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**Executive Summary:**

This report is based on a literature review and interviews and group discussions with stakeholders in the three eastern states during the field visit conducted the 1st and 15th of May 2015. The objectives of the mission were to provide a comprehensive analysis of the emerging development context in East Sudan and assess the compelling development needs and gaps and mapping out the current and planned interventions of other UN agencies in the region, outlining lessons learned and to informing future UNDP programming in East Sudan through recommendations on approach and design of development planning in the region and exploring opportunities for scaling-up UNDP interventions and identifying potential partners.

The review focused on relevance of UNDP interventions to the needs and the local context, identifying the strength and weaknesses of programmes and interventions, based on previous evaluation reports and the assessment (impressions) of government officials, UNDP staff and views of CSOs and other development actors.

The region experienced three noticeable demographic changes; a sharp decline in nomadic population (from 53% in 1956 to about 8% in 2008); a massive increase in the number of displaced persons; and a large and fast growth of urban population.

The environmental, economic and political changes have effectively shattered traditional coping strategies and undermined resilience mechanisms, especially in the pastoral and agro-pastoral sectors. Alternative means of survival include reliance on aid agencies, clearance of trees for firewood and charcoal production, and engaging in illegal activities, including smuggling and human trafficking.

The impact of successive years of drought, historical injustices with regards to development and social services, particularly in the rural areas and among nomadic communities, and political and economic policy changes at the national level during the last three decades and the armed conflict (1994-2006) have all contributed to the creation of a highly vulnerable community and a declining resilience capacity to environmental and socio-economic shocks and large numbers of IDPs from rural areas moving into urban areas, especially the state capitals. With the poor technical skills of the migrants which do not meet the urban market demand, the limited job opportunities and the difficulties of home return because of the continued environmental degradation or conflicts, the move increased unemployment and poverty rates in towns, put more pressure on the already dwindling social service institutions and negatively influenced the morphology of towns.

Besides, the drought and the armed conflicts in neighboring Ethiopia and Eritrea and the civil war in other parts of Sudan, have resulted in the influx of large numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons into the region. In 2010 the total number of IDPs was estimated to be over 400,000 both from within and outside the region and that of refugees to be about 250,000, 70% of them living outside refugee camps.

The CBS 2008 census and household baseline surveys, the Family Health Survey and MDG profile all indicated the low human development indicators in the region. All available information confirm the chronic food insecurity, poverty rates exceeding 50%, high child and maternal mortality rates, low education enrollment and limited access to safe water.

The signing of the East Sudan Peace Agreement (ESPA) in 2006, other than stopping the war brought about three positive developments (a) the recognition of the historical development grievances of the region; (b) attracting international community (donors) attention to the region and (c) Sudan Government commitment of a 600 million US Dollars fund to the region, the East Sudan Reconstruction and Development Fund (ESRDF) to address the development gap in the region. But, despite the prevalence of peace and stability in the region, a new set of problems started to appear, the most important of which are the rise in tribal politics, severe competition over resources, spread of small arms, the rise in cross border illegal trade, arms smuggling and human trafficking in the region.

The state of affairs attracted several UN agencies, INGOs and civil society organizations to the region, attempting to address the chronic and emerging problems of the region

UNDP has been involved in the east since the late 1980s and during this period in response to the regions problems and changing needs, it implemented over 20 projects and programmes in the areas of development planning, good governance and rule of law, poverty alleviation, environment, capacity development and peace building.

**Findings:**

The sharp decline in nomadic population and activities and the massive increase in urban population are two realities that need to be responded to in terms of programme formulation and resource allocation both by state governments and development actors in the region.

There is no one UN clear strategy for the east and each agency is working on their own on project by project basis, sometimes stepping on each others’ mandate, duplicating work, and sometimes applying different approaches to the same community

In addition to the endemic problems of environmental degradation, food insecurity poverty and unemployment, limited access to basic services and poor governance and institutional structures, the region is experiencing new problems and development challenges which threaten social peace, including the rise in tribalism, spread of small arms and border-related problems on top of which is human trafficking.

Although UNDP interventions reflect an appropriate response to the regions’ problems over the years, in many cases there is no match between the size of the problem and the resources allocated or the scale of intervention. For example, the allocations for environment have always been small, of very short-term and on piecemeal basis, inspite of the fact that it is a root cause to many of the region’s problems.

UNDP interventions have also been criticized for lack of thematic or geographical focus, not being cumulative, lack of adequate exit strategy for successful projects, and for failing to play its leadership role among development actors at the state levels in guiding policies, planning and strategies and development thinking

**Rationale for UNDP continued intervention in the East:**

1. The extremely low development indicators in all three states
2. The newly emerging problems which represent a global concern to international community, particularly that of human trafficking, refugees and proliferation of small arms which also present a major threat to social peace and regional security
3. The week governance structures, especially at the locality level, to build on the success of the LGDPEM programme, which is very much appreciated by local authorities
4. The need to consolidate peace and to realize ESPA peace dividend, particularly the ESPA was more of a development agenda than a political deal
5. The need to build the capacity of civil society organizations to maintain independence, mobilize and manage resources, generate and implement innovative development ideas, and perform their advocacy and accountability roles
6. Favorable conditions and encouraging factors, including
7. The relative stability in the region and donors’ interest compared to other areas outside the conflict zones;
8. UNDP relatively long experience in the region and the extensive lessons learned and recognition and anticipation of UNDP leadership of development efforts by local authorities, UN agencies, civil society and other development actors operating in the region. UNDP is also expected to take the leadership in the forthcoming Post 2015 agenda and to create a successful regional model;
9. The interest of partnering with UNDP expressed by UNHCR, UNWOMEN and ESRDF. Other than cost reduction, partnership with ESRDF present an opportunity to guide its programmes and coordinate it with state development plans;
10. The commitment expressed by all three state governments in the region to cost-share in development efforts (Dollar-to Dollar principle), an opportunity for a local financial component which is essential for sustainability of interventions; and
11. The expression of interest and readiness to engage with UNDP in productive projects by Microfinance institutions and the private sector in the three states

However, drawing from past experience in the region success, result-achievement and sustainable interventions require:

* Arriving at the right mix of what people need and want, what the government accepts and what the donors are ready to support
* Maintain balance between hardware and software interventions
* Build on past interventions and achievements
* Maintain a stronger geographical focus (area-based approach)
* Adopt a value chain approach, engaging private sector and civil society organizations
* Improve management by cutting on time and management costs

**Recommendations:**

1. UNDP should work with other UN agencies to have a one UN umbrella plan for the east and seek partnerships in interventions at state levels. UNHCR and UNWomen expressed strong interest in partnership with UNDP and IOM, which is not significantly present in the region, with its priority of migration, environment and climate change is a potential partner. FAO has also been recently involved in several livelihood projects, adopting a value chain approach with some success in Kassala state.

2. UNDP work should be cumulative, the thing that requires revitalizing the institutional memory both at UNDP and state levels as several interventions failed to utilize lessons, studies and/or inputs from previous ones

3. Future UNDP planning in the East as well as other parts of Sudan, should prepare for and be guided as from now with the SDGs, to avoid any abrupt changes in the future.

4. UNDP approach should maintain a balance between software and hardware interventions and maintain a strong geographical and cumulative focus based on need and potential, drawing on past experience of village-based, bottom up participatory development.

5. Adopt cost-sharing approach with Government institutions (and ESRDF), particularly in poverty alleviation and institutional capacity development interventions to ensure commitment and sustainability in the future.

6. Governance and Rule of Law as one package remain an essential need and a comparative advantage for UNDP. The LDF, FGS and locality action plans, which have been commended by authorities in all three states, need to be consolidated on a cost-sharing basis but should be linked with the Federal level. For government institutions, capacity building, computerization data base and network building, simplification of manuals, development and investment maps and Gender Responsive Budgeting are some of the areas that need to be strengthened and consolidated with a strong (state level/ joint) monitoring mechanism. The training and involvement of legislative council members is also important to improve accountability and availing a political umbrella for interventions

7. Environmental conservation and climate adaptation and resilience is a priority to address, is a concern for all international donors and is in line with most of the SDGs objectives. The key issues are climate change resilience, monitoring and management of natural resources and policy guidance and institutional development to conserve and rehabilitate degraded resources with the effective participation of concerned communities. However, interventions should be interwoven with livelihood, service provision and governance components rather than being stand-alone interventions. It is important to stress that environmental and natural resource management issues need to be tackled at a regional level rather than a state by state level.

8. For combating poverty in urban areas, interventions should aim at (a) reducing youth unemployment through training and development of technical and business skills, formation of business groups, business grants or revolving fund soft loans, linkage to private sector (suppliers and wholesalers) and supporting internship programmes for graduates with NGOs, private sector and public institutions and (b) increasing access to credit (micro-finance) through organization, institutional support, awareness raising and training on small business management.

9. For combating poverty in rural areas, implement community livelihood programmes using One Community one Project approach and group lending mechanisms and including community organization and capacity development. The value chain approach holds a high potential in the region as it is becoming a preference for governments and donors, diversity in the region allow for a variety of options in the three states, it allow for partnership with the private sector, which is expected to reduce costs, improve quality and optimize management costs and it proved successful in FAO experience in Kassala state. Possible areas of applying the approach include, in the Red Sea State fisheries and vegetable (Tokar, Arbaat), in Kassala state horticulture and fisheries, and in Gedarif crop production, livestock and animal products. Private sector representatives in the Red Sea state proposed tourism and the industrial/manufacturing sectors as fast track job creating opportunities

10. The issue of refugees self reliance has to be addressed, not only as a humanitarian concern but also as a security problem for the government and a long term development right for the refugees. The inclusion of refugees and IDPs in the donors and investors conference, which signaled an appreciation of their rights and potential as productive members of society who should benefit from sustainable economic growth, is a good starting point for the legitimization of their engagement in the broad-based social development. Lessons from the TSI should guide new interventions and taking note of all concerns expressed about the programme, addressing all issues including legislations and engaging all stakeholders in formulation and planning processes, including Federal authorities.

11. Develop an Initiative to combat human trafficking and transitory migration, which includes

* Supporting the design of an agreed plan between the three eastern states, since it is known that Kassala and Gedarif states are the main abduction and collection points and the Red Sea state is main route for trafficking abroad
* Providing assistance to state governments/ legislature to issue effective laws and adequate investigation and prosecution mechanisms
* Providing assistance to enhance the capacity of the law enforcement sector to petrol borders and routes used by traffickers
* Providing alternative livelihood sources for border communities, some of whom play a facilitation role in the trafficking process
* Providing assistance to victims and continuing the UNDP anti-human trafficking awareness raising initiative

12. Consolidating peace in the region. UNDP should

* Take a leading role in redirecting international community attention to the region and in realizing the pledges and commitments made in Kuwait Conference and other platforms, preferably in collaboration with the ESRDF
* Contribute to complete the DDR process through completing analysis of data collected in the small arms survey, livelihood projects support but at community rather than individual ex-combatants’ level and including a community security component in all its community development projects
* Conduct comprehensive land tenure and use studies in view of the fact that with the increased population and shrinking natural resources, land constitutes a major potential for conflict. The study will also guide environmentally sound land use policies and serve investment in the region

13. Capacity Development of Civil Society

To enhance CSOs capacity for policy formulation, monitoring and influencing state policies and to transform them into a credible development partner

* Preferably in collaboration with other UN agencies, conduct a CSO mapping and capacity assessment survey
* Design and implement a capacity development programme on institution building, effective networking, resource mobilization and management, advocacy and lobby, crisis responsive planning and interventions and monitoring
* Engaging them as implementing partners in community-relate interventions (peace building, livelihood support and awareness raising

14. In applying the area-based approach, the criteria for selection can be the conflict and environmentally affected and government prioritized areas but with the potential where economic stimulus can attract/ mobilize resources and encourage the private sector and contribute to the poverty and unemployment reduction.

**1. Introduction:**

This report is based on a desk review of relevant documents and a field work conducted during the period 1-15th of May 2015. The report provides a summary of the findings of the review of UNDP programming in East Sudan. The tasks stated in the TOR, included, though not limited to:

1. conducting a desk review and assessing information relevant to UNDP programming and operations in East Sudan
2. providing a comprehensive analysis of the emerging development context in East Sudan and assess the compelling development needs and gaps.
3. conducting technical working meetings and consultations with the programme staff and key stakeholders to identify gaps in information and requirements for further analysis and reform of the programme.
4. mapping out the current and planned interventions of other UN agencies in the East
5. outlining lessons learned and key recommendations on partnerships, approach and design of development planning in the region, to inform future UNDP programming in East Sudan,
6. exploring opportunities for scaling-up UNDP interventions that proved successful in other regions

The following were the main methods used in data collection

1. Reviewing available literature, mainly UNDP project documents and reports, government plans and documents (mostly) produced through UNDP interventions in the east, some academic studies and reports, documents provided by UN agencies and information collected from their websites
2. Interviews with UNDP staff, key government officials, UN agencies, INGOs and private sector representatives in the three states and
3. Group discussions with civil society representatives and technical staff in state government departments

The main areas of focus were:

* The relevance of UNDP current interventions to the needs and the context
* The strength and weaknesses of UNDP programmes and interventions as assessed in previous evaluation reports and documents and/or viewed by some of the current partners and target groups
* Officials’ attitudes and impressions about UNDP recent and ongoing interventions and various other stakeholders, including UNDP staff, UNDP development partners, CSOs, UN agencies and INGOs operating in the region
* Qualitative aspects relating to programming, targeting and partnerships, based on observations, perceptions and judgments of the parties interviewed and who constitute all but the final target groups of UNDP interventions. For the quantitative elements, total reliance was on previous reports and assessments, whose findings and conclusions were based on quantitative data.
* Identifying potential partners in UNDP future interventions (UN agencies, private sector and civil society organizations) and assessing the attitude and capacity of current partners, based on results achieved

It is important to note that:

* Given the duration of the field work, the numerous number of UNDP current and potential partners in the three states, and the level of cooperation by some of the parties concerned, no claim is made to have extensively covered all the tasks and requirements of the TOR. It is important to note also that the report focused on programmes relevance, viability and approaches rather than projects and activities and this why no community meetings were conducted, although discussions with civil society representatives reflected some needs, attitudes and opinions expressed by communities with UNDP intervention experience. Meetings with communities were also hampered by the wide range, diversity and geographical spread of beneficiaries and the
* No section was specifically allocated to gender issues or specific women programmes, based on the assumption that gender equality is a cross cutting issue in UNDP programming and targeting and that policy will continue to be upheld
* The report has focused more on future prospects rather than assessing the past, although several lessons drawn have guided the recommendations
* In the recommendations paid special consideration has been given to the context in which UNDP will be operating in the future, need, feasibility and potential limits and constraints to the proposed interventions as well as the attitude of envisaged partners

**2. Eastern Sudan: Context:**

Eastern Sudan is administratively composed of the three states of the Red Sea, Kassala and Gedarif. The total land area of the region is about 336,000 square kilometers, accommodating a population of some 4.5 million, of whom 31% is urban, 59% rural settled and under 10% are nomadic (Table 1). The three states have all recorded positive net migration during the 2008 census, which means that despite the region’s endemic and emerging problems, it continued to receive migrants from other regions. This may partly explain the relatively large increase in the population, as the region’s indigenous population are known for low fertility and high mortality rates.

**Table 1: East Sudan Population by State (2008)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State** | **Total** | **Urban**  | **Rural**  | **Nomadic** |
| **Kassala** | 1,769,887 | 462,454 | 1,111,755 | 195,678 |
| **Red Sea** | 1,368,330 | 531,800 | 583,636 | 252,893 |
| **Gedarif** | 1,334,947 | 377,753 | 938,582 | 18,612 |
| **Total** | **4,473,164** | **1,372,007** | **2,633,973** | **467,183** |

The three states are predominantly underlain by Basement Complex rocks and hence are poor in ground water. Rainfall levels are generally low in the Red Sea and Kassala (50 mm in the north to 300 mm in the south) and its effectiveness is reduced also by its short duration, high seasonal variability overtime and space and the high evaporation rates. All running water sources are seasonal (Khor Baraka, Khor Arab and Arba’at in the Red Sea and River Atbara and Gash in Kassala). In Kassala over 225,000 feddans are under flood and artificial irrigation annually but the irrigated area has been successively decreasing as a result of siltation. For example, Khasm Al Girba Dam storage capacity dropped from the initial 1.5 M3 to 0.43 mainly as a result of silt accumulation in the dam reservoir.

The three states also share the characteristics of recurrent drought, poor and degraded natural pastures, increasing urbanization and continued rural population displacement trends, influx of refugees from neighboring countries as well as large numbers of migrants and displaced population from other parts of Sudan. Most of the food security and nutrition studies and surveys in the region highlighted the chronic food insecurity and diminished coping strategies, ineff1cient traditional production systems and low agricultural productivity.

Generally the Red Sea is the poorest in agricultural potential and irrigation water and has lost most of its livestock herd to the drought years. The huge resources of the Red Sea both as a source of food or income have only marginally been exploited.

Kassala state economy is largely agricultural (irrigated, urban (horticulture) and rain-fed). The total cultivable area in the State is about 4 million feddans but the actually cultivated area on average is about 1.5 million feddans (39%), 58% of which is flood and artificially irrigated (R. Atbara, Gash and pumps) and 42% is rain-fed which involves about 60% of the farming population in the state. Livestock population in the state is estimated to be about 7 million heads, heavily dependent on natural pastures[[1]](#footnote-1). Nevertheless, in most of the assessments and studies conducted, the State has constantly been classified as a food deficit state with high malnutrition rates recorded at health institutions[[2]](#footnote-2). The state is also challenged by inadequacy and unequal distribution of basic services, poverty, environmental degradation, limited livelihoods opportunities and the high refugee and IDP populations in the State[[3]](#footnote-3).

In Gedarif State rainfall levels are relatively high ranging between 500-900 mm from north to south. Because of the seasonality and variability of rainfall and the Basement Complex underlying rock, the State suffers acute drinking water deficit. The state is endowed with 10.5 million feddans of cultivable land, 5.8 million of which is under rain-fed mechanized farming and it constitutes the backbone of the state economy, a major source of employment both for the state population, seasonal laborers from other parts of the country as well as refugees, and a major source of the staple food crop (sorghum) for the country. The state is also rich in animal resources, with 5.2 million heads of livestock (sheep, goats and camels), and have significant mineral resources (chromium, asbestos, talc, kaolin, marble, mica, manganese, magnesium and gold) that have largely remained untapped.

**2.1 Demographic Changes and Human Development Challenges**

Three most noticeable demographic changes in the region are (a) the sharp decline in nomadic population; (b) the massive increase in the number of displaced persons; and (c) the parallel fast increasing concentration of population in urban areas. The percentage of nomadic population in the region dropped by about 85% from 53% in 1956 to about 8% in 2008, though it is still much higher than the national average (Fig 1). Growth rates for nomadic population between 1993 and 2008 for the three states were respectively 7.3%, 2.0% and I.2% for the Red Sea, Kassala and Gedarif states[[4]](#footnote-4).

**Fig 1: Nomadic Population 1956-2008 (%)[[5]](#footnote-5)**

The number of displaced population has also increased substantially, from just over 100,000 in 2002 to over 420,000 in 2010[[6]](#footnote-6). Origins of IDP have been both from within and outside the region, most of them uprooted by drought and/or armed conflicts. For most of the IDPs, other than the South Sudanese who left after South Sudan cessation in 2011, the move seem to be permanent. As a result, the region experienced a massive increase in population moving to towns, especially the state capitals. However, with the poor technical skills of the migrants which do not meet the urban market demand and the difficulties of return to home areas because of the continued environmental degradation or conflicts, the move resulted in increasing unemployment and poverty rates and negatively influenced the morphology of towns.

For most of local IDPs from the region, climatic changes have effectively shattered their traditional coping strategies and undermined resilience mechanisms, especially in the pastoral and agro-pastoral sectors. Historical coping strategies which consisted of mobility, herd diversification, customary rules for environmental protection, and diversified income sources (livestock, cultivation and temporary manual labour) are no longer viable due to rainfall deficiency, decline of pastoralism, and weakening of traditional leaders’ authority. For some, however, particularly youth, pastoralism is an activity with no future. Other than the low paying and saturated informal sector, the destiny of most rural migrants, new maladaptive strategies are on the rise. These include reliance on aid agencies, clearance of trees for firewood and charcoal production, cross border illegal trade and more recently human trafficking.

The rise in tribal politics in the region with the severe competition over resources, including urban jobs is presenting a threat to social peace. Besides, the presence of large refugee communities, coupled with restrictions on freedom of movement, limited work opportunities and the severe competition for scarce resources aggravated by the fragile ecosystem have negatively impacted on refugees’ prospects for decent livelihoods and often became a source of friction among the refugees and host communities (UNDAF 2012).

Unfortunately, because of lack of information, misguided perceptions or vested interests, most of the development plans and interventions, by the state or other development agencies still failed to reflect those changes in terms of targeting and/or resource allocation and many are pre-occupied with the notion that the region is still a nomadic region.

The current development map of Eastern Sudan has been drawn by a number of factors and developments, chief among them are:

1. The Sahelian drought and famines that hit the region during the 1980s and early 1990s. Drought and famine resulted in the displacement of large numbers of rural population who moved towards urban centres in pursuit of survival, most of them never returned to home areas. Urban centres in the region also received huge numbers of IDPs from other regions of Sudan, especially Kordofan, Darfur and South Sudan, displaced by drought and/or civil wars and most towns started to become more rural in its geomorphology, economic activities and life style. The drought also caused the influx of large numbers of International organizations into the region to undertake relief operations during the crisis and later to contribute to rehabilitation and development efforts in the region. The large number of the displaced population is also a result and a factor in the collapse of the rural resource and development base, a cause of the decline in the level of social services as available urban institutions failed to meet the increasing demand and an increased competition in the job market that was primarily in the informal secor, that reached a point of saturation and thus failed to check the rising rates of urban poverty. Displacement of rural population also played a major role in the gradual decline in the recognition of the authority of traditional leaders (native administration) among their communities, particularly among youth.
2. The historical injustices with regards to development and social services, particularly in the rural areas and among nomadic communities. This resulted in the creation of a highly vulnerable community and a declining resilience capacity to environmental and socio-economic shocks
3. Both the drought and the armed conflicts in Ethiopia and Eritrea, also contributed to the arrival of huge numbers of refugees into the region, reaching at some point over one million, and currently estimated to be about 250,000 refugees, over half of them are Eritrean refugees, of about 30% of them live in camps and the rest in urban centres[[7]](#footnote-7). The large numbers and long stay of refugees, impacted negatively on natural environment, the already dwindling services and on the job market for nationals.
4. Political and economic changes at the national level, including:
	1. The adoption and speedy implementation of the economic liberalization and privatization policies and resulting in the laying off of thousands of public sector workers and also from private sector institutions as a result of the stoppages or closure of industrial establishments because of energy problems or high operation costs. Particularly significant was the modernization (mechanization) of the then only sea Port in Port Sudan, Red Sea State, resulting in the unemployment of the loading and unloading manual workers (*kallas*), which was the main area of employment for the unskilled local population and who had little chances to compete with other workers even in the informal sector.
	2. The cost recovery policies in the service sector, denied many families access to the basic services such as health and education because of cost
	3. the adoption of the Federal Government system, whose funding through taxation, added a new economic burden on the local population and put more pressure on natural resources,
	4. The trade embargo and boycott on Sudan and diminishing activities in the Port and the high way road, which reduced the demand for labor both in the port and other related sectors (transport, services etc..)
5. The combination of the above factors contributed to increased poverty rates and unemployment and created the environment that led to the explosion of the armed conflict led by the Eastern Front. The conflict (1994-2006) added to human displacement, especially in southern parts of the Red Sea State (Tokar) and the eastern parts of Kassala state, where most parts are still out of production because of the risks of land mines

1. The East Sudan Peace Agreement (ESPA): The signing of the ESPA in 2006, other than stopping the war brought about three positive developments (a) the recognition of the historical development grievances of the region; (b) attracting international community (donors) attention to the region’s development needs; and (c) the Central Government commitment of a 600 million US Dollars fund to the region, the East Sudan Reconstruction and Development Fund (ESRDF) to address the development gap in the region. Nevertheless, despite the relative peace and stability it brought to the region, the ESPA generated a new set of problems, the most important of which are the resurgence of tribalism as a political tool. Many observers attribute the phenomenon to Eastern Front tribal structure and hence the ESPA allocation of the power and wealth sharing arrangements on tribal basis. Another problem is the spread of small arms, partly because the arrangement did not enforce arms collection, which contributed the rise in cross border illegal trade, arms smuggling, and human trafficking in the region[[8]](#footnote-8). Besides, there is a general dissatisfaction with performance of the ESRDF, both in the type and distribution of projects it implemented and an a claim that it did not address the development needs of the region
2. The recent expulsion of some international NGOs, for security reasons, and the halting of some UN projects, such as the TSI, has created a gap that has not yet been bridged, as some localities used to depend heavily on these organizations for basic services delivery.
3. The last decade also witnessed a large increase in the number of civil society and community based organizations, seeming in anticipation of a flaw of funds expected to follow the ESPA. Although these CSOs and CBOs, with its limited capacity, contributed significantly to expand the outreach in service delivery, its impact remains limited as a result, with very few exceptions, of its weak structure and technical capacity, limited resources in the absence of donors and state support, seasonality of work, the impact of tribalism on its orientation and targeting, the relief mentality that has affected communities, institutions and CSOs due to the long duration of relief work, the severe competition over resources and the growing need of the local communities
4. Investment in the region is hampered the poor infrastructure, energy problems, international sanctions, high operation costs, instability of trade policies, multiple production tax (locality, state, national) and sometimes disagreements between Federal and State level institutions in addition to the poor information base and land disputes.

### The eastern region in general is characterized by:

1. Low human development indicators (See Table 2)

**Table 2: Selected Demographic & Human Development Indicators**

**in the Eastern States**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator**  | **Red Sea** | **Kassala** | **Gedarif** |
| Total Population (Million) | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| M/F Ratio (%) | 127.9 | 121.2 | 97.1 |
| Urban population  | 49.6 | 26.1 | 28.3 |
| Population Growth rate (1993-2008) | 6.7 | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| Nomadic Population | 18.5 | 11.1% | 1.4% |
| Dependency Ratio | 67.2 | 78 | 102 |
| Population under 15 years | 37.8 | 41% | 57.1 |
| Total Fertility Rate | 4.7 | 3.1 | 4.8 |
| Average family Size | 4.6 | 5.1 | 6.8 |
| Crude Birth Rate | 17.7 | 21.8 | 34.5 |
| Infant mortality Rate | 141.6 | 111 | 101 |
| Child Mortality Rate | 72.1 | 99.3 | 79.6 |
| Crude Death Rate | 16.9 | 17 | 16 |
| Life Expectancy at Birth- Both Sexes | 59 | 58.7 | 59.8 |
| Life Expectancy at Birth- Males | 58.9 | 58.2 | 59.4 |
| Life Expectancy at Birth- Females | 59 | 59.1 | 60.1 |
| Reproductive Health Poverty \*\* | 32 | 64 | 72 |
| Disability Rate | 3.7 | 4.5 | 4.9 |
| Maternal Mortality Rate | 565 | 466 | 564 |
| Maternal Mortality Rate for nomads | 672 | 565 | 694 |
| Persons with disability | 3.7 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Population with access to clean water | 18 | 29 | 32 |
| Households with sanitation facilities | 68 | 60 | 55 |
| Economic Activity Rate – Both Sexes |  | 35.8 | 32.3 |
| Labor Participation Rate |  | 26.3 | 21.5 |
| Literacy rate (6 and over)-Both Sexes | 47 | 44 | 57 |
| Never attended school (6 years +) | 55 | 50 | 40 |
| Net migration | 0.58 | 0.1 | 1.4 |

**Source: Sudan National Population Census, 2008**

**\*\* Source: Family Health survey, 2010**

1. Large refugee population from Eritrea and Ethiopia and from West Africa as well as the scores of displaced population from other parts of Sudan

### High vulnerability to natural hazards, particularly rainfall variability and large scale degradation of natural resources and the environment;

1. Inadequate social capital and limited skills and consequently limited access to the labor market leading to high unemployment rates and a huge, congested and growing informal sector
2. High levels of poverty in both urban and rural areas; and
3. Poor social service institutions in towns which fail to meet the demands of the growing population rural migrants, IDPs and refugees.

From the MDG profile and the Family Health Survey:

* Poverty rates of 58% and 50% in the Red Sea and Gadaref state respectively are above the national poverty line of 46%
* 44% of the population is food deprived in the Red Sea.
* The Red Sea state has the lowest Gross Enrolment Rate (13.1%) among Northern states.
* Only 14.3% of women contribute to employment in Eastern Sudan states
* Child Mortality in the Red Sea and Kassala States is over 4 times higher than the national average
* Kassala state has the highest maternal mortality in Sudan (1,414 in 100,000) and it is over 21% higher for nomadic population in the three states
* Gedarif institutional deliveries account for 13.4% of all births, compared to 34.3% national average
* The region is the highest in malaria incidence (7 times Khartoum average)
* Over half the population does not have access to safe drinking water and sanitation

Thus in each of the three states, the general situation is one of harsh living conditions with large numbers of population facing acute poverty, persistent drought and famine, limited access to safe water, health and education services, high levels of unemployment in addition to the environmental problems of land degradation and shrinking pasture areas.

**2.2 UN Agencies in the East**

In general, there is a relatively heavy concentration of development agencies in Kassala state, compared to the Red Sea and Gedarif which is rather new to international development assistance

UN agencies in the region, other than UNDP include FAO, IFAD, UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF, UNIDO have established offices in some of the states but UNFPA and UNWOMEN are implementing project through local government partners. Several of them have just started work in Gedarif state

The main changes that can be noted in UN agencies operation in the region are:

* FAO is expanding fast in terms of scale, number, type of projects in the region, particularly in Kassala state. It has just closed a food security project in Kassala state, the Integrated Food Security Project (IFSP), implemented in collaboration with the UNIDO and the State Ministry of Agriculture. One of the main results of the project was the proven viability and value of the Value Chain approach, especially with settled communities. Another ongoing project is the Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme” (FSPS), implemented in the three eastern States and its main objective is to strengthen the capacities to develop policies and strategies for improving food security and nutrition. The project engage almost all stakeholders concerned and according to the mid-term evaluation report, as a direct consequence of the reports produced by the project, several policy changes for improving food security and nutrition have been implemented in the targeted States[[9]](#footnote-9).
* IFAD presence which was heavy in Kassala state has significantly diminished
* WFP is moving from emergency to protracted relief and rehabilitation operation (PRRO), though still maintain its emergency work for refugees. The new programme initiatives include work on water harvesting (FFW), Food for education, Food for training and, in collaboration with the Bank of Sudan, Linking Farmers to Markets.
* UNICEF is withdrawing from Gedarif state and operating only in three localities in Kassala state and four in the Red Sea State. It is also changing its approach from working through government departments to direct delivery to targeted households.
* UNHCR within its mandate of protection, is providing basic services and livelihood support (microfinance, vocational training etc..) to refugees in Kassala and Gedarif states. The Kassala regional office highlighted the added value of partnership with UNDP in the TSI experience and expressed the interest in collaborating again with UNDP in area-based livelihood supporting programmes targeting refugees and host communities, including the closed camps areas. The latter is a significant development in UNHCR policy and it meets the particularly strong demand by the government of Gedarif state
* FAO, WFP and UNICEF is piloting a joint resilience programme in Kassala state, targeting four localities and working on nutrition, food security and livelihood support.

Other major actors include EU and the World Bank who are supporting some education projects in Kassala and the Red Sea. EU is also supporting several projects implemented by UN agencies and INGOs in the region. Jaica has also been active, especially in Kassala state

A recently held regional civil society consultation workshop (May 2015)[[10]](#footnote-10) identified priorities for reform and development in the regions as follows:

1. Governance reform and enhancing accountability
2. Provision of basic social services (health, education and water)
3. Combating unemployment and poverty
4. Food security
5. Addressing border problems (occupation in Halaib and Fashaga, human trafficking, smuggling and influx of refugees)
6. Land tenure and use
7. Research and generation of reliable statistics
8. A special focus on women issues in all development interventions
9. Building the capacity of civil society (training of CSOs on good governance and strategic planning, on organizing and facilitating dialogue and to participate in constitution building and to implement micro-finance projects and networking at the regional level)

**3. UNDP History of Response to East Sudan Problems:**

UNDP interventions in the east were by and large responsive to the emerging needs of the region. The first UNDP intervention in the region could be traced to the year 1986, when it sponsored the first comprehensive baseline survey upon which the Eastern Region development plan was based. (The region then was composed of the Red Sea and Kassala Provinces). But the major direct interventions included:

**3.1 The Central Butana Area Development Scheme (ADS) Project (1989)**:

This was of the first five people-planned and managed integrated rural development projects implemented in Sudan as part of the UNDP post drought recovery programmes. The ADS projects were a combination of environmental rehabilitation, livelihood and community organization and empowerment interventions that contributed to the re-building of village communities after the displacement and loss of assets caused by the drought. The modality of the Village Development Committees which ran the project contributed to empower communities and strengthen bottom-up development approaches in and outside the region, as VDCs started to be formed in almost every village receiving external assistance, including that of government.

**3.2 The Red Sea Area Rehabilitation Scheme (ARS) Project, Sinkat locality (1997):**

Based on the ADS modality, the project was part of the ARS projects which targeted the areas affected by drought and desertification. The project focus was on the rehabilitation of natural resources, community based livelihood projects, and organization and capacity development of local communities. The project though short lived and low funded, contributed to the organization of communities and the participatory development approach in the state. Such bodies bridged and continue to bridge the gap created by the absence of government institutions and traditional leaders caused by the displacement of population as a result of the drought. The staff trained in the ADS and ARS project also constituted the nuclei for the leadership of other agents’ development work in the region.

**3.3 The Poverty Alleviation Governance Oriented Project in the Red Sea State (2005-9):**

The project sought to strengthen policy coordination and target setting at the state level and to develop the financial and legal framework for the effective allocation management and of resources in Red Sea State. UNDP also supported state policy planning and formulation, strengthening capacity for policy analysis, budgeting and aid management. It also included components on awareness raising and training on the concept of good governance and rule of law and small scale livelihood projects. In 2006 a capacity building programme for localities was implemented in the Red Sea state through training of staff and provision of basic infrastructure and establishing planning and information units in the localities, the thing improved planning and budgeting and strengthened linkages between localities and the State Ministry of Finance

**3.4 Surveys and Studies:**

UNDP sponsored (a) a comprehensive survey for the Analysis of Food Security Constraints and Potentials in the Red Sea and Kassala States (2005), the result of which have been used by several UN agencies and INGOs in designing and targeting of their food security and livelihood projects; (b) in preparation for the development of its governance project, UNDP conducted Kassala Capacity Assessment for Aid Coordination, Planning and Public Expenditure, in collaboration with the Department of Economic Planning and Development and (c) a capacity assessment of civil society in Red Sea, upon which a project document was prepared but was not funded

**3.5 Recovery and Rehabilitation Project (RRP), Red Sea State (2006)**:

The Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme (RRP): The RRP was established in the Red Sea state in 2006. It was implemented through an INGO consortia operating in the state, led by IRC and included ACORD and SOS‐Sahel. With a total funding of 3.6 million Euros, the used a community‐driven approach, was linked to local government and focused on providing basic social services and livelihoods interventions (fisheries and agriculture). Although the programme struggled initially and effectively started in 2007, and ended without a proper exit strategy, the RRP mechanism has proved to be an important means of dispersing funds out and into communities, and was used later by other development actors, e.g. OXFAM UK

**3.6 Threat Risk Mapping and Analysis (TRMA) project (2008):**

TRMA project represented a response to the urgent need for strategic planning tools in Sudan. The project helped the states’ institutions generate information, interact with communities and map all the livelihood systems, natural resources, hazards, service institutions and infrastructure in the state at locality levels, identified the risks attached to them and proposed the interventions required. In the three eastern states, the project identified the potential crisis and challenges that require conflict resolution, recovery and development interventions. The TRMA’s maps and database allow for various layers of information to be extracted and visualized separately, or in combinations, as specified by information requirements from each partner, thereby facilitating their respective analysis, planning and programming processes. TRMA activities have also identified a number of priority areas for intervention, in the areas of livelihoods and sustainable natural resource management, which have immediate bearings on past, ongoing and potential conflict in the region. TRMA information was expected to guide the main development and recovery interventions in the region, in anticipation of the ESPA commitments (e.g. ESRDF). Unfortunately, although UNDP highlighted the importance of TRMA products for its programming processes and for effective coordination with counterparts, neither UNDP nor government or other development actors made adequate use of the TRMA outputs.

**3.7 Eastern Sudan Recovery and Development Programme (ESRDP) (2009)**

This was implemented in Kassala, Red Sea and Gedarif States. The programme focused on livelihoods and capacity building.

**3.8 Disaster Risk Reduction Management (2009)**:

In reaction to the recurrent floods and droughts, which constituted a major obstacle to development and undermined efforts to achieve the MDGs, and based on the information generated through TRMA and ESRDP, UNDP developed the Disaster Risk Reduction Management project. The project provided technical and capacity building support to the government to move from a reactive, civil defense‐based mode of dealing with disasters to a more proactive approach incorporating prevention and risk management. The project represented a move away from event‐driven humanitarian responses to a broad‐based, multi‐sectoral risk reduction approach.

**3.9 Crisis Prevention and Recovery:** mainly provided support to Human Security in Eastern Sudan and  [Community Based Recovery and Rehabilitation Programme](http://www.sd.undp.org/projects/cp7.htm) aiming at the recovery of livelihoods and sustainable natural resource management (NRM)

**4. UNDP Contribution to Peace Building:**

**4.1 Direct Interventions:**

* Implementing the Human Security Project (2007) in support of the DDR process, in collaboration with the North Sudan Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Commission (NSDDRC),
* Supporting registration and demobilization and providing reinsertion support to ex-combatants, in addition to improving security through supporting land mines action and community security programme.
* A second phase was implemented in 2008 to addressing the problems of the remaining caseload from the Sudan Armed Forces (SAF) and the Popular Defense Forces (PDF)
* Implementation of 11 community development projects which contributed to the integration of several ex-combatants from those communities. Those projects and the modality used contributed to build communities ability to participate, prioritize and plan projects, to increase awareness about rights and build confidence and to enhance their ability to peacefully resolve their conflicts.

In its DDR the experience, the UNDP has been criticized for

* Its slow procedures and inability to respond to urgent problems, such as tribal conflicts
* Shaking community confidence in the organization by implementing 12 out of 54 planned community projects after the communities were prepared and their expectations were raised. Also the failure to complete the Community, Security and Arms Control (CSAC) initiative. The data of the arms survey which was started with DDR North is yet to be analyzed, and as a result those arms have not been collected
* The failure to monitor or follow up the DDR process except for the final evaluation
* The UNDP insistence on collective (community) integration for ex-combatants, which contradicts the principle of the combatant’s right to choose that was provided for by the ESPA
* UNDP did not transfer sufficient technical expertise to the east from its previous global experience, including that of mobilizing donors resources

**4.2 Indirect Contribution**

* Donor Conference for Eastern Sudan (2006): The working documents presented at the workshop were based on several preparatory workshops organized at the locality level in the Red Sea and Kassala States (March-April 2006). Although the conference never came to its natural conclusion, the information (needs) presented were used by the Eastern Front in its negotiation with the Sudan Government and later appeared as priorities in the ESPA
* Contributing to the preparation, facilitation and organization of Kuwait Donor Conference
* Contributing to the ESPA implementation and the transition to peace and recovery through promoting rule of law, promoting the concepts of good governance , enhancing access to justice and supporting economic recovery through building of social capital and addressing unemployment

**Other Cross Cutting** **issues**: Issues that were central to all projects implemented by UNDP included gender issues, peace building, HIV/AIDS and identification and enhancement of strategic priorities that aim towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals in the region.

**5. Recently Implemented and ongoing Projects:**

UNDP current east Sudan programme has been thematically anchored on the UNDP Strategic Plan objectives of sustainable development, inclusive and effective democratic governance; and building resilience, aligned to the National Development Strategy of Sudan and responding to critical priorities identified in the 2011 Eastern Sudan Donors conference and the eastern States Strategic Plans 2012–2016. The main pillars of the programme are (a) Poverty Reduction, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Livelihoods; (b) Inclusive Governance and the Rule of Law; (c) Social Cohesion, Peace Consolidation and Peace Dividends; and (d) Environment, Energy and Climate Change.

In its latest strategy (2012-2016) UNDP priorities for Eastern Sudan were determined by its position as the lead UN agency for the Governance and Rule of Law, and the institutional Development and Capacity Building sectors, and its focus has been on strategic priorities that target the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals[[11]](#footnote-11). Thus priorities were set to:

* Develop the capacity of local Government, to help the ESPA achieve a successful transition to peace and recovery.
* Promote rule of law and enhance access to justice.
* Support economic recovery through building of social capital and addressing unemployment
* Improve security through the implementation of a DDR, mine action and community security programme

Within this strategic framework the following programmes were implemented and/or continued

**5.1 Rule of Law project in Kassala State:**

The programme started in 2006 and contributed to raising awareness about human rights and promote rule of law culture. It initiated community policing programmes. It focused on promoting the rule of law, human security and confidence-building by improving access to judicial services. Several projects were implemented within the programme which significantly contributed to the training of staff in the security sector and enhanced the traditional customary justice system, state institutions, civil society and communities to peacefully resolve disputes

The currently ongoing Strengthening Access to Justice and Confidence Building project implemented in Kassala worked at developing law enforcement institutions and communities to enhance access to justice, human rights and women empowerment. The project:

* Supported the Judiciary training Institute with equipment and supported judges training in Khartoum
* Trained police officers in Kassala (by Interpol Officers) and supplied computers for data collection
* Constructed two police centres, maintained the prison and built a community police station, operating under the supervision of a police officer in Wad Shariefai and enhanced the role of community policing in all localities. All reports and those interviewed indicate that crime went down in those areas.
* Enhanced women access to justice especially the rights relating to family laws
* Increased community awareness about women rights and the risks attached to FGM, young girls marriage and Gender-based Violence
* Ehnanced young females access to education

Challenges faced by the project include

* the poor understanding by law enforcement institutions and the competitive attitude towards the project,
* resistance by traditional leaders in some relatively closed communities (Talkok and Hamishkoreib)
* the widespread culture of incentives attached to development interventions
* UNDP delays in funding and procurement, which reduced partners’ and target groups’ confidence in the project and negatively affected implementation

There is a need for continuing the programme and to address the fast growing problems of smuggling and human trafficking which is affecting the three states of the East

**5.2 Local Governance Development and Public Expenditure Management (LGDPEM)**

This has been implemented in Kassala, Red Sea and Gedarif states. The Project aimed at developing Participatory Planning and Public Budgeting capacities of the State and localities and enhancing planning and budgeting framework of the State.

As was correctly stated in the final evaluation report of the programme[[12]](#footnote-12), the project was highly relevant for accelerating progress towards MDGs (a) because of East Sudan poor social indicators and the need to improve the provision and access to basic services, which is the responsibility of local government, hence the project therefore contributed to accelerating progress towards the MDGs; (b) it was aligned to the Government and UNDP priorities and strategies as well as the framework of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Sudan, (c) it represented a consolidation to the UNDP role as the UN leading agency in the areas of Governance, Rule of Law, Institutional Development and Capacity Building sectors, (d) it contributed to increased focus on provision of basic services in the region as indicated by the reviews of state laws, administrative arrangements, the issuance of state decrees and policy and guidelines to enhance delivery of basic services and the production of development plans at the locality level in all three states. In Kassala state for example, the Wali issued decrees delegating powers to localities to manage their budgets and implement projects, and directives ordering the sticking to the locality development plans.

The project delivered all its planned outputs including the review of state laws and policies, issuance of various guidelines and legislations, establishment of Planning Information Units (PIUs) in localities, delivery of the Locality Development Fund (LDF) grant, the estabksihment of the Government Financial Statistic (GFS) system within the Ministries of Finance, and the introduction of compulsory strategic planning course in all state universities. However, two years after the evaluation, from our observation, Gedarif state at present seems to be making the best use out of the project inputs.

Although the final evaluation report commended the increased participation of civil society and pointed to the formation of CSO networks and its government funding (in the Red Sea State) as an indicator for the state recognition of CSOs as a development partner, in both Red Sea and Kassala States, some CSOs representatives viewed that as a mechanism of control by the state to limit the space and direct other donors to certain CSOs.

The challenges faced by the project which will affect the sustainability of the project include:

1. The project was not sufficiently linked to or responded to changes at the federal level, particularly with regard to fiscal federalism and decentralization as well as legislative and policy changes at the federal level
2. The project lacked a coordination mechanism with the ESRDF which has been delivering services, not guided by the locality plans produced by the state governments
3. The project lacked an exit strategy
4. Contrary to what is mentioned in several reports, including the LGDPEM evaluation report, the project did not benefit from the accumulation of knowledge made through UNDP implemented activities (TRMA/CRMA, CSO mapping, RoL activities etc..), otherwise it would have taken into account more the variations between the three states.
5. Local contextual impediments, which undermines the concept of accountability to citizens, a major objective of the project. These include, among others:
* The absence of elected councils at locality levels, incomplete and sometimes non-existent local structures and the poor capacity of existing institutions at locality level
* The heavy influence of tribalism on local politics and in the allocation of resources and service delivery
* The endemic attitude in most state institutions in dealing with the project as a short-term project ending with the end of external funding (probably because of the absence of a local component), dealing with it in isolation or independently of other projects (e.g. governance and rule of Law). This latter observation to some extent also applies to UNDP
* The limited effort on building the capacity of civil society and the State Assembly members to play the role of continued accountability and follow up of government delivery of services

Nevertheless, the **LGDPEM** was one of the projects that have in fact been long overdue, as it was needed since the establishment of the Federal governance System, and the absence of such programmes has contributed to the failure of the three states to make the best use of resources during the period of relative abundance of resources (2000-2010) or to reap the peace dividend of the ESPA.

To ensure the achievement of the project overall objectives, acknowledging that decentralization process requires a long time, the project needs to be continued to

1. Perform the role of a monitoring mechanism, till the capacity of CSOs and State assembly member is sufficiently built to perform that role
2. Strengthen linkages with other ongoing projects
3. Coordinate with federal level
4. Establish a feasible exit strategy

**5.3 Small Business for Sea Port Ex-Workers Communities (Red Sea State)**

This is an ongoing one year lievelihood project with a total funding of 200,000 US$, which aims at developing entrepreneurial skills and stimulate entrepreneurship and employment opportunities of ex-port workers. It is benefiting some 700 ex-port workers and 250 female through training, organization and access to finance.

The programme has four main components:

1. Skill development: Vocational training and entrepreneur skill training;
2. Micro and small business institutional mechanism
* Forming Micro and Small Business (MSBs) Groups to coordinate and facilitate linkage with microfinance institutions
* Business and organizational management training of CBOS and Small business Groups
* ToT Training in leadership, planning, advocacy and lobby
* Establishing business networks to be linked with the state, business federation and chamber of small businesses
* Start up microfinance and business groups
1. Facilitating Access to Microfinance Institutions and business support services; and
2. Coordination and capacity Development

**5.4 NAPA Adaptation Project (Gedarif State):**

This is a part of “Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan” project implemented in ELSadda village of Gedarif state, among five other states in Sudan. The project objective was to minimize and reverse the food insecurity of small-scale farmers and pastoralists and thereby reducing rural communities’ climate change-induced vulnerability. The main

components were community organization and capacity development and introduction of mechanization and water harvesting technology with the objective of increasing agricultural production and productivity. Despite the short duration, according to the final evaluation report[[13]](#footnote-13), the project succeeded in introducing new technologies, practices and approaches that were adopted in the target village, in establishing and strengthening community organizations and in increasing community management and organizational capacity to deal with natural resources.

UNDP environmental interventions in Gedarif state will soon continue with the implementation of the “Climate Risk Finance for Sustainable and Climate Resilient Rain-fed Farming and Pastoral Systems”.

## 5.5 The Transitional Solutions Initiative (TSI)

The Transitional Solutions Initiative (TSI) programme was a UNDP, UNHCR and the World Bank joint initiative meant to address the east Sudan long standing humanitarian and development problems posed by protracted and post-conflict displacements and to arrive at a durable solution to the problems of refugees, returnees, internally displaced persons and their host communities.

**5.5.1 Programme aims**:

* Enhancing self-reliance and sustainable livelihoods by strengthening access to resources, markets and improving skills.
* Addressing vulnerable groups protection issues
* Empowering protracted refugees and host communities in the target areas through capacity building programmes
* Ehancing Government institutions to gradually hand over service delivery in target areas.
* Promoting peaceful co-existence and social cohesion between the refugees and their host communities.
* Empowering women and strengthen their capacity to participate in planning and implementation of self-reliance interventions.

**5.5.2 The main components:**

1. Vocational training
2. Business and enterprise skills development.
3. Livelihood support and diversification
4. Basic social services (health, education, water and sanitation)
5. Water harvesting to improve agricultural production.
6. Protection services and legal support to refugees and host-communities
7. Access to microfinance services.
8. Environmental protection and energy conservation.
9. Women’s empowerment (business skills, IGAs, gender based violence)
10. Local governance and local development capacity building

The programme was implemented in Kassala and Gedarif states. UNDP was responsible for the livelihood, governance and environmental components while UNHCR took the responsibility of basic services and refugee protection issues.

Implementation effectively started in 2013 through a wide network of partners including government institutions, local communities, private sector institutions INGOs, national NGOs in addition to UN agencies. Over 10 Government departments and about 20 CSOs were involved in implementation.

Without any exception, all those interviewed from the government and civil society representatives in both states commended the programme and pointed to significant results achieved during its short lifetime. The programme was prematurely stopped by the authorities in 2014. None, however, took the responsibility for or claimed knowledge about the reason for its stoppage.

TSI also contributed significantly to CSOs development in the two states, and as pointed out by CSOs representatives that included

* Building CSOs capacity in the form of staff training, introduction and adoption of M&E system (for the first time for many CSOs) and collective work
* Provided an opportunity for CSOs to interact, cooperate and exchanging experience, ending up in Kassala with the formation of a CSO network
* Linked CSOs with government institutions
* Strengthened the financial resource base for CSOs and expanded their outreach.

Several CSOs also claimed that the work that started with TSI support has continued after the programme stopped. For example, the lending groups implemented through the local CSO, Child Development Foundation expanded from 15 to 30.

**5.5.3 TSI Added Value and Lessons:**

The programme added value was seen in the following:

1. It represent a modality for UN agencies a successful inter-agency partnership and joint implementation in the east, which, by virtue of their mandate, provided an opportunity to combine addressing both the temporary problems of the refugees by UNHCR and the long term development problems of the Sudanese by UNDP
2. Addressing both refugees and host community needs, a merger of humanitarian and development work
3. Bringing together government and CSOs as partners in implementation
4. Work with civil society reaches communities faster and effectively with higher level of accountability, although the capacity of the CSO sector needs to be enhanced
5. The introduction of the very-small projects which transform beneficiaries from dependency to credit-worthiness and qualify them to access microfinance institution with some experience and self confidence
6. There is a need to engage all stakeholders, including NISS, in the process of the project formulation to avoid delays and/or interruptions

**5.5.4 Critique of TSI:**

The programme has been criticized for:

1. Although the programme involved a major capacity development component for localities and several of its activities were implemented by or in collaboration with government line ministries, the issue of national ownership seems not to have been adequately addressed in the design. Engagement of concerned government institutions during project formulation and consultation on both components and modality of implementation is critical to ensure the buy-in and support during implementation.
2. The programme was not preceded by the appropriate social and economic studies
3. TSI design, despite its sensitive political and social nature, did not include a political wing (e.g. work with State Assemblies) as part of the actors and hence failed to secure the protection it needed to continue
4. There was little coordination between the numerous actors involved, particularly CSOs working with local communities the thing that irritated communities, caused duplication and completion among CSOs and reduced the value and impact of the software interventions
5. Although a large number of CSOs was involved in implementation, they were by and large doers and barely involved in planning. Besides, there was no adequate capacity development component for the participating CSOs in the programme
6. Delays experienced in the implementation of some activities and failure to honor some commitments, such as the delivery of tractors that are still with UNDP
7. Lack of an alternative plan (Plan B) and inadequate assessment of risks and preparation of remedies and alternative

**6. Conclusion**

There are some stereo-typed fallacies that is influencing government planning orientation and hence UNDP and other development actors in the region which need to be changed. The new realities of the sharp decline in nomadic population and activities and the massive increase in urban population need to be responded to in terms of programme formulation and resource allocation. More efforts and resources need to be oriented to urban areas in the region as most towns in the region are now manifesting the problems of the rural areas, in addition to their own.

There is no one UN clear strategy for the east and each agency is working on their own on project by project basis, sometimes stepping on each others’ mandate, sometimes duplicating the work, and sometimes applying different approaches to the same community, thus reducing confidence in each other

The region suffers the endemic problems of rainfall variability and weak predictability, human displacement and fast urban population growth, widespread poverty, poor governance and institutional structures and the impact of conflict. New problems and development challenges in the region and threatening social peace which need urgent attention include the sharp rise in tribalism, spread of small arms and border-related problems on top of which is human trafficking and smuggling.

Although all three states have strategic plans and each locality has a need assessment map and strategic plan, several of the officials met pointed to the weak linkage between the ESRDF implemented projects and the state planning institutions.

Over the years UNDP interventions reflect an appropriate response to the regions’ problems but in some cases there is no match between the problem and the resources allocated or the scale of intervention. For example, while environmental degradation has been for decades the cause of numerous problems (Loss of assets, poverty, displacement, conflict over resources, pseudo and deformed urban growth etc..) the allocations for environment have always been small, of very short-term and on piecemeal basis

Over the years UNDP conducted a number of studies and surveys which provided a good data base for planning interventions and assessing change over the years.

Of the current and ongoing programmes, and with no exception, the **LGDPEM, specially the**  public expenditure and LDF components have been applauded by all government officials who claim to have seen some of the results of those interventions. The training of staff, localities need identification and plans, institutional support (the Economic Review), the preparation of investment maps, linkages created between the executive bodies, the legislature and communities and supporting the establishment of the Strategic Planning Centre in Gedarif are some of the positive achievements mentioned.

There is a strong need and a high demand for UNDP continued and scaling up interventions in the region to complete and/or consolidate some of the past achievements and to address some of the newly emerging problems.

UNDP, however, is accused by some development actors and researchers for:

1. the extremely poor institutional memory
2. trying to work on everything, including the mandate of other UN agencies (HIV/AIDS, GBV, Youth and adolescents, confusing communities and institutions about its mandate
3. failing to play its leadership role among development actors at the state levels, especially in guiding policies, planning and strategies and thinking
4. adhering to donors interest and offers more than what people need
5. several of very good projects implemented did not have an exit strategy, which minimize the chances for sustainability
6. Limited exposure of its achievements and poor dissemination of its products

**6.1 The case for UNDP continued intervention in the East:**

1. The relative stability in the region and donors’ interest compared to other areas outside the conflict zones
2. The need to consolidate peace and to realize ESPA peace dividend, particularly the ESPA was more of a development agenda than a political deal
3. UNDP relatively long experience in the region and the extensive lessons learned and recognition and anticipation of UNDP leadership of development efforts by local authorities, UN agencies, civil society and other development actors operating in the region. Also UNHCR and UNWOMEN expressed the interest in working in partnership with UNDP, with the added value of TSI experience
4. The widely expected leadership role of UNDP in the Post 2015 agenda and the opportunity to create a successful regional model
5. The commitment expressed by all three state governments in the region to cost-share in development efforts. Although what is called Dollar-to Dollar principle was mentioned in all state Ministries of finance, it may not be realistic to expect a full cost sharing, particularly if the resource input is large, but a local component is possible and essential
6. The interest expressed by the ESRDF to collaborate with UNDP in implementing development projects. Other than the cost reduction, this provides and opportunity to guide ESRDF programming (much criticized by citizens and politicians) and also coordinate it with state development plans
7. The expression of interest and readiness to engage with UNDP in productive projects in training, management and as partners in implementation by parastatals (Microfinance institutions) and the private sector (cf. Business Association and Industrial Chamber in the Red Sea State, Vegetable and Fruit Traders in Kassala and CTC Company in Gedarif)
8. The need to complete the very successful and much appreciated, as perceived by local authorities, LGDPEM programme
9. The need to build the capacity of civil society organizations to maintain independence, mobilize and manage resources, generate and implement innovative development ideas, build effective networks and perform their advocacy and accountability roles
10. The need to address the newly emerging problems in the region which represent a global concern to international community, particularly that of human trafficking, refugees and proliferation of small arms which represent a major threat to social peace and regional security
11. The extremely low development indicators in all three states

However, drawing from past experience in the region success, result-achievement and sustainable interventions require:

* Arriving at the right mix of what people need and want, what the government accepts and what the donors are ready to support
* Maintain balance between hardware and software interventions
* Build on past interventions and achievements
* Maintain a stronger geographical focus
* Engage private sector and civil society, though the latter require some capacity development
* Improve management by cutting on time and management costs

**7. Recommendations:**

1. UNDP should work with other UN agencies to have a one UN umbrella plan for the east and seek partnerships in interventions at state levels. In Kassala, UNHCR expressed strong interest in partnership, especially in targeting host communities of refugees and the closed camps. UNWOMEN expressed the interest and its objectives of women economic and political empowerment is already part of what UNDP is trying to do. IOM, which is not significantly present in the region, with its priority of migration, environment and climate change is a potential partner. FAO has also been recently involved in several livelihood projects, adopting a value chain approach with some success in Kassala state.

2. UNDP work should be cumulative, the thing that requires revitalizing the institutional memory both at UNDP and state levels as several interventions failed to utilize lessons, studies and/or inputs from previous ones

3. Future UNDP planning in the East as well as other parts of Sudan, should prepare for and be guided as from now with the SDGs, to avoid any abrupt changes in the future. However, as the private sector is expected to have a major role as a development partner in the post-2015 agenda, CSOs globally recommended taking note of the following (a) identifying current gaps based on existing research on responsibility and accountability of the private sector in delivering sustainable development and (b) identifying mechanisms at the national and regional level for strengthening state responsibility to protect human rights in any private-public sector partnerships.

4. The approach should maintain a balance between software and hardware interventions and maintain a strong geographical and cumulative focus based on need and potential rather than shallow wide presence and learn from the UNDP ADS/ARS experience which was village-based, bottom up planned, addressed environmental, economic and social needs, implemented in a participatory manner and contributed to rebuild communities. The familiarity of numerous communities with participatory approaches and planning present a potential for success and sustainability.

5. Adopt cost-sharing approach (local component) with Government institutions (and ESRDF), particularly in poverty alleviation and institutional capacity development interventions to ensure commitment and sustainability in the future.

6. Governance and Rule of Law as one package remain an essential need and a comparative advantage for UNDP. The LDF and locality action plan needs to be consolidated on a cost-sharing basis but should be linked to the Federal level, particularly all states commended the FGS and LDF components and called for their expansion. For government institutions, capacity building, computerization data base and network building, simplification of manuals, development and investment maps and Gender Responsive budgeting are some of the areas that need to be strengthened and consolidated with a strong (state level/ joint) monitoring mechanism. The training and involvement of legislative council members is important to improve accountability and availing a political umbrella for interventions

7. Environmental conservation and climate adaptation and resilience is a priority to address, is a concern for all international donors and is in line with most of the SDGs objectives. The key issues are climate change resilience, monitoring and management of natural resources and policy guidance and institutional development to conserve and rehabilitate degraded resources with the effective participation of concerned communities. However, interventions should be part and parcel of the livelihood, service provision and governance components rather than an stand-alone intervention. It is important to stress that environmental and natural resource management issues need to be tackled at a regional level rather than a state by state level.

8. For combating poverty in urban areas, interventions should aim at (a) reducing youth unemployment through training and development of technical and business skills, formation of business groups, business grants or revolving fund soft loans, linkage to private sector (suppliers and wholesalers) and supporting internship programmes for graduates with NGOs, private sector and public institutions and (b) increasing access to credit (micro-finance) through organization, institutional support, awareness raising and training on small business management.

9. For combating poverty in rural areas, implement community livelihood programmes using One Community one Project approach and group lending mechanisms and including community organization and capacity development. The value chain approach holds a high potential in the region as it is becoming a preference for governments and donors, diversity in the region allow for a variety of options in the three states, it allow for partnership with the private sector, which is expected to reduce costs, improve quality and optimize management costs and it proved successful in FAO experience in Kassala state. Possible areas of applying the approach include, in the Red Sea State fisheries and vegetable (Tokar, Arbaat), in Kassala state horticulture and fisheries, and in Gedarif crop production, livestock and animal products. Private sector representatives in the Red Sea state proposed tourism and the industrial/manufacturing sectors as fast track job creating opportunities

10. The issue of refugees self reliance has to be addressed, not only as a humanitarian concern but also as a security problem for the government and a long term development right for the refugees. The inclusion of refugees and IDPs in the donors and investors conference, which signaled an appreciation of their rights and potential as productive members of society who should benefit from sustainable economic growth, is a good starting point for the legitimization of their engagement in the broad-based social development. Lessons from the TSI should guide new interventions and taking note of all concerns expressed about the programme[[14]](#footnote-14), addressing all issues including legislations and engaging all stakeholders in formulation and planning processes, including Federal authorities.

11. Combating Human Trafficking

Develop an Initiative to combat trafficking, which can include

* Supporting the design of an agreed plan between the three eastern states, since it is known that Kassala and Gedarif states are the main abduction and collection points and the Red Sea state is main route for trafficking abroad
* Providing assistance to state governments/ legislature to issue effective laws and adequate investigation and prosecution mechanisms
* Providing assistance to enhance the capacity of the law enforcement sector to petrol borders and routes used by traffickers
* Providing alternative livelihood sources for border communities, some of whom play a facilitation role in the trafficking process
* Providing assistance to victims and continuing the UNDP anti-human trafficking awareness raising initiative

12. Consolidating peace in the region. UNDP should

* Take a leading role in redirecting international community attention to the region and in realizing the pledges and commitments made in Kuwait Conference and other platforms, preferably in collaboration with the ESRDF
* Contribute to complete the DDR process through completing analysis of data collected in the small arms survey, livelihood projects support but at community rather than individual ex-combatants’ level and including a community security component in all its community development projects
* Conduct comprehensive land tenure and use studies in view of the fact that with the increased population and shrinking natural resources, land constitutes a major potential for conflict. The study will also guide environmentally sound land use policies and serve investment in the region

13. Capacity Development of Civil Society

To enhance CSOs capacity for policy formulation, monitoring and influencing state policies and to transform them into a credible development partner

* Preferably in collaboration with other UN agencies, conduct a CSO mapping and capacity assessment survey
* Design and implement a capacity development programme on institution building, effective networking, resource mobilization and management, advocacy and lobby, crisis responsive planning and interventions and monitoring
* Engaging them as implementing partners in community-relate interventions (peace building, livelihood support and awareness raising

14. In applying the area-based approach, the criteria for selection can be the conflict and environmentally affected and government prioritized areas **BUT** with the potential where economic stimulus can attract/ mobilize resources and encourage the private sector and contribute to the poverty and unemployment reduction.
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