been fed into locality plans and Situational Analysis.

**South Kordofan (Abyei)**

Specific impacts of the CRMA now include significantly improved capacity of the State Information Centre, also involving the provision of collated data sets for planning; a stronger TRM evidence base used for DDR Commission planning; and conflict analysis used for donor fund targeting.

Specific impacts for Abyei include inputs into UNDP’s Livelihoods and Economic Opportunities Strategy and Abyei Arc Reader now used by a number of Early Recovery Steering Committee to plan reconstruction.

**Kassala**

The Kassala State Situation Analysis, April 2009 and the information available has enabled a number of organisations to better target their interventions, including a greater focus on war-affected communities (SPCRP (EC); UNDDR; Livelihoods and NRM, DRR, MicroFinance (UNDP); etc); and Policy-brief on Peaceful Coexistence and Recovery of War-affected communities, Mid-term Review of Kassala State Strategic Plan 2007 – 2011, September 2009 and Revised Kassala State Strategic Plan, Phase II 2010 – 2011, were initiatives that came out of the finalisation of the Situation Analysis and the recognition that with the current information available a revision of priorities and plans was necessary.

In direct impacts are related to how the CRMA has assisted in introducing a new culture of strategic planning that is focused on knowledge management, coordination and participation. The need for establishing appropriate structures and systems both at state and locality levels has been clearly articulated by government.

**Red Sea**

Specific impacts of the CRMA in Red Sea State include the Red Sea State Situation Analysis (CRMA Progress Report, UNDP, 2009) and the information available has enabled a number of organizations to better target their interventions, including a greater focus on war-affected communities (SPCRP (EC); UNDDR; Livelihoods and NRM, DRR, MicroFinance (UNDP); etc). Furthermore, the development of Locality Development Profiles benefited from information inputs and GIS support; and a mid-term review of the State Strategic Plan is currently underway, following a similar methodology of the process in Kassala State.
Ghedaref

The development of the Ghedaref State Situation Analysis has opened up for a more consultative and open dialogue of issues previously considered sensitive. It constitutes the first comprehensive analysis written in English about Gedaref State and provides potential international actors with a starting-point for engaging with the state government. A mid-term review of the State Strategic Plan is currently underway, following a similar methodology of the process in Kassala State.

Darfur States

Although the CRMA has not been able to carry out state-wide risk mapping and analysis with state and non-state actors, as in the East and Three Protocol Areas, it has been able to assist selected partners (UN agencies, NGOs, and some government ministries) in carrying out sector- and geographically-focused risk mapping and analysis.

Output 6.3 Comprehensive strategic frameworks developed at national and sub-national levels regarding environment and natural resource management.

Output Indicator 6.3.a: % of supported national and sub-national institutions adopting and implementing environment and natural resource management frameworks.

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “National environmental management plans and strategies (BD, CC, CD, POPs, NAPA) outlining priority actions for environmental management in Sudan are in place. No national and sub-national institutions currently adopting and implementing environment and natural resource management frameworks”. The target for 2009 is: 10% of supported national and sub-national institutions adopting and implementing environment and natural resource management frameworks. The target for 2010 is: 30% of supported institutions (cumulative). The target for 2011 is: 50% of supported institutions (cumulative). The target for 2012 is: 70% of supported institutions (cumulative).

The baseline indicates that the national strategies exist, but no institutions are yet adopting/implementing relevant frameworks for natural resource management. The targets reflect the percentage of institutions applying such frameworks, however the total number of institutions requiring support are not clear. Feedback from UNDP on this indicator noted the following:

Building on the approved Sudan National Adaption programme of Action for climate change, UNDP, with support form the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) for adaptation to climate change, has prepared and initiated implementation of the first programmatic approach for adaptation to climate change in 5 states in Sudan representing the different ecological settings. So far, UNDP initiated a set of adaptation-focused measures including water harvesting techniques and afforestation activities that will minimize and reverse the food insecurity of small-scale farmers and pastoralists, reduce vulnerability of rural communities from increasing climatic variability and climate change and improve natural resources management.

UNDP, with GEF support has enabled the government to prepare its draft Second National Communication report to be finalized and submitted to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) early 2011. The report is being prepared in accordance with guidance of the UNFCCC. UNDP/GEF also invested in developing national capacities as relates to updating of the Green House Gases and assessments of vulnerability and adaptation to climate change in Sudan to fulfill Sudan’s reporting commitments to the UNFCCC on a continuing basis and to be used as planning framework for mitigating climate change and environmental management in Sudan.
Furthermore, the CPAP mid-term review states the following:

1. The scoping of the climate change mitigation activities cover the sectors that represent the main sources for green house gas emissions in Sudan, namely energy, land use change and forestry. Fifty-three (53) national experts representing governments, universities, NGOs, research institutes and private sector employees were trained on the technology of green house gas mitigation. It further addressed ways of incorporating climate change mitigation aspects into national policies, strategies and development programmes.

2. A technical background report was prepared covering current vulnerabilities of the water sector and all the non-climatic factors that contribute to current eco-system vulnerability, including policies, institutional matters and other factors. Capacity enhancement took place at relevant institutions on data collection and modeling and the trained groups assisted in the data collection, modeling and analysis for final draft report. However, use of output data on this capacity enhancement is not available, so impacts cannot be assessed.

3. Vulnerability assessments included the important ecosystems along the coast. The report provides an assessment of the current vulnerability and adaptation of the coastal zone to the impacts of climate change and factors contributing to the current vulnerability of the system, including policies, institutional issues and others. Actions taken based on these assessments, however, are not documented.

4. The project is also used to channel UNDP’s support to the public and private sectors to raise their awareness on the carbon market in Sudan and to create an enabling environment for efficient Clean Development Mechanism and other carbon trading opportunities such as the Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and forest Degradation to support realization of the country’s environmentally sound and sustainable development. Three Project Idea Notes are so far identified, developed and are pipelined for the Clean Development Mechanism support.

Pilot Climate change adaptation measures implemented in 5 states representing the different ecological settings in Sudan:

1. In the state of Gedarif, different water harvesting techniques were used in a total area of 650 feddans. 55 farmers benefitted from these techniques and in addition they received 208 sacks of early maturing sorghum variety, tree seedlings were planted and pasture seeds were broadcasted. A number of training activities for the communities were carried out, but no training impact assessments were conducted.

2. In North Kordofan, three wells were dug, supplied with pumps and are used for producing crops and vegetables and for providing irrigation of the tree shelterbelts. Village Development Committees were established in seven villages and a number of training activities were undertaken to build their capacities. About 300,000 tree seedlings were produced and planted. About 12,000 trees and shrubs and trees were planted to fix sand dunes. More than 20 feddans are cultivated by vegetables and other crops in three villages. About 438 households are benefitting from this activity as a supplement diet and as a source of additional income. No evaluation report is available, so the impacts could not be considered.
Annex G: Outputs under Outcome 7

Output 7.1: National/sub-national capacities strengthened to manage the national mine action programme

Output Indicator 7.1.a: National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) capacitated to implement their mandate and lead the mine action activities

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) established through presidential Decrees. The target for 2009-2010 is: Knowledge of concerned NMAA, NMAC and SSDC staff developed at the technical (mine clearance) and functional level, for 2011 is: National authorities capacitated to finance and lead the mine action coordination activities, and for 2012 is: National authorities capacitated to assume full responsibility of mine action process.

Regarding the capacity of the NMAA and NMAC, according to the UNDP’s 2009 Annual Mine Action Report (UNDP, 2009: 4) the NMAA and SSDC are “now fully and actively engaged in the planning, coordination, priority setting, quality assurance and reporting of mine action activities”. The core legislative frameworks, basic organizational infrastructure (such as head and field offices), and the training of new staff has all been completed. Regarding the capacity of the NMAA and SSDC to plan, coordinate, implement and monitor all aspects of mine action in Sudan, the 2009 Annual Mine Action report states the following:

With the capacity development assistance provided by UNDP including theoretically training, on the job training and technical assistance, the National Mine Action Authority (NMAA), National Mine Action Center (NMAC), Southern Sudan Demining Commission (SSDA) and their field offices are now fully and actively engaged in the planning, coordination, priority setting, quality assurance and reporting of mine action activities in accordance with International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and National Mine Action Technical Standards and Guidelines (NTSGs). Thus, these authorities and their sub-structures have made significant progress in 2009 towards full national ownership and leadership in mine action. As a sign of more active and productive engagement by NMAC and SSDA their relevant staff, they worked side by side with the staff of UNMAO in the preparation and finalization of demining operations plan for 2010. More importantly, the revision of the mine action transition plan and the plan of action for its implementation will ensure the smooth transition of the management of mine action from the UN to the national authorities by June 2011.

During a “Mine Action Lessons-Learned Workshop” held by the UNDP and government officials from various agencies, several points were raised related to the NMAA. It was noted that most of the trainings conducted for NMAA staff were based on “ad-hoc assessments and experience from other countries”. A locally tailored training package based on a detailed needs-assessment could have provided details overlooked otherwise. It was also recommended that there should be a clear separation between policy and executive levels. It is not clear whether this has yet taken place.

Output Indicator 7.1.b: No. of national de-miners trained/equipped/field deployed for clearance of mine/ERW affected areas

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: 240 de-miners trained/equipped & 110 de-miners field deployed; 446 km of Babanusa-Wau railway line and 234 km of roads in Kassala state. The target for 2011 is: knowledge
of 130 national de-miners developed to conduct mine action activities, and for 2012: 130 de-miners equipped and deployed.

According to the 2009 Mine Action report ("Annual Progress Report", UNDP Sudan, 1\textsuperscript{st} January – 31\textsuperscript{st} December 2009) an additional 28 deminers were field deployed in Kassala. 120 deminers were desk accredited to International Mine Action Standards, field accreditation of these individuals is still underway.

Interviews were conducted with central-level and state-level government officials to gather more information about demining in Sudan. The central government employee stated that the total number of deminers trained across Sudan is approximately 560 individuals but he could not specify how many have been accredited and deployed. He stated that the plan for the coming period is to further involve State governments in the demining programs, as currently most tasks are implemented by the central government and the partners. He noted that currently UNDP implements most of the programs and that the full hand-over process has not yet taken place.

Interviews with state-level officials point to a number of issues. Interviewees from Kassala, Ghedaref, Blue Nile and North Darfour noted that there are dangerous areas in their states. The interviewee from Kassala responded that they are currently in the process of demining the State, while Ghedaref complained that there is no accurate mapping of the problem areas. Blue Nile and North Darfour describe the mine problem as “contained in specific areas” that don’t pose a problem to most residents, especially in the city, but do pose a problem to nomadic people or shepherds. The interviewee from South Kordofan said that demining activities are ongoing and constantly progressing, and thus the problem is slowly being solved, while the interviewee from West Darfour say there are no mines. Interviewees from Kassala, Blue Nile, North Darfour and South Kordofan said that over the past two years the situation has stabilized and improved due to demining programs by the local government and the UN. Interviewees from Kassala, Ghedaref, North Darfur, and South Kordofan stated that the local government is implementing awareness-campaigns for mines.

Regarding the percentage of high-priority routes that have been cleared of mines, the 2009 UN Sudan Landmine Impact Survey states that 1,186 areas were identified as “Dangerous Areas” (DAs). Of these, 456 (38\%) had been cleared.

In addition to DAs, which can be considered high-priority, there are also “Suspected Hazardous Areas” (SHAs), which can be considered lower priority. The Survey outlines the distribution of roads identified as and those cleared as follows:

Table 11: Hazardous Roads Suspected, Surveyed, and Cleared (UN Sudan Landmine Impact Survey, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. Suspected Hazardous Roads</th>
<th>Surveyed</th>
<th>Cleared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kassala</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Sea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghedaref</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kordofan (Abyei)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Nile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of priority roads surveyed = 38\%
% of priority roads cleared = 0.6\%

It is important to note that the Darfur states were not included in this mine mapping. According to the Survey (UN Mine Action Office, 2009: 9:}
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The three Darfur states could not be surveyed because of safety concerns for the survey teams though the United Nations has received few reports on suspected mines in Darfur from the local authorities or NGOs.

More important to note is that data on this issue was gathered prior to the referendum. Thus, it is unclear how the separation of the North and South will affect activities by the NMAA especially given that the deadline for clearing all mined areas is April 2014. In light of the separation, a reassessment of mine action planning and deadlines is necessary.

**Output 7.2: Reintegration of ex-combatants completed in accordance with the national DDR strategy with support of UNMIS**

**Output Indicator 7.2.a: Number ex-combatants, associated groups, demobilized & reintegrated, disaggregated by age, gender and disability**

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “1,700 ex-combatants disarmed and demobilized in ESPA areas”, and the target for 2009 is: “30,000 participants in CPA areas, including 1,900 women and 2,000 disabled, participating or completing reintegration”, for 2010: “60,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration”, and for 2011: 45,000 participants, including 4100 women and 15,500 disabled, participating or completed reintegration.


- 27,003 participants demobilized as of end of August 2010, including 6,691 women and 2,596 disabled.
- 17,850 participants are under the various stages of reintegration with Implementing Partners.

Thus, the number of demobilized is just under the target for 2009, although the targets for women and disabled are well above. However, since the indicator reflects “participating or completing reintegration” it is logical to add those participants that are described above as “under the various stages of reintegration, which brings the total number to 44,853.

For some additional details, DDR reports note that 20,716 participants have been counseled as of end of June 2010, including 5,674 women, and 1440 (including 359 women) beneficiaries are benefiting from reintegration packages or undergoing training or other services provided by implementing partners.

**Output Indicator 7.2.b: Percentage of participants who report successful individual reintegration projects in client satisfaction surveys**

The CPAP does not state a baseline for this indicator. Ex-combatants who have received reintegration support from UNDP were surveyed about their satisfaction with the support they’ve received. The majority of respondents (62%) had received some kind of livelihoods support, 43% had received vocational skills training, and 36% had received reintegration packages including foodstuffs among other things. When asked how they rate the quality of the support they received, 62% stated that the services were good and met their expectations, and 14% rated it as excellent. 22% said it did not meet their expectations and 2.3% described it as very poor. 65% said the support was relevant to their specific needs.
The question that forms the core of the indicator to be measured, respondents were asked about how they view their own reintegration into their communities. Over half (54%) considered themselves successfully reintegrated, while 43% considered themselves only moderately successful, and 2.9% did not see themselves as successfully reintegrated. However, many respondents complained about significant delays they faced in receiving reintegration support.

When asked how the reintegration support could be improved most respondents pointed to a more diversified range of services and a simplified application process.

**Output 7.3: Proliferation and circulation of small arms reduced**

**Output Indicator 7.3.a: Number of state level community security and arms control action (CSAC) plans developed and implemented. Number of communities benefitting from CSAC activities**

The CPAP baseline value for this indicator is: “No community security and arms control action plans developed. Five small CSAC projects being implemented in BNS, SKS, KRT, RS and Kassala”. The target for 2009 is: 5 sub-projects developed and implement community security and arms control action plans, for 2010: 10 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans, and for 2011: 20 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans.

This indicator consists of two components: 1) the number of CSAC plans at state level; and 2) the number of communities benefitting from CSAC activities. The CPAP baseline is: “No community security and arms control action plans developed; five small CSAC projects being implemented in Blue Nile, South Kordofan, Khartoum, Red Sea and Kassala.” The CPAP target for 2009 is: “5 sub-projects developed and implement community security and arms control action plans”, for 2010: “10 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans”, and for 2011 is: “20 sub-projects (cumulative) developed and implement community security and arms control action plans”.

Based on various UNDP progress reports, twelve community security projects in the three states of Eastern Sudan (four communities per state) are underway or completed, including the Duka Women’s Centre in Ghedaref, and the Girgir Police Station and Taboseib Geographical Water Survey in Kassala.

In the Three Protocol Areas workshops were held in South Kordofan and Abyei, and priority communities and priority interventions for each community were identified through workshops and focus group discussions and agreed to by stakeholders. However, the projects had not yet been launched at reporting time.

Thus, the current value for this indicator is **12**.
Output 7.4: Post-conflict recovery accelerated in strategic areas to ensure peace dividends are visible and tangible to conflict-affected populations

Output Indicator 7.4.a: Number of recovery projects established and/or people benefiting, including returnees and ex-IDPs from recovery and development initiatives through strengthening CBOs/Civil Society and Local Govt. Authorities.

The CPAP baseline for this indicator is: “10 community-based integrated recovery & rehabilitation projects running”. The target for 2009 is: “Rural livelihood initiatives in 10 states; 100,000 beneficiaries: 30% female; 30% youth”, for 2010 is: “200,000 beneficiaries (cumulative): 35% female; 35% youth” and for 2011 is: “300,000 beneficiaries (cumulative): 40% female; 40% youth”.

According to 2010 UNDP progress report for the Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP), there are now rural livelihood initiatives in 10 states across Sudan (North and South), which was the target for 2009. The distribution of the states is as follows:

Blue Nile (Geissan and Kurmuk localities), Abyei, Red Sea (Rural Port Sudan and Halaib localities), River Nile (Abu Hammed and Berber localities), South Kordofan (Kadugli Locality), Upper Nile (Renk County), Central Equatoria (Juba County), Eastern Equatoria (Torit County), Warrap (Gogrial East County) and Northern Bahr El Ghazal (Aweil Centre and West Counties).

The second component of the target values is the number of beneficiaries. The total number of beneficiaries during the period January 2005 to January 2010 is reported by the UNDP website to be 206,791. For the period after that, it is very difficult to report on a specific number of beneficiaries as the livelihood programme itself reports on numbers of training sessions and numbers of associations, youth centers, women’s groups, etc. Only in some cases does it refer to a specific number of beneficiaries. For example, according to the RRP progress report for the period February to April 2010, the number of individual beneficiaries is distributed among the Northern states as follows: 868 in Blue Nile (at least 364 women), 50 in South Kordofan (at least 20 women), 55 in Abyei, and 15 in River Nile (all women). Another part of the report lists at least 5,282 beneficiaries. But in addition to these, there are a number of initiatives (trainings, infrastructure projects, institution-building) for which the number of individual beneficiaries is not known. The UNDP website reports an additional 2,753 beneficiaries in 2011. This brings the total number of beneficiaries to 214,826, which indicates strong chance that the 2011 target of 300,000 beneficiaries could be achieved.

The type of support provided to these beneficiaries includes technical training, such as grinding mill management, irrigation practices, food processing, and water pump management. It also includes the establishment of irrigation groups and water users associations, as well as the provision of microcredit, seed money, and goats. In Abyei, there was a focus on the fishing industry as cash grants were given to fishing groups for the purchase of fishing equipment, and a fishing market cooperative was established, among other activities. Blue Nile has seen the most training and livelihood inputs, while activities in South Kordofan revolved more around infrastructure projects (schools, clinics, latrines) to create jobs for day laborers, especially women who transport water.

In an interview with a central government official he stated that current major livelihood challenges faced by youth, IDPs, or ex-combatants include the lack of technical and soft skills required for the growing economy sectors in Sudan, the lack of financial resources both at the micro and macro level, the lack of job opportunities at state and national level, and the lack of political representation of the affected groups.
When asked about UNDP’s contribution in this area the interviewee stated that it is very important and effective when it comes to reintegration projects, but in the field of agricultural livelihood projects UNDP-contribution has been relatively weak.

During interviews with state-level government officials most interviewees describe that crisis-affected groups can be considered socially stable but economically insecure. They explain that the majority are fully integrated into society but suffer from intense poverty and lack of opportunities. With the exception of Blue Nile and Ghedaref who both stated that there have been great improvements and the situation is now stable. Most interviewees describe improvements in the socio-economic situation of crisis-affected groups in their state in terms of financial support, job creation, and rehabilitation. With the exception of West Darfour and Kassala which indicated that the while support provided has been positive, it is much too weak and insufficient. Most states describe significant improvements in the social, economic, and psychological state of crisis-affected groups, and in the infrastructure and living conditions of IDP camps. With the exception of Red Sea and Ghedaref who said there has been no change. And West Darfour who said there was improvements but due to the good conditions for agriculture which increased production, and not due to efforts in this area.
Annex H: Description of Data Collection

Sampling Size, Methodology, and Distribution

The sample size comprised a total of 900 quantitative respondents (through the questionnaire) and 110 qualitative respondents (through interviews and FGDs). The results of the desk review were used to identify the various target groups needed to assess each indicator.

Quantitative Sample
The quantitative sample consists of people who have participated in trainings by UNDP on political and justice-related issues, users of local public services in areas where UNDP has conducted capacity-building of local government, IDPs and ex-combatants that have received reintegration packages. The population size represents the total number of “beneficiaries” from UNDP activities, which was retrieved from UNDP project documents. For example, the population size for the target group “trainees on political issues” was calculated by adding the total number of trainees by various UNDP projects under Outcome Three “Fostering Democratic Governance”. This exercise was repeated for each target group. A statistician then used these population sizes and the total sample size of 900 (pre-defined in the contract with the Client) questionnaires was distributed among the target groups based on the nature of the indicator being measured. Some indicators by their very nature necessitated larger sample sizes, and this was accommodated in the sample distribution. Finally, the statistician calculated the margin of error for each quantitative indicator. Thus, although the sample was more or less evenly spread out over the nine States, the basis of this distribution was not the States but rather the target groups necessary for each indicator. After the sample was distributed per target group, the States in which these groups existed were identified and a State-based sample plan was drawn up.

Qualitative Sample
The sample for the qualitative research included government officials at various levels, government service-deliverers such as judges and public lawyers, citizen users of public services, and IDPs and ex-combatants that have received reintegration packages from UNDP. As in the quantitative sampling, these target groups were chosen based on the nature of the indicators and the type of information needed to assess them. The total sample size of 108 interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) was pre-defined in the contract with the Client. Interviews with government officials in the central government in Khartoum were conducted about each of the seven outcomes, meaning a total of seven central-level interviews. Interviews with government officials at the state level were conducted about each of the seven outcomes as well, meaning a total of 7-8 state-level interviews in each state. Interviews with a judge and/or a lawyer were conducted in almost every state, and FGDs with IDPs and/or ex-combatants were conducted in the relevant states.

Table 12: Distribution of Quantitative and Qualitative Sample by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Quantitative Sample</th>
<th>Qualitative Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Nile</td>
<td>135 questionnaires</td>
<td>• 8 interviews with State-level government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 interviews with judges/lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 6 focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Collection Instruments

The development of the fieldwork instruments took place in conjunction with the sampling after the target groups had been defined. The first step was to derive a set of research questions for each indicator, and to turn those research questions into quantitative and qualitative questions. As a result of this process, one quantitative questionnaire and five qualitative guides were developed. The details of instrument each are explained below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ghedaref       | 66             | 8 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 3 interviews with citizen service users  
                |                | 3 focus group discussions |
| Kassala        | 138            | 8 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 1 interview with a judge  
                |                | 3 interviews with citizen service users  
                |                | 1 focus group discussion |
| Khartoum       | 69             | 7 interviews with central-level government officials  
                |                | 2 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 2 interviews with judges/lawyers |
| North Darfour  | 135            | 8 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 1 interview with a lawyer  
                |                | 6 focus group discussions |
| West Darfour   | 129            | 8 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 1 interview with a lawyer  
                |                | 6 focus group discussions |
| Red Sea        | 75             | 8 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 3 interviews with citizen service users |
| South Kordofan | 153            | 8 interviews with State-level government officials  
                |                | 1 interview with a judge  
                |                | 3 interviews with citizen service users  
                |                | 3 focus group discussions |
| Total Sample   | 900            | 110        |

The development of the fieldwork instruments took place in conjunction with the sampling after the target groups had been defined. The first step was to derive a set of research questions for each indicator, and to turn those research questions into quantitative and qualitative questions. As a result of this process, one quantitative questionnaire and five qualitative guides were developed. The details of instrument each are explained below.
1. **Quantitative Questionnaire**

The questionnaire includes several modules addressed to various target groups, as per the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of and access to justice systems and confidence in rule of law institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political knowledge and participation, as well as confidence in media, political parties, and civil society in holding government accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with local public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security, crime levels, mines and small arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with reintegration process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Interview Guide for Central Government Officials**

This interview guide includes different modules, each of which was used with a government official from the appropriate ministry or government agency, as outlined below.

Area 1: Poverty reduction and the achievement of MDGs
Area 2: Supporting small and medium enterprises (SMEs)
Area 3: Responding to HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria
Area 4: Strengthening local governance and decentralization
Area 5: Environmental management and crisis prevention
Area 6: Recovery from disaster and conflict, and post conflict socio-economic recovery and employment creation.

3. **Interview Guide for State-level Officials**

This interview guide includes different modules, each of which was used with a government official from the appropriate local government agency at State level, in each State, as outlined below.

Area 1: Poverty reduction and the achievement of MDGs
Area 2: Supporting small and medium enterprises (SMEs)
Area 3: Responding to HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria
Area 4: Strengthening local governance and decentralization
Area 5: Strengthening human security and local rule of law institutions
Area 6: Environmental management and crisis prevention
Area 7: Recovery from disaster and conflict, and post conflict socio-economic recovery and employment creation.

4. **Interview Guide for Service-Deliverers**

This interview guide consists of one set of questions addressed to lawyers and judges in various States. The questions aim to gather their opinions on the state of local justice and rule of law institutions, equitable citizen access to these institutions, and the state of local prisons and treatment of prisoners.

5. **Interview Guide for Citizen Service Users**

This interview guide consists of one set of questions addressed to randomly selected citizen users of local public services. The sampling was conducted at public service spots (e.g. health clinics) in States that have been a focus of UNDP’s local government capacity-building activities. Questions aim to gather user opinions on the quality of public services in their State and whether citizens can access these services in a fair and equitable manner.
6. Focus Group Guide

The focus group discussion guide includes several modules addressed to various target groups, as per the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Topic of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People that have received training or awareness-raising as part of UNDP projects on issues related to access to justice and rule of law institutions</td>
<td>Knowledge of and access to justice systems and confidence in rule of law institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People that have received training or awareness-raising as part of UNDP projects on issues related to political knowledge and participation.</td>
<td>Political knowledge and participation, as well as confidence in media, political parties, and civil society in holding government accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of IDP camps and areas with landmines</td>
<td>Human security, crime levels, mines and small arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens (mainly ex-combatants) that have received reintegration packages as part of UNDP projects</td>
<td>Satisfaction with reintegration process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobilization of Field Teams

Dialogue & Coordination with Client

This phase consisted of collecting from the Client and UNDP field offices the necessary information about the beneficiaries and target groups that we would include in the fieldwork. A series of field visits took place to liaise with the Client and present the assignment to local government officials in the States. An operational plan was then devised to outline the process through which the field teams would conduct the sampling and data collection.

Selecting & Hiring Field Teams

Field teams were established in each of the States in which data was collected. Each team consisted of a supervisor, field managers, enumerators, PRA researchers, interviewers, and data entry clerks. The hiring of the teams took place based on a profile of the skills needed for each member of the team.

Conducting the training

A manual on how to conduct qualitative and quantitative research was prepared, as well as a manual on how to conduct sampling in the field. This manual was used in a training conducted jointly by Sanad and NSCE in which all the supervisors took part. They were also trained on how to communicate via email and Skype. After this training, which included a Training of Trainers component, the supervisors went back to their States and trained the other members of their teams. In addition to research methods, the teams were also trained on data collection methods, as well as how to use the data collection instruments and data entry software (SurveyMonkey).

Field Work

Pre-testing of Field Instruments

After the field instruments were approved by the Client in English, they were drafted in Arabic and disseminated to the field teams. The teams in Kassala, South Kordofan, and North Darfour then conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire. The results of the pre-test were then incorporated into a revised version of the questionnaire which was re-sent to the field teams.
Fieldwork Arrangements & Quality Control System
Each field team was provided with a mini-laptop (netbook) on which to conduct the data entry and a USB internet key. An email and Skype account was created for each state field supervisors to ensure consistent communication. But most communication was done via telephone.

Once the teams were in place in their States and ready to commence field work, a Field Quality Control Manager was sent from Egypt to oversee the sampling and data collection in cooperation with Sanad Consultancy in Sudan. His tasks included assisting in reaching the sample, answering any questions on part of the field teams about the questionnaire, and reviewing all questionnaire responses (both on SurveyMonkey and hard copy when available) to ensure that no data is missing and that data collection and entry is proceeding according to plan.

Thus, the system for quality control was multi-tiered as follows:
Reaching the Sample

Based on the instruction of the operational manual, the field supervisors met with the UNDP field offices in their respective States for assistance in reaching the sample. To assist the supervisors in identifying their sampling needs, a fiche was created for each of the 9 States that contains:

1) The sample in that State
2) The different sample populations and which projects they are each drawn from
3) A table for each project summarizing the project goals, location, target group, and activities.

From these meetings the supervisors managed to retrieve the necessary information to conduct the sampling, such as lists of trainees and beneficiaries from reintegration packages. All researchers (this term refers to the quantitative enumerators, the interviewers, and the PRA researchers) were given the fiche for his/her State. The researchers were then trained on how to reach the sample. Reaching the sample began by checking the State fiche to see which UNDP project this particular sample belongs to. The researcher then met with the local UNDP coordinator in his/her State to discuss how they would reach the sample.

Fieldwork implementation

After gathering the sample information from UNDP field offices, the supervisors then proceeded to implement the fieldwork. Quality control for the quantitative data was conducted on a daily basis and any questionnaires that had missing information, or were inadequate for any reason, were repeated. Sanad assisted in arranging interviews with the necessary government officials and ensured that all interviews and FGDs were conducted adequately.

Data Entry

Quantitative Data

In order to ensure that entry of data occurs in a timely fashion, it was planned to take place in parallel with the data collection. The field teams in each State were supplied with a laptop and a USB wireless internet modem to enable them to access the Internet no matter where they are. This was meant to facilitate the data entry process and save time, however some difficulties occurred due to electricity blackout and weak network signal. When such difficulties occurred, the questionnaires were sent in hard-copy to Khartoum and entered there. However, most of the questionnaires were entered in the States in parallel with the data collection.

Qualitative Data

After all the interviews and FGDs had been conducted, transcripts were delivered to Sanad in Khartoum. The results of the qualitative data collection were later sent to NSCE in a slightly tabulated format.

Constraints in Implementation

As expected in any assignment of the scope and complexity of the one at hand, some unforeseen difficulties caused delays in the implementation and necessitated adjustments to the work planning. The main adjustments are listed below.

- One sampling plan was created for South Kordofan and Abyei together. However, in the field it was found that they have two separate coordinators. In cooperation with the UNDP local coordinators the sample was divided between the two regions.

- Many government officials found it very difficult to find time in their schedules to be interviewed. Consecutive cancellation and rescheduling led to some delays.

- The State of South Darfour was cancelled from the study for security reasons.
• There were some external problems such as electricity blackouts, weak cell phone reception, inconsistent availability of transportation, flooding and political instability during data collection period.