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Summary

The Republic of South Sudan gained independence from the Republic of Sudan on 9 July 2011, following civil wars that began in 1955 and left more than two million dead. Goodwill for the new country is huge, but the challenges faced by the new government are daunting. South Sudan has some of the worst social indicators globally. The maternal mortality rate is the highest in the world. Years of conflict have left South Sudanese society highly militarised and fragmented, with 40% of the budget spent on defence. Government capacity at all levels is extremely limited, corruption widespread, and the new country relies heavily on international donors and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) to provide services. Relations between the Government in Juba and its counterpart in Khartoum are tense. No agreement has been reached about oil revenues and the Government of South Sudan has closed down oil production—which represents 98% of government income.

The Department for International Development (DFID) has quickly established and scaled up a full office in Juba. DFID has developed a four-year development and humanitarian aid programme for South Sudan, amounting to some £360 million. This makes South Sudan one of the largest recipients of UK bilateral aid.

Regrettably, the delivery of DFID’s programme is already at risk before it has properly begun. We are deeply concerned at the prospect of a humanitarian crisis created by the loss of South Sudan’s oil revenue, combined with the increasing number of returnees and refugees arriving in the country and ongoing inter-tribal violence. The decision by the Government of South Sudan (GRSS) to halt production on all its oilfields, despite undoubted provocation from Sudan, has potentially grave economic and humanitarian consequences for the South Sudanese population. The GRSS has introduced austerity measures to cope with the loss of 98% of its income, which may lead to an increase in humanitarian needs. The UK Government must continue to press Khartoum and Juba to seek an equitable and sustainable agreement on the export of oil through Sudan’s pipelines. We do not consider there to be any realistic alternative in the next few critical years. It must also be made clear that the UK, and other donors, cannot bankroll South Sudan through this austerity period. As a result of the oil crisis, DFID has already re-focused its development programmes away from long-term development towards supporting the most vulnerable people and saving lives. Given the mounting humanitarian challenges, we recognise that the Department may need to continue to modify its development programme and focus to a greater extent on humanitarian assistance. The key priority in South Sudan must be to prevent a humanitarian crisis. But, if the country is to develop, it will need to invest in health, education and infrastructure.

Overall, we believe that DFID’s 2011–15 programme for South Sudan is diverse and challenging, although it is too early to judge its success. The Government of South Sudan has many priorities, including health and education, security and demobilisation. It is therefore right that DFID has a broad programme and co-ordinates its work with other donors. We welcome the emphasis that DFID gives to the equality of girls and women in its programme and, despite the pressures and uncertainties, urge the Department to maintain this emphasis. To a significant extent, the success of DFID’s South Sudan 2011–
15 programme will hinge on the performance of the Health Pooled Fund, to which DFID will contribute £82 million. Given its cost and importance, we recommend that the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) review the effectiveness and value-for-money of the Fund. Building the capacity of the administration in South Sudan—at all levels—will take time but is essential if the new country is to reduce reliance on international donors and the proliferation of NGOs. We welcome DFID’s emphasis on building the capacity of the South Sudanese Government, so that the government can gradually take primary responsibility for the delivery of basic services. We are concerned, however, that DFID’s decision to fund the United Nations rather than the Episcopal Church of Sudan to deliver its school construction programme misses an opportunity to strengthen and complement the limited internal capacity that already exists within South Sudan.

There have been well-documented difficulties with both World Bank and UN-administered pooled funds in South Sudan. It is hugely disappointing that the effectiveness of UK taxpayers’ money has been diminished through the World Bank’s problems in administering the Multi-Donor Trust Fund in Southern Sudan. Given DFID’s record in Southern Sudan as an effective donor and as a leader of the successful Basic Services Fund, we have reservations about the extent to which DFID should continue to channel bilateral aid through the World Bank in South Sudan. It is also vital that international donors effectively co-ordinate their work in South Sudan, not least because of the limited capacity of the state, the scale of the development challenge, and the huge sums of money involved. DFID has already demonstrated good examples of co-ordination and co-operation with other key bilateral and multilateral donors and should continue to seek opportunities to do so.

Insecurity remains a constant destabilising factor in South Sudan, both internally and on its borders. The United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS)—which was mandated on 9 July 2011 to consolidate peace and security conditions conducive to development—has had a difficult beginning. It appears to lack the air assets it requires for a country of this size and it has been slow to produce a peacebuilding strategy. UNMISS is also a hugely expensive operation, costing the UK taxpayer £60 million in its first year—two thirds of DFID’s annual development and humanitarian budget. UNMISS does not currently provide value-for-money and its resources have not been deployed most effectively. The UK Government should press the UN for an urgent review of UNMISS’s cost, mandate, assets and operations.
1 Introduction

1. The Republic of South Sudan gained independence from the Republic of Sudan on 9 July 2011. It was a day of celebration for the South Sudanese who had fought two long civil wars with the north since 1955 and had voted overwhelmingly—by 98.83%—for independence in January 2011. Tens of thousands watched the new country’s flag raised at an independence ceremony in Juba. A host of international dignitaries, including the President of Sudan Omar al-Bashir, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon and the British Foreign Secretary the Rt Hon William Hague MP, watched the events. Goodwill for the new country from the international community was, and remains, huge. It was clear from our visit to South Sudan five months later that a strong sense of optimism still prevailed across the country. Many South Sudanese we spoke to were hopeful about the future. Posters and billboards confidently proclaimed the ambitions of the young republic.

2. Yet, as the initial euphoria of independence dies down, it is clear that South Sudan faces a range of significant and complex challenges:

- The new country has some of the worst social indicators in the world, particularly in the health and education sectors.
- Years of conflict have left South Sudanese society highly militarised, and fragmented, with frequent outbreaks of internal violence.
- Up to 40% of government expenditure is defence-related, primarily due to the large number of ex-soldiers on the payroll, and demobilisation will be difficult.
- The economy is unhealthily dependent on a single resource: oil represents 98% of government income, yet production is expected to decline rapidly from the middle of the decade in the absence of new discoveries.
- Government capacity at the national, regional and local levels is extremely limited, corruption is widespread, and the new country is heavily reliant on international donors and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) to provide services for the population.
- Relations between Juba and Khartoum are tense, with each side accusing the other of supporting rebel groups in its territory and ongoing violence in Sudan’s Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile state could spill over into war.

3. The Department for International Development (DFID) has quickly established and scaled up a full office in Juba. DFID has developed a four-year development and humanitarian aid programme for South Sudan, amounting to some £360 million. This makes South Sudan one of the largest recipients of UK bilateral aid.

4. We announced our inquiry in September 2011 to examine the prospects of peace and development in South Sudan, with a particular focus on DFID’s evolving programme of
aid there. We received written evidence from 22 organisations and individuals. We held two oral evidence sessions in January and February 2012 with NGOs, academics, representatives of the South Sudanese Church and Mr Stephen O’ Brien MP, DFID Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, alongside his senior officials. We are grateful for all those who contributed evidence, both written and oral.

5. We visited South Sudan from 5 to 10 December 2011 to see first-hand the challenges facing the country and how DFID intended to spend its money. A sub-group of the Committee travelled first to Khartoum to hear the perspective of the north Sudanese on issues such as oil, returnees and conflict in border regions. In Juba we held meetings with government ministers and officials, including President Salva Kiir Mayardit, UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) officials, including the UN Special Representative of the Secretary General, Hilde Johnson, and representatives of other international donors, NGOs, the Sudan Council of Churches, and the private sector. Two sub-groups of the Committee visited Eastern Equatoria and Lakes states respectively to see DFID and EU-funded projects and to meet state and county level politicians and local NGOs. We wish to thank all those who helped facilitate our visit.

---

1 Our terms of reference were to examine: the extent of humanitarian need, especially among returning South Sudanese and those displaced by fighting in Abyei and Southern Kordofan, and any problems with humanitarian access; the provision of basic services, essential infrastructure and DFID’s efforts to reduce extreme poverty and promote sustainable livelihoods; how DFID can help to improve governance, including at the county and local level; the management of oil and oil revenues for development; the role of the UN development and humanitarian organisations, the World Bank, other bilateral donors and the extent of coordination and leadership between them; the security situation including the effectiveness of the UN peacekeeping force, UNMISS, and the prospects for a non-militarised border; and the implications of potential membership of the Commonwealth and the East African Community.
2 Background

Key statistics

6. South Sudan is the size of France yet has a dispersed population of eight million people. It the fifth largest economy in East Africa, but has by far the highest GDP (US $1,546 in 2010) and GNI (US$984) per capita rates (see Table 1). The relatively high rates in 2010 are largely explained by South Sudan’s oil exports. About 40% of government expenditure is defence-related, whilst expenditure on the health and education sectors is limited (7% and 4% respectively).

Table 1: Key statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Sudan: Key statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (Thousands of km²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population less than 18 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population less than 30 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population literate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government budget (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil revenues as % of total revenues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Republic of South Sudan National Bureau for Statistics; Government of the Republic of South Sudan

Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals

7. South Sudan faces significant challenges in making progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (see Table 2). Although it has improved in certain areas, such as education enrolment, other areas are lagging significantly. Eight out of ten people live on an equivalent of less than one $1 (63p) per day. Six out of every ten have no access to any form of health care. The maternal mortality rate is the highest in the world.

---

2 Gross Domestic Product (GDP) measures the value of all final goods and services produced in a country over a given period. Gross National Income (GNI) is the primary income received by residents of a geographical area (primary income is income received from production of goods and services as salaries or profits). Release of first GDP and GNI figures for South Sudan, South Sudan National Bureau of Statistics press release, 11 August 2011. Ev 70 [DFID].

3 In the years 2006–2010, 40% of central government expenditure was allocated to conflict prevention and security. According to DFID, the Ministry of Defence and Sudan People’s Liberation Army budget accounts for 35% of the total budget in the latest 2012-13 circular. Government of the Republic of South Sudan, South Sudan Development Plan 2011–13, August 2011, p 29. Ev 101 [DFID].

4 2011 allocations (prior to the austerity budget introduced in March 2012). Government of Southern Sudan, 2011 Budget Speech (by H.E. David Deng Achorbej), January 2011. No definitive figures on 2011 expenditure were available at the time of publication of this report.

5 No definitive figures for expenditure in 2010 or 2011 were available at the time of publication of this Report. For 2011 the Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly approved a budget of $2.1bn in March 2011, although this was expected to increase due to independence and referendum-related expenditure. Austerity measures were introduced in early 2012 due to the implications of South Sudan ceasing its oil production (see Chapter 3). In March 2012 the Government of South Sudan proposed an austerity budget of about 3.45bn South Sudanese pounds (SSP) for the February to June 2012 period. This means that the total draft budget for 2011–12 amounts to about 5.39 SSP. Ev 60–61 [DFID]
Table 2: South Sudan’s progress towards the Millennium Development Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1 Poverty and hunger</td>
<td>In South Sudan, chronic hunger was reduced from 48% to 33% between 1995 and 2004. However 50.6% of the population lives below the national poverty line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 2 Universal primary education</td>
<td>Net enrolment in primary school was 46% in 2010, but far fewer children complete all eight years. The qualified teacher to children ratio is 1:117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 3 Gender equality</td>
<td>Girls make up only 36.9% of primary school enrolment. One positive development is that 34% of all seats in the South Sudan Legislative Assembly are held by women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 4 Child mortality</td>
<td>There has been a decrease in under-five mortality from 250 per 1,000 live births (2001) to 135 per 1,000 (2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 5 Maternal health</td>
<td>South Sudan has the highest maternal mortality rate in the world—2,054 per 100,000 live births: there is a one in seven chance of a woman dying of pregnancy related causes. Currently there is one qualified midwife per 30,000 people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MDG 6 Diseases | HIV prevalence among the 15-24 yr population was 3.1 in 2006. Malaria is hyper-endemic.  
7 Meaning prevalence is between 51% and 75% of the population. |
| MDG 7 Environmental sustainability | Access to safe water and sanitation rose from 47% in 2006 to 67% in 2010 and from 6% to 14% respectively. |

Source: UN Development Programme
3 The humanitarian situation

8. Since independence, humanitarian needs in the Republic of South Sudan have remained acute, exacerbated by conflict, natural disasters and a lack of basic services and jobs. During late 2011 and early 2012, the humanitarian situation appeared to deteriorate following a poor harvest, rising food prices, escalating tribal violence and a significant influx of refugees from conflict-affected border areas and returnees from the north. The inability of South Sudan and Sudan to reach agreement on oil revenues and other outstanding matters from the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA, see Box 1) has further humanitarian implications. As explored in this Chapter, the combination of these challenges threaten to derail DFID, and the international community’s, development efforts at this early stage of South Sudan’s existence. DFID warns that 2012 is likely to “present the biggest challenge to humanitarian operations since the signing of the CPA in 2005”.

Box 1: The Comprehensive Peace Agreement 2005

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed in January 2005 between the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) and the Government of Sudan. The CPA ended the Second Sudanese War and established a secular, semi-autonomous Southern Sudan within its own executive, legislative and judicial institutions. It provided for a six-year interim period until (until January 2011) by the end of which Southern Sudan would have a referendum on its independence. The CPA made provisions for Khartoum and Juba to agree a number of important matters before the referendum took place. But several issues—including border demarcation, the status of the oil-rich border region of Abyei, oil revenue sharing and debt sharing—were not resolved before the January 2011 referendum. It was decided to proceed with the referendum, and later with independence, with these matters unresolved rather than delay and risk renewed conflict.

Implications of the oil dispute

9. During the post-CPA period from 2005 to 2011 oil revenues from production in Southern Sudan were split equally with Khartoum. Following independence South Sudan acquired about 75% of the former Sudan’s oil output although it continued to rely on pipelines running north through Sudan to a Red Sea port (Port Sudan) to export oil. A final settlement on oil revenues has been one of the key sticking points in negotiations between the two countries. There was agreement that South Sudan would pay Sudan a fee for use of the pipelines (rather than a share of revenues) but, as we heard in both Khartoum and Juba, the two parties have very different views of what the fee rate should be. In the

---

8 Ev 84 [DFID]
9 Ev 85
10 350,000 barrels per day compared with the former Sudan’s 500,000 bpd. Standard Chartered, “South Sudan—Oil in dispute”, 27 January 2012.
11 Khartoum proposed the equivalent of $32–36 per barrel, although this figure included provision for transitional compensatory payments which it was agreed they would receive to help them adjust to the loss of oil revenue following independence. South Sudan proposed less than $1 per barrel.
absence of an agreement, both sides have taken unilateral steps. In December 2011, Sudan announced that it would take payment of transit fees in kind, in other words siphoning off part of Juba’s share, as compensation for unpaid fees it claimed South Sudan owed. Ships were prevented from leaving Port Sudan until (the disputed) arrears had been paid.

10. Matters escalated when Sudan reportedly seized South Sudanese oil on 13 January 2012. On 20 January, South Sudan said that it would stop the flow of oil through the Sudanese pipelines and halt oil operations with immediate effect. The following week, South Sudan and Kenya signed a memorandum of understanding to build a pipeline between the two countries. It is thought this will take several years to build and cost billions of dollars. Mr Stephen O’Brien MP, DFID Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, questioned the wisdom of building a pipeline to Kenya given that South Sudan’s oil assets were expected to deplete over the coming decade. The Government of South Sudan (GRSS) has subsequently ceased production at all its oil fields and—given that oil accounts for 98% of government income—approved austerity measures, including an average 50% reduction in non-salary expenditure and the elimination of unconditional grants to state governments.

11. DFID says it is “very concerned” by the GRSS’s decision—which could have “major economic consequences for both countries”—and by the potential for a “rapid rise in humanitarian needs.” DFID has been “clear” to GRSS that it would “not bail South Sudan out”. The Minister told us in February that the South Sudanese stance was “absolutely not in the interests of the broad population of South Sudan” and posed a risk to DFID’s development efforts: “Maintaining our development programme and the humanitarian aid element […] will clearly be phenomenally challenged if we find that South Sudan is not in a position or prepared to use what revenues it can have to support its own basic services”.

12. On 22 March 2012, the Secretary of State confirmed to us that aspects of DFID’s 2011–15 programme would be revised as a result of the oil shut-down:

“There is a real possibility that the government will deplete its financial reserves [as a result of the oil shut-down], with an associated sharp reduction in the ability of government to carry out core functions; and that we will see an uncontrolled depreciation of the South Sudanese Pound, spiralling inflation and a rapid increase in poverty. In this scenario, many of the gains made since the signing of the CPA in 2005 could be wiped out.

“I have decided that we need to start a sequenced process to refocus our development programmes away from the government’s longer term development agenda towards

12 Khartoum claimed South Sudan owed about $720m in outstanding fees for the July to October period.
13 It has been reported that South Sudanese authorities expect such a pipeline to take 11 months to complete, costing $1.5bn. Some commentators believe this is “overly optimistic”: difficult geographical terrain means the construction would take three years and cost a much higher amount. Standard Chartered, “South Sudan—Oil in dispute”, January 2012
14 Q 83
15 Ev 102; HL Deb, 27 February 2012, col 317WA
16 SS17c [DFID]
17 Qq 68–69
supporting the most vulnerable and addressing life saving needs. If the current shut-
down persists, this will entail a substantial redirection of resources away from the
longer-term priorities set out in the South Sudan Development Plan.”

The Secretary of State gave examples of DFID projects that would be put on hold or
delayed, with immediate effect, including in the health, education and governance sectors.
We discuss DFID’s programme in Chapter 4.

Refugees from Abyei, Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile

13. Conflict in the disputed border region of Abyei, and in Blue Nile and Southern
Kordofan states in Sudan, has resulted in hundreds of thousands of refugees arriving in
South Sudan over the past year. In June 2011, 110,000 internally displaced persons fled
Abyei to the border town of Agok in South Sudan. Fighting in ethnically-mixed Southern
Kordofan and in Blue Nile state, which broke out in mid-2011, has led to almost 100,000
refugees arriving in South Sudan, mainly to Upper Nile and Unity states. 46,000 refugees
are based in Doro Camp in Upper Nile State—with around 2,000 new arrivals each week.
The humanitarian community is providing food, health, shelter and protection assistance
to 16,000 refugees from Southern Kordofan at the refugee site in Yida, in Unity State. Over
36,000 more refugees are estimated to be at other sites or located in border areas.
Humanitarian agencies are involved in over 30 operations in the country but are “stretched
to capacity”.23

14. Sudan has carried out several aerial attacks on targets in the border area since
independence, some of them on refugee camps within South Sudan. The UK has
condemned these attacks.24 Many NGOs have stopped working in border states of South
Sudan due to increased conflict and risk of conflict.25

18 Ev 104
19 Ibid.
20 Abyei is located between Bahr el-Ghazal and Southern Kordofan and sits just above the January 1956 boundary
between Sudan and South Sudan. The CPA signed in 2005 granted Abyei a special administrative status and the
prospect of a referendum in January 2011 to decide whether to join what might then become an independent
south. But the referendum was blocked by the Government of Sudan over the question of whether the nomadic,
Arab Misseriya should be eligible to vote, and the area remains a recurrent flashpoint. Both governments have
forces deployed there.
21 The fighting is largely between those whose loyalties lie with either Khartoum or Juba but also incorporates ethnic
and tribal dimensions. Many within the ‘southern’ camp in Southern Kordofan are ethnic Nubans, who sided with
the South during Sudan’s civil war. They are fighting under the guise of the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement–
North (SPLM-N). Along with the Sudanese Armed Forces, Khartoum loyalists include militia elements belonging to
the Arab Misseriya tribe, which has long-standing tensions with the Nubans.
22 Estimates as of March 2012. OCHA [UN Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs] South Sudan, Weekly
23 Ev 85 [DFID]
24 Ev 83, 98 [DFID]
25 HL Deb, 20 March 2012, cols 163–164WA
Box 2: Perspectives of the North

Sudan and South Sudan have had a tense relationship since secession, with the oil dispute, frequent border clashes, and both sides accusing the others of supporting rebel groups in each other’s territory. In the West, Sudan is often presented as the aggressor in these disputes. It was clear from our visit to Khartoum, however, that many Sudanese resent the negative portrayal of their country, especially as they co-operated with the secession of South Sudan and agreed to relinquish most of their oil fields. There is a common perception that Sudan has demanded $36 per barrel as a transit fee but the Sudanese claim that this figure also includes provision for transitional compensatory payments which it was agreed they would receive to help them adjust to the loss of oil revenue when South Sudan became independent.

Returnees

15. Following independence, the Government of Sudan requested that South Sudanese people living in the north determine their citizenship and residency status by 8 April 2012. More than 360,000 people of South Sudanese origin have subsequently “returned” since independence (many families have been based in the north for generations). GRSS and the international community are attempting to accommodate the returnees in settlements and residential areas, but resources are stretched. Returnees are faced with multiple obstacles, ranging from land disputes and security concerns to early and forced marriage, due to economic hardship and lack of livelihood opportunities, and tensions over access to food, water and firewood. A January 2012 inter-agency assessment of returnee conditions in Northern Bahr el Ghazal state found that in the areas where returnees planned to settle, there was a lack of essential drugs in all health facilities, limited access to safe drinking water, an acute food shortage due to poor crop performance and a lack of shelter and non-food items. We visited returnees at the permanent Nyotic Angui settlement in Lakes State and in residential areas of Torit.

26 As of January 2012. Ev 85, Q 127 (DFID).
27 International Rescue Committee, Northern Bahr el Ghazal Protection Stakeholder Analysis Report, November 2011.
29 Led by the UNHCR (UN High Commissioner for Refugees).
Box 3: Discussions with returnees at Nyotic Angui settlement in Lakes and in residential areas of Eastern Equatoria, 4–5 December 2012

People told us of the difficulties they had faced on their journey from the north. Some people’s luggage had been confiscated at the border; others had been wounded. There were few opportunities to gain employment, even for the many people who had previously had skilled employment in the north. It was difficult to know where to earn money. Many people spoke only Arabic, yet English had been declared the official language of the new South Sudan. Those in Nyotic Angui camp were dependent on food hand-outs. Water and sanitation facilities in the camp were extremely limited, with no proper toilets. Parents were concerned for their children’s safety when going to the bush at night because there was a risk of attack by wild animals.

16. By March 2012 more than 500,000 people remained in Sudan who were required to either regularise their residence status or leave the country. The majority are expected to move to South Sudan.30 The Minister was “very concerned” at the “major cliff edge facing us”. There was a risk that people could find themselves “stateless”—or, more precisely, they would not have legal status—because there was no South Sudanese Ambassador in Khartoum to facilitate the process. DFID was engaged with both Sudan and South Sudan to try to find a resolution. The Minister stressed that DFID might need to “divert resources” to assist returnees.31 We note that Khartoum and Juba have subsequently signed a memorandum of understanding to co-operate in the transfer of more than 300,000 people to the South. But the International Organisation for Migration has said that the 8 April deadline represents a “massive logistical challenge” to both governments and the international community.32 There are concerns that people of South Sudanese origin who remain in the north could be victimised should continue to tensions escalate between the two countries.

Tribal conflict and rebel militias

17. Tribal fighting continues in a number of states as it has done for hundreds of years. In recent years, in a country awash with small arms from the civil war, the stakes have been significantly raised. In Jonglei State alone—which has a long tradition of violent conflict between tribes, clans and subclans caused by cattle-raiding and competition for resources—hundreds of people were killed and tens of thousands displaced in 2011.33 An attack by the Lou Nuer tribe on Murle communities in Jonglei State in December 2011 is estimated to have displaced 60,000 people, with an unknown number killed (see Box 5 on page 35).34 The Government of South Sudan declared Jonglei a disaster zone and asked

---

30 “South Sudanese leave Khartoum by train”, International Organization for Migration press release, 2 March 2012
31 Qq 127, 129
32 “Sudan and South Sudan sign return deal, but April deadline “massive logistical challenge”, says IOM”, International Organization for Migration press release, 14 February 2012
33 EV 77 [DFID]
34 OCHA, South Sudan: Humanitarian Snapshot (as of 27 January 2012), www.unocha.org/south-sudan/maps-graphics
humanitarian agencies to accelerate life-saving assistance. A revenge attack by the Murle tribe in March 2012 resulted in at least 220 deaths. Melinda Young, Save the Children, told us that the violence in Jonglei was becoming “more brutal”, with more civilians, women and children targeted for abuse, including abduction and killing.

18. Rebel militias have been active in South Sudan throughout 2011, particularly in Jonglei, Upper Nile and Unity states. Some are armed rebellions against the government, alleging electoral fraud by the ruling Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM), whilst others cite land issues or tribalism as a reason for taking up arms. Four significant rebel groups signed peace agreements with the GRSS but some others operating in Upper Nile and Unity remain outside the fold. A serious attack took place in October 2011 by the South Sudan Liberation Army on Mayom Town in Unity state, which left at least 50 fighters and civilians dead. Aid agencies were warned to leave a week previously.

19. In total, rebel militia attacks and tribal violence displaced more than 350,000 South Sudanese people in 2011. Giving evidence, Mr Stephen O’Brien MP, DFID Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, warned that “the current level of internal violence and cross-border conflict is seriously threatening to, at the very best, delay [DFID’s] programme”.

**Food security**

20. In January 2012 the UN’s World Food Programme estimated that around 2.7 million people (about one third of the population) in South Sudan would require food aid in 2012—an increase from 1.4 million people in mid-2011. This was due to increased food prices, conflict, market disruption from border closures (with Sudan) and an increase in demand from returnees and refugees. WFP Country Director Chris Nikoi warned: “A gathering storm of hunger is approaching South Sudan”. That same month the UN High Commissioner for Refugees described the humanitarian situation in South Sudan as “acute” and “fragile”: the country could face a “humanitarian disaster of enormous proportions”.

21. Failure to reach agreement on the outstanding matters from the Comprehensive Peace Agreement process—most notably oil-revenue sharing, border demarcation and the status of the disputed border region of Abyei—threaten the prospects for peace and development within South Sudan’s short lifetime as an independent nation. We are deeply concerned at the prospect of a humanitarian crisis given the loss of South Sudan’s oil revenue, combined with the increasing number of returnees and refugees arriving in the country and ongoing inter-tribal violence.

---

35 “South Sudan cattle raid toll ‘passes 200’”, BBC News Online, 13 March 2012, news.bbc.co.uk
36 Q 2
37 Ev 84, 103–104 [DFID]
38 OCHA, South Sudan: Humanitarian Snapshot (as of 27 January 2012), www.unocha.org/south-sudan/maps-graphiss
39 Q 77
40 OCHA, Consolidated Appeal for South Sudan 2011, July 2011.
41 “South Sudan, World’s Newest Country, Faces Hunger Crisis”, UN World Food Programme press release, 15 December 2011
42 “UNHCR chief appeals for massive humanitarian support for South Sudan”, UNHCR press release, 10 January 2012
22. The decision by the Government of South Sudan (GRSS) to halt production on all its oilfields, despite undoubted provocation from Sudan, has potentially grave economic and humanitarian consequences for the South Sudanese population. It could also precipitate instability in the country. The UK Government must continue to press Khartoum and Juba to seek an equitable and sustainable agreement on the export of oil through Sudan’s pipelines. We do not consider there to be any realistic alternative in the next few critical years. It must also be made clear that the UK, and other donors, cannot bankroll South Sudan through this austerity period.

23. We are concerned at the potentially unclear legal status of hundreds of thousands of people of South Sudanese origin living in the north. The UK Government must continue to press Khartoum and Juba to find a resolution to ensure that those who wish to move to South Sudan can do so safely, while those who prefer to remain in the north can have their legal status clarified. Many returnees to South Sudan are living in extremely difficult circumstances and DFID should divert additional resources to assist them if required.

24. DFID is operating in a difficult and fast-changing environment. It has already had to re-focus its development programme as a result of the pressures created by the oil shut-down. Given the mounting humanitarian challenges, we recognise that the Department may need to continue to modify its development plans and focus to a greater extent on humanitarian assistance. The key priority in South Sudan must be to prevent a humanitarian crisis. But, if the country is to develop, it will need to invest in health, education and infrastructure.
4 DFID’s programme

26. The UK first established a development presence in Southern Sudan in 2005 as a member of a six country Joint Donor Office. It was the first country to appoint an Ambassador in the newly independent South Sudan. DFID has now established a full office in Juba and issued an Operational Plan for South Sudan to cover the period 2011–2015. In this Chapter, we examine DFID’s evolving aid programme, including its funding plans, confirmed and planned projects, and expected results. As discussed in Chapter 3, DFID has already decided to modify aspects of its development programme and focus to a greater extent on humanitarian assistance, as a result of the GRSS’s decision to shut down oil production. We recognise that DFID may need to modify its programme further if the humanitarian situation continues to deteriorate (paragraph 24).

DFID’s South Sudan Office

27. DFID opened its full Office in Juba in July 2011 following independence. For the previous nine months, DFID had operated a Sub-Office in Juba, which reported to DFID Sudan in Khartoum. There has been a rapid increase in staffing in Juba (from two staff in August 2010 to 30 by February 2012). Unusually the South Sudan office is a joint office between DFID and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), with the “platform” managed by DFID. South Sudan is the first country in the world where DFID provides the platform for the work of other HMG departments. This is because the objectives for the UK’s development assistance to South Sudan are “central to wider UK Government objectives of achieving peace, stability, inclusive and accountable governance, respect for human rights and more equitable growth in South Sudan”. DFID and FCO staff work together on issues such as corruption and defence transformation. We received positive evidence about the joint DFID-FCO unit. We were impressed during our visit with how well the arrangement was working. The establishment of a joint DFID and Foreign and Commonwealth Office operation in South Sudan—with DFID in the lead—is a welcome innovation and an encouraging example of joined-up government. It is early days but the signs are that the joint office is working well. The Government should seek to adopt a similar model in overseas counties where development assistance is central to wider UK foreign policy objectives.

Funding

28. DFID expects to spend around £360 million in South Sudan between 2011 and 2015, making South Sudan one of the largest recipients of UK bilateral aid. About £74 million...
will be spent in 2011–12,\textsuperscript{49} and about £90 million in the following three years (Table 3). This compares to about £60 million expenditure in 2010–11.\textsuperscript{50} Due to current uncertainties, these estimates remain provisional: DFID said in February 2012 that “the Government of South Sudan’s decision to close the oil wells means that we cannot currently give firm figures for future expenditure.”\textsuperscript{51}

**Table 3: UK assistance to South Sudan over the period of the Comprehensive Spending Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ 74 million</td>
<td>£ 91 million</td>
<td>£ 96 million</td>
<td>£ 99 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DFID (Ev 92)

29. DFID does not currently channel any money through the Government of South Sudan (GRSS). It instead routes funds through Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), private sector firms and multilateral agencies, such as the UN or World Bank. Thus far, the bulk of DFID’s programming has been through multi-donor trust funds and other pooled mechanisms, such as the Basic Services Fund (see Box 4).\textsuperscript{52} We explore funding through multilateral institutions in Chapter 5.

**Box 4: Basic Services Fund, 2005–12**

DFID established the Basic Services Fund (BSF) in 2005. It is widely considered to be one of the most effective pooled funds in Southern Sudan over the past seven years. DFID is the lead donor to the BSF—other donors include the EU, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden—but the Fund is managed by a private contractor. DFID expects to spend more than £60 million on the BSF for the 2005 to 2012 period.\textsuperscript{53} Since 2005 the BSF has funded NGOs to support government health services for 2.2 million people (or approximately 20% of the country) in 186 government health facilities. It has also funded NGOs to support school construction and pre-service and in-service teacher training. DFID estimates that almost 70,000 children have benefited from going to schools supported by the BSF. The BSF was scheduled to end in December 2011, but DFID decided to extend it for an additional year to address the needs of returnees from Sudan and to ensure there is no gap in service delivery while sector-specific funding mechanisms are put in place.\textsuperscript{54} Witnesses were extremely positive about the BSF. NGOs cited the BSF as an example of best practice: it was described as “one of the few successes” seen in South Sudan.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{49} DFID initially expected to spend £90.6 million in 2011–12. The Minister explained that the under-spend was due to difficulties in DFID becoming established in such a challenging environment (Q 86).

\textsuperscript{50} There are no official OECD DAC figures for donor spend in Southern Sudan in 2010. This is a DFID estimate. Overall the UK spent £125.7 million in Sudan in 2010–11. Ev 102.

\textsuperscript{51} Ev 102

\textsuperscript{52} DFID visit briefing to the Committee

\textsuperscript{53} Ev 93

\textsuperscript{54} Ev 68

\textsuperscript{55} Q 49 [Dr Sara Pantuliano]. Ev w52 [World Vision UK] See also Ev 45 [Episcopal Church of Sudan and UK partners] and NGO Joint Briefing paper, *Getting it Right from the Start*, September 2011, p 29.
DFID’s Operational Plan 2011–15

30. DFID published its South Sudan Operational Plan in July 2011. It sets out DFID’s priorities for South Sudan up to 2015, including targets on health, education, governance, girls and women and humanitarian work (see Appendix). Witnesses were generally complimentary about the Operational Plan.56 Tearfund, however, said it was “disappointing” that the plan did not include objectives related to water and sanitation (WASH). There was a “potential vacuum” if DFID did not successfully pass its “significant experience, expertise and reputation” in the WASH sector to other donors.57 International HIV/AIDS Alliance also noted that the Plan allocated no specific funding to HIV/AIDS.58 The Minister argued that DFID could not cover every sector in detail, but it would continue to provide some WASH activities as part of its humanitarian work (Germany was now the lead donor on WASH activities). He considered the targets in the Operational Plan to be “stretching and ambitious”.59

31. DFID is developing more than thirty projects to achieve its strategic objectives for South Sudan. Some projects are already being implemented, whilst others are at the design or concept phase. We asked DFID for specific information about its current and planned projects, including their cost. The five most costly projects are listed in Table 4.

Table 4: DFID’s planned five most expensive projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector/title</th>
<th>Summary of purpose</th>
<th>Estimated duration</th>
<th>Funding contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Security &amp; Livelihood*</td>
<td>Target beneficiaries are farmers, youth and returnees. May involve: increased production and marketing of agricultural products in count towns; vocational training in county towns to support market chain; and social protection for those without labour in three states.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Up to £100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Pooled Fund*</td>
<td>To increase overall access to regular health services in South Sudan from the current 40% to 60% and build capacity in the Ministry of Health and other institutions. Will focus on six states.</td>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>£82 million from DFID plus funds from other donors to reach a target of £156 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan Service Delivery (Basic Services Fund)</td>
<td>DFID created the BSF in 2005. It is now the largest single source for the provision of primary health care in South Sudan. The current interim arrangement phase has helped to expand coverage and use of health, education and water and sanitation across Southern Sudan.</td>
<td>7 years (2005–2012)</td>
<td>£60.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56 For example, Ev w50
57 Ev 57; Q 5
58 Ev w56
59 Qq 83–84
Girls’ Education*  To accelerate girls’ enrolment, retention and completion at primary and secondary levels of education. Approximately 200,000 girls will benefit.  

Feeder Roads*  Contribution, probably via the UN World Food Programme, to build 550km of rural feeder roads.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 years</th>
<th>£52.3 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ Education*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Roads*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*project still at the concept or design phase, as of January 2012

Source: DFID (Ev 92)

Education

32. DFID notes that South Sudan started at the “bottom of the world league table” for education. Only 23% of South Sudanese people are literate. The net enrolment rate at primary level is only 44%, and it is slightly over 9% at the secondary level. As we saw during our visit, school infrastructure and staffing are inadequate. Only 23% of existing classrooms are of permanent construction; fewer than 5% of teachers have pre-service training, and 9% have in-service training. The average pupil to classroom ratio is 134:1 and the pupil to teacher ratio is 194:1. Textbooks are in short supply, with one textbook available for every four pupils.

33. DFID intends to spend about £11 million to print and distribute 12.5 million textbooks by 2013. In evidence, Save the Children told us that DFID’s textbook target was “not the most effective means of measuring outcomes” in the education sector. The Minister argued, however, that research showed that textbook availability was the single most positive factor in increasing learning outcomes for children. Textbook provision, he said, also proved successful in DFID’s Zimbabwe education programme. English is also the new official language of South Sudan so there is clearly a need for English language textbooks.

34. DFID also has a target to support 240,000 children (including 180,000 girls) in primary education in South Sudan. This will be partly be achieved through DFID’s £37m South Sudan Education Project, which will construct 33 primary schools and four secondary schools in four states. Representatives of the Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS), including Archbishop Deng whom we met in Juba and Rebecca Coleman who gave evidence, were disappointed that DFID had overlooked the ECS for the new school construction contract, awarding it instead to UNICEF and UNOPS (United Nations Office for Project Services). They told us that the ECS had a good record of constructing schools cheaply and to a high standard. The Minister told us that DFID selected the UN “given the scale of the project

60 A road that feeds traffic to a more important road.
61 Ev 67 [DFID]
62 Government of South Sudan, 2010 South Sudan Statistical Booklet: Education, March 2011
63 Ev 67 [DFID]
64 Ev 39
65 Q 88
66 Rebecca Coleman said that the Church could construct an eight-classroom school within two months for £40,000. The ECS was previously funded by the DFID-led Basic Services Fund. Q 51
and the need for rapid completion, on time and with value for money”: he said the ECS had constructed 90 classrooms in 22 schools over five years whereas DFID required 200 classrooms in about 25 schools in one year. The costs between the two bids were also said to be broadly similar. However, the Minister emphasised that the Church would continue to play a “very critical” role in the education sector, for instance in DFID’s Girls’ Education programme.67 We note that DFID has decided to delay plans to construct teacher training centres as a result of the oil crisis.68 When allocating funds for its development projects, DFID should as far as possible seek to strengthen and complement the limited internal capacity that already exists within South Sudan. We have some concerns that DFID’s decision to fund the United Nations rather than the Episcopal Church of Sudan to deliver its school construction programme misses an opportunity to do so.

Health

35. Decades of war have left South Sudan’s health system extremely weak. There are only 37 hospitals in South Sudan.69 It is estimated that fewer than 40% of the population have access to basic primary health care services in South Sudan, and that about 70% of health facilities are reliant on NGOs for operational support.70 South Sudan’s health outcomes reflect this weak capacity and infrastructure. It has the highest maternal mortality rates in the world with more than one in fifty women dying during pregnancy or delivery.71 Immunisation rates are still low, with only 20% of one-year olds immunised against measles.72 Sudan as a whole ranks fourth globally for malaria deaths with an estimated 44,000 per year.73

36. DFID’s Operational Plan sets a target to reach 762,000 people with malaria prevention or treatment interventions by 2015. DFID also aims to provide couples with 143,000 cumulative years of protection from unintended pregnancy.74 One of DFID’s major projects over the next four years is the Health Pooled Fund (HPF). DFID expects to contribute £82 million to the HPF, and hopes funds from other donors (Canada, Australia, Sweden and the European Commission) will reach a total of £156 million. The aim of the HPF is to increase overall access to regular health services in South Sudan from the current 40% to 60% and intends to focus on capacity building in the Ministry of Health and other institutions (see paragraph 48). The Minister agreed with us that the success of DFID’s South Sudan 2011-15 programme would, to a large extent, hinge on the performance of the Health Pooled Fund.75 Given its cost and importance, we recommend that the

67 Q 92
68 Ev 104
69 Three are teaching hospitals, seven are state hospitals and 27 are county hospitals. Ev 103 [DFID].
70 South Sudan Health Facility mapping survey (2009)
71 2,054 per 100,000 in 2006. Sudan Household Survey.
72 Preliminary results, Southern Sudan Household Survey 2010
73 World Malaria Report (2009)
74 Cumulative Years of Protection (CYP) is the estimate of protection provided by contraceptive methods during a one-year period, based upon the volume of all contraceptives sold or distributed free of charge to clients during that period. DFID says that it is not only applicable to couples but provides an indication of the distribution of contraception. Ev 104.
75 Q 98
Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) review the effectiveness and value-for-money of the Health Pooled Fund at a suitable moment in the future.

37. Neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) are a major public health problem in South Sudan. 12 NTDs, including trachoma, lymphatic filariasis, onchocerciasis, schistosomiasis, and soil-transmitted helminthiasis, are endemic.76 The Minister told us that South Sudan was the “nursery of every NTD”.77 DFID expects to spend about £4.7m on a NTD Programme in South Sudan over three years, which aims to improve the Ministry of Health’s capacity to handle treatment and prevention of NTDs.78 The immediate focus will be on eradication of lymphatic filariasis.79 In January 2012, DFID announced a five-fold increase in funding to tackle NTDs across the developing world between 2011 and 2015 (from £50m to £245m). It has not yet been decided how much will be allocated to South Sudan. We welcome DFID’s commitment to significantly increase funds to tackle neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) in the developing world. Given that several NTDs are endemic in South Sudan, DFID must ensure that South Sudan receives an adequate share of this money.

Girls and women

38. DFID’s Operational Plan states that improving women’s and girls’ access to basic services, economic opportunities and human rights in South Sudan is a “top priority”.80 Only seven girls for ten boys attend school at the primary level; five girls for ten boys at the secondary level. Only 9% of girls who enrol at grade one complete primary education.81 Several of the girls we spoke to in South Sudan wanted a good education and a profession. However, we heard how some customs and traditions, particularly in rural areas, could act as a barrier. Teenage pregnancy is common and 41% of girls are married before their eighteenth birthday.82 We heard how marriages are often arranged by parents in order to collect the bridal dowry—typically several cows. Women and girls also carry and collect most of the household water, with adult women carrying 60% of the burden and girls 8%. The average time spent collecting water can be up to eight hours in areas without water and sanitation, meaning that girls do not participate fully in education.83 Schools also did not have separate toilets for girls and boys.

39. DFID aims to promote the equality of girls and women through a planned six-year £52 million Girls’ Education project to help tackle the economic, social and cultural barriers that prevent girls from going to school and to support 150,000 girls through primary school and 50,000 through secondary school.84 In the health sector, DFID plans to
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76 Neglected Tropical Disease Control Program website
77 Q 83
78 This is centrally-funded (not country specific) DFID resources. Ev 92
79 Ev 92 [DFID]
80 DFID, South Sudan Operational Plan 2011–15 [Gender Annex], July 2011
81 World Bank, South Sudan Education Status Report 2011
82 Sudan Household Survey 2006
83 Ev 68 [DFID]
84 Ev 92, 102 [DFID]
strengthen family planning and support for pregnant women, so that 21,000 women have the help of a trained birth attendant when giving birth.\textsuperscript{85} DFID has also set a target to improve access to justice services for 250,000 women by 2014. We note that there have been some positive indicators of success to promote equality: for example, women police officers represent 50\% of the police force in some of South Sudan’s states.\textsuperscript{86}

40. We asked the Minister how much impact DFID and the wider international community could make to improve women and girls’ equality, given that some barriers related to cultural traditions and practices such as the bride-price system. He accepted that it was a challenge but said there was “now a recognition that we do need to address some of these cultural barriers”.\textsuperscript{87}

41. The improvement of equality of girls and women is crucial if South Sudan is to prosper, socially and economically, over the next generation. We strongly endorse the emphasis that DFID has placed on girls and women in its programme. While we recognise the current pressures and uncertainties surrounding DFID’s programme, we urge the Department to maintain these programmes as a priority.

Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration

42. South Sudan currently spends around 40\% of its budget on “defence”, largely due to the high number of soldiers on the government payroll (estimated to be between 180,000 to 220,000 soldiers).\textsuperscript{88} This compares to 7\% and 4\% allocations to the education and health sectors respectively.\textsuperscript{89} We were told during our visit that the army was currently the only welfare system in South Sudan. A sustainable reduction in the size of the armed forces is essential to release resources for investment in development. The GRSS, with support from the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and UNMISS, is currently developing a programme to put 150,000 ex-combatants through a Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) process over the next eight years. DFID has been involved in the development of this strategy. It expects to spend about £20 million on DDR, with a particular focus on the reintegration of former soldiers back into communities (although this programme has been delayed due to the oil crisis).\textsuperscript{90}

43. DFID notes that there are likely to be “huge” challenges in reintegrating ex-soldiers into the community. An estimated 80\% of ex-combatants are illiterate with poor numeracy. There are limited private sector job opportunities available and South Sudan is affected by widespread insecurity.\textsuperscript{91} On our visit we heard that it could be difficult to encourage ex-
soldiers into other fields of work which they considered to be “beneath” them. On the other hand, many ex-soldiers already have a sense of discipline instilled in them and, with appropriate training, could form part of South Sudan’s much-needed reformed security sector (we discuss security sector reform in Chapter 6).

44. It is unsustainable for 40% of the Government of South Sudan (GRSS)’s budget to be spent on defence. Once the economic situation in South Sudan has become more stable, DFID should re-prioritise its support to reduce the size of the South Sudanese army and reintegrate ex-soldiers back into the community. This presents a considerable challenge given the high levels of unemployment and soldiers’ lack of skills, but is important if the GRSS is to begin providing basic services for the population.

 Governance

45. Government capacity in South Sudan is extremely limited. Although basic structures have been established, delivery systems across all sectors are either absent or dysfunctional. There is a significant shortage of skilled people in the civil service and trained police. Nearly half of all civil servants in South Sudan only have a primary education. Many have poor literacy and IT skills. Michael Ryder, UK Special Representative to Sudan, said there is a “lot of talent” in the Juba Government—particularly at the ministerial level—but “very limited depth of capacity”. But we were told during our visit that GRSS ministers had to spend too much time in meetings with international donors. Public financial management capacity is also very low, meaning that the GRSS lacks control over its finances. Formal government institutions at the county and local level are limited.

46. DFID states that it is “crucial” to strengthen capacity at all levels of government, and public finance management, if South Sudan is to prosper and be stable. The Department provides direct support to the central executive, through high level mentoring to key personnel within the Ministry of Cabinet Affairs, the Office of the President and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. It has employed technical consultants, such as the Adam Smith Institute, to undertake this role. DFID is also supporting work to strengthen South Sudan’s management of its public finances, including a £1.5m contribution to an Overseas Development Institute (ODI) programme to create more effective, transparent and accountable budget processes and systems. DFID also helps to fund the secondment of ODI Fellows to key ministries such as the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning—which is generally regarded to be one of the better ministries in Juba. It was clear that the ministers we spoke to highly valued this technical expertise. At the state level, DFID provides about £5 million to a UNDP-led project to improve the functioning of state administrations to allow, for example, enhanced interaction between the capital and state administrations.

47. More broadly, DFID incorporates government capacity-building measures within development projects in other sectors. The Health Pooled Fund, for example, intends to

---
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build the capacity of the Ministry of Health and other institutions, in order to gradually take over responsibility from NGOs for health care. This would likely take the form of technical assistance; there are no plans to provide budget support at this stage. The NGO Tearfund said that there had already been “notable successes” in handing over basic service provision for some elements of the health sector to the government. It planned to exit the health sector within the next 18 months. In March 2012, the Secretary of State told us that the plans to move from NGO-led to government led-approaches in the health sector had been “put on hold”, with immediate effect, as a result of the GRSS decision to halt oil production.

48. South Sudan is currently a society built on the work of NGOs and international donors. This cannot be sustainable. Building the capacity of the administration in South Sudan—at all levels—will take time but is essential if the new country is to become less dependent on others. DFID’s capacity-building support to date has been largely focussed on Ministries and personnel in Juba. This work appears to have been effective and is highly valued by the GRSS. Given that basic services are primarily delivered at the state or local level, DFID must ensure that it strikes a balance between supporting governance in Juba and other levels of administration.

49. We welcome the intention within some DFID’s projects, such as the Health Pooled Fund, to build the capacity of the South Sudanese Government, so that the government can gradually take primary responsibility for the delivery of basic services. Although the oil shut-down has disrupted some of these plans, DFID must ensure it resumes them once the economic situation in South Sudan becomes more stable. DFID should use its leverage and influence to persuade other key donors to integrate capacity-building support within their own development projects.

50. It should not only be the responsibility of the key international donors to build the capacity of the South Sudanese Government. Neighbouring countries in the region, such as Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia, can also play a valuable role, for instance through providing training to civil servants. DFID, alongside other donors, should seek to engage South Sudan’s neighbours in this important work.

**Private sector development**

51. The private sector is still very small in South Sudan; there are only just more than 7,000 registered businesses in the country. The expansion of South Sudan’s private sector will be important to diversify its economy and reduce dependence on oil. DFID particularly notes that the development of agricultural and livestock potential is the “best engine” to diversify South Sudan’s economy in the medium term. Large fertile areas of South Sudan remain untouched—only about 4% of potential agricultural land is presently utilised.

---
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52. DFID contributes to several funds that aim to encourage private sector development. It will contribute £6m over four years to the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF)—a USA-led private sector fund—which aims to catalyse private sector investment in agriculture.\(^{101}\) DFID also expects to provide £6m to Trade Mark East Africa (TMEA), which will assist the GRSS establish a customs service. We met representatives from both AECF and TMEA on our visit. About £5m will be spent on the Global Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Financing Programme, a programme of support for SME development channelled through the International Finance Corporation.\(^{102}\)

53. During our visit we also met representatives from some of the few businesses operating in South Sudan, such as SAB Miller (who opened a brewery in 2009) and Equity Bank (one of the few licensed commercial banks). Our meetings with private sector representatives highlighted various barriers that prevented businesses from operating effectively in South Sudan. These barriers included:

- Conflict and insecurity was a major impediment to private sector growth;
- Poor road infrastructure and market access particularly constrained agricultural development;
- An incomplete legal and regulatory framework (several important laws for the private sector had not been enacted);
- A lack of licensed banks and common customs procedures;
- There were no cement-production facilities in the country, which significantly increased infrastructure costs; and
- UK Trade & Investment\(^{103}\) did not have a presence in South Sudan.

54. The expansion of the private sector in South Sudan—particularly in agriculture—will be crucial if the country is to diversify its economy and reduce dependence on oil in the medium term. We welcome DFID’s emphasis in its 2011–15 programme to encourage the growth of the private sector. We urge it to continue to do so, with a particular focus on agriculture and the provision of basic infrastructure. The current oil crisis demonstrates that South Sudan’s overwhelming economic reliance on oil is unsustainable.

55. CDC, the UK’s development finance institution, does not currently invest in South Sudan (or Sudan).\(^{104}\) We note, however, that CDC intends to place greater emphasis on “frontier” markets—that is, markets at an early stage of economic and financial development.\(^{105}\) Private sector investment in South Sudan is complicated by legal, land
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101 AECF will competitively select and co-finance private sector-led projects in agri-business with a direct positive impact on poor people in rural areas, in the form of jobs and cash incomes. Ev 70, 92.
102 Ev 92
103 The joint government department run by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. UK Tie undertakes bespoke research into the market on behalf of UK companies
104 Our Fifth Report of Session 2010–12 concerned the work of CDC (HC 607).
105 Markets at an early stage of economic and financial market development.
access and security issues. But we believe the country also presents real commercial opportunities. We recommend that CDC explore the potential for investment opportunities in South Sudan. This would tally with its broader aim of seeking greater involvement in frontier markets.

Conclusion

56. DFID has been operating in Southern Sudan since 2005. It was clear from our visit that the Department is regarded as a highly effective donor in South Sudan. Many people we met—government ministers and officials, at the national and local levels, as well as other key donors and NGOs—were complimentary about the Department. The BSF is widely regarded as one of the more successful pooled funds in South Sudan. Dr Sara Pantuliano—who co-authored an evaluation of donor support from 2005–2010—told us that DFID had demonstrated it was a “better donor than many others” and had dealt “creatively” with some challenges.\textsuperscript{106} This should not be downplayed. South Sudan is an extremely difficult environment for international donors to operate in. As was made apparent from our visit, the development challenges are so numerous it can be difficult to know where to begin.

57. Since independence, DFID has acted positively and swiftly by scaling up its office in Juba, issuing a four-year Operational Plan and developing and implementing its aid programme. \textbf{We commend DFID’s speed and determination to establish and scale up its operation—and to put together a good team—in such a difficult working environment.} DFID’s actions over the past year have demonstrated that the UK is an enthusiastic and committed ally of the new independent South Sudan.

58. DFID’s anticipated programme for South Sudan for the next four years is diverse and challenging, and it is clearly too early to judge its success. It could also be completely compromised if the oil shutdown persists for any length of time. \textbf{We recommend that the Department provide us with an annual update, for the remainder of the Parliament, on progress in delivering its South Sudan programme.} This should include an analysis of DFID’s work to build the capacity of government structures to enable the handover of basic service provision.

\textsuperscript{106} Q 49
5 The role of international donors

59. Total committed Official Development Assistance (ODA) to South Sudan in 2010 was approximately £735m, including reported humanitarian funds. Most assistance is provided by relatively few donors: data published by the Government of South Sudan (GRSS) suggests that 84% of financial assistance in 2010 was provided by 12 main donors (Table 5). DFID was the second largest bilateral donor, spending about £60m that year. The USA was the largest donor (£202m) and the EU also spent a significant amount (£64m).

60. DFID spent about three quarters of its money in 2010 through pooled funds and multdonor trust funds. This includes money spent through multilateral institutions, such as the United Nations (UN). The use of pooled funds varies significantly amongst donors: the USA, for example, provides all assistance bilaterally.

Table 5: Top 12 donors to South Sudan in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor country</th>
<th>Total 2010 expenditure (£)</th>
<th>% Funding to Pooled Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 USA</td>
<td>202m</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 European Union</td>
<td>64m</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 UK</td>
<td>60m</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Norway</td>
<td>46m</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Netherlands</td>
<td>42m</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Canada</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Denmark</td>
<td>19m</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sweden</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Japan</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Spain</td>
<td>11m</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107 Ev 75 (DFID). This equates to $1.15bn.  
108 There are no official OECD DAC figures for donor spend in Southern Sudan in 2010. 
109 Ev 102 
110 Ev 102 
111 Including Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance 
112 Including European Community Humanitarian Office 
113 Unlike the others in this table, the UK figure is a DFID internal estimate and relates to the 2010–11 financial year. The GRSS figure for the UK expenditure was slightly lower, at about £51m ($81m) for 2010. GRSS also estimated that the UK spent 75% of its expenditure via pooled funds, rather than the 80% estimated by DFID. Ev 102.
61. In this Chapter, we explore the performance of the key multilateral donors in South Sudan to which the UK contributes money—the UN, the World Bank and the European Union (EU)—and the extent of leadership and co-ordination between the many bilateral and multilateral donors.

**Key multilateral donors**

**United Nations**

62. The UN is by far the most established multilateral actor in South Sudan. It aims to spend a total of £700m on development and humanitarian assistance in 2012 and 2013.\(^{114}\) DFID currently plans to disburse about £50m through UN development and humanitarian agencies over those two years (7% of the UN’s desired total). The UN will spend a further £456m on its peacekeeping force, the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS).\(^{115}\) We discuss UNMISS separately in Chapter 6.

63. We heard contrasting evidence about the UN’s development and humanitarian work in South Sudan to date. The UN Development Programme (UNDP) has achieved some successes, such as its support to South Sudan’s referendum process during 2010 and 2011. DFID disbursed a total of £33m through UNDP in 2011–12.\(^{116}\) DFID said that the UNDP has “strong leadership” at the senior level, but had been “operating under capacity for some time”, risked “overstretch” and had at times “overpromised and struggled to deliver”.\(^{117}\) This reinforced some views expressed to us on our visit that the UNDP wanted to be involved in too many sectors. We were also told during our visit that the UN had been pressing upon the GRSS that it should be considered the main donor in South Sudan.

64. The UNDP-administered Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)—created in 2006 to provide “flexible and predictable” humanitarian assistance—has been subject to particular criticism. DFID is the largest donor to the CHF, contributing almost half (£24 million) of CHF funding allocated to South Sudan in 2011.\(^{118}\) In evidence, Dr Sara Pantuliano said that the CHF had posed a “significant hindrance” to the ability of NGOs to operate effectively, for instance by disbursing funds to NGOs before the rainy season when it was extremely
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114 $1.1bn.
116 Through the South Sudan Recovery Fund, Community Security and Small Arms Control, the UNDP-Strategic Partnership and Common Humanitarian Fund. Ev 103.
117 Ev 75
118 DFID visit briefing for Committee visit.
difficult to operate.\textsuperscript{119} The NGO Tearfund shared this view, although we note that some NGOs say that the administration of the CHF has improved of late.

65. In evidence, the Minister acknowledged the UNDP had a “bit of a plus and minus record” in South Sudan. But DFID expects to contribute £30 million to the new round of CHF during 2012 and 2013.\textsuperscript{120}

\textbf{World Bank}

66. The World Bank has a small but expanding presence in South Sudan.\textsuperscript{121} Since the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the Bank has administered the Multi-Donor Trust Fund for South Sudan (MDTF), which has funded 20 projects in ten sectors. As of September 2011, $453 million (£286 million, 84\%) was disbursed of the total $541 million (£340 million) committed to the MDTF. DFID’s contribution was $132m (£83 million).\textsuperscript{122} All MDTF projects will be completed by June 2012.

67. The MDTF has achieved some successes in South Sudan: it has provided 2.8 million primary school textbooks and helped to build nearly 1,500kms of road and a water, sanitation and solid waste system serving 250,000 people in Juba.\textsuperscript{123} However, as documented in previous reviews,\textsuperscript{124} including our February 2011 report on the World Bank,\textsuperscript{125} and reiterated in our evidence,\textsuperscript{126} the MDTF has been over-bureaucratic and slow to disburse funds to NGOs. A joint NGO report described it as the “slowest and most bureaucratic” of all funds.\textsuperscript{127} Dr Pantuliano told us that the MDTF’s problems stemmed from the imposition by the World Bank of a “completely inappropriate” funding model to the South Sudanese context. She explained that the World Bank usually operated in more stable settings, working with governments with greater capacity than in South Sudan. We also heard that the World Bank had experienced difficulties deploying suitably qualified staff to South Sudan, which had contributed to delays, although this problem had now been remedied.\textsuperscript{128}

68. DFID has had “concerns about the performance of the [MDTF], particularly in the education sector”.\textsuperscript{129} The Minister asserted, however, that he still had confidence in the World Bank—which was an “important partner”—because the problems with the MDTF

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} Q 47
\item \textsuperscript{120} This will be implemented by 35 NGOs and UN agencies. Q 126, Ev 92.
\item \textsuperscript{121} We published a report on the World Bank earlier in the Session (Fourth Report of Session 2010–12, HC 606).
\item \textsuperscript{122} Q 126
\item \textsuperscript{123} Q 126 [DFID]
\item \textsuperscript{124} The OECD found the MDTF to be “static and inflexible” and the House of Lords European Union Committee was similarly critical. See also Stephen Commins, “Non-state providers, the state, and health in post-conflict fragile states”, Development in Practice, vol 20 (2010), pp 594–602.
\item \textsuperscript{125} International Development Committee, Fourth Report of Session 2010–12, The World Bank, HC 606, pp 18–19
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had been “sufficiently well recognised for the lessons to be learned and applied”. But Dr Pantuliano argued that there was “little indication” that either the World Bank or UN-administered funds would be “any better in the new iteration”. We note that DFID has no current plans to channel additional bilateral funds through the World Bank in South Sudan.

**European Union**

69. The EU established a development presence in Sudan in 2005, following a 15-year suspension from the country. Since then the EU has spent about €300m (£250m) on development assistance to Southern Sudan. It has also provided a further €87m (£73m) since 2010 to assist Southern Sudanese people affected by conflict. We visited a €1.7m (£1.4m) EU livelihoods project in Eastern Equatoria, which trained local people in carpentry, tailoring and other skills, and provided support to farmers, including cassava cultivation.

70. The EU has recently opened a full delegation in Juba and is likely to play an increasingly important role in South Sudan. It will spend €200m (£166m) on the development of the country from 2011 to 2013, focussing on the rural development, health, education, and security and rule of law sectors. South Sudan is one of two pilot countries where “joint programming” is taking place. This means that EU funds will be programmed together with additional financial assistance from EU Member States. The aim is to reduce the GRSS’s transaction costs of engaging with both the EU and Member States. We will cover joint programming in our upcoming Report on EU Development Assistance.

71. The EU has been criticised for delays in scaling up its delegation in Juba which has made it difficult for it to disburse funds efficiently. As of March 2012, it had 18 vacancies in an expected office of 27 people. The office is not expected to be fully staffed until summer 2012. In evidence, Mr Stephen O’Brien MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, said it was “very important” that the UK used its position as a Member State to ensure the EU is “getting its act together by matching resources with staff on the ground”. The UK, he said, had “repeatedly asked” the EU Development Commissioner, Andris Piebalgs, to ensure the EU delegation was “fully staffed”. During our visit to Brussels in February 2011, a senior official from the European External Action Service told us that the delays were due to human resource issues and budgeting constraints.

72. It is hugely disappointing that the effectiveness of UK taxpayers’ money has been diminished through the World Bank’s problems in administering the Multi-Donor
Trust Fund (MDTF) in Southern Sudan. We recognise, however, that the MDTF has achieved some positive results. Given DFID’s record in Southern Sudan as an effective donor and as leader of the successful Basic Services Fund, we have reservations about the extent to which DFID should continue to channel bilateral aid through the World Bank in South Sudan. We believe that the Secretary of State for International Development should ask the UK’s Executive Director to press for the Bank’s board to consider the problems experienced by the MDTF and how to overcome them.

73. The UN Development Programme (UNDP) has a mixed record in South Sudan. The UNDP’s administration of the Common Humanitarian Fund hindered the work of some NGOs in Southern Sudan, although the Fund is now operating better. DFID will continue to channel money through the UNDP on a variety of projects and it must monitor how effectively this money is spent. We are also concerned that the UNDP is overstretched and seeking involvement in too many sectors.

74. We urge the Government to press the EU authorities to scale up their office in Juba as a matter of priority. We are concerned that the EU’s slow speed in recruiting staff in South Sudan may delay the delivery of important development projects on the ground and hinder the combined development and humanitarian efforts of the international donor community.

Donor co-ordination

75. Donor co-ordination mechanisms in South Sudan are still at an early stage of their evolution, although there are some examples of good practice. The Joint Donor Office (including Canada, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and UK) was established in 2006 and has common office in Juba.138 The office, which we visited, comprises technical experts whose role is to provide policy advice, coordination, and liaison with the GRSS, as well as oversight of pooled funds and other joint donor activities. The range of pooled funding mechanisms in South Sudan, such as DFID’s Basic Services Fund, were cited by witnesses as another example of effective co-ordination between donors. These had helped NGOs and civil society actors “avoid duplication and manage gaps in service provision”.139 Importantly, the GRSS is also increasingly proactive in attempting to co-ordinate the large amount of overseas assistance that South Sudan receives from donors. For instance, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning has recently published an aid strategy and a donor book.

76. DFID told us that the UK “works closely” with other bilateral donors. It had signed a bilateral development agreement with USAID (the US development agency) and was looking to engage to a greater extent with important non-traditional donors such as China. The Department accepted, however, that donor support in South Sudan was “relatively fragmented”,140 a view shared by some other witnesses. Save the Children believed that the challenges of delivering basic services in South Sudan had been compounded by “poor co-ordination, irregular and unpredictable funding, and the lack of a clear joined-up strategy

138 DFID will provide £1 million to support the Joint Donor Office between 2010 and 2012.
139 Ev 45
140 Ev 77
for delivery of services jointly agreed between the government, donors and service delivery providers”. A joint NGO report published in September 2011 recommended “substantially improved” donor coordination, including between donors operating in different sectors and between humanitarian relief and development donors.142

77. It is vital that DFID, and other international donors, effectively co-ordinate their work in South Sudan, not least because of the limited capacity of the state, the scale of development needs, and the huge sums of money involved. Some mechanisms are in place—such as the Joint Donor Office and the various pooled donor funds—to facilitate co-ordination, and these are working in practice to some extent. We are pleased that DFID is co-operating with other key bilateral and multilateral donors, to ensure its programme complements, rather than duplicates, those of others. We urge the Department to continue this approach.

78. The Department, alongside other donors, should also provide the GRSS with the necessary technical support and advice to ensure that the Government can take a lead strategic role in co-ordinating the plans of donors.

141 Ev 36
142 NGO Joint Briefing paper, Getting it Right from the Start, September 2011, p 33
6 Security, conflict prevention and peacebuilding

79. Prospects for development in South Sudan will largely depend on achieving stability and security in the newly independent country. Insecurity remains a constant destabilising factor in South Sudan, with conflict accounting for 3,200 fatalities from January to October 2011. This death-toll is three times the total for 2010. There are numerous security challenges for the GRSS and the international community to address. Several armed rebel groups are still at large in some states, such as Unity and Upper Nile. On-going, low-level conflict, both inter-tribal and intra-tribal, is widespread. Approximately one million weapons are in circulation. The security context is further complicated by the difficult relationship with the Republic of Sudan and the potential for spill-over from the conflicts in Abyei, South Kordofan and Blue Nile.

80. The GRSS is ill-equipped to tackle these internal and external security threats. The Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) is too large and possesses the structure and mindset of a guerrilla force rather than a modern army under civilian control. The USA is leading security sector reform programmes to develop and train a modern army and police force; DFID will contribute about £25m over six years. This is likely to take many years to achieve. Dr Sara Pantuliano told us that “we are still a long away from seeing an effective police force and a professional army that citizens can trust and respect”. For the moment, the GRSS is largely reliant on UN peacekeeping troops and, to a lesser extent, civil society actors such as the Sudan Council of Churches (SCC), to assist in peacebuilding, conflict prevention and mediation work. In this Chapter, we examine efforts to stabilise the security situation in South Sudan, with a particular focus on the roles of the United Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) and the SCC.

United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS)

81. UNMISS was established in July 2011, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, for an initial period of one year. It has a mission to consolidate peace and security conditions conducive for development, as well as to assist the GRSS to improve governance and develop its own capacity to provide security and establish the rule of law. Its authorised strength is 7,000 military personnel, 900 civilian police personnel and an “appropriate” civilian component. Full capacity is expected to be reached within three years; by February 2012, 4,900 military personnel, 450 police and about 1,800 civilian personnel had been deployed. Peacekeeping in South Sudan is expensive, due to the lack of infrastructure such as roads. The approved budget for UNMISS’s first year is £456m. Over half this
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amount (£246m) will be spent on “operational requirements”, a third (£153m) on military and police personnel, and the remainder (£57m) on civilian personnel. The UK contribution is £60 million, 13% of UNMISS's budget. We met the UN Special Representative of the Secretary General, Hilde Johnson, and other senior UNMISS officials during our visit.

82. We heard contrasting evidence about the performance of UNMISS. GRSS ministers in Juba were generally positive: UNMISS was considered to be a useful deterrent which helped create safe working environments for NGOs and others. Archbishop Deng of the Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS) valued UNMISS’s provision of helicopters to transport Church mediators to conflict areas, such as Jonglei. We note that UNMISS has received praise for its response to tribal violence in Jonglei in late December 2011 and early January 2012 (see Box 5). Mr Stephen O’Brien MP, DFID Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, said that UNMISS had played an “important role in reducing casualties” in Jonglei on this occasion—although it could still learn lessons to be “better prepared” in future, for example through better use of early warning systems and “more robust troop deployment and posture”.

Box 5: Violence in Jonglei State, December 2011–January 2012

The period between Christmas and New Year 2011 witnessed an attack on Murle communities in Pibor county, Jonglei State, by thousands of heavily armed members of the predominantly Lou Nuer “White Army” militia. This marked the latest in a cycle of killings between the two tribes reaching back to 2009. Three villages were burned down. Over 110,000 people were affected and more than 60,000 displaced, including large numbers of unaccompanied children. An unknown number were killed. 50,000 to 80,000 heads of Murle cattle were seized. On 5 January, the Government of South Sudan declared Jonglei a disaster zone and asked humanitarian agencies to accelerate life-saving assistance. UNMISS conducted daily air and land patrols to the state. It transported half of its combat-ready personnel to the heavily-populated areas of Pibor and Likuongole. The attacks also saw the SPLA—for the first time in recent Jonglei history—ordered to stand up to Nuer fighters and to protect civilians.

83. A common theme in evidence was that UNMISS lacked sufficient troops and resources for the size of the country. We were told on our visit that UN Member States had not
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allocated UNMISS sufficient resources to implement its mandate. Dr Pantuliano told us that it was “impossible, given the size of the mission and the kind of assets they have, to provide the effective protection that is required”.157 Melinda Young from Save the Children said that UNMISS did not have the capacity to “deal with two Jongleis at once”.158 We heard that UNMISS’s mobility was affected by a shortage of helicopters (in part, caused by Russia’s withdrawal of its helicopters)159 and a lack of any military aircraft, a point also emphasised publicly by Lise Grande, UN Humanitarian Co-ordinator.160 DFID agrees that UNMISS has “regularly been stretched in responding to specific crises”. But whilst the Department recognises the need for UNMISS to have “more helicopters and heavy-lift assets”, it appears reluctant to support an increase in troop numbers.161 The Minister noted that the UN Security Council had reviewed UNMISS’s resources in January 2012 and decided to maintain military troop levels at 7,000. He wanted UNMISS to focus instead on “immediate challenges” such as the “deployment [of troops], where and how they are deployed, the rapidity of their response capabilities, and being flexible in the access they have to assets, not least heavy lift and helicopters”.162 We agree with this statement. In Eastern Equatoria we saw many UNMISS troops based in places where there was no apparent risk of violence or disorder and who seemed to be largely involved in low-level policing operations.

84. Some witnesses believed that UNMISS’s mandate should be broadened. The Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS) and UK partners argued that the UN Security Council should give UNMISS a “border-monitoring component” to its mandate. On the other hand, the Minister did not believe that it was the right time to change UNMISS’s mandate.163 He wanted it to focus on its current mandate, namely peacebuilding and conflict prevention within South Sudan. We note that UNMISS produced a draft peacebuilding strategy in March 2012, four months later than specified in the initial UN Security Resolution, although this has still not been finalised.

85. Given the range of security challenges in South Sudan—and the ineffectiveness of the country’s army and police force—it is essential that the international community provides a robust peacekeeping force. The United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), however, has had a difficult beginning. It appears to lack the air assets it requires for a country of this size. It has been slow to produce a peacebuilding strategy. We are concerned that its mandate is too broad and unrealistic.

86. Costing almost half a billion pounds in its first year—and still under-capacity—UNMISS is also a hugely expensive operation. It costs the UK taxpayer two thirds of
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DFID’s annual development and humanitarian budget for South Sudan. UNMISS does not currently provide value-for-money and its current resources have not been deployed most effectively. The UK Government should press the UN for an urgent review of UNMISS’s cost, mandate, assets and operations, including the deployment of troops.

87. In the medium-term, the aim must be for the Government of South Sudan (GRSS), army and police to take on primary responsibility for internal security in South Sudan and for dependence on UNMISS to be reduced. This will require technical assistance, including assistance to the military (which will not count as Official Development Assistance). The Department should work alongside the United States, UNMISS and the GRSS to produce a strategy to enable this transition to take place.

The Church’s peacebuilding and mediation role

88. The Sudan Council of Churches (SCC)—consisting of six churches located in Southern Sudan—played an important peacebuilding and mediation role during the 22 years of civil war in South Sudan and the Comprehensive Peace Agreement period. Since independence, Archbishop Deng, the leader of the Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS) and key figure in the SCC, whom we met in Juba, has been heavily involved in mediation efforts between tribes, particularly in Jonglei State.164 Church representatives told us that the SCC had a “unique advantage” in its peacekeeping and mediation work because it reached into every part of the community.165

89. The Minister agreed that the SCC was a “crucial partner” for peace and development in South Sudan.166 It could play a particularly important role in Jonglei “engaging in grassroots mobilisation for peace”.167 DFID allocated £250,000 to the SCC in 2012 to facilitate this (the funding will focus on disarmament amongst rural people).168 Interestingly, the Department also suggested that the recent Jonglei attacks had seen the “break down of the peace process being led by Archbishop Deng and the SCC”. Whilst the SCC would continue to have an “important role to play in Jonglei”, this would be “most likely as part of a ‘twin track’ approach led by the Government of South Sudan”. In evidence, Mark Mallalieu, Head of DFID South Sudan, explained:

“The thing that has changed is that previously the Church was given a role, or asked to play a role, by the Government that was perhaps unreasonable. The Church could not deliver that kind of peace resolution process in the way that it was being asked on its own.”169

90. We asked Church representatives to respond to the Department’s analysis. The ECS and UK partners told us that the churches “continue to maintain the confidence of the

164 This was mandated by President Salva Kiir (Q 39)
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people” and would work as a “strong and complementary” actor in the peace processes. However, the ECS noted that the GRSS and SPLA had been slow to respond to church leaders’ repeated requests, from as early as September 2011, to deploy troops to protect civilians when attacks in Jonglei were anticipated.170

91. It will clearly take time to build the capacity of the GRSS, army and police to take on primary responsibility for peacekeeping and mediation. In the meantime, DFID must not disregard the constructive role that the Sudan Council of Churches can play in this area.

170 We were told that warnings by Archbishop Deng as early as September 2011 about possible violence in Jonglei had not been acted upon.
7 Conclusion

92. The new Republic of South Sudan presents a real development opportunity. The country possesses many of the pre-conditions required for development, potentially of a large scale, to take place. The new government is accommodating to the international community, granting donors and NGOs access at all levels. Donors are spending hundreds of millions of pounds in development assistance—money largely spent by the hundreds of NGOs based in Juba and elsewhere. It is not surprising that South Sudan is sometimes considered a defining test-case for international development. The Minister accepted that we were starting with a “white sheet of paper”.

93. But it is important not to get carried away. Our visit, and the evidence we have received, have struck home the sheer scale of the development challenge in South Sudan. Ongoing economic, humanitarian and security problems foster a constant sense of fragility and instability about South Sudan—despite the optimism and hope that still resides in its people following independence. There are a large number of priorities and, as President Kiir told us, it is not easy to choose one over another. The population will become disillusioned if living conditions do not improve.

94. We consider South Sudan to be one of the most difficult and high risk environments that DFID is operating within. Despite the uncomfortable surroundings, we are pleased that DFID has an engaged and committed team in place. Importantly, the DFID team also appears flexible in its approach. Several aspects of the 2011–15 South Sudan development programme have already had to be modified as a result of the oil shut-down. The DFID team will need to remain flexible in the coming months, as the full impact of the GRSS’s decision to halt oil production, and the continuing numbers of refugees and returnees, become clearer.

95. There is a debate within the development community about whether DFID and other donors should have a long-term strategic plan in South Sudan. This was an issue we raised with various people during our visit. Most donors have set out plans for two to four year periods. The Minister told us that DFID was “at the very foothills of a strategy” but putting a timeline on such a strategy would be impractical. We accept there is some logic in the argument that the donor community should produce, say, a generational strategy for South Sudan, including an exit strategy. But, given the highly volatile political, economic and humanitarian situation in South Sudan, we do not consider it sensible or realistic to develop such a plan at present. There are too many uncertainties and potential destabilising factors. The key focus in the short-term must be, as far as possible, to help secure greater stability in South Sudan and prevent humanitarian needs from escalating significantly. If this can be achieved, the people of South Sudan can look forward to the development of their nation and, hopefully, to a prosperous and peaceful future.
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## Appendix: DFID’s South Sudan targets (July 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar/Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline (including year)</th>
<th>Expected Results (including year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Number of children supported by DFID in primary education in South Sudan</td>
<td>0 (2011)</td>
<td>240 000 (2015) 180 000 = 75% girls (End year snapshot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Number of textbooks printed and distributed supported by DFID in South Sudan.</td>
<td>0 (2011)</td>
<td>12.5 million (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty, Hunger and Vulnerability</strong></td>
<td>Number of people achieving food security supported by DFID in South Sudan</td>
<td>0 (2010)</td>
<td>1 million (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Couple Years of Protection delivered through DFID funding in South Sudan (i.e. years of protection from unintended pregnancy for one couple)</td>
<td>0 (2011)</td>
<td>143,000 (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Number of people reached with one or more malaria prevention or treatment interventions through DFID support in South Sudan</td>
<td>0 (2011)</td>
<td>762,000 (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance and Security</strong></td>
<td>Number of people who vote in elections supported by DFID in South Sudan</td>
<td>3 million (2014)</td>
<td>(End year snapshot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance and Security</strong></td>
<td>Number of women with improved access to Justice Services through DFID support in South Sudan</td>
<td>0 (2011)</td>
<td>250 000 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian</strong>*</td>
<td>Number of people reached by nutrition-related programmes through DFID support in South Sudan</td>
<td>2 million (2011)</td>
<td>2 million (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DFID humanitarian assistance is based on an annual needs-based call for proposals. This operational plan will ensure assistance is delivered to those who need it. But it will also help build peace and stability so that people can look after themselves. Success might therefore be reflected in a reduction of the number of people assisted by our humanitarian spend.*
Conclusions and recommendations

The humanitarian situation

1. Failure to reach agreement on the outstanding matters from the Comprehensive Peace Agreement process—most notably oil-revenue sharing, border demarcation and the status of the disputed border region of Abyei—threaten the prospects for peace and development within South Sudan’s short lifetime as an independent nation. We are deeply concerned at the prospect of a humanitarian crisis given the loss of South Sudan’s oil revenue, combined with the increasing number of returnees and refugees arriving in the country and ongoing inter-tribal violence. (Paragraph 21)

2. The decision by the Government of South Sudan (GRSS) to halt production on all its oilfields, despite undoubted provocation from Sudan, has potentially grave economic and humanitarian consequences for the South Sudanese population. It could also precipitate instability in the country. The UK Government must continue to press Khartoum and Juba to seek an equitable and sustainable agreement on the export of oil through Sudan’s pipelines. We do not consider there to be any realistic alternative in the next few critical years. It must also be made clear that the UK, and other donors, cannot bankroll South Sudan through this austerity period. (Paragraph 22)

3. We are concerned at the potentially unclear legal status of hundreds of thousands of people of South Sudanese origin living in the north. The UK Government must continue to press Khartoum and Juba to find a resolution to ensure that those who wish to move to South Sudan can do so safely, while those who prefer to remain in the north can have their legal status clarified. Many returnees to South Sudan are living in extremely difficult circumstances and DFID should divert additional resources to assist them if required. (Paragraph 23)

4. DFID is operating in a difficult and fast-changing environment. It has already had to re-focus its development programme as a result of the pressures created by the oil shut-down. Given the mounting humanitarian challenges, we recognise that the Department may need to continue to modify its development plans and focus to a greater extent on humanitarian assistance. The key priority in South Sudan must be to prevent a humanitarian crisis. But, if the country is to develop, it will need to invest in health, education and infrastructure. (Paragraph 24)

DFID’s South Sudan Office

5. The establishment of a joint DFID and Foreign and Commonwealth Office operation in South Sudan—with DFID in the lead—is a welcome innovation and an encouraging example of joined-up government. It is early days but the signs are that the joint office is working well. The Government should seek to adopt a similar model in overseas counties where development assistance is central to wider UK foreign policy objectives. (Paragraph 27)
DFID’s Operational Plan 2011–15

6. When allocating funds for its development projects, DFID should as far as possible seek to strengthen and complement the limited internal capacity that already exists within South Sudan. We have some concerns that DFID’s decision to fund the United Nations rather than the Episcopal Church of Sudan to deliver its school construction programme misses an opportunity to do so. (Paragraph 34)

7. Given its cost and importance, we recommend that the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) review the effectiveness and value-for-money of the Health Pooled Fund at a suitable moment in the future. (Paragraph 36)

8. We welcome DFID’s commitment to significantly increase funds to tackle neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) in the developing world. Given that several NTDs are endemic in South Sudan, DFID must ensure that South Sudan receives an adequate share of this money. (Paragraph 37)

9. The improvement of equality of girls and women is crucial if South Sudan is to prosper, socially and economically, over the next generation. We strongly endorse the emphasis that DFID has placed on girls and women in its programme. While we recognise the current pressures and uncertainties surrounding DFID’s programme, we urge the Department to maintain these programmes as a priority. (Paragraph 41)

10. It is unsustainable for 40% of the Government of South Sudan (GRSS)’s budget to be spent on defence. Once the economic situation in South Sudan has become more stable, DFID should re-prioritise its support to reduce the size of the South Sudanese army and reintegrate ex-soldiers back into the community. This presents a considerable challenge given the high levels of unemployment and soldiers’ lack of skills, but is important if the GRSS is to begin providing basic services for the population. (Paragraph 44)

11. South Sudan is currently a society built on the work of NGOs and international donors. This cannot be sustainable. Building the capacity of the administration in South Sudan—at all levels—will take time but is essential if the new country is to become less dependent on others. DFID’s capacity-building support to date has been largely focussed on Ministries and personnel in Juba. This work appears to have been effective and is highly valued by the GRSS. Given that basic services are primarily delivered at the state or local level, DFID must ensure that it strikes a balance between supporting governance in Juba and other levels of administration. (Paragraph 48)

12. We welcome the intention within some DFID’s projects, such as the Health Pooled Fund, to build the capacity of the South Sudanese Government, so that the government can gradually take primary responsibility for the delivery of basic services. Although the oil shut-down has disrupted some of these plans, DFID must ensure it resumes them once the economic situation in South Sudan becomes more stable. DFID should use its leverage and influence to persuade other key donors to integrate capacity-building support within their own development projects. (Paragraph 49)
13. It should not only be the responsibility of the key international donors to build the capacity of the South Sudanese Government. Neighbouring countries in the region, such as Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia, can also play a valuable role, for instance through providing training to civil servants. DFID, alongside other donors, should seek to engage South Sudan’s neighbours in this important work. (Paragraph 50)

14. The expansion of the private sector in South Sudan—particularly in agriculture—will be crucial if the country is to diversify its economy and reduce dependence on oil in the medium term. We welcome DFID’s emphasis in its 2011–15 programme to encourage the growth of the private sector. We urge it to continue to do so, with a particular focus on agriculture and the provision of basic infrastructure. The current oil crisis demonstrates that South Sudan’s overwhelming economic reliance on oil is unsustainable. (Paragraph 54)

15. Private sector investment in South Sudan is complicated by legal, land access and security issues. But we believe the country also presents real commercial opportunities. We recommend that CDC explore the potential for investment opportunities in South Sudan. This would tally with its broader aim of seeking greater involvement in frontier markets. (Paragraph 55)

16. We commend DFID’s speed and determination to establish and scale up its operation—and to put together a good team—in such a difficult working environment. DFID’s actions over the past year have demonstrated that the UK is an enthusiastic and committed ally of the new independent South Sudan. (Paragraph 57)

17. We recommend that the Department provide us with an annual update, for the remainder of the Parliament, on progress in delivering its South Sudan programme. This should include an analysis of DFID’s work to build the capacity of government structures to enable the handover of basic service provision. (Paragraph 58)

Key multilateral donors

18. It is hugely disappointing that the effectiveness of UK taxpayers’ money has been diminished through the World Bank’s problems in administering the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) in Southern Sudan. We recognise, however, that the MDTF has achieved some positive results. Given DFID’s record in Southern Sudan as an effective donor and as leader of the successful Basic Services Fund, we have reservations about the extent to which DFID should continue to channel bilateral aid through the World Bank in South Sudan. We believe that the Secretary of State for International Development should ask the UK’s Executive Director to press for the Bank’s board to consider the problems experienced by the MDTF and how to overcome them. (Paragraph 72)

19. The UN Development Programme (UNDP) has a mixed record in South Sudan. The UNDP’s administration of the Common Humanitarian Fund hindered the work of some NGOs in Southern Sudan, although the Fund is now operating better. DFID will continue to channel money through the UNDP on a variety of projects and it must monitor how effectively this money is spent. We are also concerned that the
UNDP is overstretched and seeking involvement in too many sectors. (Paragraph 73)

20. We urge the Government to press the EU authorities to scale up their office in Juba as a matter of priority. We are concerned that the EU’s slow speed in recruiting staff in South Sudan may delay the delivery of important development projects on the ground and hinder the combined development and humanitarian efforts of the international donor community. (Paragraph 74)

Donor co-ordination

21. It is vital that DFID, and other international donors, effectively co-ordinate their work in South Sudan, not least because of the limited capacity of the state, the scale of development needs, and the huge sums of money involved. Some mechanisms are in place—such as the Joint Donor Office and the various pooled donor funds—to facilitate co-ordination, and these are working in practice to some extent. We are pleased that DFID is co-operating with other key bilateral and multilateral donors, to ensure its programme complements, rather than duplicates, those of others. We urge the Department to continue this approach. (Paragraph 77)

22. The Department, alongside other donors, should also provide the GRSS with the necessary technical support and advice to ensure that the Government can take a lead strategic role in co-ordinating the plans of donors. (Paragraph 78)

United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS)

23. Given the range of security challenges in South Sudan—and the ineffectiveness of the country’s army and police force—it is essential that the international community provides a robust peacekeeping force. The United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), however, has had a difficult beginning. It appears to lack the air assets it requires for a country of this size. It has been slow to produce a peacebuilding strategy. We are concerned that its mandate is too broad and unrealistic. (Paragraph 85)

24. Costing almost half a billion pounds in its first year—and still under-capacity—UNMISS is also a hugely expensive operation. It costs the UK taxpayer two thirds of DFID’s annual development and humanitarian budget for South Sudan. UNMISS does not currently provide value-for-money and its current resources have not been deployed most effectively. The UK Government should press the UN for an urgent review of UNMISS’s cost, mandate, assets and operations, including the deployment of troops. (Paragraph 86)

25. In the medium-term, the aim must be for the Government of South Sudan (GRSS), army and police to take on primary responsibility for internal security in South Sudan and for dependence on UNMISS to be reduced. This will require technical assistance, including assistance to the military (which will not count as Official Development Assistance). The Department should work alongside the United States, UNMISS and the GRSS to produce a strategy to enable this transition to take place. (Paragraph 87)
The Church’s peacebuilding and mediation role

26. It will clearly take time to build the capacity of the GRSS, army and police to take on primary responsibility for peacekeeping and mediation. In the meantime, DFID must not disregard the constructive role that the Sudan Council of Churches can play in this area. (Paragraph 90)
Draft Report (South Sudan: Prospects for Peace and Development), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 95 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fifteenth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

Written evidence was ordered to be reported to the House for printing with the Report (in addition to that ordered to be reported for publishing on 30 November 2011, 17 January, 22 February and 27 March 2012).

[Adjourned till Tuesday 17 April at 10.00 am]
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Examination of Witnesses

Witnesses: Melinda Young, Director of Programme Development and Advocacy, South Sudan, Save the Children UK; Emily Speers-Mears, Senior Conflict and Fragile States Advisor, Save the Children UK, Robert Schofield, Disaster Management Director, Tearfund, and Clea Kahn, Head of Policy and Advocacy, International Rescue Committee UK, gave evidence.

Q1 Chair: Can I say good morning and thank you all very much for coming in to give evidence to us? Before we start, perhaps I could ask you to introduce yourselves formally for the record.

Emily Speers-Mears: My name is Emily Speers-Mears. I’m the Senior Conflict and Fragile States Advisor at Save the Children, and I work on South Sudan, among other countries.

Melinda Young: My name is Melinda Young. I am the Director of Programme Development and Advocacy for Save the Children in South Sudan. I’m based in Juba in South Sudan. I’ve been working in South Sudan for the last three years.

Robert Schofield: Good morning. My name is Robert Schofield. I’m the Disaster Management Director for Tearfund, and we have been working with partners and operationally in South Sudan for many years.

Clea Kahn: I am Clea Kahn. I am the Head of Policy and Advocacy for the International Rescue Committee in the UK.

Q2 Chair: Thank you all very much. As you know, the Committee visited South Sudan in the first week in December. While I do not think any of us could claim that that gave us expert knowledge compared with yours, we certainly did get quite an insight into the challenges the country is facing. Even since we have returned, things have continued to be reported that indicate that the challenges are real and current. I just wondered, perhaps, if we could start with asking your view on how you feel the situation is in the country and whether it is getting better or worse. I think you were in Jonglei recently. Can you give us any kind of feel for how that is progressing, the role of UNMISS and the international community in intervening? It is kind of a biggish question; obviously there are four of you, so do not all feel you have to answer all the questions in detail. It would be sensible to start with you Melinda, and then the others can come in.

Melinda Young: We have just come out of the most violent wet season we have seen since the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005, so we are just on the seasonal change now into the dry season. In the wet season, it is very hard to deliver aid, but it is also usually a quieter period because, while we cannot move around, the armed groups cannot move very freely either. Coming into the dry season, we would expect the situation to deteriorate further, as armed groups have much greater ability to move and to shift. The attacks in Jonglei in December were on the cusp of that period, so we would expect that counter-attacks, which will be almost inevitable will be happening. There are multiple humanitarian situations in South Sudan at the moment, which we would expect to escalate further.

In Jonglei we have a series of problems in terms of refugees, due to military operations in Blue Nile and South Kordofan states in Sudan, moving south, and returnees, with the moratorium on the status of southerners in Sudan coming to an end on 9 April; if southerners who are still living in Sudan are made stateless at that point, you have an estimated 700,000 people who might suddenly move south as well. There is inter-communal violence not just in Jonglei. That is a case in point, and what happened in December has brought more attention to that, but there is inter-communal violence across many states of South Sudan. There is a lot of fragility and factions within society. This is they are not seeing the peace dividend coming out of independence. There are situations also with food insecurity, FEWS NET has warned, in terms of low harvest. We are seeing drought-like conditions and food insecurity warnings across various areas of southern Sudan. We have a complex interweaving of humanitarian issues that we think are escalating into the future.

The violence we have seen in Jonglei: people say, “We’ve seen Jonglei violence before,” but it is getting more brutal. More civilians and women and children are being targeted for abuse, including abduction and killing. In terms of the role of UNMISS and also the role of Government, Jonglei has shown a positive in terms of the UNMISS action there in the pre-positioning of troops and in terms of patrolling, which is to be encouraged, but there needs to be more. In many ways, what was happening in Jonglei was predictable; you could have seen what was happening a month in advance. Also, UNMISS does not have the capacity to deal with two Jongleis at once. It is quite
probable you could have two simultaneous situations that need UNMISS involved. It is not up to its full capacity in terms of troops as yet. It needs to have more resources. It needs a protection-of-civilians strategy, so troops know how to assist and protect civilians with the resources they have and with the growing number of conflicts that are happening across South Sudan.

Q3 Chair: We will come on to the role of UNMISS in any case. One observation is the extent to which the Government and the international community are appealing to the people of South Sudan, saying, “You’ve got your independence. You’ve got a new nation. Should your energies not be directed into trying to build that rather than fighting each other?”

That is internal; you also have this border dispute. To what extent are the NGOs able to get safe access either to the dispute areas within South Sudan, or perhaps also those areas on the border, where clearly Sudan is trying to keep NGOs and the international community in general out?

Melinda Young: There are environmental access problems throughout the wet season. We are just starting in the period when we are going to be able to have access, because it is dry. There are also multiple rebel militia groups that are in operation throughout South Sudan, with a tendency to lay land mines. For example, in Unity state, where we are looking at refugee responses there, we cannot travel between the state capital and the areas of prospective camps due to land mines. If there are large military operations also between the SPLA and militia groups, we are very often unable to get access to those areas. In Jonglei, because of insecurity, our local staff are on the ground in Akobo, Waat and sometimes, on and off, in Fibor, but we cannot have a permanent presence for most of our staff there at the moment, because there are attacks and counter-attacks.

Robert Schofield: Just to build on that, Tearfund has a presence in Motot in Jonglei and, because of similar inter-tribal violence at the end of last year, we had to pull our team out. In fact, they have not been able to return, because the situation is still insecure. We are able to access, but it is by remote management, so it is not ideal, but we are creatively trying to continue providing services. The other area I wanted to mention was this issue of the regulatory framework for aid agencies working into South Sudan. Particularly in recent months, we have had an issue with work permits, so that all but our country director have short-term work permits as the Government, rightly, tries to seek a policy of Sudanisation. But there is a huge capacity issue in terms of people’s educational ability, so there is the prospect that we may lose some of our senior staff, who will not have their work permits re-issued.

Chair: That is also an issue we want to explore, so we will come back to that.

Q4 Richard Harrington: I would like to ask you some questions about the DFID operational plan, which I am sure you are familiar with. We have seen the summary of the different headings and everything like that. When one reads it cold, it does seem very comprehensive, but I do understand that yourselves and other organisations have had comments about it. I would like a general view on what you think about it and whether you think DFID has the right priorities or not, and then maybe, from Tearfund and Save the Children, some specific points. I know Tearfund made some comments about the water and sanitation, and Save the Children about the educational targets to do with textbooks. As much as you could give us on this plan would be helpful, but with those two points specifically in mind please.

Robert Schofield: We would really like to commend DFID for the operational plan and this major investment of £94 million every year, for the life of the plan. We commend the focus on governance, health and ongoing humanitarian work. Our concern is that there must be a gradual and well planned transition from NGO provision of basic services to Government of South Sudan provision of services. As you probably know, something like 85% of basic services are delivered by NGOs in South Sudan at this point. It is really quite a major issue to transition to the Government of South Sudan. Just one small example of that is that we have been trying to hand on our health work. One of the major barriers to that is the payment of salaries by the Ministry of Health to staff in South Sudan. We are conscious that humanitarian needs are going to continue for many years to come, and so there is rightly in this plan a desire to move towards recovery, but a concern that the humanitarian efforts might slow down as a result of that. There needs to be a mix of approaches, not either humanitarian or recovery, to development. I can say a bit more about WASH at this point.

Richard Harrington: Please, if you would not mind.

Robert Schofield: Tearfund has been working in the area of water and sanitation for many years in South Sudan. DFID was taking a lead in the area of water and sanitation but is no longer. That is a disappointment to us, because it is such a vital basic service, and makes links to so many other sectors.

Q5 Richard Harrington: Is that because other donors are actually performing this function or do you think there is a hole—a vacuum—there?

Robert Schofield: Potentially there is a vacuum. Our concern is that DFID had built up significant experience, expertise and reputation. Whenever there is a switch in donors, the danger is you lose that expertise that has been built up. We urge DFID to ensure that all their learning is passed on to Germany, which is becoming the lead donor.

Q6 Richard Harrington: Presumably you have spoken to DFID about that. I imagine they would say they are satisfied that it is covered.

Robert Schofield: Yes. They are confident that another donor has picked up; our concern is that there would be a gap in provision and expertise.

Melinda Young: Just to echo on the WASH front, speaking to DFID in country, they were speaking about WASH in terms of putting that as part of pooled funding on humanitarian, but I think water and sanitation are linked to many other things—for example, Save the Children’s nutrition programming.
One of the key causes of malnutrition can be lack of access to water. One of DFID’s operational priorities, in terms of humanitarian, is nutrition work, but it is not looking at some of those linkages.

Again, I would commend DFID in terms of their engagement in South Sudan, and that it is increasing. Two years ago, there was one DFID staff member in Juba. Now there are multiple. That presence is very much appreciated, including the humanitarian adviser position, which has now been extended. For education, it is that need for consistent long-term investing in education, in terms of building the human capital. For textbooks, it is laudable in terms of reaching numbers in textbooks, but the curriculum is being reviewed two times over, so the Government will be wanting then to renew textbooks. So there is a need to look at some of that as well, in terms of how long the textbook intervention will be effective with curriculum review as well.

Q7 Richard Harrington: I must say from what we saw, and I accept the length of our visit is very superficial compared to your involvement on a day-to-day basis, but in terms of the textbook objective, while admirable, actually is very secondary compared to the fact that there are no schools or qualified teachers to use the textbooks. It would seem to be very ambitious, given what we saw. Leading on from that, if we could go back to the point Mr Schofield made about DFID’s stated intention of moving from humanitarian to development, it all sounds very good, and I do not think anyone who has had any experience in this field could say that is a bad thing. To me, though, perhaps somewhat cynically or because I do not know it in enough depth, from what we have seen, it seems pie in the sky at the moment.

There are just so many basic humanitarian things to do that, while it is admirable talking about switching over to the more sophisticated development assistance, it seems almost inappropriate, given what we saw. Would you agree with that or have I not got it properly, in your opinion?

Robert Schofield: I would just repeat the point about it not being an either/or. We need to push into both areas. This whole issue of returnees is a good case in point, because there are some short-term humanitarian needs, but also we need to build the resilience of local communities, and we might come back to that.

Q8 Richard Harrington: I took your point on that very well. The fact is, though, there are a lot of different countries and very well meaning organisations there; in the end, there is a finite pot of money. When it comes to priorities, I cannot see, from what I have seen, how at the moment anything other than humanitarian can be the priority.

Clea Kahn: I was just going to say that one of the things you can see in the operational plan is a gradual transition, or the expectation of a gradual transition, to development, with the reduction of humanitarian spending and an increase in development spending. I think that that is going to be too rapid a transition. Ongoing crises will need to be responded to, but there also needs to be an investment in long-term needs. Crises are arising in part because there is a lack of development; there is a lack of opportunities and a lack of livelihoods investment. If they are not invested in, then there will be no way of preventing the crises. There needs to be a balance, but there should not be this anticipation that it will be as rapid as planned.

Q9 Pauline Latham: Could I go back to the textbook issue? DFID has committed to delivering these 12.5 million textbooks, but I met with the Minister of Education and the Higher Education Minister last week, and they were saying that they are already having lots and lots of textbooks printed. Given Richard Harrington’s view, which I agree with, that there are very few schools and not enough qualified teachers, DFID has to be careful not to duplicate what they are doing themselves, because they are printing them there. As you say, they are going to change the curriculum and they also have the problem of returnees only speaking Arabic, not English. There are a lot of complex issues. Do you feel that DFID has comprehended all of this? If they are producing textbooks, why are we giving them textbooks as well?

Melinda Young: At the moment, there are no textbooks at all in South Sudan. There is a lot of duplication because, speaking to the Ministry of Education, they are very well aware of the DFID programme and that plan. It is looking at targets just in textbooks, when the comprehensive needs in education, as you have seen, are so massive. Just getting more women teachers into education, having in-service training and these sorts of long-term and sustainable inputs beyond textbooks really need to be focused on.

Q10 Pauline Latham: We are in a textbook vacuum, but also in a teacher and school vacuum. Do you have the textbooks first? Do you have the schools? Do you have the teachers? They have a huge problem, and I think DFID needs to work very closely with their Ministers to make sure they are getting it right.

Emily Speers-Mears: For anyone who tries to look at the problem of South Sudan and how to address the multiple humanitarian and development challenges, there is a sense of, “Where do you start?” How do you identify your priorities within a context where there are so many vacuums and there is so much need? DFID is very aware of the whole range of need. We should give them some credit for starting somewhere with what is actually a very difficult situation.

Clea Kahn: I just want to chime in on that. It is excellent that there is an emphasis put on education, and particularly that it highlights the need for education for women and girls. There is an emphasis in the operational plan on supporting women and girls, and addressing violence against women and girls. One
of the challenges is just getting girls to schools in the first place. We can talk about the concrete nuts and bolts of the textbooks and, as you say, having the infrastructure and the teachers is important in the first place, but there is also a need to address some of those structural problems that are preventing particularly girls getting to school at all.

**Q11 Richard Burden:** My question really follows that exactly. A bit later, we will be going on to a number of broader issues concerning women and girls, but, on education itself, some of us, when we visited Lakes state, were able to see the Save the Children co-operation with DFID there around accelerated learning programmes and so on. We were getting, to some extent, mixed messages from different partners and people, all of whom had valid points, but I would appreciate your view. To tackle some of those deep-seated problems of expanding education among girls that you referred to, how far do you see we should be trying to support projects that tackle the transport problem of actually getting girls to school and back safely? How far, in terms of a priority order, should it be an issue of trying to address important infrastructure issues at existing schools, sanitation being a key one? What would be your view on something where we have diametrically opposed views—again for very good reasons, both sides—about whether the bullet needs to be bitten and you need to be looking at trying to promote expansion of boarding schools to address development of, in a sense, a cadre of women that can then be role models for others in the future?

**Melinda Young:** There are multiple barriers to girls reaching education. One major cultural barrier is early child marriage. Girls often do not go to school, where they might be spoiled by male teachers, which are the majority of teachers, or male students, therefore affecting the bride price that they would receive upon marriage. If girls do go to school, they often drop out at puberty in order to marry. In talking to a variety of teachers, mothers and students, access to schools and transport to schools are a problem, but there are so few schools. Only 15% of the schools in South Sudan finish all eight years of primary education, and those are often in more elite-based areas, not remote rural areas. Alternative mechanisms of education like informal schools teaching girls in their mother tongue, rather than having the minimum time is wasted trying to work out a system? Do you do something different from Oxfam, Christian Aid and whoever? How do you make sure that the minimum time is wasted trying to work out things from first principles?

**Chris White:** The point of my question is, when we saw a map of the country, it is an absolute patchwork quilt of different NGOs looking after specific areas. How on earth are you trying to avoid the wheel? Do you do something different from Oxfam, Christian Aid and whoever? How do you make sure that the minimum time is wasted trying to work out things from first principles?

**Clea Kahn:** There are quite a lot of co-ordination mechanisms. There is little fear of duplication, to be honest, with the scale of need in South Sudan. There is a fair bit of co-ordination between agencies and a lot of best practices. There is an enormous amount that has been written and created, in terms of best practices and how to intervene. In terms of identifying priorities, one of the risks with South Sudan is that we will focus on the immediate crisis of the day, and there are an endless number of crises—we’ll not an endless number, but there are problems on the border areas; there are small-scale conflicts; there are areas where we are expecting, as you were saying earlier, food problems later on in 2012. The risk is that we will continue to chase the crises and put out the fires, rather than dealing with some of the longer-term issues. One of the particularly challenging things about South Sudan is the level of capacity. Realistically, it has one of the lowest literacy rates in the world. In urban areas, you are able to find more trained staff with a higher level of education, but particularly in rural areas the level is very low. In
implementing different kinds of programming, what we find is that it is an enormous challenge just to try to make up the difference. There is a lot that we can learn. There is a lot that is already being implemented, in terms of how we balance and co-ordinate with other actors. There is a need not to be simply putting out the fires, but dealing with the longer-term approach, but that is going to take a longer-term approach in order to redress some of the capacity issues.

Robert Schofield: Can I just pick up the point about learning? It is a really valid point about ensuring learning across agencies, but also recognising the multiplicity of agencies working in South Sudan. I have made the point already about basic service provision essentially being delivered by NGOs at this point, but there is a good cluster mechanism in place level. The reconstruction is and delivery of services is going to be done at the NGO forum. Those are good places where learning can be shared and dispersed. Not to underestimate the incredible complexity of South Sudan and also the hugely important task of building the capacity of the Government of South Sudan to start delivering these services in due course, there is a whole other point there about how to be done at every level. There has been a huge emphasis at capital-city level in Juba, but at state level, at county level, at payam level, DFID and others need to intentionally build capacity for the Government.

Q14 Jeremy Lefroy: If I could just follow on from that, you have already mentioned, Mr Schofield, the development in South Sudan on NGOs and also the moves by South Sudan to look to perhaps restrict the number of visas and increase the number of nationals working in the delivery of basic services. Could I just ask you all briefly, because I know we are running a bit short of time, what efforts are you, in your own organisations, making to involve South Sudanese in the reconstruction and delivery of services? How many South Sudanese do you employ? Could you perhaps expand a little bit on the problems that will arise if there is too much or too hasty a move towards, to use that rather ugly word, indigenisation of staff?

Melinda Young: For example, Save the Children has over 600 staff in country, of whom 91% are South Sudanese. Some of those people who have even the basics will be moving in there, Qualified staff of the level that are needed in Government, local organisations and civil organisations, as well as NGOs that are currently providing the services, is a very small pool. To move on from what Robert was saying just now about the need to focus at the local level, in terms of local governance, at the moment, we are running health facilities. They need to be passed over to the Ministry of Health and into the hands of the local health officials, which is what we are doing. We are doing that to support them, on the job, being able to run those facilities. Over the past five or six years, the most concentration in terms of governance has been on building Juba, first and foremost, and the Ministries there. Latterly, in about the last year to year and a half, it has been at the state level. It is very interesting; when you take some state-level Government officials out to the counties it is often the first they have ever been there. They are not connected to that constituency. The development plans are set at the state level, but there is not that interaction. Building up the local level, which has that connection with its people and how those facilities and services will be run, is not going to happen quickly, but there is very much that push. I speak to a county commissioner and say, “I am politically a threat to you because I deliver services to your people, but this is something where you have to have that social bond with your citizens. How do we move that forward?” We speak over five years of how that might happen, but the worry is that most funding cycles and donor strategies are for one year to three years; they want that kind of fix over that period of time. It needs that kind of consistency of investment and predictability of knowing how that will happen, so there won’t be that gap in terms of NGOs’ time to draw out Government and time to draw in, because there will be quite a long phase-in period for that to happen, especially in remote rural areas.

Clea Kahn: I would echo that. We see a lot of projects when we travel through South Sudan and talk to people who say, “A project was started and we were making progress but then it stopped.” In addition to our national staff, we also work with local community groups in trying to build capacity within the community to take ownership of some of the local governance and local issues. It is often this stop/start, stop/start, because there is no continuity. Programmes are put in place for the shorter term. They get so far and then falter. It is also important to bear in mind that for most of us, in most of the places that we work, the majority of our staff are nationals. It is also important to ask the question of not just how many but at what level. We can all employ a vast number of cleaners, guards and so on, but it is also about having the systems that allow those people to be brought up within the organisation or supported to reach higher levels.

Robert Schofield: I would just add that I think it is the right challenge: how much are we handing on responsibility, particularly at senior levels, to national staff? Tearfund employs 370 staff in South Sudan, as well as working through local partners. A handful of those 370 staff are expatriates. Increasingly we are employing people from the region, if we cannot find them within South Sudan itself so that we are not a kind of post-colonial organisation imposing British management on South Sudan. But let’s not underestimate the educational challenge in South Sudan, with 80% of women illiterate. That is really a significant issue when we are looking for people who have good levels of education to operate at the more senior levels.

The other aspect of this, which is really important to all of us as agencies, is how much the communities themselves have a voice in the way we do our programming. That is another issue to push in terms
of DFID and the Government of South Sudan: how much are they listening to the community themselves, rather than taking a top-down approach from Juba? We have complaints mechanisms in place, with complaints from people on the ground in our programmes in Upper Nile and Jonglei, eventually going all the way to our executive team in our headquarters. We do really want to promote that sense of transparency, and the communities themselves being a part of designing the programmes that will benefit them.

Jeremy Lefroy: Can I just come back and press you all a little bit on this question of the South Sudanese Government’s desire, perhaps, to restrict the number of visas? Is that affecting all your operations at the moment, and in what way?

Robert Schofield: As I said, all but our country director now have limits on the amount of time they can work in South Sudan, depending on the role. The expectation is that those roles will be replaced by Southern Sudanese. As well as the stress of those individuals trying to work out whether they have a job in six months’ time or not, there is also the issue of us just wondering how we are going to continue our programmes. We would love DFID to lobby, on NGOs’ behalf, to ensure that there is a robust regulatory framework in place and ideally that NGOs themselves are consulted as that framework is developed.

Anna Liddell: I wish I could. I do not see an exit strategy?

Jeremy Lefroy: mean work permits; I beg your pardon.

Melinda Young: I do not know enough about business visas. I only know anecdotally that there is a lot of encouragement, certainly from South Sudan, of two-year multi-entry visas with work permits.

Chris White: Just picking up on Mr Schofield’s point earlier, I don’t think anybody in this room or DFID wants to go back to colonial practices and the idea of British management, but I think one of our great exports is some of the things we do in terms of governance and the way we do things. I would hope that no NGO would be resistant to some of the practices and knowledge that we can transfer, but that was not really my question.

My question, looking at a specific example, is from when we visited Lakes and we visited schools. On more than one occasion and in more than one school, NGOs and DFID were being asked, “When could we build a fence?”, which seemed to be very low level. Obviously the confidence was in NGOs and in DFID; there was not confidence in whatever level of local or national authority being able to deliver. Talking to yourselves directly, you called for DFID to develop a realistic plan for the transition of Government-led service delivery. How satisfied are you that DFID has developed such a plan and how long a time scale do you think that plan will take to deliver?

Melinda Young: I think that plan will take longer to deliver than the planning that is being done so far. Developing strategies on three-year scales is understandable, and why they are being developed since independence has happened, but growing a new country will take significantly longer than that. South Sudan has also been prone to politically motivated change of priorities in terms of development and humanitarian. Being in Sudan in 2005, after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed at that stage, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in the UN was suddenly drawn down, because now South Sudan was in a new era of development and progress. In 2009, you then had major humanitarian crises across South Sudan, with a lack of humanitarian capacity in the country. In 2010, as a result of that, “development” was a dirty word. Everything was “humanitarian”. You’ve then got problems again coming in post-independence. Again, with the development of a new country that happened in Washington last month, very little was discussed about the conflict situation or humanitarian issues, because again South Sudan was on that footing, with independence, to move through to a bright future of development. It goes back to what Mr Harrington was saying earlier: we are not talking in linear terms of development and humanitarian. As Clea had said before, it is a complex pattern of interaction. That is also in terms of building of the Government over this time and DFID’s operational plan; we are talking in small windows, so it is actually a little hard for me to answer that, because the longer frame that we need to put this in moves beyond that.

Chris White: Can you talk in terms of an exit strategy?

Melinda Young: I wish I could. I do not see an exit strategy in that kind of a window yet. I think it needs to be a phased response and a different use of NGOs. We all have experience from our organisations in working in a multitude of different countries in post-conflict environments, in these kinds of conflict situations. You were talking about best practice; we can use some of that in how that kind of transition can be taken. It is also very much contextually informed by South Sudan. I have worked in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Sudan and so on, but South Sudan is a whole new kettle of fish in many ways, because of how low the levels of education and development were 50 years ago. It is not recovery. There is nothing to recover. It is very much starting from scratch. That is why that timeframe has to be stretched out in terms of expectation.

Chris White: Do you think or would you agree that the aim and the goal must be local confidence in the national Government? In terms of NGOs, the longer it takes, the longer that will take.

Melinda Young: Absolutely, and we do not want to be providing basic services here and to the ever after. We want to make sure there’s not a gap, but the sooner
Q20 Chris White: Before you ask, because I am going to come directly to yourselves, can you talk in terms of health service delivery and the transition to national responsibility?

Clea Kahn: Actually, that fits in nicely with what I was about to say. What is important, at the end of the day, to your average South Sudanese is not actually who is delivering it, but that it is delivered well. That is particularly true, in fact, in terms of health. They want to be able to go to a hospital and to find that things are in place, that there are drugs. That is going to reflect well on both the NGOs and the Government of South Sudan. A lot of what the Government of South Sudan has been doing, in terms of service delivery, is to a certain extent co-ordinating NGOs as a means of providing services. There is a lot of co-habitation in hospitals. It is not necessarily that a hospital is run by an NGO; there is a hand-in-hand approach and most of them are Government services, accompanied by or working with.

It is important to recognise that the expertise and skills that are brought to this kind of service provision are necessary. When you are dealing with a hospital situation in South Sudan, you really are dealing with medical people who are literally on call in the middle of the night in order to help with a basic malaria protocol. It is simply not at a level where you can say, "I am going to go home and, if somebody comes in with malaria, then the staff there will be able to handle that." There is so much work to be done in terms of the training and getting the basic skills in place that it still needs an enormous amount of support.

Robert Schofield: Just to respond to the question, absolutely the endgame is the Government of South Sudan taking full responsibility for provision of services. That is the endgame for all of us. As we have said, there are massive challenges along the way. We have been working in health for over 10 years, and are actively trying to hand over services and have had some success with that. Just in the provision of drugs, the Ministry of Health has started to take that over since 2007 without too many delays. In terms of the provision of health services, it is such a complex area—the hospital facilities themselves, transport of outreach workers, payment of salaries and getting the drugs to the health centre. What we are calling for is really a gradual and a very well planned transition from the NGO provision to, ultimately, the Government of South Sudan.

Q21 Pauline Latham: Obviously South Sudan has a lot of problems in terms of conflict and the size of the Army probably reflects that, but it is taking 40% of the national budget into defence-related things including the Army. Unless they reduce the number of people in the Army, they are not going to have the money to spend on other things. Do you think there has been any progress made in reducing that Army and do you think there is any likelihood of any success in doing so?

Robert Schofield: A related point is about people’s felt greatest need. When we ask people on the ground, as we go out and do needs assessments, “What is your greatest need?” what they say is “security”. I think what they mean, and what we interpret that as, is a functioning police service and a disciplined Army. I am not sure as NGOs we are necessarily the best people to ask about troop levels. We have got some comments about UNMISS, but what we know is that security is a critical need for people on the ground.

Q22 Hugh Bayley: I wonder if you are so close to the problems that you cannot see the progress. I was in South Sudan a week or two after the CPA was signed. Going back now, seven years later, it seems to me there has been huge progress. There are schools, infrastructure and roads that just were not there five years ago. Isn’t that your experience as a result of your work?

Robert Schofield: I absolutely agree. I first started working in South Sudan in 1998, in the midst of a major war. There was a famine at that point and massive levels of malnutrition. Actually, I went back two months ago, just before some of you were in Juba, and went right up into Bahr el Ghazal. That sense of optimism and the visible signs of transformation were brilliant. It was one of the most encouraging visits to Africa I have ever made, but there is still a massive humanitarian challenge and a development challenge. We need to be pressing into both.

Q23 Hugh Bayley: Okay, let me come back to you. The question is not that you, as NGOs and the official donors, and the Government of South Sudan, starting from a very low base, have not made a significant difference. It is how much you can expect and what the rate of progress ought to be. You, Robert, in your evidence, said that you felt a lot of international assistance had been characterised by an absence of realism. What do you mean by that and how would a more realistic approach have achieved more per pound spent?

Robert Schofield: The point we made in our evidence was related to funding mechanisms since the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, and it was a concern that things like the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund lacked realism, particularly in terms of their planning and then their delivery. There did seem to have been an absence of accurate assessments of what the actual situation was on the ground and understanding of local communities. All of that led to long delays and delays in implementation. We are urging that there be better planning and preparation. We do want to encourage donors to ensure there are no gaps in funding mechanisms. We recognise the Basic Services Fund has been extended for a year, until December of this year, but there is a concern that the clunking between funding mechanisms has implications for the delivery of basic services.
comments before me, and I do not want to repeat those.

Q24 Hugh Bayley: Do you think DFID’s programmes have been guilty of a lack of realism and, if so, in what respect?  
Robert Schofield: It depends a bit on what you mean by “DFID’s programmes”. They have made investments in the Multi-Donor Trust Fund, the Common Humanitarian Fund and the Basic Services Fund. To keep it positive, the Basic Services Fund has functioned well and has connected well with NGOs. It is encouraging that there is another year of that Basic Services Fund. What we are arguing for as NGOs is timely, predictable funding over more than a one-year cycle. If we want to address these deeper development issues and ideally link to the seasonal calendar, you must bear in mind the rainy season when disbursing funding, because it is such a deterrent to doing good humanitarian and development work, you end up having a tiny window in which to deliver services.

Q25 Hugh Bayley: What about your colleagues? Do you think DFID is acting effectively, spending money wisely? Do you think the World Bank is doing the same, managing its resources well or badly?  
Melinda Young: I think DFID has engaged for the long term and wants to engage for the long term. That is highly beneficial. The realism aspect applies to all donors. There is a desire to change a lot in a small period of time, and that is where the realism is: to hit very high targets, for example with the textbooks—if we print this many million textbooks, we have hit that kind of a target—rather than look at some of the quality-related aspects that might have cultural changes, for example in early marriage and what barriers that will then release in terms of the future, some of those areas.

For the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund, we know that was not the best of mechanisms. Moving into the future in terms of health funding, it is very opaque at the moment. The World Bank will be looking to fund health in Jonglei and Upper Nile states—two of the most difficult remote-access areas with crises in them—putting together a mechanism and having a tiny window in which to deliver services running.

Clea Kahn: It is also worth saying that, although there has been a lot of progress made in terms of best practices and learning how to do things in the best possible way—and there is an enormous amount of emphasis put on value for money and making sure we are doing things as effectively as possible—there is still a certain amount of trial and error involved in working in these contexts. There has been an enormous amount of time and effort invested in Jonglei just to prevent the kind of violence that has broken out, which is not to say that peacebuilding efforts are not worth doing. It just means that we have not quite figured out how to do it all right yet. There has to be space for that. There should not be so much emphasis put on value for money that we do not take the risks and invest in programming that is innovative and has the potential to make a difference.

Q26 Hugh Bayley: It seems to me you are saying that we, as NGOs, and the donors, bilateral or multilateral, are doing much more good than harm, but, it is an extremely difficult environment. Sometimes money is wasted. Sometimes you do not deliver what you hope to deliver. Is that the right balance for me to pick up from what you are saying? You are not saying the World Bank should not run multi-donor funds, or are you?  
Robert Schofield: That mechanism was slow and overly bureaucratic. It does not mean it has to be, but, because it was poorly planned and there was not a good connection with or understanding of the field, that led to serious delays.

Q27 Hugh Bayley: All of you have used the World Bank fund as an illustration of clunking bureaucracy. What three changes or few changes would you want the World Bank to make so that future multi-donor funds are more responsive and effective?  
Robert Schofield: Let me just repeat some of the things I have said, if that is okay. It should make sure there are no gaps in the funding mechanisms between mechanisms. It should very carefully plan and prepare, and consult NGOs and local communities in the development of that funding mechanism. Those three things would make a huge difference.

Q28 Richard Burden: Could we talk a little bit more about UNMISS? We really would like your take on this, because again it is an area where we have had very different views put to us. On the one hand, some of us who were on the ground there have said in the heads of a row of white UN helicopters sitting on a runway not going anywhere because of a dispute between the Russians and the United Nations. At the same time, we were being told in another room that there was a vital need to get helicopters to get people where they need to go more quickly. We appeared to see UN personnel stationed in places where you would wonder, “Is that really where you would expect to see a UN force?” Yet in other places where quite extreme violence was taking place, or there was the risk of it, they were in short supply. We were told the problem was operational, and we were also told, in other quarters, “Absolutely not; the problem is with UNMISS’s mandate or it is the UN bureaucracy in New York.”

Again, that has all been played out in the media in the last month with the Jonglei issue, with people making the same criticisms and quite robust comments coming back from Lise Grande saying “Absolutely...
not. We have done more than could be expected. Don’t forget the mandate. Don’t forget the level of resources we’re operating under.” Who do we believe and what could we sensibly say to ensure that what is a really big UN effort is actually being effective?

**Melinda Young:** Almost every peacekeeping mission will always say they do not have enough helicopters and troops. What is needed within UNMISS now is, as I mentioned earlier, a protection-of-civilians strategy. What approach are they taking? They do have a Chapter VII mandate, so how is that going to work in South Sudan? That then needs to be broken out into an action plan: what actions can be taken in situations such as in Jonglei, or situations nearer the border area as well, with the resources they already have? With patrols and the Pibor example, UNMISS troops were in Pibor. They were digging in and they were patrolling and moving around, despite the fact that they did not have heavy weaponry because of the Russian pilots. They were unable to bring them in. There are still actions and deterrents available regardless of the resources. We would certainly encourage there to be more resources because, as I mentioned, two Jongleis could not have been managed at the same time.

UNMISS did engage in patrols and put troops into Pibor and are putting troops into Akobo—because we would expect there could be counter-attacks in that area—which is to be encouraged and needs to be continued, but there is much more that can be done in various areas. UNMISS did respond in Pibor; earlier in 2011 and 2010, as NGOs, we were often bringing up inter-communal violence as something that UNMISS’s predecessor, UNMIS with one ‘S’, was needing to intervene on, but the response back was usually, “That’s not within our mandate. That’s inter-communal. That’s tribal violence. That’s not part of what we do.” The inter-communal violence does have a political element. It has an enormous risk to the peacekeeping mission. It has huge amounts of awareness of basic gender-based violence expertise at one level, in terms of protection of civilians, but it does not filter down. There is a lack of awareness of basic gender-based violence protection, or even an understanding of the extent to which that is in their mandate. These are all issues that need to be addressed.

There have been improvements. We do hear that UNMISS gets out more often—that they are making progress in actually addressing issues. The fact that they reacted as Melinda was saying is a big step forward. We are more concerned by rumours that the troop numbers might be decreased and that there might be major shifts. At this stage, they have spent so much time trying to understand how to implement that mandate, shift it, change it, adapt to it and put these systems into place that it would be a shame to start right from the beginning and go through the whole process again.

Q29 Richard Burden: If we said to you, “Okay, sit down and write the chapter of our report on UNMISS,” what would you say in it? Would it say that it is improving; it is getting better; it needs to do more of the same but these are the extra things it could do? What would they be? or is there something fundamental about the mandate? Does the change need to happen in the way it operates in South Sudan, or is it something between New York and South Sudan?

**Clea Kahn:** There has been a lot of work put into that mandate and into discussions about the protection-of-civilians role and the way that UNMISS functions over the last few years. There has been a huge amount of discussion of all of that. As is the case with a lot of peacekeeping missions, there are always a lot of complaints, but, at the end of the day, it is necessary to have them there and they generally do more good than harm. I would be hard-pressed to say that it was something fundamental about the mission. If you look at most comments about most peacekeeping missions, from one country to another, a lot of the complaints are similar. A lot of it has to do with the way that peacekeeping missions invest in training for protection of civilians for their field staff, whether they are civilian or military. The command and control structure may have a certain amount of expertise at one level, in terms of protection of civilians, but it does not filter down. There is a lack of awareness of basic gender-based violence protection, or even an understanding of the extent to which that is in their mandate. These are all issues that need to be addressed.

There have been improvements. We do hear that UNMISS gets out more often—that they are making progress in actually addressing issues. The fact that they reacted as Melinda was saying is a big step forward. We are more concerned by rumours that the troop numbers might be decreased and that there might be major shifts. At this stage, they have spent so much time trying to understand how to implement that mandate, shift it, change it, adapt to it and put these systems into place that it would be a shame to start right from the beginning and go through the whole process again.

Q30 Richard Burden: I know it is stargazing a bit, but what kind of timeframe do you think we should be looking at for UNMISS’s presence in Sudan? As a best guess, when do you think the South Sudanese Army and police might be sufficiently developed that you would not need an UNMISS? Are we talking five years, decades or several decades?

**Robert Schofield:** It depends entirely how much investment is made in the Government of South Sudan’s own Army and police force. The police force is an appropriate area to invest heavily, and also thinking about demobilisation and disarmament, really pressing into that, because of the availability of small arms in South Sudan.

**Emily Speers-Mears:** As well as peacebuilding and local-level community-based reconciliation processes, which are an essential part of what we would encourage UNMISS to continue to be engaged with, along with the Government of South Sudan and local communities, which is often where these conflicts start.

**Chair:** We are reaching slightly into the second group’s time, but we have a couple more questions. If we can just be crisper, we will get to the end.

Q31 Pauline Latham: Can you tell me what the key measures are that are needed to be taken to improve women’s and girl’s equality in Sudan? Clea in particular has been heavily involved with gender-based violence programmes in South Sudan. How do you feel that DFID can help and reinforce the programmes that you have taken forward?

**Clea Kahn:** The fact that it is addressing violence against women and girls specifically, and the programming for women and girls in general is specifically mentioned in the operational plan—that there is this emphasis—is hugely welcome. That is extremely important. When we talk about conflict prevention and long-term sustainable development
inside Sudan, the critical issue is going to be, first, the elimination of violence against women and girls, and then giving them the tools to move forward. It is taking a very comprehensive and holistic view of how to provide services to women who have suffered violence, which unfortunately appears to be on the increase. It is hard to put a figure on it, but the levels of violence appear to be becoming worse, in conflict situations and in general. Most women say that there is an enormous amount of domestic violence, in addition to early and forced marriage and a lot of harmful traditional practices.

It is addressing, first, providing the services to women, but then, in addition, giving them opportunities in terms of livelihoods programming and fostering women’s groups. There are a large number of women’s groups—and this is one of the things I was referring to earlier—that say, “There was a group here that provided a certain amount of support or a livelihoods opportunity, but then they ran out of funding and so they left.” That women’s coalition would try to keep going for a while, but eventually faltered from lack of resources and investment.

There’s a need for continued direct service provision, because the systems simply are not in place. We are talking about systems at a variety of levels, including health support—not just to survivors of sexual violence, for example, but also just on reproductive health. A woman is more likely, still today, to die in childbirth than to graduate from primary school. It is investing in health, education, access to justice—making sure that there are systems in place that will support women having access to justice when they either have had violence perpetrated on them or, in some cases, are simply put in jail as a proxy for a husband, child or son. Then there is livelihoods support that allows them to take a bit more command of their own lives. Again, that means direct service provision and also mainstreaming to make sure that, when we talk about putting schools in place, there are toilets for girls and the systems in place that will facilitate girls getting assistance. If a woman goes to a health clinic, can she be seen in private? All of these things are essential.

Q32 Pauline Latham: Certainly from our visit, it was fairly obvious that many of the barriers for women are cultural practices that they have, particularly, say, in the dowry system. It is all very well for us to go in and say these things should not happen, but we are interfering in their cultural life. How much do you feel that the international community should go and talk about these very sensitive cultural issues and try to persuade them that they are wrong? Having said that, the girls that I spoke to were very aware that they ought to have the education; they wanted the education. They did not want to get married young. Although we go in with our Western ideas, I think that the younger women are beginning to feel that they do not want to continue with the old-fashioned practices. It is very difficult for us to say you should not do it. Surely it has to come from their own communities to say, “Enough is enough. We need to move on in order to have any sort of prosperity or future life that gives us a better quality of life and living. Should we not change the practices?” How much do you think we should hold back and let it happen naturally?

Clea Kahn: I would hesitate to say we should. I think the change will come, and it is partly because people have been exposed to other ideas, but it is also partly that, when you talk to women, as you say, they do not want to be beaten. They want to have access to opportunities. They want to be able to better their families. These are not things that are brought in. When we do this kind of stand-alone programming for women and girls, a lot of it is focused on working with the communities and having them dictate what it is that they want. We have these discussions and, very often, we might say, “You should be advocating for the right to vote.” They say, “Really what we want is a sewing machine for the community, so that we can make a little bit of money.” That is fine, because that is what they feel that they need in order to take some control over their lives.

That is where the change comes: through empowering women to make those decisions and to have some influence on their own lives, rather than coming in and simply saying to communities, “No, you must change this.” It is about helping women to have the opportunity to change it themselves, but that takes a fair bit of work. In the meantime, there just needs to be work done to prevent women from being killed—beaten to death, savagely hurt and dying in childbirth needlessly. There are simply protections that should be in place. Women should not be left to die because we do not think we should interfere with people’s culture.

Melinda Young: I would just add there that a useful mechanism to get beyond this being a Western notion is the Child Act of South Sudan, which is one of the most solid Children’s Acts in the entire region. The age of marriage is contained within South Sudanese law, but knowledge of South Sudanese legislation, through to the police, through customary chiefs and customary mechanisms, is not there. It is not so much a Western notion; it is South Sudanese law that the rights of these girls are protected. Being able to have that happen out in communities is the next step.
local community and had created a 25-year development plan in this community. As a result of that, another agency had come in and built a school. The community themselves had built their own local latrines and hand-washing facilities. It was great to see. What we are doing in Upper Nile is hardcore humanitarian work, but, in another part of South Sudan, long-term development work is going on through the Church. It was a good example of the Church potentially being a very powerful agent of change. They can be a good complement to the Government ultimately being the ones responsible for providing basic services. What we want to urge is that the Government and donors connect with local community-based organisations and the Church, so that they can start being fully engaged in the development process.

Q34 Chair: I think we are just at the end. You have mentioned returnees. The only thing I would ask you very briefly is about this pent-up potential as we get towards March. To what extent do you think there will be a mass migration, and to what extent are the community and DFID, in particular, able to respond to it?

Robert Schofield: The figures OCHA gave last week were that 362,000 people had returned. There is a concern that the provision for those returnees is quite sporadic and ad hoc, depending on individual Governor's needs, and how engaged they are with the return process. Again as part of my trip, I saw people camped next to a train that had come down from Khartoum. It is a two-week train ride on a rusting old train. When they arrived, the transit facilities were not ready, so they just had to camp next to the train for several weeks. There is a concern that the provision is not equitable. In some areas it is good; in other areas, transit sites are unsanitary and overcrowded. We are urging the Government and donors to really step into that.

Q35 Chair: Is there a danger of that being overwhelmed by another influx?

Robert Schofield: One of the figures I had read was that there is the potential for 800,000 additional people to come over. If the current structure is stretched, how much more will it be if double that number return? Yes, we need to step up.

Chair: I think that is something we may need to ask the Secretary of State. Can I say thank you, all, very much indeed for coming in and the answers you have given us? It has helped to give a broader dimension to what we have seen and heard ourselves. Thank you very much.

Examination of Witnesses

Witnesses: Dr Sara Pantuliano, Head, Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, and Rebecca Coleman, International Co-ordinator in the Office of the Archbishop, Episcopal Church of Sudan, and Canon Ian Woodward, Diocese of Salisbury, representing the Episcopal Church of Sudan, Lambeth Palace, the Diocese of Salisbury and the Anglican Alliance, gave evidence.

Q36 Chair: Hello, good morning and thank you very much indeed for coming in. Nice to see you again, in my case, all of you, and for those the rest of the Committee welcomes. I just wondered, for the record, if firstly you could introduce yourselves, and then we can proceed, starting with you, Sara.

Dr Pantuliano: I am Sara Pantuliano. I am the Head of the Humanitarian Policy Group with the Overseas Development Institute, and a long-standing Sudan analyst.

Rebecca Coleman: My name is Rebecca Adelaide Coleman. I am International Co-ordinator in the Office of the Archbishop for the Episcopal Church of Sudan. I have met some of you before in Juba. I have just come from Juba. I represent the Archbishop here today, and he apologises for not being here himself.

He is delighted that you have allowed me to represent him. I have a letter here directed to the Committee members, from him to you.

Canon Woodward: Canon Ian Woodward. I am Vice-Chairman of the Diocese of Salisbury Sudan link. We have had a link with Sudan for 40 years, and it is very much part of the life blood of our diocese.

Q37 Chair: Thank you very much. I can only say we enjoyed our visit with the Archbishop, and indeed we met him when he was here. I am sure you are a very adequate representative of him and his Church, thank you. Obviously, even since we have come back, there have been some issues that have been reported to us. Perhaps starting with you, Sara, could you give us a flavour of what you think the current situation is? In particular, is the biggest threat conflict on the border or the internal conflicts, because they seem to be playing against each other? Then perhaps I might ask you what you think of DFID's role in contributing to resolving those conflicts.

Dr Pantuliano: I am sure you have all followed the reports of the last couple of weeks, since the violence restarted in Jonglei in December. It is important to remember that this is not a new eruption of violence; this builds on ongoing tensions, particularly in that state, which have been characteristic of the Greater Upper Nile region, of which Jonglei is a part, ever since the civil war. It builds on a cycle and dynamics that are ongoing and some of the internal tensions, particularly in the state of Jonglei, have actually been the worst during the civil war. They have seen some of the different ethnic groups in Jonglei come to direct confrontation several times. The Bor Massacre, when the SPLM split in 1991, was probably the worst example of violence during the civil war, and that was internal within South Sudan.

Having said that as a preamble, this was the last iteration of a series of confrontations that we have seen over the last two or three years, and perhaps even before, that actually have never seen any remedial action by the Government of South Sudan in terms of
administration of justice holding the perpetrators of violence accountable and bringing them to justice. We have come to a situation where, because there is very scarce provision of security and administration of justice is so wanting, the youth have just decided to take matters in their own hands and go after one another. This is not just characteristic of Jonglei. It is starting to happen in other parts of South Sudan as well, increasingly.

You have mentioned the conflict across the border. That is the other big part of the scenario we now have in South Sudan. Obviously the conflict is taking place within Sudan, in the states of South Kordofan and Blue Nile, although there is tension in Abyei, which is the contested region between the two states. Of course, South Sudan is receiving a large amount of returnees from the region of South Kordofan in particular. Refugees from Blue Nile are going over the border to Ethiopia. You have a very large refugee crisis in a state that does not have the infrastructure to cope with this influx of people. Of course, the influx of people brings with it tensions, and we have seen a series of attacks within South Sudan as well, following the refugees. The instability over the border is profoundly troubling.

Q38 Chair: When I attended a briefing you gave across the river a few months ago, you were quite negative and pessimistic about the international community’s role in the scenario. Do you feel the situation is getting worse or better in terms of the capacity of the various agencies to deal with it?

Dr Pantuliano: You need to distinguish whether we are talking about agencies engaging in humanitarian response, international political action or peacekeeping. We have the international community responding in three different spheres. Politically, we still do not see the kind of firm and coherent political action that is required. We have been working with Hilde Johnson and the President, Salva Kiir, to lead the reconciliation and mediation process. He has been mandated by the President, His Excellency Salva Kiir, to lead the reconciliation and mediation process in Jonglei state. We held a conference of MPs in Bor, which the Archbishop chaired. The Governor of Jonglei state, His Excellency Kuol Manyang, was present. Hilde Johnson invited Archbishop Daniel and me to travel on her plane to Jonglei state—sometimes it is recognised and sometimes it is not—we do feel now, particularly towards the end of last year, that the support is growing.

Q39 Jeremy Lefroy: I would like to move on to ask specifically about the Church’s role in mediation and peacekeeping. Do you believe that this is properly recognised, that the work that the Archbishop and others are doing is being supported through the official agencies, and that the great potential there seems to be is being fully used?

Canon Woodward: Increasingly it is, but perhaps I could say that the unique advantage the Churches have, and I am speaking ecumenically as well as for the Diocese of Salisbury and the Church of England, is that we reach into every part of community. Church is community in South Sudan, and that is a unique advantage. There is always the risk that the Church does not have the resources, but what we increasingly do better is to work in partnership with agencies and NGOs. We work very closely with the Foreign Office, DFID, the Sudan Unit, people on the ground and so on. We can always do better and be better appreciated. If I may, I will ask my colleague, Rebecca, to say what she has been doing with the Archbishop on that particular issue.

Rebecca Coleman: Thank you very much. The recognition from the international community has been a long time coming. I think it could be strengthened. However, at this point in time, the Archbishop and other Church leaders in South Sudan have been mandated by the President, His Excellency Salva Kiir, to lead the reconciliation and mediation process in Jonglei state. We in the ECS and the Sudan Council of Churches Committee have been working very closely with the UN leadership, with Hilde Johnson, Lance Clark and others. They have increasing trust in us. They have stated on numerous occasions, publicly, that the Churches are the strongest civil society in South Sudan. We held a conference of MPs in Bor, which the Archbishop chaired. The Governor of Jonglei state, His Excellency Kuol Manyang, was present. Hilde Johnson invited Archbishop Daniel and me to travel on her plane to go from Juba to Bor. Small things like that add up to something very significant. While we have been campaigning and advocating on behalf of the people of Jonglei state—sometimes it is recognised and sometimes it is not—we do feel now, particularly towards the end of last year, that the support is growing.
Q40 Jeremy Lefroy: Just as a follow-up to that, I believe that DFID has recently made an allocation of something like £200,000 to support the Church in that work, which is welcome. Could you perhaps explain how that is going to be used and whether the Church itself has the administrative capabilities to be able to deal with the quite high levels of accountability that this funding involves?

Rebecca Coleman: The Churches have been entrusted by the President to lead this reconciliation process, so that is a very big encouragement and a boost for us. DFID approached us with funding, because they have recognised the commitment and the dedication of the Church leaders to address the conflicts in Jonglei. It has been very clear from interviews and trips that the Archbishop and the rest of the committee have made to the ground, trips from United Nations and feedback that the local government officials have received from people that the people have faith in the Church. They are able to speak to Church leaders on a very personal basis. For example, Archbishop Daniel travelled to Pibor to meet some women after their houses had been destroyed and had nothing to wear anymore; they have not known anything of civilisation and education. They are completely isolated and cut off, but they felt able to speak to him about their children who had been abducted and about their houses that had been burnt down. That shows the unique role the Church has in this peace initiative. DFID on the ground certainly understands that, which is why they have given us that money. I think it is £300,000. They call it “tiny money”. I think one of the DFID representatives actually said that when you came to Juba and met with the Archbishop, he called it “tiny money”. There are positive murmurings about further funds.

Q41 Chair: I think that was in relation to what you were looking for in education, which we will come on to a bit later. That was the context in which she used that expression. I do not think we regard it as an insignificant sum of money.

Rebecca Coleman: No, we certainly do not in the ECS either; it is vital to our peace work. We are very grateful, and we praise DFID and Her Majesty’s Government for supporting us with those funds.

Q42 Jeremy Lefroy: If I can just come back to the second part of my question, DFID raised concerns about the ability of the Church to process this kind of money and use it. I wondered how you would respond to that.

Rebecca Coleman: The money that was given to us will be used eventually for a joint conference between them together in dialogue. The Government of South Sudan has failed to do that to date. The money that was given to DFID will support the costs of that conference. We are working in companionship with other Churches; it is not just the ECS. Additionally, we have a lot of technical support from NGOs, such as DanChurchAid and UNMISS Civil Affairs, so we are not working on our own here; it is very much a team effort.

Canon Woodward: Maybe I could add to that. If the concern was whether the money would be properly accountable and so on, I think it is. The systems in the provincial office of the Episcopal Church in Juba have improved considerably, and they are much more open to access by partners, particularly from the United States and from the United Kingdom. We are more satisfied.

Q43 Richard Burden: Can we return to UNMISS again? In the Church’s written evidence, you say you would like to have a broader border-monitoring mandate, Sara, this is where you talked about the need to do something about the mandate. Can you say a little bit more about what precise changes to the mandate you would like to see, and why you think that is important?

Rebecca Coleman: It touches on what Sara has said, in that 7,000 troops may sound like a large number but, with the size of Jonglei and considering that there is also a north/south border conflict, it really is not. We would like to see UNMISS supported. We would like to see their mandate extended. We feel it is very important that there is proper civilian protection on the ground—not just in Jonglei, but also along the border—in order to prevent people being caught up in a conflict that they just want nothing to do with.

Q44 Richard Burden: If in New York they said, “Okay, we will now authorise a greater border-monitoring component,” and even if they said “with some more troops involved”, would UNMISS then be doing what you feel it needs to be doing or are there other institutional impediments to that that need to be addressed as well?

Dr Pantuliano: I think the force component is one element. Definitely you do need more peacekeepers to be able to provide effective monitoring and protection when required, including intervening if there is physical violence involved. The other element though, learning from the experience of the previous mission, which wound up with the declaration of independence of South Sudan, is the ability to have a strong civil affairs component that can focus on reconciliation work and support NGO peace building initiatives, as well as facilitating the involvement of the Government in these initiatives, with the political affairs capacity that can bring together these initiatives at a different level. Learning from the previous mission, there has not been enough of this work done at county level, in the peripheries. Too much of its work has been concentrated at the level of Juba or, where it has happened, in the state capitals, but not in the more peripheral counties, where the state is less present and has more difficulties administering security and justice. That is where the role of an international peacekeeping mission is particularly required: to support the Government where it is less able to fulfil its responsibilities for security and protection.

Rebecca Coleman: I would like to add that it is important also to consider just how difficult it is to operate in Jonglei state. It is the largest state in South Sudan with the largest population. There are no
paved roads. From April to November, it is practically impassable. You find yourselves stuck in a Land Rover in the mud, with no one around—no police forces, no telephone reception. It is very difficult and also very expensive. I know UNMISS Civil Affairs, especially in light of this recent conflict in Jonglei, worked in collaboration with the SPLA to move troops to specific key areas by helicopter, but that alone is an expensive time-consuming operation. There is a lot that needs to be considered when we are talking about a stronger mandate, a broader mandate or a longer mandate. It is going to cost a lot, but it is absolutely vital to secure the safety of the people of Jonglei state.

Q45 Richard Burden: In terms of what they have been doing so far, understanding that you think they need a broader mandate and they could clearly do with more troops, from what you have said, given the environment that they have been operating in, are you saying that you think their performance in Jonglei has been as good as it could be under the circumstances and given those difficulties, or are you saying it is better than it was, but they could still have been doing this, that and the other, even within their current mandate?

Rebecca Coleman: I am speaking from a Church perspective and from what we have seen in the discussions that we have had with the Civil Affairs leadership just last week. We talk to each other all the time about this kind of thing, strategies and so on. The Archbishop made a trip to several villages within Jonglei state in September. After that trip, he came back to the office of the Vice-President, His Excellency Riek Machar, to brief him on what he had seen, and he made it very clear that there was going to be conflict at the end of the year if there were not troops deployed in strategic areas. Nothing happened. Two weeks before the conflict, the Archbishop went back again. He verified the information and took it back to Riek Machar. Again, very little happened. It is difficult and irresponsible to pin any blame, as such, on UNMISS for what happened at the end of the year. It is just extremely difficult to work in those circumstances, and also there was not a speedy enough response from the SPLA and the Government of South Sudan, from the experience of the Church. That is what we have seen. It is not really UNMISS’s role to work alone; they have to work in partnership with the Government through the structures that are already in place. If there is not seen to be that much of an immediate concern, it is very difficult for UNMISS to move forward, and that is certainly what we, as the Sudan Council of Churches, have witnessed.

Q46 Richard Burden: Do you see this changing any time soon? I asked the previous witnesses to just crystal-ball-gaze a little bit about when the South Sudanese Army and police might be in a position to take more of a role themselves in dealing with these things, even to the extent of UNMISS not being necessary at some point. What kind of horizon should we be looking at?

Rebecca Coleman: It is going to be very difficult, because 80% of the South Sudan police force are illiterate. Many of them in Jonglei state do not have weaponry; some of them do not even have shoes. We are talking about a very basic police force. Again, I will mention another trip the Archbishop made. He was told by some ladies, “The police are just like women; they’re just like us,” because the women do not walk around with guns. The women are always advocating for peace. That is exactly what the police are seen to be doing in Jonglei state. They are incapable of protecting because they do not have arms, because they are remote and are not able to move around and inspire people with confidence. As the recent conflicts have shown, there are serious problems when it comes to civilian protection by armed forces. It will definitely take a very long time to build the capacity of the police force and the Army, which is why it is just so important for Her Majesty’s Government and other Governments around the world to be advocating for capacity-building in the armed forces.

Dr Pantuliano: I could not agree more with what Rebecca said. It is important to stress that, because in the past six years, the fact that there was an autonomous Government that was potentially preparing for independence, has given many donors and actors the impression that there was a state that was able to provide on a number of different fronts, including in terms of security. It was very obvious that an army that was never really trained or qualified would be unable to act like a professional army. Likewise, a police force, which was non-existent, obviously could not materialise overnight. There has been some support to the professionalisation of the Army and the police, but it has been very little, and absolutely not commensurate with the scale of the need. We are still a long way away from seeing an effective police force and a professional Army that the citizens can trust and respect.

If we are really serious about supporting the transition in South Sudan, we need to make, as international partners, a serious commitment, also in terms of funding, to support these processes, long term otherwise instability and violence will continue to characterise the future of South Sudan. We have seen studies done on this in other countries. For instance, the World Development Report of the World Bank in 2011 highlighted a very clear link between the end of an armed conflict, continued violence because of inefficient or inadequate security structures in the country, and levels of homicide, violence and large criminality—for instance, in Central and Latin America, 15 to 20 years after the end of the conflict in those countries. It is something where we can learn from other contexts, and try to invest robustly now to make sure that we can help South Sudan lay down the foundations for a better and safer future for its citizens.

Canon Woodward: If I can just add one point, there is a specific issue here, talking to colleagues in UNMISS at the moment. It is one thing of course to have properly trained forces, but the big problem at the moment is mobility and getting them to the right place, at the right time, with their equipment. I think
we all saw that very strong leader in The Times on Saturday, with the suggestion that the UN was walking into the case of Somali into another Srebrenica or another Rwanda. The point is that the forces need to be movable quickly. They were relying on other resources for helicopter transport—the Russians, I believe in this case—that were not forthcoming. We could put international pressure on that.

Q47 Hugh Bayley: Dr Pantuliano, do you think the World Bank and UNDP have got on top of the problems they had with administering their trust funds, multi-donor funds?

Dr Pantuliano: I was part of the team which conducted the evaluation of aid assistance to South Sudan over the five years from 2005 to 2010. We looked very closely at the Multi-Donor Trust Fund administered by the World Bank, as well as other funds administered by UNDP, as well as UNDP’s own programmes and interventions. The deficiencies of those funds have been very well documented. You asked me if there has been an improvement, I assume compared with what was documented up to 2010. As far as I understand, there has not been any marked improvement. The funding frameworks that existed until the evaluation was carried out—it concluded at the beginning of last year—are winding up now. We are in a transitional phase between the old funding frameworks and the new funding frameworks. There is obviously a lot of discussion that is informed by the inefficiencies and problems that the Multi-Donor Trust Fund and other pooled funds have proved to have, but, to be honest, there is little indication that these funds administered by the World Bank or the UN will be any better in their new iteration.

There is a lot of concern among NGOs and others that we will see a repeat of the same burdensome administration and potentially delayed disbursement. For instance in the case of the Common Humanitarian Fund, the CHF, which is so critical in providing funding for emergencies and humanitarian assistance, there is the continuation of a calendar that is completely out of sync with when you can actually implement activities in South Sudan. The deficiencies of those funds have been very well documented. You asked me if there has been an improvement, I assume compared with what was documented up to 2010. As far as I understand, there has not been any marked improvement. The funding frameworks that existed until the evaluation was carried out—it concluded at the beginning of last year—are winding up now. We are in a transitional phase between the old funding frameworks and the new funding frameworks.

Q48 Hugh Bayley: What I do not understand is this: is it badly managed, the World Bank fund, because of a lack of management capacity—bad design, badly managed—or is it because the World Bank is working in a difficult environment?

Dr Pantuliano: It is both, if you want. It is applying a funding model to a context for which it is completely inappropriate. The World Bank obviously operates in more stable settings normally, with Governments that have the capacity to administer and deal with cumbersome procedures. What we have seen is, first of all, the difficulty the Bank itself has had in deploying quickly in this context. It took a long time for the World Bank to actually have staff on the ground. For the first year and a half, if not two years, the Bank administered the fund using a manager based in Nairobi, who would frequently be in South Sudan. Then you have a set of procedures that have been put in place to mitigate the fiduciary risks, but, in a context where there is no Government capacity to deal with such cumbersome procedures, this obviously delays the capacity to administer and spend the fund quickly enough. This has been the biggest problem.

There has also been a really inadequate staff presence. The Bank has found it very difficult to find personnel that would deploy in a country such as South Sudan, because World Bank staff are, I guess, not very used to working in environments such as South Sudan. There has been an objective difficulty in finding experienced staff that could go there and would be willing to serve there for sustained number of months or years.

Q49 Hugh Bayley: Can I ask you one final question, and then I will turn to Rebecca and Ian? Do you think that DFID is an effective international donor in South Sudan and, if so, should it be putting its money through multi-donor funds run by UNDP or the World Bank or, if they are poorly managed, should it be doing something different?

Dr Pantuliano: DFID has demonstrated itself to be a better donor than many others. It is responsive. It has tried to deal creatively with some of the challenges. Surely it has put money in the Multi-Donor Trust Fund and in other funds administered by UNDP, but it has also remedied the inefficiencies by creating new pooled funds administered by private companies, such as the Basic Services Fund, which have performed infinitely better than the World Bank-managed pooled fund or UN-managed pooled funds. That is really to DFID’s credit, and the BSF was DFID’s creation and has been one of the few successes we have seen in South Sudan. It has provided critical assistance in the service delivery sector. In the discussions that are
being held now about the new funds, a lot of the advocacy that the NGOs are offering around these issues very much emphasises the success of this model, which was very much of DFID’s own making. DFID was also one of the first donors to invest in the security and justice sector, recognising the importance of not just supporting service delivery, but also funding security and justice, and supporting peacebuilding separately. Not all of what they have funded has been successful or has proved to have the impact that they were expecting, but at least there has been an effort to recognise the importance of issues that were so critical, which we have not quite seen with a number of other donors.

**Q50 Hugh Bayley:** I know we are getting short of time.

**Dr Pantuliano:** Can I just mention the one concern that I think is voiced more and more in South Sudan about DFID’s action? It is the relatively new emphasis on value for money. Now, South Sudan is a context where it is going to be very difficult to get value for money. If you want to operate in Jonglei, you are not going to get much value for money, and also the pooled funds have not proven to provide the value for money that they were expected to provide—for which they were set up.

**Q51 Hugh Bayley:** Could I just ask this of Rebecca and Ian? The Church has expressed concerns that some of these big funds’ programmes will come to an end this year, and you are worried that they will finish before other programmes are up and running to take over. Is the situation any better now or is that still your concern?

**Rebecca Coleman:** It is still very much our concern. What the Basic Services Fund has been able to show is that basic services can be delivered through local and indigenous organisations. We have a very good relationship with the Basic Services Fund in the Episcopal Church of Sudan. For example, through funds from the Basic Services Fund, we have been able to construct several schools, all across South Sudan, for a number of years now—for almost five years. It has proven to be an opportunity for the ECS to train teachers to construct schools and to really provide education services across the country, so much so that we have been recognised in Central Equatoria and Western Equatoria states, by the Ministry of Education in both of those states, to be the best provider of in-service teacher training in the country. Those are just two states out of the 10 states of South Sudan, but they are the only two that have declared, at this point in time, who they think is the best. Without trying to blow my own horn or the horn of the ECS, it is generally perceived that we are able to provide an excellent service when it comes to teacher training, school construction and general provision of basic services. That is definitely because of the support that we have received from the Basic Services Fund. I do have to say that we were also very concerned when funding that was pledged to us, verbally and through emails, for school construction was later diverted to UNOPS, the UN agency, without proper explanation to the ECS as to why, particularly when we are very well known to construct schools without needing a lot of money—schools that serve the community well, that are owned by the communities, where the community can then hold the Church to account if there is a problem. They are involved from beginning to end with the planning and construction process. It is a concern to us when there is not mutual partnership in the relationships we have with other donors. We are certainly concerned by what the future will hold next year if the Basic Services Fund and other funds come to a close, but we would strongly like to encourage this Committee to urge DFID and Her Majesty’s Government to continue supporting local organisations, particularly the Church, with the provision of basic services. If that can be through the extension of the Basic Services Fund, we would certainly be advocates for that.

**Q52 Jeremy Lefroy:** If I could come back to something that Dr Pantuliano said and I was a little concerned about, you were implying that one of the problems with the disbursement of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund with the World Bank was basically that the World Bank could not find staff who were willing to work in difficult environments. That seems to me a serious charge. If the World Bank cannot do that, should they be entrusted with such funding?

**Dr Pantuliano:** That has been documented in a number of analyses and evaluations that have been conducted on the Multi-Donor Trust Fund. The Bank did remedy the problem in the end, but it was definitely a problem in the first two or three years of the fund. There were significant delays, because it was difficult for them to find staff who would deploy in South Sudan, stably and continually in Juba. As I said, people were coming in and out of Nairobi.

**Q53 Jeremy Lefroy:** Yet—if I may interrupt, because we are short of time—all other agencies seem to be able to find people to work there who are willing to work possibly in much more difficult environments outside Juba. Why is the World Bank not able to do that and what lessons should be learnt?

**Dr Pantuliano:** They have a different organisational culture. If you work for OCHA or for a humanitarian NGO, for MSF, you will find people who are happy to be deployed in South Sudan, even at the height of an emergency or a conflict. For development organisations that have only recently started engaging in transitional and post-conflict contexts, it is more difficult to find the type of staff internally that can be entrusted with the management of such a large and important fund, and are willing to be deployed. They need to have a level of seniority within the organisation to do that, and to be willing to serve in such a complex environment. This is not my first-hand assessment; this is something that has been documented by enough evidence.

**Chair:** It is a criticism the British Government has levelled at the World Bank: not being able to sustain the kind of country offices that DFID believes they should. It is an issue.
Q54 Jeremy Lefroy: It seems to me extraordinary that such a major and important part of the rehabilitation of South Sudan was put into an organisation that was the wrong organisation to deal with it. That seems to be a question that perhaps we could push at another time. I realise we are short of time.

Rebecca Coleman: I would just like to make a very quick comment based on what you have said. The Episcopal Church of Sudan is made up of 31 dioceses; 26 of those dioceses are in South Sudan. Every single diocese has, via satellite, access to the internet. We have trained staff, who know how to use computers. We have solar panels to keep our dioceses and offices running. The Episcopal Church of Sudan has a network—not just of people, but a proper infrastructure across the whole country. It can sometimes be a bit frustrating when we are overlooked by some of the big organisations. They are not so willing to work with us or work through us—they just see our limitations and immediately write us off—but we would really like to be given the chance to show that we can work for development. We can work in the areas of relief distribution, not just because, as a Church, we have a presence in every single community, but also because we have the communication structure that allows us to keep in communication with donors, to ensure that money is spent correctly, and to ensure that, if any messages come from Geneva, Nairobi, Juba or wherever, they can reach us.

Chair: We have got that message loud and clear.

Q55 Chris White: I am going a bit further into depth with regard to schools. What do you think the impact will be on the Government’s decision to classify Church schools as private schools?

Rebecca Coleman: What do you mean by “the impact” exactly?

Q56 Chris White: What will be the impression? What will be the public view of those schools moving from the Church to a different kind of set-up, if I can put it like that, or classification?

Rebecca Coleman: By classifying the ECS schools as private schools does not imply that they will not be funded by the Government of South Sudan. That is really our main worry. We are the best provider of education across the country. We have 300 schools. We have 80,000 pupils. To be frank, if our schools were not supported, if we decided today to close down our schools, there would be an education crisis in South Sudan. The Government of South Sudan is not yet at the stage where it is able to provide any alternative for those 80,000 pupils that we are teaching.

That is not to say that donors or the international community should not support the Government of South Sudan, or should support us at their expense. I think we are all doing the same work, and the Episcopal Church of Sudan is working in order to serve the people of South Sudan and to support the Government of South Sudan. As I said, we do have quite a strong partnership and a very good working relationship with the Ministry of Education, at the level of Juba and also in the field. It would be rather reckless and would not make very much sense for the Government to suddenly turn off the taps and say, “We are not going to support Church schools anymore.” When not just the ECS, but the Catholic Church, the Presbyterian Church and other Churches, provide so much education and opportunities for people across the country.

Q57 Chris White: Thank you. If I can just ask one further question, obviously, to have good schools you need to have good teaching. How is the training of these current and potential teachers getting on, in terms of your role, DFID’s role and NGOs’ role? Is it seen as a priority?

Rebecca Coleman: Yes, absolutely. It is a priority of the Ministry of Education and it is also a priority for us. At the moment, we have in-service teacher training, so training teachers while they are on the job, and we also have about 400 hours of residential training in the centres across the country. The Government of South Sudan has stressed that training is hugely important. However, I think they only have about 13 training centres across South Sudan, and they do not even cover every single state of South Sudan. There are huge limitations on the part of the Government, which is why organisations such as the ECS are working in such close collaboration with them: to ensure that teachers are trained. Just for clarification, in our training institutions, it is not just ECS teachers who are trained. We train teachers from other Churches. We also train a large proportion of Government teachers, who then go back to Government schools and work on behalf of the Government.

Canon Woodward: If I could just add to that, that shocking statistics of literacy or illiteracy, depending on how you look at it, demonstrate that education is absolutely No. 1 if Sudan is going to grow.

Chair: We have some very stark statistics about the literacy rates within Government. The majority of people working within the civil service, though it was not their fault, were probably not literate in their capacity.

Q58 Jeremy Lefroy: We have talked about reducing reliance on international NGOs to deliver basic services and moving towards Government-provided services, whether that is through local community organisations, the Church and so on. How long do you think the international NGOs are going to be needed at this level of delivering basic services?
Dr Pantuliano: I think for a long time to come. The important issue to address is the ability of NGOs to work in partnership with the Government to help the Government in the transition. We have seen in the last five to six years, and from some of the discussions that continue to permeate the aid sector in South Sudan, this emphasis on allowing the Government to take over and administer the services. Perhaps there are areas where the Government can do that—I am talking about geographical areas as well as sectoral areas—but there are many other areas, both geographically and in terms of sectoral and technical capacity, where the Government is unable to take over service delivery. Actually, pushing for this accelerated transition, if the Government does not have the capacity to take over the responsibility of delivering services, will only deprive people of the services, especially in some peripheral areas.

What we need to see are funding arrangements that allow NGOs to be more accountable in terms of the way they support the Government in the various counties in which they operate, with benchmarks put in place to see a gradual transition over the years, from the NGO delivering the services towards moving to the Government being able to provide timely and adequate services to its citizens. At the same time, there is a need to do work at the central level to ensure that the Government is able to pay the people that are supposed to deliver the services. A large part of the problem where the transition has been pushed, in terms of state schools, hospitals or health centres, is the inability of the Government to pay people in the counties in which they operate, with benchmarks put in place to see a gradual transition over the years.

Q59 Chair: We saw that first hand. Dr Pantuliano: You have to be able to eliminate these problems to see this a transition to Government delivery, where the services are protected for the citizens.

Canon Woodward: From a Church point of view, we would see the support that is there at the moment for the foreseeable future.

Q60 Jeremy Lefroy: Following on from that, with a considerable amount of the provision being done by the various Churches, do you see it as a problem in the eyes of the people of South Sudan that it is not the Government that is delivering these services, but other organisations?

Canon Woodward: I suppose there is that risk, but, if it can be demonstrated to be done in partnership—so that it is not just an NGO or not just the Church, but working with Government—that could ameliorate the problem, but it is a risk, yes.

Rebecca Coleman: This is happening on a practical level. Whenever we establish a school, from education services even to advocacy, we are always working with the Government of South Sudan. They sit in on our meetings; they are present with us in our dialogues. When it comes to forming parent-teacher associations at ground level, the county commissioner or local government official is informed. This is our methodology.

Q61 Jeremy Lefroy: Presumably that is why you are very concerned that the schools should be kept as part of the Government system or a community-Government system, rather than being seen as a separate body of schools?

Rebecca Coleman: That is right, because they were not formed in isolation; they were formed with the Government.

Q62 Chair: If you look at the history of the UK, that is precisely how our schools developed, and some of them are still funded by the state.

Dr Pantuliano: Can I add a quick thing on that? This was one of the questions that the evaluation I referred to earlier interrogated. The evaluation proved that, actually, people did not feel that service delivery by NGOs undermined Government. They often referred to the Government as ‘our baby Government’, one that needs support to become a robust and strong Government. What the evaluation proved was that, where the capacity of the NGOs to provide the services had been taken away and the Government was not able to deliver services either, this is what delegitimised the Government even more, because people felt they were worse off than during the war. They did not receive services from either the NGOs or the Government.

Q63 Chair: Perhaps just a final point: when we were in South Sudan, we were split into two groups. One group went to Lakes and one group went to Eastern Equatoria, and I think we had two different experiences. Basically in Lakes, the feeling was they saw nothing much on the ground, whereas we in Eastern Equatoria felt we saw some things that were working, whether they were clinics, schools, policing or things like that. It was not perfect, but there were things happening. Indeed, the general criticism of the international community and everybody else has been that it is all happening in Juba and, by the way, Juba is not exactly a metropolitan capital. It has not got mains electricity, water and all those kinds of things. Ultimately, you have to deliver across the country—the 10 states. To what extent do you think there is a consistent or co-ordinated approach to delivering that capacity through the state governments and the local and regional governments for it to meet you precisely at the point you have just made there? People can perceive, even if it is not as much or as fast as they want, that things are happening and there is some visible idea of a peace dividend. To what extent do either the Government of South Sudan or DFID and the international donors really work together to try to deliver this?

Dr Pantuliano: The peripheries continue to be profoundly under-served. The farther away they are, the less presence we see. There is a concentration of assistance in the Equatoria region because, it is more stable, it is more accessible and it is closer to Juba. Naturally, it is easier for organisations to operate and set up there, but there is a parallel problem, which is a policy of the Government of South Sudan, which
DFID and other donors should strongly advocate to modify. That is that the Government sees any provision or any support has to be distributed equally across the 10 states—not equitably but equally. The same amount of money that goes to Jonglei goes to Eastern Equatoria. That means that it reaches a third of the population of Jonglei. Of course, we have very unreliable population data, but we know approximately that there are a lot more people in Jonglei than in Eastern Equatoria, just to use an example of another state. Unless this policy is redressed, we will continue to see the same inability to concentrate assistance where it is needed most. Assistance has to be on the basis of need and need alone. That has to be the paramount criterion to assess what the needs are and allocate assistance in a way that is commensurate with the level of need.

Q64 Chair: We had that conversation with the President, those of us who met him, and he did acknowledge the point you make, exactly that—equal but not equitable. I do not know to what extent he was going to do something about it, but he did acknowledge that he felt that needed to be addressed.

Canon Woodward: We do have a network of 26 dioceses within South Sudan. As the Church both here and in the provincial office, we keep in very close touch with them. Pressure comes from the bishops and their people about their needs. In many ways, we are in a position here to take a good overview of constantly saying, “Where are the needs? How can we help and how can that be delivered?” While there is a risk of Juba getting the concentration, the diocesan structure does allow us to have a view of the needs across the whole country.

Rebecca Coleman: May I just add also that Dr Sara made the point about the staffing of the World Bank and maybe not wanting to live in the more uncomfortable areas of South Sudan? At least from my experience of what I have seen living there for the last two years, that is not an accusation that can be levelled at just the World Bank. There are several NGOs that are guilty of this. Even the Government of South Sudan and Members of Parliament who are supposed to be residing in their constituencies are often found in the state capital, in Juba or even in Nairobi. One of the fundamental problems is just lack of personnel on the ground and a sustained presence. What we have in the Church are people who suffer alongside the people, and see exactly what is lacking. All they can do is comment. They could not necessarily deliver or implement a very large project, which is why the network we have is so useful. In terms of constructing a school for example, we can build a school in two months. We can build a school with £40,000. That is not a lot of money to build eight classrooms, and to go from having a budget approved to having a school fully functioning, but all of that requires a maintained presence on the ground and liaising with the communities. If you do not have that presence, whether it is the World Bank, any other NGO, the Government of South Sudan or even the Church, you cannot have development that is owned by the communities and something that is sustainable. I would very much encourage you to urge DFID to encourage the Government of South Sudan to maintain their presence in the periphery, and to ensure that, if services need to be provided, they are there to supervise the provision of those services. In that way, you build credibility, communities are happy and peace dividends are finally delivered.

Q65 Chair: That is a clearly understood message. DFID is still in the process of establishing itself on the ground. They have done a lot in a short space of time, but I would want to put on record our appreciation that they are not living in entirely comfortable conditions, but they are there and they are developing. We appreciate what they are doing, but obviously there are continuing issues with reaching the whole country and giving people measurable, identifiable signs of progress to keep optimism and the enthusiasm together.

We would like to thank you very much for your honest analysis. It is a huge challenge, but it is not all bleak and bad. There are probably worse places in the world, in terms of what is going on on the ground, but not very many places that are so under-provided. We are very well aware of both the Church’s capacity and, if I can put it this way, the Church’s assessment of its capacity, which clearly is somewhat different from DFID’s assessment of the Church. There is an issue there, which I cannot say we can resolve, but we are very aware of it. I am glad that there is a role for the Church and support for DFID on reconciliation, but we appreciate that you feel there is more you could do in partnership, if you were given the chance. Indeed, the relationship between the Church in the UK and the Church in South Sudan is a positive issue too. I guess you have a foot in at least three camps, Rebecca, being based in Juba, I think you said, Ghana. Is that right? You are also from a UK base, so you are very much the triangle in all of this. Seriously, we are finding it a very fascinating study and challenge. There are people on the ground. There are huge issues. Something Hilde Johnson said in her New Year message was that, ultimately, if there are not enough people in South Sudan who want South Sudan to succeed, it will fail. That was a plea to say, “Do not just blame the international community. We are all in this together.” Your evidence has demonstrated that perspective, which was much appreciated. Thank you very much indeed. It was nice to see you all.
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Q66 Chair: First of all, thank you very much indeed for coming to give evidence on the closing stretch of our inquiry into South Sudan. Although it is not under our control, I obviously apologise that we are meeting on a slightly fraught afternoon and things are a bit delayed. I think we might try to aim to finish about 4.30 pm, if we can get there, which would probably recover some of the situation. Minister, first of all, I wonder if you could, for the record, introduce your team.

Mr O’Brien: Thank you very much indeed, Chairman. Stephen O’Brien, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State of the Department for International Development, and I am accompanied by Michael Ryder and Mark Mallalieu, who I am sure would happily introduce themselves.

Mark Mallalieu: I am Mark Mallalieu, Head of DFID, South Sudan.

Q67 Chair: If we may put on record, thanks to Mark and his staff for the arrangements they made for our visit, which were extremely well organised in not easy situations, and extremely worthwhile.

Mr O’Brien: And Michael Ryder.

Michael Ryder: UK Special Representative for Sudan and South Sudan.

Q68 Chair: Obviously since we were there in December, things have changed and maybe even deteriorated, certainly based on the news reports. I wonder perhaps at the start, Minister, if you might want to just bring us up to speed on developments that have happened in the last few weeks. We discussed in the House the issue of UNMISS and the issue of oil production, and there have been these ongoing conflicts and so forth. I wonder whether you might just want to bring us up to speed, to put the context for the rest of the afternoon.

Mr O’Brien: Thank you, Chairman, and may I place on record the appreciation that the Committee took your very helpful comments. As you indicated at oral questions in the House a few moments ago, the economic consequences of a lack of agreement are grave, and clear for all to anticipate. South Sudan is on the point of introducing an austerity budget, and when you think about where they are starting from, that really does sound like austerity, by any test. It is also likely to impose drastic reductions in capital and operational costs and funding. It may, however, seek to protect salaries and security spending, which will obviously have an effect. I know this inquiry is focusing on South Sudan, and the DFID strategy. We think the situation is fluid. I wish to be as helpful as I possibly can to the Committee. You will appreciate that I cannot actually predict many of the consequences. Equally, there are some sensitivities that I shall try not to stray into, those that could in any way impact negatively upon the ongoing negotiations and opportunity to try to bring the parties together, which you will be all too aware of.

The main thing is, as best as possible, to recognise that the challenge that we face in a very challenging environment—maintaining our development programme and the humanitarian aid element, alongside others—will clearly be phenomenally challenging if we find that South Sudan is not in a position or prepared to use what revenues it can have to support its own basic services. That would make our ability to support those even more challenging.

Q69 Chair: Just a basic question that rises out of that. If production of oil has stopped, and then very quickly that means revenue has stopped, is there...
anything the international community can or would do to provide any kind of transitional cashflow management for the Government of South Sudan? Is that even being discussed, or are they on their own?

Mr O’Brien: What is being focused on is where there would be humanitarian consequences as a result of the absence of any continuing programme funding, and that is where we will have to redeploy our current programmed effort back towards the more humanitarian side. I fully understand why you asked the question, but of course the last thing we want to do is in any way make it penalty-free to adopt such a stance, which we regard as being one that is absolutely not in the interests of the broad population of South Sudan.

Q70 Hugh Bayley: What discussions has our Government had with the Government of China, and what is the Government of China doing to try to resolve the deadlock?

Mr O’Brien: We have had a series of discussions with our contact with the Government of China in relation to South Sudan. When I was visiting Sudan, it was quite clear that there were a series of discussions with the Government of China, not least because—I think I am right in saying, from the top of my head—about 6% of China’s oil supplies come out of the shipments from Port Sudan. Clearly, now the ships are not leaving, they will already be feeling some form of impact. The discussion there is more to do with the continuing sourcing of their oil ex-Port Sudan, which of course has to come down the pipe primarily from wells in South Sudan, which are, as we speak, being or have been turned off. If that is done rapidly, there is a real danger to the infrastructure; the pipes and so forth can be damaged, and if it is not done in a measured and managed way, either there will be a great cost in putting them back into operation, or indeed they could be damaged and put out of use for good. Those are the contextual things that have a direct impact on China. The broader context of our discussions with China about the whole of this area is to do with how we are all looking for the future sources of economic growth, not least the diversification of their economic base in South Sudan. As we know, it is 98% dependent on oil revenues.

Q71 Richard Harrington: Gentlemen, being someone, like all of us around this table, who spends a lot of time when being interviewed on the radio and things like this defending everything that DFID is doing and the general international development effort, I really got the impression that South Sudan is the defining test case for the new way of doing things. We have a new country, a Government that seems to allow access to agencies, government and otherwise, at all levels. We have what seems to us like every NGO and organisation in the world. We have money being piled in. We have DFID, and congratulations to Mark for putting together 25 such bright, committed people in such a short period of time. It seems to have everything there. From my point of view, it seems the test case for the modern way of doing international development, and that the whole efforts of the Western world in this way will survive or fail on what happens in South Sudan. Would you agree with that?

Mr O’Brien: I certainly thank you for your compliment, not least to Mark and his team, and I can confirm that the staffing is now up to 30 even since you were there. That has been a tremendous resource enhancement and skill range. Whilst I fully understand where you are coming from, I would be somewhat hesitant to load the pressure on South Sudan and indeed the South Sudan development community, particularly the DFID community, by calling it the test case. I fully understand it is a new model of working, and if you like we do start with a white sheet of paper. There is no basic infrastructure, very little to build upon, the models are pretty new in many ways. However, it is also trying to make sure that we have learned all the lessons of what works from parallel, and not dissimilar, conflict and post-conflict development. You are right to identify that this is a real development opportunity, but let us not forget that the circumstances on the ground at the moment, post the referendum and post the declaration of independence back in July last year, have not moved in a direction that has made access, or the sense of confidence, any easier, either in government- or democratic-institution-building, or indeed in the attraction of investment, either external or internal. Where you have continuing conflict, it inevitably has that negative impact.

Q72 Richard Harrington: I must press you on this, because it seems to me that there will always be that kind of thing, almost by definition, in a country that we go into. Here we are, in at the beginning, with no obstacles as far as I can see. There might be isolated areas where war or conflict is happening, but in the rest of the country it seems to me, we are welcome. We are at all levels, from the top of Government down to local police stations, schools and everything like that. I really do feel that if I were to be here for years and years and on this Committee, as I hope to be—I hope to be carried out of this Committee in my box one day, because I really enjoy it—in the end the question will be asked, be it in five years or 10 years, “You have had plenty of time now. We know it is not tied aid. We the taxpayer have given you everything you could want. Why has it not worked?” I really do feel that this is the place that it will happen, and I say that with great pride as to what DFID is doing there. If I could move on—

Mr O’Brien: If I could just interject to say that I entirely would endorse that aspiration, and I share the confidence that—with this extremely challenging environment, where some of the access is perhaps not quite as open at the moment as perhaps one would wish or indeed perhaps your comments might indicate—the design we have for the programme is likely to yield the results that you are describing in that prospective medium-term period.

Q73 Richard Harrington: What would your assessment, Minister, or indeed Mark’s, be of the South Sudanese Government? Does it have the right priorities? We seem to think that there is access at all
levels. We went to visit the President—in fact with you, Mark—and we saw the Adam Smith Institute there. We saw people funded by DFID sitting in Cabinet meetings, advising at all levels. Would any of you gentlemen like to give your assessment of the South Sudanese Government?

**Mr O’Brien:** I will ask my colleagues to comment. As you know, I was in Washington for the conference that was convened just before Christmas, and in the discussions I have had there was a complete openness by the South Sudanese Government to take advice, to want to draw upon the best practice, and to recognise the importance of good governance. Given the responsibility we have as the United Kingdom within the troika of accountability, transparency and good governance, and anti-corruption, we definitely had a sense of commitment. Of course these have to be replicated by actions on the ground. However, I would say that the key here is to build good governance in a way that does not go off-track, that the milestones and the best-practice-sharing are available to them, and that they are eager to work from it. I will ask Mark perhaps if he wants to add to that.

**Mark Mallalieu:** Just one point that you are already familiar with: the defence budget is far too high. It consumes 40% of overall spending. In terms of the key policy choices that the Government has to make, reducing that defence budget and getting that money into the social sectors is absolutely key. Of course, at the moment it has just become a lot more difficult, but they need time to do that.

Q74 **Richard Harrington:** Do we press on that with the Government when we get the chance to do so?

**Mark Mallalieu:** We do, and we will continue to do so.

**Mr O’Brien:** Do you want to add anything, Michael?

**Michael Ryder:** Only one thing, if I may. There is a lot of talent in the Government in Juba, but there is very limited depth of capacity. This is a long-term issue as the SPLM transitions from being a resistance movement to a Government, and the distinctions between party, Government and state evolve in ways that they are still doing.

**Mr O’Brien:** That is a really important point: moving from the culture of being a Government comprised of people who have been fighting for 30 years for independence to a Government that is now there on behalf of the people it represents, democratically accountable. Replicated on our side of that equation is, in my opinion, the good, close working between the Defence Force and UNMISS.

Q75 **Chair:** We will come onto the relationship between the Defence Force and UNMISS.

**Mr O’Brien:** Yes.

Q77 **Hugh Bayley:** The Committee went to South Sudan perhaps five or five and a half years ago, just after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed. You see a huge difference on the ground over that period of time. What do you think the key achievements were of the DFID sub-office, when it was a sub-office, during the transition period, and how satisfied are you, Minister, with the performance of the DFID office in the six months that it has been an office in its own right, since independence?

**Mr O’Brien:** I can certainly speak perhaps a little bit more confidently about what has happened over recent months, and I think that in many ways Mr Harrington has already identified that there is much to be applauded for the way that in some of the most difficult contextual conditions, a functioning, well-collaborating office has been able to staff up and attract people of sufficient calibre, commitment and skill, in a complementary team, to be able to deliver on the programme. The office, by the way, now has a roof on top of it, which was not the case when you visited.

The challenge for us, as a significant donor and with the commitment we have for the future of South Sudan and its people, is that the current levels of internal violence and cross-border conflict is seriously threatening to, at the very best, delay the programme. This is to do with our capacity to deliver the programme given that it is not simply to try to resist and deflect some of the negative aspects of the conflict that is continuing and very disappointing, given that the early part of your question was what achievements were signed. You see a huge difference on the ground over after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed. I too—in a different capacity, when I was chairing a charity called the Malaria Consortium—visited when there were only 10 metres metalled road in Juba, and went to Rumbek and Wau and Aweil, and out to Aroyo. I tried to see quite a lot of it. I was really struck by how the first thing to do, where I think the DFID office was doing a good job, was, with such a dispersed population—mainly because the conflict had made people scatter to the four winds for their own safety—and with the challenging conditions of so much of the land being under 10 inches of water for so much of the season, DFID had found ways to get delivery and start building distribution centres for basic services, and to get that set of points enabling contact with communities, as well as the political context in supporting what was in the end a successful
refrigeration. That was very much to do with the international community supporting that in the right way.

Q78 Hugh Bayley: This, I think, is the first office that is a joint FCO-DFID office, using a DFID platform. Do you think it is working well?

Mr O’Brien: Yes.

Q79 Hugh Bayley: And do you think it is a model that should be adopted in other developing countries?

Mr O’Brien: What is interesting, particularly as I focus on sub-Saharan Africa, is that very often the sense of presence within a developing country is through programmes. There are very important representational, political, strategic and security issues that are quite properly the remit of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. You are right that an increasing ability to find the joint ways of working, the collaborative nature and the skill sharing, is something that for each country has to be looked at in a tailored way, particularly where we sometimes do not have representation. Recently I deliberately went to countries where we do not have a DFID bilateral programme to see our multilateral effort, so I went to Senegal and Mali. It was interesting there to re-emphasise how important it was for our FCO representatives in those countries to be fully briefed and fully aware of the intense help that the British people, through their taxes and through the Department for International Development and their support for multilaterals, were exercising in those countries as well. It is horses for courses: a tailored situation in each country, and we have to look at it in a calibrated way, but yes, you are looking at something of a model that can be applied elsewhere—by no means universally, but certainly where there are similar circumstances, and very often where conflict or fragility is predominant.

Q80 Pauline Latham: I am reassured by what you said, because it has been suggested to me that maybe this closer working together might be a weakening, and less effective from DFID’s point of view, and that we might be—not dumbing down—not putting so much emphasis on DFID. I think, from what you said, you are saying that is not the case.

Mr O’Brien: I see it almost the opposite way around.

Q81 Pauline Latham: That is good news. Thank you.

Mr O’Brien: I do not think you should discount either—and I am sure you do not—that this is not just DFID and FCO. In certain West African countries there are extremely good liaisons with SOCA, for instance, and others, such as DECC, where we have significant interests with some of the climate change issues. There is now a much better approach to thinking about what the resources are, and what the front-facing of HMG is vis-à-vis our relationship in a particular area. This also applies not just country-by-country, but increasingly, and very important, I think, for sub-Saharan Africa—we know it in many other parts of the world—as we think about

the regional issues. These are not just to do with politics, security and trade. They are also to do with internal regional economic integration, which will often be one of the great spurs for economic growth, particularly in the landlocked countries.

Q82 Chair: I will just put on record that Alastair McPhail, the Ambassador, spent a lot of time with the Committee. I think we saw the dynamic in action. He, by the way, is not working in comfortable conditions. Anybody who thinks it is a cushy number being an Ambassador in a place like that should perhaps go and have a look at the hotel room he is operating out of. I think he still is, isn’t he?

Mr O’Brien: I have a funny feeling it may be the hotel room that I was put up in, because the Consul, I think, had shared the room. Mr McPhail, the Ambassador in a place like that should perhaps go and have a look at the hotel room he is operating out of. I think he still is, isn’t he?

Mr O’Brien: I have a funny feeling it may be the hotel room that I was put up in, because the Consul, I think, had shared the room. Mr McPhail, the Ambassador in a place like that should perhaps go and have a look at the hotel room he is operating out of. I think he still is, isn’t he?

Chair: That is appreciated.

Q83 Pauline Latham: I will ask my proper question now. South Sudan obviously faces lots of challenges, and your operational plan sets out targets related to health, education, governance, girls and women. What do you think will be the Department’s most pressing priority to achieve in the next three years?

Mr O’Brien: As you know from everything else we are seeking to do, it is to secure results. It has taken a little longer, perhaps, to set up some things than we had anticipated, and we have had throughout very ambitious plans. I think that strengthening the sense of security that comes from having good governance, and therefore access to justice, and the ability for the South Sudanese people to feel confident in their country and their future, will have an enormous impact upon woman—girls as well, but particularly women—and their access to justice. I know that our determination to support girls into, and retain them in, school beyond primary is absolutely a key issue for us. Equally, ensuring that women have improved access to justice; we are hoping that our aid will directly lead to 250,000 women having that sort of access.

Of course, improving health and education is a priority, when you look at the burden of disease in South Sudan. I am not just talking about what I have recently been engaged with, which is the neglected tropical diseases, where South Sudan is currently the nursery of every neglected tropical disease, but even the big diseases such as malaria are still very seriously unaddressed. Maternal mortality in South Sudan is, as we know, the worst in the world on the data that we have.

Supporting 250,000 children through primary school, helping to print and distribute 12 million textbooks, where I believe there is only one printing press in South Sudan as we speak, on the data I have been given, enabling 37,000 women to deliver in a facility with a skilled birth attendant: these are the genuine results that we have planned and that we believe we have a real opportunity to get to. They are stretching and ambitious. The context is ever more challenging. You have heard from Mark that it is proving more
chalenging than the plan. However, we are there with real determination to get there. This is a bit fine-grained, but it does mean looking at food security, where we can secure jobs, and wealth creation—not least because, as the Chairman pointed out in his opening question, if we do not achieve diversification of the economic base, there will be a real risk that it is always, "Bet on oil." On the current knowledge, those oil assets will deplete over the coming decade, which in itself, for instance, will beg the question of whether the pipeline proposal down to Kenya makes any kind of economic sense.

Q84 Pauline Latham: You have decided to cease funding water and sanitation projects after this December. How would you respond to the suggestion that there is a potential vacuum? I will give you an example: we split in two, but I was part of the group that went to Rumbek and saw a returnee camp, where the women were distraught because they had no sanitation whatsoever at this camp. There were 2,000 people. It is within a town, and yet there is no toilet, no latrine of any description. They said that there were hyenas circling round at night, so they cannot let their children go very far away. The one thing in life is you cannot stop people going to the loo. If 2,000 people are using that ground every single day—and there will be more when more returnees come—how can you justify not funding water and sanitation? That will not be the only example. It is just one example.

Mr O'Brien: You are quite right that water and sanitation are absolutely critical, as you would expect, and there is no way that DFID can do everything, nor should it try. On the water and sanitation, there has already been significant achievement on the contributions we have made so far. We are very pleased to see how much has been achieved through some of the multilateral agencies so far on some of the water and sanitation, not least in Juba, which I am sure you are aware of. A lot of that will be continued under the humanitarian funding element of what we do. Equally, however, where others are prepared to step up and burden-share, it is vital that, if that is where the interest is shown, we do not in any way become precious about what we hold on to. I am particularly pleased that the German interests are stepping up to a lot of the water and sanitation programming. That itself is very important. I do not know, Mark, whether you want to amplify any of that?

Mark Mallalieu: That is right. Through the humanitarian programme, we will be a significant donor to water and sanitation activities. We are expecting other donors to step up to the plate, and clearly we cannot do everything. The Germans, certainly, may well be a significant donor in future.

Q85 Pauline Latham: That is encouraging. However, you said that some of it would be spent through the humanitarian spending, but your plan says that you are anticipating a reduction over the next three years, and an increase in development spending, which will not then go on water and sanitation. How likely do you think it is, given recent developments, that this will happen, and that the balance will tip?

Mr O'Brien: I would be clearly giving you a false steer if I thought I knew the answer to that. I can only take the facts as I find them reported to me on the ground, when I go and see with my own eyes, as the Committee has already done, and when I receive the reports from Mark and the team out there in Juba as to what the feeling is about the progress towards establishing this functioning, democratically governed state by a group of—as Michael Ryder has said—talented people, albeit without the strength in depth and therefore the capacity that you would hope could be in place, as they transit from being effectively an independence campaigning, quasi-military movement, and sometimes a very explicitly military movement, to what we hope will be a peace-loving, peace-building, democratically accountable government. That transition is something that, at the point of independence last year, we were optimistic—although not over-optimistic—could happen quite fast, because we had been given a sense of confidence by the way the referendum and so forth had gone. Now there is a series of facts that are challenging us even more. It is quite possible that the progress from humanitarian to development is a trajectory; whilst that has to be the right trajectory, because in many ways that is the acid test that Mr Harrington was very keen to emphasise, and with which I agreed, it may well be delayed. As we speak, that is what we have to plan for, even if we should not lose our aspiration that we can go at the pace we originally planned. Quite a lot needs to fall into place rather quickly in order for us to keep to that original plan and not to allow ourselves to recognise the recalibration necessary.

Q86 Jeremy Lefroy: Just a quick one on the current year’s spending, which apparently is likely to come out at about £74 million, as opposed to the budgeted £91 million. Given that one of the major criticisms of the trust fund managed by the World Bank was that they were incapable of spending properly the resources they were allocated, could you perhaps give us an indication as to why we have come up about 20% under what was forecast for this year?

Mr O’Brien: I fully understand the impact of the question. Perhaps not surprisingly, it has been even more challenging—in the establishment of what I think is recognised in the circumstances to be a high-functioning team in Juba, now that we have the full complement of people, or thereabouts—attracting them in the right way that will enable them to give their commitment and their time, and can deliver their security and our duty of care. That has meant there has been a drag throughout the financial period, and whilst of course the financial period is important—it is an accountable budgetary marker—nonetheless it is arbitrary compared with what it takes to become established. You are right, we expect the 2011–2012 financial year to come out at about £74 million, but we are now confidently on track to be spending £90 million and plus over the coming three years, the remaining part of the four-year spending review period. Mark, I do not know whether you want to say anything more. I think it is purely the timeline of getting things in place. It is not in any sense a
deliberate drag. It was just to become established in a very difficult context.

Q87 Jeremy Lefroy: Is there one particular programme that might be affecting this?
Mr O’Brien: I think it is more the start time of all of them. One could not really flick a switch. It had to be wired in, and it took time.

Q88 Chair: We will turn to education. The new Government have declared that the official language of the country is English. They have an ambitious education programme, but, as we understand it, they are still arguing about what the curriculum will be. DFID is committed to delivering 12.5 million textbooks at a cost of £11 million. First of all, are these in English, or are they in local language, or a mixture, and is that part of the reason why DFID is doing it? Given the curriculum is not settled, is this the right priority now, laudable though it is?
Mr O’Brien: I am grateful for the question, because in many ways I know there have been some questions raised on this. First of all, I can confirm that the textbooks are in English, and it is therefore yet another reason why our commitment and our connection are so important.

Secondly, on the question of whether supplying textbooks is the best way forward: apart from the fact that however much the curriculum, quite understandably and rightly, is being reviewed by the Ministry of Education and by the Government of South Sudan, it will take time for them to go through that review. Second, as I have explained earlier, there is a phenomenally restricted capacity to print textbooks or to procure them in South Sudan. Even if there were to be a dramatic shift, which we do not anticipate, that would be difficult in itself. Equally, on the question of textbooks, I was interested in checking the evidence before this Committee hearing to see that it is Eric Hanushek, the world-leading expert on the economic return to education investment, who has established that the availability of textbooks is the single most positive factor in increasing learning outcomes for children.

DFID’s own research project on education quality in a number of sub-Saharan countries found that the impact of textbooks is greatest in the poorest countries, where teacher quality may be low, and where facilities and resources are scarce and generally of poor quality. I do not want to go too far outside South Sudan, but I think in particular, Chairman, you will be aware that this has been one of the most successful aspects of our programme in Zimbabwe, where equally the conditions, and being able to get access, has been signally successful. We are building on the back of that best practice and track record.

Q89 Chair: What is the timing, given that they are still working on the curriculum? Presumably you cannot start printing the books until you have some sort of agreement. Do you have a timescale—
Mark Mallalieu: It has been agreed.
Mr O’Brien: The curriculum has been agreed, has it?

Q90 Chair: It has now been agreed. Is this something that you can start doing? Where will they be printed? Uganda, or somewhere like that?
Mark Mallalieu: It is being done on a competitive basis, so we cannot be sure, but in the region, in Southern Africa.

Q91 Chair: As you know, we have had considerable contact with the Church, and we met Archbishop Deng here and there, and they also gave evidence to us here, as well as the meeting we had there. I think it would be fair to say that the Church feels a bit hurt, rightly or wrongly, that they feel that they have a capacity particularly to build schools very competitively, and for reasons that I think were explained to us, DFID does not feel able to use the Church as a major partner, even though they maintain that they are cheaper than either NGOs or others. They also maintain that they have good local connections, in terms of community engagement; we will talk about other aspects of the Church in a minute. Are you in a position to say, first of all, why you do not feel you can use the Church, and whether or not that might change? In other words, might dialogue with the Church lead to a situation where they can do more? They feel very strongly that they are a natural partner, and clearly, at the moment, DFID does not agree.

Mr O’Brien: You have indicated we might come on to the broader engagement in a moment, but let me say—
Chair: Specifically on the school topic—
Mr O’Brien: On the schools issue, in the context of this very wide reach that the Church has, this has been looked at very carefully. As you rightly observe, DFID is very much looking at the opportunity to support education, with 30 primary and four secondary schools, and particularly designing programmes to reduce barriers to girls attending and staying at school, to which I would add how important it is to build latrines so that girls feel there is sufficient privacy to stay on.

Q92 Chair: We saw that happening in the schools we visited.
Mr O’Brien: It is absolutely vital. It is often a bit of evidence that is overlooked, but it seems to me to be one of the great keys to retention of girls at school at a critical period when they will then have the health and choice about parenting and birth spacing and so forth. I want to pay tribute to the Church. What they have done throughout the whole peace-building and community-building process has been of enormous significance, and they play a very important role, as you rightly say, in schools.

DFID has engaged the United Nations to build the schools, given the scale of the project and the need for rapid completion, on time and with value for money. There is no question but that we would expect to see the Church playing a very critical role in the future in education work, not least on the girls’ education programme, and very much as a complement to that. In terms of the actual decision making, in addition to our commitment to work in partnership with the Church on education issues in
South Sudan, that scale of project, and the organisation needed for engineering, procurement and logistical ability, at that scale and to comply with our DFID regulations and all the checks and accountabilities that above all you as a Committee would expect to see us put in place, we are looking at building over 200 classrooms in about 25 schools in one year. That compares to what the ECS has constructed: about 90 classrooms in 22 schools over five years. There was a programmatic comparison that did not quite reach the sense of scale and urgency that was required. In terms of the cost, which was one of the points you mentioned, I think it is fair to say that it is pretty much there and thereabouts between the two of them. I think the ECS costs about US $620 per square metre, and the costs that we are looking at are about $629, so they are very much in the same magnitude. The issue was scale, deliverability, conformity with the necessary procedures that DFID has to impose, quite rightly, and making sure that we can get the overall value for money. That was the reason. However, we are not unsympathetic.

Q93 Chair: I understand. The final question on that would be: “Fine, but does the UNICEF/UNOPS approach involve capacity building?” The whole point we come across is that there is virtually no internal capacity. The Church is part of the capacity that does exist, and strengthening that, and/or building other complementary capacities, seems to be important. Will the United Nations effort have a legacy? Or will they simply build the schools and deliver the programme, but not actually transform the capacity?

Mr O’Brien: I think that putting this infrastructure, primarily, in place absolutely does require that partnership and complementary working, and the expectation is that that will be very much hand-in-hand with so much of what the Church has already demonstrated as a track record on this. That will be subject to going through the local contractors process, and ensuring that that is tailored. I do not know whether we will come on to this, but this is all via the Government of South Sudan, centrally, and as donors internationally we are doing our best to coordinate—it is all quite central. It links to how much we can achieve some form of devolution of Government into state-by-state working, and how much that carries the education burden with it. That then becomes the opportunity, because it knows how to fashion the local contracting.

Chair: We will come on to that.

Q94 Jeremy Lefroy: Just following up very briefly on that, Minister, one thing that a number of us saw was the very high cost of construction and infrastructure, particularly buildings. We wondered whether there are any plans in progress to see the manufacture of cement in South Sudan. That seems to me something that is pushing costs of construction, whether for schools or health facilities, sky-high compared with other parts, because it all has to be imported, and it is obviously extremely heavy.

Mr O’Brien: I do not have a brief on that, so I will pass that to Mark, but I fully understand the economics of that, having a background in precisely that industry before I was a politician. One of the great lead indicators to any form of basic infrastructure and competitive positions in a growing economy is whether you have the capacity to have access to cement at a relatively competitive price, and whether that is being used both in the private sector and for public sector projects.

Q95 Jeremy Lefroy: Given that CDC used to be quite heavily involved in that industry, certainly in Tanzania if not elsewhere, perhaps that might be put in their direction, if it has not already?

Mr O’Brien: That is an extremely helpful and important point, as I hope I indicated in the House earlier in oral questions. The completely and radically revamped CDC is now in a position to re-examine its role to be the patient capital investor, particularly where we can have these strategic opportunities. It will not be appropriate in all settings. Of course it will be harder in areas of great fragility or even conflict, but there are very good examples of what has worked in the past. Clearly that has to be tailored to the modern circumstances and technologies, but it therefore roots that capacity in-country, which can help underpin the economic base. Maybe, Mark, you would want to give an update on where things are?

Mark Mallalieu: Anecdotally, we have heard repeatedly that there is a firm interested in establishing a cement factory in the Eastern Equatoria state, but I do not have firm information that I can give you.

Mr O’Brien: It goes to a slightly wider question, which I appreciate is not for today. I am very conscious that in the past, whether it was CDC or others, it would very often be the interest that we, as a traditional country investor, might have. There are now, from the emerging powers, very significant interests. There is a whole new model yet to be examined—I do not even have an example that I could give you—of where we need to look carefully at how much the capacity needs to be put in the hands of the commissioning Government, by the Government of South Sudan, to say, “That is what we need. It is very good of all these countries to show interest, both the private sector and as donors, but the specification and the quality of what we need is as follows, located strategically in this way.” Then perhaps there would be more of a consortium approach instead of a selection of who does it one by one by one, so that you can achieve the highest quality to supply against a spec, and put a little bit more of the purchasing power into the hands of the commissioning Government. That could be a useful way forward, and CDC could well play a role in that.

Q96 Jeremy Lefroy: Returning to health again, you mentioned earlier the very, very welcome news about neglected—or, as you said, perhaps not so neglected in the future—tropical diseases. Given, as you rightly said, that Sudan is probably the home to more of these than most, if not all, other countries, how significant do you expect the UK’s investment in NTDs to be for Sudan? Given that the timeline can be very short with NTDs, what real outcomes do you expect us to see in the next three or four years in Sudan, in respect of guinea worm, for instance, or other NTDs?
Mr O’Brien: You are more aware than almost anybody else of the announcements on neglected tropical diseases over the last few days, which of course are very important and of enormous impact. Those initiatives potentially have the most phenomenal value for money for the British people, as UK taxpayers, to be part of supporting. The focus has to be upon the burden of disease, where these diseases exist. You are quite right: South Sudan is probably where all of them exist, and in the most intractable way. There is enormous hope now, because it is a question of resource. Our priorities at the moment are through the health pooled fund; I do not know whether you want to come on to that as well. That would provide the population of six out of 10 so you will get somewhere. They are all in South Sudan, so patenty it must mean that it would be appropriate, at the right time, when the right ability to deliver on the ground is in place, then we of course will have South Sudan very strongly in our minds.

Q97 Jeremy Lefroy: Does that mean that the funding you have announced for NTDs, should some of that be in South Sudan, would be in addition to the £82 million over four to five years that has already been announced for the health pooled fund from DFID?

Mr O’Brien: That is absolutely correct. The whole point about the NTD programme is that it is an additional fund, which will be deployed and allocated according to where we will achieve the greatest impact.

Q98 Jeremy Lefroy: Would you accept that given the importance of the health pooled fund in South Sudan, and DFID’s leadership and participation in that, the success of our programme South Sudan will be quite considerably judged by the success of that particular programme?

Mr O’Brien: I have no doubt it will very much be exactly as you describe, because we are already building on quite a track record of achievement, and I am equally hopeful that South Sudan, as I have seen for myself, will continue to be an attractive destination for those who perhaps under the International Health Partnership scheme will be keen to devote some time in their volunteering capacity to bring skills to bear, just as I met a number from St Mary’s Hospital on the east coast of Kenya, at the KEMRI research institute. It was very interesting when I was recently in Kilifi, that we have a number of countries in which we are operating. There is a lot of best practice. It is something that the still relatively new team of Ministers at DFID are very focused on; how, given the fact that we can manage a lot of our DFID affairs bilaterally, even though we go through the multilaterals in other ways, we achieve more cross-fertilisation of the best practice, and sharing of the experience that really is showing what works. A lot of this now is moving, in addition to some of the scientific evidence, to some of the social sciences evidence and research that needs to help us achieve behavioural change, what motivates and incentivises these behavioural changes on which these programmes are absolutely dependent in order to be successful in delivering.

It was very interesting when I was recently in Kilifi, on the east coast of Kenya, at the KEMRI research institute. I deliberately challenged them on these assumptions. There is a recognition now that we do need to address some of these cultural barriers. For instance, if I can take an example, and something that I am strongly advocating, perhaps a subject that is difficult, and that people have kept under wraps for too long, of female genital mutilation, which is far too rife across many communities here is to get the community leaders to recognise that this is no longer a sense of “Are you a belonger?” to a community. That is often a male who is in charge. Actually, however, it is persuading the grandmother, the aunt, and the mother that the girl will not, as it were, arrive into society in the appropriate way. One is because it is very clear that it is not the men who are demanding this. This is to do with often the sense of cultural tradition, where women do not want to not do it. It is finding the keys that unlock behaviour change, rather than simply saying, “We have the technology and the treatments and the ability to have access to a hospital,” because there will not be that access if they do not feel that there is a need. It is achieving that sense of behaviour, so that girls are not then perpetuating a continuing problem. You are absolutely right to identify this, and I am using an example we know about. In many ways, part of what we have to understand and learn in Sudan, and part of what Mark and his team are absolutely

Q99 Pauline Latham: Quite rightly, improving equality for girls and women features prominently in your programme in South Sudan, yet we heard on the visit that many current problems stem from the long-held cultural traditions and practices, particularly in rural areas. How much difference do you see that DFID and the international community can make in the area, in the forthcoming years?

Mr O’Brien: That is a very acute analysis of what is an underlying challenge for us. We do not have any choice but to address this. We must tackle it, because a 15-year-old girl in South Sudan is more likely to die in childbirth than finish primary school. We know it has the highest maternal mortality rates in the world, estimated at about 2,054 per 100,000. Our support for the health system is absolutely vital. I have mentioned the 37,000 women results that we want to achieve in terms of delivering with a skilled birth attendant, and we have also covered the plan to support girls’ education, if you like. The key here is to recognise that there are these many cultural barriers. South Sudan, of course, is not unique in this. We have a number of countries in which we are operating. There is a lot of best practice. It is something that the still relatively new team of Ministers at DFID are very focused on; how, given the fact that we can manage a lot of our DFID affairs bilaterally, even though we go through the multilaterals in other ways, we achieve more cross-fertilisation of the best practice, and sharing of the experience that really is showing what works. A lot of this now is moving, in addition to some of the scientific evidence, to some of the social sciences evidence and research that needs to help us achieve behavioural change, what motivates and incentivises these behavioural changes on which these programmes are absolutely dependent in order to be successful in delivering.

It was very interesting when I was recently in Kilifi, on the east coast of Kenya, at the KEMRI research institute. I deliberately challenged them on these assumptions. There is a recognition now that we do need to address some of these cultural barriers. For instance, if I can take an example, and something that I am strongly advocating, perhaps a subject that is difficult, and that people have kept under wraps for too long, of female genital mutilation, which is far too rife across many communities here is to get the community leaders to recognise that this is no longer a sense of “Are you a belonger?” to a community. That is often a male who is in charge. Actually, however, it is persuading the grandmother, the aunt, and the mother that the girl will not, as it were, arrive into society in the appropriate way. One is because it is very clear that it is not the men who are demanding this. This is to do with often the sense of cultural tradition, where women do not want to not do it. It is finding the keys that unlock behaviour change, rather than simply saying, “We have the technology and the treatments and the ability to have access to a hospital,” because there will not be that access if they do not feel that there is a need. It is achieving that sense of behaviour, so that girls are not then perpetuating a continuing problem. You are absolutely right to identify this, and I am using an example we know about. In many ways, part of what we have to understand and learn in Sudan, and part of what Mark and his team are absolutely
having to be experts in as part of growing the capacity of our office, is, “What will be those behavioural change barriers to us delivering on these ambitious programmes, which otherwise look too linear?” These are the greater uncertainties that do not really belong to an X and Y axis. It is to do with human decision making.

Q100 Pauline Latham: We visited the Nike Hub at DFID earlier this week. Do you see that there is a role for them in South Sudan, whilst we are going in very early, and hopefully changing things and doing things so that people are more likely to be open, because they are rather at sea, the ordinary person in South Sudan, because they can see there will be change happening, but they are not sure what. Do you think there would be a role there for the Nike Hub?

Mr O’Brien: You have raised a very interesting issue, and I will ask Mark to comment. I think there is some room for encouragement; the work the Nike Hub is doing is outstanding and I am delighted you have taken the time and trouble to go and see it for yourselves. It is clear to me that as that is making huge progress in Ethiopia, geographically that is quite proximate, and there is an opportunity for the cross-fertilisation of where the merit and benefit is of designing programmes. A lot of this is, “How do you design into your programme things that otherwise we have rather latterly just had as bolt-ons, or add-ons?” If it is part of the design, you cannot actually access all the other benefits that come with the programme unless you are in part of the way that the Girl Hub would anticipate and suggest. Do you want to add, Mark?

Mark Mallalieu: I think it would be great if the Girl Hub were involved in South Sudan. As you saw, one of the key challenges is simply that the population is so dispersed. What we need to do through our girls’ education programme is to reach as many of those girls as possible, with other interventions as well, including the Girl Hub; we would hope that they would not be in any way elitist or focussed on an easy urban centre. We would like to be out there reaching the people who are most in need.

Mr O’Brien: There is an opportunity, particularly in South Sudan: the evidence I have been seeing coming through is that on the education side for girls, there is quite a yearning to see whether there can be more boarding schools for girls. Putting to one side what people may think about that, it is partly a security thing: the parents feel the girls are very secure in that environment. Of course, if you are in a boarding environment, you have even greater opportunity to give girls this chance to see what a different model of independence and inner confidence and physical freedom to make their own choices can be like. There will be role models they can aspire to, which is more difficult when, in a community setting, you have all the old cultures and traditions crowding in to suffocate those potential new areas of freedom.

Q101 Pauline Latham: It is interesting, because I think the young teenagers and the mothers I spoke to whilst I was there in two different groups, are very keen that they have professions, and that they do not get married early. They said to me themselves that they did not want to get married early. They wanted an education, and they wanted a profession. I think there is an opportunity here that we must not miss, before everybody sinks back into, “This is how it really is.” We must try to take that. On another point, we were told in Juba that DFID had not decided yet exactly how to meet its target to improve access to justice for 250,000 women. Could you give us an update on how we are doing so that?

Mr O’Brien: I will ask Mark to answer that, because I think he is due to send a submission to me quite soon.

Mark Mallalieu: At the moment, we are looking at a number of options, but I think the front-running option will be to work through a very competent and experienced non-Government organisation that is already doing the work that could extend what you are doing a year’s worth of action research, delivering access to justice, both through the traditional system but also looking at how to make more use of and develop the formal system. We have some reasonably well-developed ideas, but we have not yet finalised a programme.
Q103 Chair: That is helpful. We did not pursue it; we just asked the question and heard the answer. That is a very helpful point, and maybe we need to ask the questions in a different way.

Mr O'Brien: Anything you would like to add?

Mark Mallalieu: There is a regionally funded DFID programme that includes South Sudan that has just started under which Marie Stopes are providing family-planning services in a relatively small part of South Sudan, but it is a start. The unmet demand for family planning is 1%, because the demand itself is so low. A huge amount of attitudinal change is required, particularly among men, who appear to be the main barrier, not allowing women to get family planning. This is a huge task and will take many years.

Mr O'Brien: As we discovered in Senegal the other day, when we were over there for the big conference that at last was taking place on these areas, this is why injectables and implants are so important, because very often that means women can access those without necessarily having to discuss it with men. This is part of the barrier breakdown we need to get through.

Q104 Chris White: One thing that struck us all when we were out there was the role of NGOs. Certainly visiting schools was a particular example, where the school was asking us, or DFID, or the Select Committee, or NGOs, to build a fence around the school. There was no real consideration that the Government, whether at the local level or the national level, had a role, or that that would be the first port of call. My question would be: how satisfied are you that the South Sudanese Government, rather than NGOs and the international community, is able to be seen to deliver for its people?

Mr O'Brien: You ask a very important question, because there are a raft of NGOs, both large and small, who are doing absolutely brilliant work and on whom we absolutely rely as being part of the delivery mechanism of getting development done on the ground. There are contracts and there are ways of that being accessed. Equally, however, and particularly if we are talking about the transition into a functioning democratically accountable government, it is vital that as much is done in partnership with and in support of the Government of South Sudan’s programmes for public service delivery as possible.

This is not least because it is important for the South Sudanese people to see that it is their Government delivering these basic services for them, so that, come the next elections, there is an accountability for whether the promises that were made were delivered. At the moment there will be, we know, because of the austerity budget, because of the contraction of oil revenues. Where will that lead in terms of any kind of democratic accountability? I do not think that we can answer that question now, but it does matter that there is a connection between a democratic Government and the services being delivered. Therefore, rather than getting into an either/or, I think this is a question of making sure that there are sufficient policies, and that Government plans and strategic plans are in place, that they are published, that we understand and interlocute with those Ministers to make sure that we as donors, coordinated as best we can, are sharing the burden of supporting those programmes. Very often, given the lack of depth of capacity of the Government of South Sudan, their delivery agents will be some of the NGOs, and there will be proxy and direct contracts, accordingly. It is both, but it would be counterproductive, as it were, to go down one route, i.e. the NGOs or the Government of Sudan. It has to be a blend.

Q105 Chris White: I accept the idea that it cannot be either/or, certainly at this stage in the country’s development, but there needs to be at least some vision of a strategy for a shift from the role that is being given to the NGOs to the Government. We have spoken to a number of NGOs: is the urgency there for them to be looking at an exit strategy, or at least to be able to have something in place that by such-and-such a time, such-and-such a milestone should be met? Certainly one of my first impressions in visiting the country was to see what looked very much like a patchwork quilt of NGOs, one doing one here, one doing another. My view is that there should be some idea of best practice. One NGO should be better at delivering education or health than another. It did seem that a patch of land was given to one NGO, and another patch of land was given to another NGO to do pretty much identical work. I suppose the short question is: do you think there are too many NGOs?

Mr O'Brien: The straight answer to that is that the needs and challenges of South Sudan mean that, to put it most crudely, the market is big enough for all of them. The question is whether there is adequate coordination and sufficient efficiency that will ensure that, however valuable some of the very innovative aspects of some of the smaller ones are, the cost/benefit ratio is not in danger of being insufficiently efficient in the use of public money, which is often the programme money source.

However, I think you make a very important point about the trajectory. All of these programmes—and this is when we say that we hope to see the humanitarian-towards-development type of shift. Of course, the more you go down the development route, so also—although we are talking such early days in South Sudan; this is not where we are for instance, in Ghana—there comes a point on that development strategy where you have to have a realistic and prospective ability to say, “We are aiming to graduate from aid.” That often means making sure that the legacy of the programmes is always building and strengthening the delivery system, whether in health, or education, good governance or anti-corruption. These are the legacies. It goes back to Mr Harrington’s point in the early part of our session: how are we building our optimism that this is all on a journey that takes us to a point where we have delivered a developed position now?
Q106 Richard Harrington: Leading on from that, Minister, we were taught, when this Government came into power, that everything would shift towards measuring outcomes. Of course it is very good, because it is something that non-experts can understand in measuring things, but to what extent does DFID have a long-term exit strategy? What will trigger that? Is it just what we will do in the next couple of years? Is there a five-year plan or a 10-year plan? It is a bit Stalinist, I know, but in terms of what DFID believes the conditions will be, will it be measured in the number of schools and hospitals, etc? Will it be measured in GDP? Is there a long-term strategy for DFID in a country like South Sudan to say, “When that is achieved, that is it, and we are moving on somewhere else?”

Mr O’Brien: There is a strategic approach. I would be very reluctant to put a timeline on it, because that is something I know I cannot deliver, because there are so many other variable factors, and we can see them happening before our eyes at the moment, which can come to impact on that. The strategic approach, however, is quite clear. In many ways you already have the testament of that through the whole of the BAR process that we went through, where we reduced, from 43 to 27, the countries of our bilateral footprint. A country like Angola, where the per capita income had reached a point where it is lower middle income, and of course, even if it is appropriate for us at that point to have graduated our relationship, and that we are no longer a donor to Angola, other than a legacy contract on some mine clearance, it is absolutely vital to recognise that as you come out, it is not as though everybody in Angola is now suddenly no longer poor. There are still many poor people in Angola. It has become a point, if you like, the trigger point: at what point is a country developing sufficient of its own resources, has the prospect of being able to sustain that, that will then put it under pressure under democratic accountability to deliver those basic services for its own people, and to be able to take care of its own financing. At this stage in South Sudan, where 98% of government oil deposits are beneficiaries of oil-sharing agreements and the country cannot work if it does not have resources. In a sense, it is the same context as the previous question: without peace, without an absence of conflict, a lot of these discussions become political theory rather than the ability for us to deliver. If DFID is about anything, it is about how you find the will and the resource to deliver these results on the ground. We are not at that stage with this yet.

Q107 Richard Harrington: So there could be a strategic approach, but not yet?

Mr O’Brien: It is at the very foothills of a strategy.

Q108 Richard Harrington: I think that is a perfectly rational thing to say.

Mr O’Brien: I think to aspire to putting a date line on it could be to overspeak, to coin a phrase.

Q109 Richard Harrington: It would be measured in terms of the Government’s ability to sustain itself and the country?

Mr O’Brien: Because, as the Department, we have made a ministerial decision, which has been endorsed by the National Security Council, that we want to put 30% of our development effort, the ODA spend, into conflict-affected and fragile states, of course that makes it more difficult to deliver, but it does show that that strategic approach applies even to where it is most difficult to deliver, but where the development need is most. It is strategic.

Q110 Chris White: To take this a little bit further, perhaps this is just after the foothills at the bottom of the strategy. Do you think the state governments should receive more funding from the national budget?

Mr O’Brien: You mean each individual state? This is where we find there is not much strength in depth at the moment. I think I might ask Michael for his observations on this, as well as Mark, if he has anything to add. There is no question but that we would like to see an increased amount of state capacity, because it is very important to ensure effective service delivery that that is increasingly put in place.

Had we not been faced with the current oil crisis, then that would be a discussion we could be having now. At the moment, because of the sharp reduction in revenues that we can see is happening, it is a discussion that will have to wait until that point has been resolved. In a sense, it is the same context as the previous question: without peace, without an absence of conflict, a lot of these discussions become political theory rather than the ability for us to deliver. If DFID is about anything, it is about how you find the will and the resource to deliver these results on the ground. We are not at that stage with this yet.

Q111 Chris White: I apologise if I am barking up the same tree, but would you consider your intention would be to build capacity into the state and county governments?

Mr O’Brien: As I say, I will perhaps bring in Michael and Mark, but I can certainly confirm that, for example, programmes as we currently have them designed, even if we had to delay, and we find that this humanitarian-to-development trajectory is slowed, the programmes currently contain training of state school inspectors, and the provision of two to three technical advisors for each of the six states where the health pooled fund will work. We will also help with some capacity-building work through the UNDP. Michael, do you want to make some observations on this?

Michael Ryder: Mark will have some thoughts as well. We are certainly concerned with effective governance at state level, and that is one of the reasons why the Stabilisation Unit has deployed staff into, I think from memory, Warrap and Eastern Equatoria, but Mark will be able to confirm that. State government cannot work if it does not have resources. In a state like South Sudan, where 98% of government revenue, as the Minister has said, comes from oil, it has largely to flow from the centre. States that have oil deposits are beneficiaries of oil-sharing agreements built into the way in which the contracts and state allocations are worked. There is an ability for states like Unity, for example, to fund some of their own activity out of that oil share, and the oil industry provides some employment as well. However, as a general principle, clearly funds have to flow from the centre to the periphery.
Chair: Can I just say that, as you might appreciate, because of the pressure on time and because of the late hour, we are in danger of losing our quorum. I do not want to stop your answers.

Mark Mallalieu: Two quick points: first of all, it is very, very likely under this austerity budget that grants to states will be cut, possibly severely. Second, leaving aside the percentage of oil receipts that some states can keep, the block grants are divided equally between the 10 states, which have very largely divergent populations. One thing that the Government could do would be to allocate those state grants on a more equitable basis, based on a number of variables, certainly including population size.

Q113 Hugh Bayley: Do you think that UNMISS has sufficient numbers of troops and sufficient funding to fulfil its mandate? Are you satisfied that its mandate is appropriate as currently written?

Mr O'Brien: I was asked this question in the House earlier today. The clear view is that it would not be right, we believe, to reopen the UNMISS mandate as we speak. It does, however, need to focus on its key tasks: the division of labour within the UN country team through the peace-building plan. We are expecting the Secretary-General to present these in his next report to the Security Council, which is in March, and that is obviously a very important moment and a deadline we hope will be kept to. I think we do need to recognise, fully accepting your concerns about what you have observed, that on balance we regard UNMISS as having had a success in Jonglei, and played an important role in reducing the casualties there.

Nonetheless, there are lessons which are being learned, and need to be learned, and UNMISS does need to be better prepared in the future. In terms of troop numbers, the UN Security Council met on Monday and decided to keep the troop levels at 7,000. Currently they are at about 5,300. I think this is as much to do with their deployment, where they are deployed, how they are deployed, the rapidity of their response capabilities, and being flexible in the access they have to the assets, not least heavy lift and helicopters. Those are the immediate challenges we need to focus on, as well as all the discussions that need to take place at a policy and strategic level.

Q114 Hugh Bayley: I am genuinely puzzling over how one could get the balance of international community funding stacked up in a more positive way. We as a Committee, of course, only visited safe and stable parts of the country, but we saw hundreds of UNMISS troops based in places where there was no apparent risk of violence or disorder, and they were largely involved in, I would say, lower-level policing operations that ought to be provided by a country that has hundreds of people in uniform of its own. I was also struck that we spend almost as much on our contribution to UNMISS, perhaps two thirds as much, as we do on our aid programme. I wonder if that balance is right, and how long that can be sustained, how we move the balance of funding away from short-term security and into development, and what the period of transition ought to be.

The final thought I have had is this: the usual UN pattern when it puts in a peacekeeping force is to hire troops from the Indian subcontinent, or wherever. Here is a country that has far too many soldiers of its own, and spends as much on its armed forces as the international community is spending on UNMISS. Surely to goodness UNMISS should be retraining SPLA fighters as soldiers, and replacing its Pakistani or Bangladeshi soldiers with local people whom it has trained and to whom it is giving the sort of skills and leadership that will be needed. I suppose what I am really saying is: how do you transfer from an unsatisfactory situation to a more satisfactory security situation, where South Sudan is managing more of its own affairs, and releasing international community funds to be spent on development?

Mr O'Brien: It is totally appropriate that I should ask Michael Ryder to comment. I think, just as an introduction to what he might say, there is no question but that the mandate currently in place is one that is about the ability to peace-build, and having the capacity to do that. It is not currently expected that the UN can be in all parts of South Sudan. It has to be focused and targeted. It has to take those actions that are to do with peace-building. A lot of that is therefore conflict prevention. I am conscious that even by your asking the question, the record and these proceedings no doubt will be read by Hilde Johnson and others at the UN. Therefore, the fact that we are moving towards a March position with the document that we hope to see come out makes this is a very useful time to address these issues. I do not want to forejudge those, because I think it would be inappropriate, but we are certainly doing our best to press on the UN being very focussed on the job it has under the mandate, and to be much more flexible and deployable, according to the need and the essential elements that will lead to that. I will ask Michael Ryder to comment, given how much he is deeply involved in this aspect.

Michael Ryder: First of all, the implication of your question is absolutely right, that the primary responsibility for providing security in the South Sudan rests with the Government of South Sudan and its own armed forces and police. However, there are a range of issues buried in there. Security sector reform is an important part of what DFID is doing. It is a relatively small programme by comparison to the health and education areas, but it is in there, and we are focusing on the central administration elements of security sector reform. The United States is a substantial contributor, much more closely involved with the retraining and reskilling of soldiers, of whom South Sudan has far more than it needs, given the threats that it faces. Norway is also participating in this.

However, in the short term, those SPLA soldiers need to be maintained, and the reason that the Government’s pay bill for the army is so big is that it is in effect acting as a social security net, to keep soldiers, whose command and control structures are not as strong as one might wish in a professional army, out of trouble. Mark can probably say more about this, but the role of UNMISS is conceived very much as a mobile force, a deployable force, not a
static force. The question of exactly where they might be based should, in principle, not be the first concern. The question is, "Can you get them rapidly to where they need to be?" This goes to the point the Minister made about mobility. There is, as you know, an issue there about the shortage of helicopters, something that is common to every UN peacekeeping force in the world. Bangladeshi helicopters are presently redeployed from the DRC.

Q115 Hugh Bayley: In round terms, UNMISS costs £800 million per year, and the Government of South Sudan spends £800 million per year, or 40% of its budget, on its own forces. Everybody nods their head wisely and says, “£800 million is far too much for the Government of South Sudan to be spending on its own force.” Yet we are saying that we should be spending at least £800 million on UNMISS, and probably more, if the numbers increase to 7,000. Shall we say £1.2 billion? It struck me that you have two processes: DDR and security sector reform going on with a tiny budget on one side, and external security being provided through the UN with an enormous budget on the other side. Why do you not have a single operation? The military expertise in South Sudan from outside is largely there in the form of UNMISS soldiers. Why on earth are they not retraining that relatively small number of SPLA soldiers to do a job, to take over the job that UNMISS is doing? I do not know what a reasonable period is—I would need military advice—but should we say three years, to train a corps to stay behind at a tenth of the cost? Is that realistic?

Michael Ryder: It is certainly taking a lot longer than that in Afghanistan, where similar issues arise.

Q116 Hugh Bayley: So the timescale is not realistic.

Michael Ryder: Yes. It is also a very labour-intensive activity, and the troop-contributing countries that can supply forces for a peacekeeping or peace-building mission are not necessarily the same ones who would be best placed to provide that kind of transitional training. It is not accidental that we have the US, UK and Norway involved in that security sector reform area, while we are not providing any boots on the ground. We have some officers in UNMISS, but we are not providing the core troops for that task, because it is a different kind of task.

Q117 Hugh Bayley: Could I just make one last observation, and then I will shut up? The Bangladeshi soldiers, a couple of the officers we met, told us that one of the soldiers had been deployed to Jonglei, a major I think, to step in for another major from a different detachment that was deployed, who was not available for service. The one exercise they could tell us about was where a contingent of soldiers went off to deal with a problem of fee-taking, perhaps bribe-taking, by a policeman at a road junction to flag people through. They are almost standing in the way of local security forces dealing with law and order problems, aren’t they? Why on earth is UNMISS doing a job that ought to be done by the police themselves?

Mr O’Brien: The quality of the local police is very variable, and in some cases extremely low. I suspect if there were a strategic operational decision that it actually carried with it a threat, that would be a matter for them. It is quite difficult at this distance. I understand the question, but—

Q118 Hugh Bayley: It is an extremely costly way to deal with the issue.

Mr O’Brien: Of course. However, it is quite difficult from this distance—

Q119 Hugh Bayley: You do not have further suggestions about how you can resolve this contradiction? There seems to be fuzziness on both sides, in terms of what UNMISS’s role is and what the security sector reform role is, and a fuzziness on timescales, too.

Michael Ryder: I don’t know the specifics of the case you are referring to. It is certainly the case in other peacekeeping operations elsewhere that from time to time the local communities will specifically ask for internationals to come and resolve something like that, because they do not trust their own people. I cannot say with certainty what happened in this case.

Mr O’Brien: We will certainly reflect on that.

Q120 Chair: It is an issue that arose in the DRC, and I suppose you could argue in Afghanistan, at least the mission is to train up the army and the police. Maybe there should be more of that going on. I think we are going to run out of time. As you can see, we are down to our quorum. There is one question I want to ask, because I think I would rather you answered it orally. I am not sure you would put it in writing. The others I think we can put to you in writing afterwards, if we may.

Mr O’Brien: Okay. That is fine.

Q121 Chair: It relates to the role of the Church, again, in peace-building, and not least because there seems to have been a change in attitude, even in the few weeks since we were there. The Church takes the view, and I know DFID has given them some funding for this, that they have a connection to the local community that makes them very constructive in peacekeeping and bringing people together. The Archbishop told us that one of his bishops, in fact, I think had had a grenade or something thrown at him. I think the implication was that the Church puts itself into harm’s way when other people do not necessarily do so.

The impression that seems to have happened since the latest conflict in Jonglei is that DFID appears to have slightly reviewed its view of the Church, and as a result you are reviewing the support you might be giving. The Church has come back and said, actually, whatever the evaluation was, it was not their fault. They felt that the Government did not respond quickly enough, and that undermined the activities of the Church. They are, as they see it, being slightly punished for the slower response of the South Sudanese Government. That is the take on what I had. This has all happened since we were there, so I wondered whether you could perhaps give us an
indication of whether you have reassessed the role they have in peace building.

**Mr O’Brien:** Perhaps I could be very clear that from our point of view, as a strategic approach within the programme and our ambition for South Sudan, the New Sudan Council of Churches’ own view that they can now most usefully support the Government of South Sudan’s response to the intercommunal violence in Jonglei by engaging in grassroots mobilisation for peace, is absolutely right. Their abilities, as you describe, to be out there amongst the communities, to be able to reach out not least to the armed youth, and into the cattle camps and the realities of what comprises South Sudan in terms of where the points of conflict arise, and helping to deliver on the peace dividends to isolated and impoverished communities is absolutely vital. I am in no doubt, and as the UK government we would want to genuinely recognise the valuable attempts by Archbishop Daniel Deng and the New Sudan Council of Churches to support the dialogue, not least in Jonglei before Christmas.

Q122 **Chair:** Sorry. You said in your submission that the recent Jonglei attacks “saw the breakdown of the peace process being led by Archbishop Deng and the Sudan Council”. That sounds like a fundamental reassessment of the role, if you think it has broken down.

**Mr O’Brien:** I will ask Mark to comment on that, because I would not want there to be any kind of misinterpretation. Clearly it is important, as I said in my submission, that we are working in partnership with the Government of South Sudan. The church, which does enormous and valuable work, not least amongst some of the hardest to reach communities, is a vital partner and complementer to that set of programmes and ambitions. It has an enduring presence. It is clearly a crucial partner for peace and development in South Sudan. We have agreed to provide the UK Conflict Pool funds to the NGO pact to partner with the SCC on peace-building in Jonglei. That is £250,000 to March 2012, this year. Maybe, Mark, if there is any kind of sense of hurt or misunderstanding, this is an opportunity to clarify it. From my point of view, strategically it is certainly not intended.

Q123 **Chair:** Just so we are aware of the context, you put what I quoted in your submission.

**Mr O’Brien:** I appreciate that.

Q124 **Chair:** We then had a written response from the Church, which was basically to some extent repudiating that evaluation.

**Mr O’Brien:** I see.

**Mark Mallalieu:** The thing that has changed is that previously the Church was given a role, or asked to play a role, by the Government that was perhaps unreasonable. The Church could not deliver that kind of peace resolution process in the way that it was being asked to on its own. The Government is now saying it will take lead responsibility, as it should, for the peace process in Jonglei, with the Church playing a supporting role. It is that supporting role that we are funding.

Q125 **Chair:** We will probably leave it there, but their assertion is that “the churches continue to maintain the confidence of the people, and are able to work as a strong and complementary actor in the peace process.” You would not dispute that?

**Mark Mallalieu:** No.

**Mr O’Brien:** I think the word “complementary” there is the key, where we are all aligned.

**Chair:** There are several questions that we have not had time to get to.

**Chris White:** I had hoped that we would have a chance to talk about the role of the UN, our partnership, and how they deliver, and whether we have confidence in the World Bank. Presumably we can be adding that in our request for written—

**Chair:** The three of us are quorate. If we do not get to the end, we will put them in writing.

Q126 **Chris White:** My question is really about your level of confidence in the UN and World Bank pooled funds. I am sure in your role you have visited a great deal more places than I have, but the number of very clean UN empty parked-up Land Cruisers in airfields was certainly fairly apparent. I do not particularly have a thing about Land Cruisers—obviously I would prefer them to be Land Rovers—but supporting the World Bank after some of their previous failures: do you still have confidence in their roles?

**Mr O’Brien:** The straight answer to that is, “Yes”, because I think what has been a series of pretty well-documented problems by the World Bank through its multi-donor trust fund has now become sufficiently well recognised for the lessons to be learned and, most importantly, applied. We should not lose sight of the successes that they did achieve; nearly 1,500 kilometres of road, compared with what I saw just four years ago, a water sanitation and solid waste system serving a quarter of a million people in Juba. These are genuine achievements that are now in place, and already 2.8 million primary school textbooks provided. That is fine.

Working with the World Bank and the Government of South Sudan, and indeed the other donor partners, this is where, through those lessons learned, to spend the money effectively it will be absolutely vital that between now and the close of the fund in June this year, that those weaknesses have now been identified and are addressed. That is where the confidence comes from. I would not have confidence if we thought there were weaknesses but we had not addressed them or even understood them. One has to get to the point where confidence is re-engaged.

The World Bank is an important partner. Whilst we do not have plans to increase and put further funding to its work in South Sudan, its current implementation is important. We have the Common Humanitarian Fund, which is now being established. We have worked extensively with the UN to ensure that we will have improved procedures. We will provide £30 million to the Common Humanitarian Fund over the next two years. As far as UNDP is concerned, again it is a bit of a plus and minus record. It has been
very stretched, as we have touched on already. It is absolutely vital that it focuses and does not overstretch itself, and that it does engage now with the states, so that there is this ability to deploy out into the country. Everything has been rather centralist. Unquestionably, though, UNDP does have the success of the referendum under its belt, and again we should not lose sight of that.

In addition, one has to look at the other international players. It is very important that you now work not least as a constituent member of the EU to see that the EU is getting its act together by matching resources with staff on the ground. We have repeatedly asked the Commissioner to make sure that the delegation is fully staffed, and we believe that it is now likely to have its full allocation of people by the end of the first half of this year.

That is all encouraging. Everything would be more attractive if it were done more quickly, but a lot of the lesson that has been learned is that sometimes speed has been the cause of the weaknesses and inefficiencies, and that one needs to establish things sufficiently on the ground. Basically that is the lesson we have learnt through establishing our own DFID office, and therefore the equivalents—remember, as you would be the first to support, I know, that each of these organisations, in a country with an extremely difficult operating environment, has a duty of care to its own people as they attract some of these very high-skilled, highly committed people into an area of operation that is not easy.

Q127 Chair: The one issue hanging over us is the potential flood of returnees at the end of March. What is your reading of the situation? Has there been any progress whatsoever for processing that? What do you think is likely to happen? Indeed, how can the Government of South Sudan cope with that in circumstances where they are in dispute with the Government of Sudan over the oil revenues? Or does that in itself mean it is likely that nothing much will happen in March, because that is just throwing oil on the flames?

Mr O’Brien: You are right to be concerned. We are very concerned. This is a major cliff edge facing us. I think I gave the number already in answer to a question in the House. We know the numbers. There are potentially another 700,000 who could come. The status of those who might remain in Sudan is simply not clarified. There is no appointment of a South Sudanese Ambassador in Khartoum, so there is no ability for those who might remain to have access to the necessary process to get paperwork that might give them legitimation.

I have seen it from the other side as well, because I was more recently in Sudan, and in Khartoum, where I had a lot of these conversations, and took every opportunity with everybody I met—which was of course not the head of state but everybody else at a senior level—to press on them the need to be more tolerant and accepting that this is a process, albeit one that is generated by the CPA, which needs to be less of a cliff edge and more of an understanding that for many people who came across from South Sudan up into Sudan at the same time as my forebears came from Ireland to England, and that just simply because they carry a name that belongs to a place they are now suddenly finding that they will be stateless.

You can imagine the deep inner distress that that causes to people and their families. I saw at Kosti on the Nile a waystation where there was a refugee camp with characteristics not dissimilar to Dadaab in Kenya, which is as you can imagine very, very tough. For every boatload of people, there were three of their possessions: bedsteads, plastic buckets, chairs. They were taking everything they had with them, however meagre, and heading down. The real problem in the South—and personally I had this conversation in a long meeting with President Salva Kiir in Washington when I was there for the meeting last December—is to say: “What preparations are being made, not just in Juba but in Rumbek, in Malakal, and in places around, where these families are arriving and then they are disappearing to communities?” There are then potentially land disputes. You are quite right in my view to be deeply concerned about this and we are having discussions with both South Sudan but equally North Sudan to try to find a way.

There is some indication, but no more than that, in a discussion that my colleague, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Mr Bellingham, had in the African Union at the weekend, that there may be some room for hope that there is some hope for movement in Sudan. However, we have nothing confirmed; there was just a statement that showed that there may not be an absolute categorical expectation of the deadline.

Q128 Chair: Three of us visited Khartoum, and obviously it was a very short visit, and people were giving us different interpretations. One was that nothing would happen, because nobody was ready to do it. The problem is that the people themselves might choose to move, because they are in fear that they have no rights: a date has passed, threats have been made.

Mr O’Brien: Absolutely.

Q129 Chair: You could have an uncontrolled voluntary migration, which would create huge—

Mr O’Brien: The stretch in South Sudan hardly bears thinking about, when you think about the numbers that might suddenly therefore be arriving in the next coming weeks. I do not know whether you have any later information, Mark, on this?

Mark Mallalieu: No. It is a big risk. The UN, in particular the International Organization for Migration, is doing a lot of planning around this. It is an area where we might need to divert resources.

Mr O’Brien: It is another reason why we may end up more in the humanitarian space rather than the development space for a lot longer than we had hoped for. However, we will be sufficiently flexible and indeed nimble in our programme. We must respond to the facts on the ground, and if the facts change we must change our plans and our strategy. It is important not to be stuck with what we first thought of if the facts change.
Q130 Chair: Thank you; we obviously appreciate the situation is changing very quickly, at the moment in one direction, but hopefully it might turn around again. Can I thank you very much? There are some questions that we did not get to, but if we can put them to you in writing. They are relatively straightforward ones that you can give a factual answer to, I think. Can I thank all of you for coming to give evidence? It is nice to see you here again, Mark. I want to say that I think the Committee found the visit very interesting, very fascinating, in a way very challenging, but there is that underlying thing about a new country, where there is still that sense of optimism and will, in spite of the most appalling challenges. You get the impression that that will not carry you very far until you start to deliver results. However, we can be pleased that we have a team in place that is very engaged with that process, and appears to be very flexible and very nimble, as you absolutely have to be, in not comfortable surroundings. I think that should be recorded as well. Thank you very much indeed. We obviously will produce our report in due course, but I suspect we will have had to update it several times before we do.

Mr O’Brien: I would have thought so.

Chair: Thank you very much.
Written evidence

Submission by Save the Children UK

Introduction

1. Save the Children is the world’s independent children’s rights organisation. We’re outraged that millions of children are still denied proper healthcare, food, education and protection and we’re determined to change that. Save the Children UK is a member of Save the Children International, working to change children’s lives in more than 120 countries.

2. This document draws on Save the Children’s experience of working in South Sudan since 1991, including in some of the most severely affected conflict zones. We currently have programmes in nine of the country’s 10 states. These programmes cover nutrition, community and facility-based healthcare, livelihoods and food security, education, child protection, child rights governance and emergency response.

3. Save the Children’s submission focuses on the first four areas outlined in the Committee’s inquiry, namely: the extent of humanitarian need and problems with humanitarian access; the provision of basic services and how DFID can help to improve governance; the management of oil revenues for development; and the role of the UN development and humanitarian organisations, the World Bank and other bilateral donors and the extent of leadership and coordination between them. As co-lead of the Education Cluster, Save the Children has a depth of experience in education; this submission therefore has a particular emphasis on education as a basic service. For each of the four areas addressed we have set out clear recommendations that the international community and DFID should take into account to ensure that South Sudan has a real chance for peace and development. These recommendations are as follows:

The extent of humanitarian need and Problems with humanitarian access

— To address the high levels of humanitarian need that persist in South Sudan, donors should undertake thorough mapping of the situation that includes context analysis, in order to develop a well-coordinated response that links relief and development, and incorporates a Disaster Risk Reduction and Climatic Change Adaptation (DRR/CCA) approach.

— DFID should support the government of South Sudan to develop an approach to the reintegration of returnees that includes the needs of the host community and incorporates DRR/CCA elements.

— Given South Sudan’s continued vulnerability to conflict and natural disasters, DFID should incorporate disaster risk reduction and resilience considerations into its basic service delivery projects and programmes.

— Donors to need to recognise and adjust to the increase in prices for humanitarian operations and delivery, given the increase in prices for basic items and fuel, and the instability of the new South Sudanese Pound.

— DFID should support the government of South Sudan to make a concerted and genuinely consultative effort to agree the parameters in which civil society and NGOs function.

The provision of basic services

— DFID should support the government of South Sudan and work with other donors and basic service providers to develop a realistic plan for transitioning to government-led service delivery, which includes capacity building benchmarks.

Ensuring DFID’s commitments to education lead to more children gaining a quality education in more schools

— Given the specific barriers which prevent girls going to school, DFID should ensure its programming to address girls’ education needs is conflict-sensitive, based on context analysis, and addresses the holistic challenges and external blockages that prevent girls going to school.

— In the case of education, DFID’s focus on result measurement should incorporate infrastructure and human resources including in-service teacher training, which are most likely to positively influence learning outcomes.

— To reinforce its considerable support to the education system, DFID should continue to support the nascent teacher payroll, and lobby the government of South Sudan to make greater financial commitments to teacher salaries and the education system in general.

— So that children have the best chance of learning in school, DFID should lobby the government to reconsider its policy on the use of English as the official language of instruction in South Sudan.

— DFID should recognise the quality education provided by the church in South Sudan, and engage this important service provider in education policy debates and efforts towards increasing the number of children in school.
DFID should work with the government to help reduce hidden school levies, and support community initiatives targeting PTAs, schoolchildren and the community at large to monitor school funds and ensure that they are properly used.

To ensure that education gains are not lost in areas affected by emergencies, DFID should support the smooth transition of emergency education interventions into education development by guaranteeing education funding to these areas.

**How DFID can help to improve governance**

- Donors, including DFID should lobby the government of South Sudan to ratify international and regional child rights treaties; strengthen legal frameworks and public accountability to promote and protect children’s rights.

- South Sudan’s 2008 Child Rights Act is a significant piece of legislation in promoting child rights. DFID should ensure that the training on budgeting and resource allocation takes place as tools for the government to implement the Act, and put pressure on the government to use its own resources well.

**The management of oil and oil revenues for development**

- A fixed percentage of South Sudan’s oil revenues should be ring-fenced for a Future Generations Fund, on top of those revenues allocated for basic services.

- Donors including the UK government should encourage the government of South Sudan to commit to this ring-fenced Fund by matching the percentage with their own funding.

**The role of the UN development and humanitarian organisations, the World Bank, other bilateral donors and the extent of leadership and coordination between them**

- The World Bank should abide by the Ministry of Health’s call for harmonisation on health across South Sudan, and align its plans with DFID and USAID.

**The extent of humanitarian need, especially among returning South Sudanese and those displaced by fighting in Abyei and South Kordofan**

4. Humanitarian need remains high across South Sudan, exacerbated by conflict and natural disasters. Inter-communal tensions in Jonglei continue to affect people in the state. Hundreds of people have been killed in the last few months, making this one of the most violent wet seasons of the era since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005. The fatal impact of this violence has been exacerbated by the use of automatic weapons. Child abduction is characteristic of these conflicts; following the latest series of attacks and counter-attacks in Jonglei (August/September 2011) Save the Children identified 312 children to be missing or abducted.

5. Militia groups have been waging battle with the SPLA. Protection Cluster rapid needs assessments have mentioned sexual violence perpetrated by military actors, against which the community felt unable to protect themselves or seek redress. There has also been consistent laying of mines; this not only threatens the lives of resident populations, but also affects humanitarian access.

6. The existence of internal security threats is particularly concerning given the potential for high expectations about the dividends of independence to go unmet. Should this occur, old inter-clan and inter-tribal grievances risk being amplified. 70% of South Sudan’s population is under the age of 30, and a large portion of those of working age are unemployed, making them susceptible to rogue militia recruitment and cattle raiding for profit. Young people need training in technical and vocational skills, as well as the opportunity to go back to school.

7. South Sudan’s economy has been exposed to additional risk by the adoption of the new South Sudanese Pound (SSP) since independence. The SSP has already lost more than 25% of its value leading to a run on the dollar, which itself further undermines stability.

8. Food insecurity: The Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET) is reporting food insecurity conditions ranging between “stressed” and “crisis” in South Sudan. Food insecurity has been heightened by the increase in food prices due to the cutting off of border trade, high fuel prices and inflation. While South Sudan’s agriculture potential is vast, it is significantly under-exploited. Rains came late this year and were destructive, which caused problems for planting. With coping mechanisms strained by years of war, vulnerability to shock is high. This was evident most recently during the flash floods in Agok. The closure of the north-south border has led to food prices doubling on a monthly basis in the border states, as well as to empty markets. People are facing increasing levels of poverty as prices rise: the fuel price has increased four-fold in some places. This is resulting in the sale of assets, eroding people’s already slim livelihoods base, while in some areas ongoing conflict threatens people’s ability to develop sustainable livelihoods.

---

* FEWSNET/USAID, *South Sudan Food Insecurity Outlook Update, September 2011.*
9. However, the full picture of the levels of food insecurity remains unclear due to insufficient comprehensive mapping. A thorough mapping of the situation and context analysis is now needed, followed by the development of an appropriate, well-coordinated response that links relief and development, and incorporates a Disaster Risk Reduction and Climatic Change Adaptation (DRR/CCA) approach. It is important that the lessons learnt from the East Africa crisis, whereby early warnings were ignored until there were full-scale food shortages and hunger, are heeded in South Sudan.

10. Returnees: In the last 11 months, almost 350,000 people have been registered as returnees to South Sudan,2 and the flow of returnees continues. The situation for the majority of returnees is very difficult. There is little in the way of formal assistance or clearly articulated reintegration plans for most returnees. Many rely on already stretched host communities for some support, alongside some NGO distributions. Returnees are often previous urban-dwellers, who have returned to rural areas despite their skills not being suitable to rural livelihoods.

11. Government ambitions for meeting the needs of returnees are highly optimistic; even before one takes into account the lack of financial support to realise these ambitions. Promises for return packages in the south that exceed what can realistically be delivered risk inequity with resident populations, and increase the likelihood of tensions and resentment. The situation for host communities is already challenging, with returnees placing a strain on stretched resources.

12. A structured policy is needed for returnees’ reintegration. Beyond just providing life-saving services, the returnees need resettlement packages—support to allow them to settle properly and regain a normal life. An approach that includes the needs of the host community is required, and the policy also needs to incorporate DRR/CCA elements. DFID should support the government of South Sudan in the development of this policy.

13. Humanitarian funding: As the above summary of diverse and increasing humanitarian needs demonstrates, there is a need for a balanced focus on humanitarian and development funding, so that effective humanitarian responses can still be mounted alongside longer term recovery, rehabilitation and development. As part of this, the Common Humanitarian Fund needs to be adequately resourced. We welcome DFID’s commitments in this regard. The ongoing humanitarian needs in South Sudan also necessitate the incorporation of disaster risk reduction and resilience considerations into the basic service delivery projects and programmes funded by DFID.

14. Humanitarian donor including DFID also need to recognise and adjust to the increase in prices, which has also led to an increase in the cost of operating and delivering humanitarian aid for NGOs.

Problems with humanitarian access

15. The Republic of South Sudan is generally supportive of humanitarian work and agencies delivering humanitarian and basic services. However, space for humanitarian actors to operate appears to be shrinking, while insecurity continues to impede humanitarian access. The laying of landmines in Upper Nile, Unity and other states has resulted in the interruption of programmes. In recent months, Save the Children has evacuated relocatable staff from Waat and Akobo (to where they have not yet returned). Also in 2011, violence forced staff evacuations in Mvolo, Western Equatoria state and Pibor, Jonglei state.

16. While SPLA leaders and other authorities such as the South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission at Juba level engage appropriately and constructively with NGOs, they can struggle to ensure that their subordinates in the field adhere to their instructions. As a result, NGOs have been harassed by armed forces and humanitarian assets including vehicles and goods commandeered.

17. The lack of clarity surrounding which version of the NGO Bill is currently in the process of being tabled continues to cause difficulties and concern for NGOs. What is needed is a concerted and genuine effort to agree the parameters in which civil society and NGOs function. The lack of regulations is a problem across the board (see paragraph 31).

The provision of basic services

18. There is an extreme lack of basic services—including health, education, and social services—in South Sudan. It is estimated that only 44% of people live within 5km of a functioning health facility,3 while school enrolment rates are below 50%4 and only one out of every ten children who enrols in school manages to complete primary education.5

19. South Sudan’s lack of infrastructure and the low human resources base—40% of men and 16% of women are literate, while functional literacy rates are likely to be even lower6—means that delivering basic services is hugely challenging. These challenges are compounded by poor coordination, irregular and unpredictable

---

3 Southern Sudan Health Facility mapping survey (2009)—44% of people live within 5km of a functioning health facility (data from 6 states).
Ensuring DFID’s commitments to education lead to more children gaining a quality education in more schools in South Sudan.

21. The education needs in South Sudan are huge, and encompass all of the challenges typical of delivering education in fragile states, from lack of infrastructure including school buildings, to lack of both administrative and teaching capacity, to security, conflict and the weather. It is perhaps no surprise that education statistics (noted above) are dire. As such, DFID’s commitments to education in South Sudan are noted and commended. The following section focuses on ensuring DFID’s substantial resources for education are used to improve the learning experience of children in South Sudan, in line with the principle of value for money.

22. Education for girls: A recent report by UNESCO found that a young girl in South Sudan is three times more likely to die in pregnancy or childbirth than to finish primary school. We commend DFID’s engagement and commitment on this issue. DFID-supported programming to address girls’ education needs to be conflict-sensitive, based on context analysis, and address the holistic challenges and external blockages that prevent girls going to school. As well as engaging civil society to tackle cultural issues, this includes ensuring access to water and sanitation both at school and in villages so that girls do not have to spend their school-day collecting water, and provision of feminine hygiene kits to older girls so that they do not have to miss school every time they menstruate. Early childhood education is also particularly beneficial for girls, as it gives them the opportunity to learn before they are required to start performing household tasks, as well as increasing the likelihood that they will remain in school.

23. Results measurement: In its 2011–15 Operational Plan for South Sudan, DFID has set a target of 12.5 million textbooks to be delivered by 2013. While increasing the availability of textbooks is central to improving educational levels, we question whether the target of delivering 12.5 million textbooks by 2013 is the most effective means of measuring outcomes. It would seem more advisable to focus on infrastructure like school buildings, and human resources like teacher quality, which is most likely to positively influence learning outcomes.

24. Improving learning outcomes: Poor teacher quality greatly impedes the ability of schoolchildren to learn, and puts children off going to school. Out of South Sudan’s approximately 27,000 teachers, only 13% have some level of basic training. Almost half of them have only completed primary education. In-service training is crucial if the quality of the teacher cadre is to be improved.

25. Teachers also need to be supported to teach. Teachers on the nascent government payroll receive approximately $200 per month. However, many other teachers not yet on the payroll depend on goodwill gestures from their communities/PTAs. DFID should continue to support the further development of the payroll so that all teachers are registered and receive 100% of their official salaries from the central government. DFID should also lobby the government to make greater financial commitments to teacher salaries and the education system in general.

26. Schools are not always a safe space for children in South Sudan, and there is a general lack of protection awareness within the schooling system, which is a disincentive to all students. Gender-based violence within and around schools is all too common (and far from specific to schools), highlighting the need for teacher training on critical protection principles and psychosocial support practices.

27. Language presents another barrier to education. The government of South Sudan’s policy on using English as the official language of teaching is also concerning given the poor capacity of teachers themselves to teach in English. Mother-tongue education in the first years of schooling has better results for children and leads to better learning outcomes. We strongly encourage DFID to work with the government to reconsider this policy.

---

5 Save the Children, South Sudan: A Post-Independence Agenda for Action, 2011; Joint NGO Report, Getting it right from the start, 2011.
6 Joint NGO briefing paper, Getting it right from the start: priorities for action in the new Republic of South Sudan, 2011
28. The church in South Sudan and other faith-based groups play an important role in delivering quality education and mobilising children to go to school. DFID should recognise the quality education provided by the church, and engage this important service provider in education policy debates and efforts towards increasing the number of children in school.

29. Getting rid of hidden costs for education: The number of children able to attend school once enrolled is greatly affected by unofficial levies including charges for textbooks, payments to teachers, and other hidden or indirect costs.\textsuperscript{12} DFID should work with the government to help reduce these hidden fees through getting rid of school uniforms and continuing to support the further development of the payroll to avoid a situation where pupils are charged for the balance. DFID should also support community initiatives targeting PTAs, schoolchildren and the community at large to monitor school funds and ensure that they are properly used, and also to ensure that clear reporting mechanisms are put in place for any form of misuse. Civic education on available school resources at different levels should form part of the governance strategy for education activities.

30. Emergency education: In Unity State alone, 32 schools were closed for more than half of the school year due to conflict, affecting 18,000 children.\textsuperscript{13} School buildings have been targeted for attack: in Jonglei state, 13 schools have been burnt down to date this year.\textsuperscript{14} If children have to wait until conditions improve before education services are restored, they may miss substantial periods of schooling and often never return. This is not only a violation of their right to education, but also has a long-term—and often irreversible—effect on the development of the country’s human and social capital, jeopardising recovery and future development.

31. Ensuring education development gains are not lost in emergencies: Despite the need to address interruptions to schooling and given the critically low enrolment and literacy rates in South Sudan, the UN humanitarian system neglects to include education in more long-term humanitarian thinking. This is reflected in the withdrawal of education from Central Emergency Response Fund, as well as for the lack of any allocation to education from the CHF. This seems a particularly critical lost opportunity.

32. The IASC Education Cluster, alongside the Ministry of Education, has been working to harmonise coordination mechanisms for education, as well as mainstreaming emergency response into all education programming; so that the gains from development programming are maintained during acute emergencies. This is particularly important in South Sudan given the country’s weak infrastructure and high risk of further long term damage to the education system—and thus to DFID’s own education investments—in the case of emergencies.

33. In these circumstances, a smooth transition of emergency education interventions into education development programming, conforming with the framework used by the Ministry of Education and Education Cluster partners, is essential. DFID should support this process by guaranteeing funding to areas affected by emergencies; and ensuring it supports education (both development and humanitarian) in South Sudan within its policy, funding allocations and strategic plans. The UN country team also needs to be encouraged to recognise the importance of education in emergencies.

How DFID can help to improve governance, including at the county and local level

34. The majority of government institutions are still very much in the formative stages. Getting it right from the start addresses capacity building issues. This includes supporting parliament to pass the huge number of bills that are waiting to be tabled. The current lack of legal regulations in the new state is unsettling for many and undermines the development of belief in rule of law.\textsuperscript{15}

35. Despite the lack of legal clarity elsewhere, South Sudan does have a Child Act, which was passed in 2008. But implementation and promotion of this important legal framework for realising children’s rights remains weak. We describe the implications of this situation in South Sudan: A Post Independence Agenda for Action. Save the Children would thus like to focus donors’ attention, particularly DFID, towards the following areas:

- strengthening legal frameworks for the promotion and protection of children’s rights;
- lobbying the government to ratify international and regional child rights treaties;
- strengthening enactment of polices to supplement these legal frameworks;
- supporting a consultative and participatory law review process;
- ensuring training on budgeting and resource allocation as tools for the government to realise child rights,\textsuperscript{16} and putting pressure on the government to use its own resources well;
- supporting institutionalisation of monitoring and reporting of child rights violations; and

\textsuperscript{12} Schockland and Save the Children, A study report on school levies in South Sudan, June 2010.

\textsuperscript{13} Sourced from EMIS 2009 data and Education Cluster Sit Reps, August 2011.

\textsuperscript{14} Jonglei Education Cluster Needs Assessment & Response Plan, August 2011.

\textsuperscript{15} Save the Children, A Post-Independence Agenda for Action; joint NGO report, Getting it right from the Start.

The management of oil and oil revenues for development

36. Allocation of South Sudan’s oil revenues is currently inefficient, and there are many problems with budgetary transparency. Subventions to the state are very small compared to the amount of money that is spent at central government level, and despite the government’s policy of “taking the towns to the people”. The percentages of the budget allocated to basic services is minimal—4% for health and 5.6% for education for 2011. As described in our July 2011 report South Sudan: A Post-Independence Agenda for Action, there is scope for the government to make greater commitments to social services out of its oil revenues. The draft constitution of South Sudan contains provisions for a Future Generation Fund to be established (Article 176–3), but does not provide further detail on what such a fund would be directed towards, how it would be managed, or even what percentage of oil revenues should be dedicated to such a fund. Save the Children argues that a percentage of the country’s oil revenues should be ring-fenced for this fund, on top of those revenues allocated for basic services.

37. Donors including the UK government should consider encouraging the government of South Sudan to commit to this ring-fenced Future Generation Fund by matching the percentage with their own funding.

40. Although it is reassuring that the Health Pooled Fund and USAID are aiming to align strategies to cover “their” eight states, there has been some concern about the World Bank support to health services in the two states it covers, Upper Nile and Jonglei. The World Bank consultant leading the process has suggested piloting a largely unproven Performance Based Finance model in some areas of these states, including introduction of fees-for-service. This is against South Sudan’s Constitution, which specifies that health care be free at the point of use. It also has the potential to restrict access to health services in these politically sensitive and unstable states. Nor is it in line with the Health Pooled Fund and USAID approach for the other eight states. The Ministry of Health has rightly called for harmonisation across all ten states. The World Bank should abide by this, and align its plans with DFID and USAID.

41. A final word of caution on pooled funds: these should not abrogate the responsibility of DFID (or other donors) to ensure that the funds are managed effectively. This includes supporting staff to get out to the field more. We hope the staff scale-up in presence will free up more time for this to happen. Managing agents that are responsible for disbursement of funds should be held to account more, including through 360 degree evaluations. The Basic Services Fund (BSF) management and monitoring systems are a good example of this and should be adopted more widely. This is one of a number of positive lessons to be learnt from the BSF.

42. To end on a positive note, we would like to commend the engagement of DFID and the Sudan Unit with NGOs (both at Juba and London-level) as a positive example of a comprehensive, cross-government approach.

October 2011

Written evidence submitted by the Episcopal Church of Sudan, Lambeth Palace, the Diocese of Salisbury and the Anglican Alliance

1. Summary

This submission sets out; the historical involvement of the Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS) in supporting the ongoing peace process in South Sudan and its key role as a civil society and development actor, including:

— Humanitarian need in South Sudan, and the experiences of the ECS in gaining humanitarian access.
— The need for DFID and other donors to work in closer partnership with local NGOs and Community Service Organisations (CSOs), including church and faith based organisations delivering development outcomes, especially in education.
2. Background: The Episcopal Church of Sudan, Lambeth Palace, the Diocese of Salisbury and the Anglican Alliance

2.1 The Episcopal Church of Sudan, Lambeth Palace, the Diocese of Salisbury and the Anglican Alliance welcome the opportunity to make this submission to the International Development Select Committee.

2.2 The Province of the Episcopal Church of Sudan (ECS) consists of 31 dioceses spanning both the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan, and this unity has remained since the independence of South Sudan. It is led by the Most Reverend Dr Daniel Deng Bul Yak (Archbishop Deng) who has been a key advocate for the peace process, the welfare of people of both countries, and the urgent need for a peace dividend. He has been supported by Lambeth Palace, the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Salisbury Diocese. The two Archbishops have had regular interaction with the UK Government, including with DFID, and with the United Nations. The Diocese of Salisbury has been in partnership with the ECS for almost 40 years and focuses on education, health and advocacy issues. The Anglican Alliance is an international development initiative by the Anglican Communion to bring together the development, relief and advocacy work of Anglican churches and agencies in over 160 countries.

3. Responses to the Select Committee’s Areas of Interest

3.1 The Episcopal Church of Sudan’s work in peacebuilding, relief and development

3.1.1 Churches and faith based organisations represent the principal form of local and national civil society in South Sudan, central to building community resilience. They are key development actors, providing an estimated 90% of healthcare and a substantial amount of education, and helping communities to meet their basic needs for food, water and sanitation. During times of war and severe crisis, South Sudan’s churches have frequently been the only institution able to remain on the ground and maintain unfettered access to local communities. They are often among the first to respond with humanitarian aid—as in Abyei earlier this year.

3.1.2 Working ecumenically, churches in Sudan have been instrumental in building and brokering peace between North and South, mediating the 1972 Addis Ababa peace agreement and launching the People to People peace process. The ECS has played a key role in supporting this ecumenical effort. For decades, it has been a constant and committed local agent for peace, leveraging its legitimacy, broad constituency, infrastructure and resources, and international connections to support reconciliation. During the six year interim period (2005–11), the ECS was a key contributor to the South-South Dialogue process that promoted unity within South Sudan. On the eve of the referendum, Archbishop Deng brokered a ceasefire agreement between the army and militia loyal to General George Athor, enabling the South to go to the polls united. Post-referendum, the ECS has mobilised its international networks to encourage continued international engagement at this critical moment. It continues to support the efforts of South Sudan’s government and the international community by delivering basic services (crucial to local perceptions of a peace dividend), promoting tolerance and justice, countering ethnic divisions through building collaboration around community development activities, and providing spiritual leadership and pastoral guidance.

3.1.3 The ECS has also played a key role in building peace at the sub-national level, where it continues to assist in mediation processes in an effort to find political solutions to armed conflicts currently breaking out among armed groups. In recent days, the Sudan Council of Churches (SCC), under the leadership of the Anglican Archbishop Deng, convened a consultative workshop\footnote{Meeting on Escalating Violence in Jonglei State, held 8 October 2011 at South Sudan Hotel, Bor Town, Jonglei State.} in Jonglei State to address the outbreak of violence between the Lou Nuer and Murle communities which has claimed the lives of between 600 and 1,000 people in recent months [communiqué available at Annex 1]. More generally, the ECS supports reconciliation processes at the local level through its pastoral role in providing trauma counselling and spiritual mechanisms for national healing. In line with its historical role and responsibility, the ECS will remain engaged in the country’s future development.

3.2 The extent of Humanitarian Need, and problems with Humanitarian Access

3.2.1 South Sudan faces considerable humanitarian challenges in the immediate post-independence period. Continued violence along the border with (north) Sudan, as well as an upsurge in inter-communal violence in states like Jonglei and Warrup, increases incidences of mass displacement and prevents the return of civilians to their communities. This year, over 300,000 Southern Sudanese have been internally displaced due to armed conflict. Additionally, a steady flow of refugees continue to arrive from conflict areas north of the shared border, most notably South Kordofan and Blue Nile states, compounding the humanitarian crisis.

\footnote{Meeting on Escalating Violence in Jonglei State, held 8 October 2011 at South Sudan Hotel, Bor Town, Jonglei State.}
3.2.2 The situation is particularly difficult in and around Abyei, where the ECS has been responding to the needs of 110,000 people displaced since May 2011. Local churches continue to provide emergency relief to people in need and advocate for unhindered humanitarian access. Protracted negotiations in the establishment of an Abyei Area Administration delay stabilisation, and any significant breakthroughs in responding to the humanitarian situation will require breaking this political impasse. Churches have been asked to support the efforts of the South Sudan government to deescalate the Abyei conflict amidst fears of further violence if it does not intervene. 18 We recommend the International Development Committee press the UK government to support mediation efforts, including those led by the church and other local CSOs. Given that the costs of a return to war are estimated to be in the region US$100 billion, much of which would be borne by international partners, it is imperative that international actors re-engage in the peace process in Abyei and in the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) more widely.

3.2.3 It is likely that the deteriorating security situation throughout South Sudan will soon have a severe cumulative impact on food security, with displaced subsistence farmers unable to return to their homes to cultivate their land. Already many displaced people have not cultivated for the current June-September cropping season, exerting additional pressure on household and market food stocks. Currently, crisis levels of food insecurity are concentrated in Eastern Jonglei and pockets along the new international border with the north— in Warrup, Unity and Northern Bahr El Gazal states—largely due to a combination of insecurity, displacement, and elevated food prices due to restricted cross-border trade. We welcome DfID’s ambitious targets to ensure 1 million South Sudanese are food secure by 2015 and note that food security accounts for the second largest proportion of DfID’s 2011–15 aid budget. Yet, we also note that the cereal deficit for 2012 is estimated to double compared to this year and urge a more concerted effort by the international community to support efforts by the World Food Program and others to provide adequate levels of food aid to address approaching hunger, and to work for long term resilience and food security in local communities.

3.2.4 One of the principal factors affecting the ability to deliver basic services in South Sudan will continue to be the nature of the relationship with the Republic of Sudan. Favourable conditions between Sudan and South Sudan will be crucial to future development in the South as well as to averting further humanitarian crises there. We therefore recommend that the International Development Select Committee also pays attention to the situation in the North, visiting as appropriate, and identifies ways of strengthening community resilience including education initiatives such as church-based schools.

3.3 The provision of basic services and promotion of sustainable development

3.3.1 The government of South Sudan has listed basic service provision as a key priority, particularly education, healthcare, rule of law, and infrastructural development. The ECS welcomes these efforts and seeks to support the government by aligning its own development work with the government’s ambitious Development Plan. Currently, faith-based groups and NGOs provide the bulk of basic service provision where it exists (providing an estimated 90% of all health services, for instance) and any move towards greater state provision is likely to be gradual given the significant challenges facing the new administration. eg. there is a long way to go before the government can fully take over the education services, given the current lack of human capacity and systems to pay teacher salaries, manage the county education centres and the few government teacher training institutes.

3.3.2 Most South Sudanese lack any access to healthcare, education, clean water or sanitation, and these gaps in basic service provision present a peace-building risk. Patchy service provision results in overcrowding in areas where services can be accessed, as returnees from the North and the recently displaced congregate in these areas, placing an additional stress on local resources and the social fabric, and threatening to cause social unrest. Throughout South Sudan, maintaining and encouraging fragile peace relies in large part on local communities registering a tangible peace dividend in their immediate environments.

3.3.3 Education provision is a key issue in South Sudan, where less than 25% of children are in school. We commend DfID’s commitment to education. We also welcome efforts by the government of South Sudan, DfID and other international agencies to increase functional literacy, which nominally stands at 27% (40% for men and 16% for women) but is likely to be lower. Increased literacy is crucial to sustainable long term development, and improved literacy skills are particularly important among public servants if the state is to live up to expectations in the post-independence era. Currently, 80% of the police force is illiterate, which has clear implications for justice and the rule of law. ECS conducts a significant adult literacy programme for women through its 38,000 members of the Mothers’ Union.

3.3.4 Church education services as part of overall provision. The churches are currently the largest education service provider in the country. As evidenced by the churches’ work in education, teacher training and school construction, supported through the Basic Services Fund (BSF) in recent years, churches are well placed to provide education services throughout South Sudan—always provided on the basis of need and without reference to religious or other affiliation. Further investment in the educational potential of churches is an investment in South Sudan itself—engendering local ownership of development structures and institutions. The churches are also able to ensure local participation, across ethnic groups, in school management. We are concerned to know how the church education services will access funds after the closure of the Basic Services

18 Dr Barnaba Marial Benjamin, Minister for Information and Broadcasting addressing International Ecumenical Conference on Republic of South Sudan and Republic of Sudan, 28–29 September 2011 in Juba.
Fund. Civil society providers should not be ruled out of some of the hardware provision (mainly school construction). While community mobilization is integral to who we are as grassroots, local organizations entrenched at all levels, state, county, payam, boma- having civil society in some of the hardware projects enables a greater level of community ownership, pride and willingness to care for the assets built. Also civil society, such as the Church, can deliver most of these hardware projects at a much lower cost than the big NGOs or UN agencies, as evidenced by work under the BSF. While recognizing the value and contribution of church education provision, DfID should advocate with the government to revoke the classification of church schools as private, which has resulted in teachers being cut from the pay roll and church schools being unable to function, a crucial loss given lack of overall provision. Church schools should be reclassified as community schools.

3.3.5 Participation in education policy reform. As the largest education provider in the country, the Churches’ perspective in the policy debate is central, especially on the future of teacher training. ECS’ teacher trainers have all some level of tertiary education, and many years in the education system in South Sudan. The main areas of concern for policy include: certification and examinations for qualification; pay grade levels for teachers entering the system with pre or in service training; curriculum development.

3.3.6 Teacher training and remuneration. Adequate and reliable payment of teachers’ salaries is central to teacher motivation. We encourage DfID to work with the government to invest in the education system, especially in this area. RoSS has a goal for 45,000 teachers to be trained in the next five years, some funded through USAID. In the long term boosting pre-service training and teacher training institutes is critical. In the short term improvements in in-service training, at present very patchy, would help raise the overall level of qualification of teachers. DfID is encouraged to work with the government to secure more funding on this over the next five years to work in tandem with growing pre-service facilities in order to produce quality teachers in South Sudan. We welcome DfID’s support to expanding coverage of the County Education Centres and encourage strategic thinking with the government and churches on location in the short term to maximise access.

3.3.7 Girls’ Education and Early Childhood Education. We note and commend DfID’s championing of girls’ education. The planned interventions for teacher and student accommodation and for scholarships are welcome. However, until there is a paradigm shift in communities, attendance will remain low, except in wealthier communities. For the largest impact, it will be critical to engage civil society organizations such as the Church in project implementation. Churches have the spread and depth of presence in communities across the country. Through ECS’ team at the Province, each Diocesan church, through the Mothers’ Union and other partners, it could effectively mobilise communities on the importance of girls being in school. Early Childhood Education also remains a high need, but appears to have little attention from the government or donor community. Statistics show that there are higher retention rates in school for students who attended pre-school. This is especially true for girls.

3.3.8. The international donor community provides significant support for basic service provision in Sudan, but this is often channelled through international NGOs, bypassing an important and critical opportunity for building local and national human capacity. We encourage a gradual extension towards channeling funds and programme interventions, both governmental and non-governmental, in order to build capacity within the South Sudanese government and civil society. We recommend this include additional support for church and faith based organisations, which have already been delivering development outcomes in education, health and community development. We also welcome moves towards increasing the level of joint programming between international NGOs and local and national NGOs and CSOs.

3.4 How DfID can help improve governance, including at the county and local level

3.4.1 The government of South Sudan has initiated some positive changes in broadening access to governance structure in recent months (at the national level, the new cabinet is significantly more regionally and ethnically diverse than the caretaker government it replaces and women make up nearly 30% of all posts). The ECS welcomes this progress, as it has long been a supporter of ethnic and gender equality and routinely campaigns against tribalism—a key driver of conflict at the national, state and local levels. Good governance will remain a challenge for South Sudan, a country which is building its governance structures from the minimum of material or human resources, and in a time of continuing insecurity and social upheaval.

3.4.2 Despite this progress, there remains significant room for improvement in governance and there is a great deal that DfID and other international donors can do to promote this. Donors and their subsidiaries can work directly with the government to rapidly improve human capacity in key ministries. They can also support the development of civil society institutions that are essential for a functioning democracy, including a free media, and freedom to participate in the democratic process, and an independent judiciary. Tackling corruption is particularly important, as the country’s resources are already inadequate to the scale of development needs; if unaddressed, rampant corruption could generate anti-government sentiment.

3.4.3 An additional concern is that progress on and investment in governance regularly emphasises central government institutions in Juba, often at the expense of other regions. This runs contra to the decentralised mode of governance anticipated by the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, and critical for managing the peaceful development of the significant regional diversity in South Sudan [the ECS sets out a compact between the
government and the church in promoting development through effective decentralisation in Annex 2.\textsuperscript{19} We urge the International Development Committee to highlight the need for a refocusing of efforts to improve governance so that they place greater emphasis on programmes delivered at the regional and local levels, particularly in light of the recent decision to move the capital from Juba to Ramciel.

3.5 Coordination between donors

3.5.1 Over decades of international engagement in South Sudan, significant progress has been made by international organisations and the donor community to provide strong leadership and coordination. Coordination mechanisms such as the cluster system and DfID’s Basic Services Fund, which pool money for NGO projects, enable the aid sector to avoid duplication and manage gaps in service provision. As a local actor invested over the long term, the ECS commends these efforts by its international friends and partners. Yet, important issues remain to be addressed; of particular concern are the risks to post-conflict recovery bred by uncertainty in the post-independence funding outlook and the persistent tendency to sideline local NGOs and CSOs in favour of international partners.

3.5.2 We note the particular value of the Basic Services Fund, in enabling civil society, including faith based organisations, to effectively deliver services. We welcome the extension of the BSF until the end of 2012. However, with the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), the Basic Services Fund (BSF) and Sudan Recovery Fund for Southern Sudan (SRF-SS) all drawing to a close within the coming year, there is a real risk of even wider gaps in basic service provision will emerge. There is also a danger that interruptions in the timely allocation and disbursement of donor resources to activities that demonstrate quick recovery impacts could compromise perceptions of a peace dividend, running the risks of a return to conflict that ensue. To counter this risk, we urge the administrators of major funding mechanisms to lead the international community in establishing and charting out precisely what funding mechanisms will be in place over the coming years to support peace-building, humanitarian relief and long term development work. We also urge timely and accessible communication of changes in the funding landscape to local NGOs and CSOs.

3.5.3 The ability of local organisations, including churches and faith based organisations delivering development outcomes, to access aid funding will be critical to achieving sustainable change in South Sudan [see Annex 3].\textsuperscript{20} Yet, the administrative burden placed on grant recipients makes it difficult for local actors to access funding. It is crucial that these barriers are overcome in South Sudan, where supporting local organisations fits with the model of decentralised planning, coordination and implementation envisaged by donors to support the roles and leadership of states and counties. To ensure wider local access to international funding streams, we encourage moves towards tailoring and streamlining the application process to take the needs and skills of local organisations into account. We also recommend funding windows for medium size grants and/or the establishment of intermediary bodies to enable access.

3.6 The security situation including the effectiveness of the UN peacekeeping force

3.6.1 The Government of South Sudan’s ambitious Development Plan relies on a peace and security which has not yet been achieved. The human costs of armed conflict continue to rise in parts of South Sudan; in Jonglei and Unity states because of inter-communal violence and cattle raiding, in Abyei because of the ongoing conflict over its status with (north) Sudan, and in Western Equatoria State due to frequent and sporadic attacks by the Lord’s Resistance Army. Much of the security infrastructure that exists comes from the UN, whose three combined missions in Sudan and South Sudan have a mandate for some 38,000 military and police personnel. It is likely to be some time before South Sudan has the capacity to meet its own internal and external security needs.

3.6.2 One of the most significant barriers to security in South Sudan is cattle raiding, which has increased both in terms of numbers and violence since independence. UNMISS has struggled to provide a swift response—partly because lack of transport networks and infrastructure. The ECS condemns inter-communal violence and cattle raiding, routinely working to bring about locally owned and administered peace processes in an effort to break cycles of violence [see Annex 1]. Whilst the peacekeeping efforts of the UN and others are welcome, we believe that locally owned and administered peace processes represent the best hope for lasting peace, deescalating tensions and disarming civilians. In Jonglei, where attacks between the Murle and the Lou Nuer resulted in 600–1,000 deaths last month, there are more armed civilians than police or security forces. Successful disarmament is sine qua non for the restoration of order, but it needs to address the security concerns and fears of exposure among local people, which can only be achieved as part of a comprehensive process of conflict mediation and reconciliation.

3.6.3 South Sudan faces an additional security challenge in the ongoing conflict with its northern neighbour centring on the status of Abyei, but also triggered by the lack of security along the shared border, the conflict between the Sudan Government forces and those of the SPLM (North) in the states of South Kordofan and Blue Nile, and the management of oil revenues and principal routes between north and south. It is critical the future of both countries and for maintaining the integrity of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement that these

\textsuperscript{19} The Episcopal Church of the Sudan House of Bishops Pastoral Letter Advising the Sons and Daughters of the Republic of South Sudan, Saturday 9 July 2011.

\textsuperscript{20} The Communiqué of the International Ecumenical Conference on the Republic of South Sudan and the Republic of Sudan, held 28–29 September 2011 in Juba, highlights the urgent need for international partnership with churches.
outstanding issues are concluded as swiftly as possible, and we recommend the International Development Select Committee register firm support for efforts to this end. A peaceful relationship is clearly crucial to the future of both countries and all parties should recognise the interdependence of their security.

3.6.4 Although signs for agreement over the 2,000 kilometre shared border between (north) Sudan and South Sudan are promising we urge the international community to consider additional contingency measures in readiness for potential setbacks—in particular, we recommend that the International Development Select Committee support moves in the United Nations Security Council to maintain UNMISS’s current authorised force level of 7,000 military personnel and for the addition of a border-monitoring component to the mission.

3.7 The implications of potential membership of the Commonwealth and EAC

3.7.1 As the world’s newest state, it is imperative for South Sudan to secure its position on the world stage by building effective bilateral trade, security and political relationships with its neighbours and the wider East Africa region. The two key blocs to which South Sudan could be admitted are the Commonwealth of Nations and the East African Community. Aside from its northern counterpart, the primary trading partners of South Sudan are Kenya and Uganda, both of which are networked into these organisations.

3.7.2 It is likely that the Commonwealth of Nations would be able to offer South Sudan capacity building support in terms of instituting good governance systems and structures. We recognise the key role of DfID in strengthening the East African Community and are confident that these are discrete areas where their support can make a valuable contribution, by building up South Sudan in readiness for its integration.

4. Conclusions/Recommendations

4.1 We recommend the International Development Committee press the UK government to support mediation efforts, including those led by the church and other local CSOs.

4.2 We note that the cereal deficit is expected to double in 2012 and urge a more concerted effort by the international community to increase food aid to address approaching hunger, and to work for long term sustainability and resilience in the local community.

4.3 Noting that peaceful relations between South Sudan and Sudan are a necessary condition for development in South Sudan, we recommend that the International Development Select Committee also pays attention to the situation in the North, visiting as appropriate, and identifies ways of strengthening community resilience including education initiatives such as church-based schools.

4.4 We urge donors to channel funds through South Sudanese government and non government institutions, including through church and faith based organisations already delivering development outcomes.

4.5 We urge the International Development Committee to highlight the need for a refocusing of efforts to improve governance to place greater emphasis on programmes delivered at the regional and local levels.

4.6 To counter the risk of a return to conflict due the perceived lack of a peace dividend, we urge key donors to chart out what finances and funding mechanisms will be in place over the coming years to support peace-building, humanitarian relief and long term development work.

4.7 We encourage the streamlining of funding application processes to take into account the needs and skills of local organisations, including establishing funding windows and/or intermediary bodies to facilitate such access.

4.8 It is critical for maintaining the integrity of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement that outstanding issues between (north) Sudan and South Sudan are concluded as swiftly as possible, and we recommend the International Development Select Committee register firm support for such effort. Peaceful co-existence will define the future of both countries.

4.9 We recommend that the International Development Select Committee support moves in the United Nations Security Council to maintain UNMISS’s current authorised force level of 7,000 military personnel with the addition of a border-monitoring component.
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Further written evidence submitted by Episcopal Church of Sudan, Lambeth Palace, the Diocese of Salisbury and the Anglican Alliance (Annex A)

Role of the Sudanese Churches in the Peace Process

The overarching priority for the churches in South Sudan is to build peace. Through the Sudan Council of Churches and the Sudan Ecumenical Forum, the churches provided the framework for self-determination which led to the Machakos Protocol in 2002, culminating in the Comprehensive Peace Process in 2005. The church leadership played a central advocacy role in maintaining the commitment of the international community to the CPA. The churches are regularly asked by the Government of South Sudan to mediate on the ground between conflicting parties, such as the peace agreement with General Athor in early 2011. The churches have a presence across the communities in South Sudan and are equipped to serve as agents of conflict transformation.

The Sudan Council of Churches is currently developing a strategy to strengthen a grass roots campaign though dissemination of peace messages and by replicating the People to People Peace Process, a strategy that had successes at a high political level by successfully reconciling John Garang and Riek Machar during the SPLA split, as well as at a grassroots level through the reconciliation of many communities involved in similar tribal conflict we see today in Jonglei. This new approach follows the breakdown of the Jonglei peace talks in mid-December. There are concerns that the Government did not respond in time to the church leaders’ repeated requests to deploy troops to protect civilians when attacks were anticipated. The Government has its own peace strategy, and resources and training are shared. The churches continue to maintain the confidence of the people and are able to work as a strong and complementary actor in the peace processes.

February 2012

Written evidence submitted by the International Rescue Committee

About the International Rescue Committee

1. The International Rescue Committee (IRC) works in conflict-affected and fragile countries around the world to deliver life-saving assistance to people affected by violent conflict and disaster, and remains on the ground to assist with rebuilding through the post-crisis phase. We work to empower communities to lead their own recovery and development and to restore safety, dignity and hope to millions who are uprooted and dispossessed. Our work across 25 countries in education, health, protection, gender-based violence and economic recovery provides us with a unique understanding of the humanitarian and development challenges in the context of conflict and fragility.

2. The IRC has worked in South Sudan since 1989 providing health, water and sanitation, education, protection and gender-based violence programming. In 2010 the IRC’s programmes served a combined population of more than 450,000 in six states. After so many years of conflict and instability, the IRC was delighted to be present with the South Sudanese to welcome the birth of the new nation.

3. However, South Sudan faces numerous developmental challenges as it embarks on statehood. Millions of South Sudanese are dependent on food aid, the maternal mortality rate is the worst in the world, and one in seven children dies before the age of five. The legacy of decades of conflict is an economic and social infrastructure left in ruins, with few functioning schools and hospitals. At the same time, South Sudan faces chronic and recurrent emergencies—thousands of people have recently been displaced by natural and conflict-related crises.

4. This submission focuses on three issues vital to the birth and development of the Republic of South Sudan. Basic services like health, education, and water and sanitation are essential not only to improving development outcomes, but also to building confidence in the government and in the future. Investing in women and girls at all levels, will increase the pace of development and create a more equitable South Sudan. It is also crucial to anticipate insecurity and to prepare for emergencies through the early phases of South Sudan’s nationhood, by maintaining humanitarian assistance at stable levels, prioritising protection of civilians, and assuring humanitarian access.

Basic Services

5. The provision of basic services is vital not only to improving the well-being of people in South Sudan, but also to building confidence in the state. Services like health, water and sanitation, and education are the building blocks on which the country’s development depends. Their provision also requires governance capacity, in particular at the county and local levels where, too often, the reach of the government has been weak. It is vital that these basic services are made available consistently and equitably, reaching all communities, and not merely those that are the most accessible.

6. Ensuring positive outcomes requires a multifaceted approach:

(i) Providing long-term programme funding at a level that ensures that basic services can be provided throughout the country, including to rural populations.
Supporting capacity building initiatives that strengthen governance functions from the central to the most peripheral level.

Setting in place long-term pre-service training systems to develop sufficient local technical capacity to deliver good quality services.

Incorporating functional monitoring systems into funding mechanisms to assure the effective use of resources and to show evidence that basic services do reach difficult-to-access rural locations.

DFID can support better provision of basic services by providing stable, long-term investment in programmes targeting rural areas, and building the capacity of local structures. The IRC’s health programme provides services at the health centre, health unit and household level. The IRC’s health centres offer life saving procedures for women experiencing complications of childbirth. At the household level IRC supports community volunteers to identify and treat the three most common causes of death of children in South Sudan: malaria, diarrhoea, and acute respiratory infection.

The success of such interventions, however, relies heavily on relationships and continuity. Historically much of the support for provision of basic services in South Sudan was short-term, on a 12-month cycle. This problem is one that the IRC has been raising for several years, and one that continues to hamper longer-term development initiatives. DFID can address this problem both through strong advocacy with pooled fund mechanisms and by ensuring that bilateral funds are committed at an appropriate level and are predictable, with at least a three-year timeframe.

Protection and empowerment of women and girls

The IRC strongly supports DFID’s commitment to women and girls, and applauds the explicit inclusion of a gender strategy in its 2011–15 Operational Plan. However, we suggest that this plan could be even more comprehensive and ambitious.

Through the IRC’s GBV programmes, we have seen that domestic violence, early/forced marriage, and rape are widespread. However, there is a very low level of knowledge and education around violence against women and girls—and even a cultural acceptance of some forms of violence against women and girls. Services for survivors of such violence remain lacking; women and girls have few means to report and even fewer options for care. There remains a continuing cycle of silence and denial around the issue. The women and girls that the IRC speaks to reveal that violence is one of the most significant problems they face and that it is limiting their ability to benefit from the country’s development.

The IRC operates one of the few clinical service delivery sites dedicated to caring for survivors of gender-based violence. This facility, located within the Lakes State Hospital, has been deemed a model for South Sudan and is used as a demonstration site for GBV training initiatives, which have brought representatives from all states of South Sudan. Services like these can and should be rolled out throughout the country.

However, a consistent lack of adequate, long-term funding for GBV programmes has drastically limited NGOs’ abilities to offer critical GBV services to those in need. The dearth of resources also prevents international actors from providing ongoing capacity-building and support to local NGOs and government agencies, which are key to having a sustained impact. Limited programming and geographic coverage means that women and girls are not receiving the holistic, life-saving care that they need.

DFID should ensure that free, high quality medical services for survivors of gender-based violence are available in all health facilities that receive DFID support. DFID should also provide support to dedicated programmes, including provision of clinical care and psychosocial services for survivors, especially in rural areas where basic support is scarce.

While responding and providing services to survivors is critical, this should not be at the expense of prevention programming. DFID should start developing longer-term initiatives that will strengthen women’s protection and empower them to have a role in a new South Sudan, driving the long-term behaviour change to address deep-seated power inequalities. Such programmes should include livelihoods programming designed to reduce women’s vulnerability to violence as well as to cope with the social and economic consequences of such violence. Programmes like the IRC’s Economic and Social Empowerment (EASE) programme use Village Savings and Loans Associations and discussion groups to open up women’s access to financial resources and strengthen their ability to safely control and use those resources. This strengthens their position in the household and community. DFID should also support leadership initiatives for women, education, and other programmes that will strengthen women’s economic status.

DFID should also use the power of its voice with the government of South Sudan to advocate for recognition of women as equal partners in the new nation. Too often, particularly at county and local levels, women are excluded from a voice in their community, let alone the government. DFID should ensure that there is a gender component to all of its programming.

16. The newly independent state of South Sudan has emerged under fragile and complex circumstances. The internal political and security dynamics of the new country pose formidable challenges to the physical and legal protection of its citizens. The centralised government in Juba has limited reach beyond the capital. The extension of the government’s authority and credibility throughout the country remains one of many hurdles for the new state. While there has been efforts to invest in reform, many areas remain volatile, and it will take years to build the consistency and reliability that the security sector needs in order to protect its citizens.

17. The United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) should prioritise the physical protection of civilians under imminent threat of physical danger when and where government security services are unable to do so. UNMISS should provide a comprehensive and robust approach that includes civilian, military and political components, and that prevents, deters and responds to violence and threats against civilians.

18. DFID should invest in innovative, community-based programming that extends the reach of protection activities. For example, the IRC protection teams work in areas of high refugee and IDP return. During their community assessments, 3,482 individuals participating directly in the IRC’s activities, voiced their concerns and gave their opinions on protection issues and advice on possible solutions. The IRC also carries out Community-based Protection Trainings (CBPTs) using a manual developed by the IRC, NRC and UNHCR. The trainings cover a broad range of human rights issues and target community leaders, local civil society organisations and other community members. As part of a new initiative in South Sudan, the IRC helped six communities establish Community Protection Committees in Central and Eastern Equatoria States. The communities were all places where monitoring visits raised significant protection concerns, such as security or land disputes, and the communities had already completed a CBPT.

19. Preparing for emergencies also means ensuring that humanitarian assistance continues to be available, even as development programming increases. DFID’s Operational Plan highlights a transition from humanitarian to development programming, with a gradual reduction of funding to the former. The IRC emphasizes the need to maintain humanitarian funding at its current levels during this vital early phase of South Sudan’s nationhood.

20. DFID should encourage the Government of South Sudan to respect humanitarian principles, and provide an environment for unconditional humanitarian access to populations in extremis. In compliance with the humanitarian access framework agreed between national authorities and NGOs, the GoSS must take steps to address criminal attacks and harassment of NGO humanitarian staff, and ensure safe and unhindered conditions for delivering life-saving assistance to its citizens.

21. Finally, DFID should use its voice with both the Government of South Sudan and the Government of Sudan to advocate for access to populations in disputed areas, and areas that are currently inaccessible to humanitarian actors.
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Written evidence submitted by Tearfund

Executive Summary

Tearfund is calling on the UK Government to:

1. Encourage and support the government of South Sudan to prioritise provision of effective internal security for its citizens. Efforts should focus on police development and on areas prone to conflict in order to prevent humanitarian needs developing in the first place. Improving and investing in infrastructure, especially roads, airstrips and communications is key to this.

2. Continue to invest in adequate humanitarian resources and emergency preparedness alongside development/recovery work. Humanitarian needs look certain to continue for several years and all donors should therefore opt for a mix of approaches rather than either/or.

3. Develop the capacity of South Sudan government structures, at all levels, especially in regard to emergency preparedness, and ensure clear transitional planning and discussion happens before basic services can be handed over by NGOs to government Ministries, so there are no breaks in services.

4. Encourage the government of South Sudan to allocate sufficient funds and assistance for the ongoing needs of returnees and their host communities, for both short and longer term interventions. This includes provision of basic services in sites earmarked for returnees to settle, faster allocation of land to those waiting to move, broad consultation and collaboration with returnees and host communities to mitigate against tensions, and an equitable response across all locations so that no areas are neglected.

5. Encourage the government of South Sudan to develop and implement an appropriate regulatory framework for continuation/facilitation of humanitarian and development assistance by and through international aid agencies.

6. Invest and contribute to a range of funding mechanisms for South Sudan including provision of bilateral funds directly to implementing agencies. The UK needs to ensure that whilst new
mechanisms are being designed there is a continued flow of funds for basic services and that lessons are learnt from previous aid architecture.

INTRODUCTION

1. Tearfund welcomes this opportunity to contribute to the International Development Select Committee inquiry on South Sudan. Tearfund is a Christian relief and development agency working directly in response to disasters and in partnership with organisations in more than 50 countries, working alongside or through networks of local churches.

2. Tearfund has been working in South Sudan for over 40 years. Our work follows a two track approach, firstly that of supporting seven local partners, who work on a number of long term development projects addressing areas such as HIV and education, but secondly direct Tearfund operations in South Sudan, since 1998, undertaking projects to improve water and sanitation, nutrition, household food security and the provision of basic health services.

3. In South Sudan Tearfund’s approach in our direct operations is one of developmental relief, with a strong emphasis on community participation, reducing the risk and impact of disasters and building the capacity of government structures. The programme works in remote locations that have been severely affected by the civil war, and continue to be underserved and underdeveloped, and subject to continued humanitarian disasters such as drought and flooding. We have four project sites in the states of Upper Nile, Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Jonglei with support sites in Juba and Nairobi. We currently employ 370 staff with an annual turnover of £5 million. We serve approximately 360,000 beneficiaries and our main donors are the European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO), the Basic Services Fund (BSF), the Canadian Foodgrains Bank and the government of Canada (CIDA). Our most recent project is serving 25,300 returnees in Aweil town in Northern Bahr el Ghazal, by increasing their access to safe water sources, improving sanitation coverage, promoting good hygiene practices and minimising the spread of disease, and where applicable, through emergency response activities, providing food and non food items.

Question 1: The extent of humanitarian need, especially among returning South Sudanese and those displaced by fighting in Abyei and South Kordofan; and any problems with humanitarian access

4. Humanitarian needs in South Sudan are in part determined by the chronic under-development of the country following years of civil war, which ended in 2005 with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). There have been improvements in the humanitarian situation as the country has started to rebuild but South Sudan is still one of the poorest nations in the world and off track to meet the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. For example, it has the highest maternal mortality rate in the world—2,054 per 100,000 live births, and only 6.4% of the population has access to improved sanitation.

Instability and conflict

5. South Sudan suffers from ongoing instability and conflict. In 2010 more than 220,000 people were displaced due to various conflicts and this trend is continuing, with a further 300,000 fleeing their homes and 2,000 people killed so far this year (mostly in Warrap, Jonglei, Lakes, and Unity States). Conflicts range from clashes between tribes (over land, cattle and other resources), to attacks by the Lords Resistance Army (LRA), to clashes between the government and local breakaway militia groups (many formerly in the army, some with political grievances) to fighting in the border areas. Not only do those displaced need emergency assistance but they cannot continue with their usual activities such as planting crops, leading to long term hunger and other problems. There have been reports of new landmines being planted during outbreaks of conflict in 2011.

6. The most recent tribal clashes in Jonglei State between the Murle and Lou Nuer tribes prompted a humanitarian response, firstly to register and verify those displaced and then to provide them with food rations as well as non food items such as plastic sheeting and mosquito nets. Tearfund has ongoing projects in the area affected by the most recent tribal violence. The figures are difficult to verify but conservative estimates reported that 600 people were killed and thousands were displaced. Child protection was also a concern with reports of 283 children missing in Motot and Pulcholu payAMS (equivalent of districts) as well as others separated from their families or orphaned. One health clinic in Pieri was burnt down with medicines looted, and boreholes were also dismantled, reducing access to safe drinking water. Villages and crops were destroyed and a World Food Programme (WFP) warehouse in Pieri was looted (apparently containing sufficient food for 2,000 people for one month). There are numerous challenges in the humanitarian response to this situation, including issues of access, infrastructure, continued insecurity and limited humanitarian capacity on the ground (as several Non Government Organisations (NGOs) temporarily relocated from the area). Thus subsequent relief efforts have slowed down. The Government needs to organise mediation between senior tribal elders.

---

22 Statistics taken from South Sudan MDG profile, Basic Services Fund website http://www.bsf-south-sudan.org/node/489
23 Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, Sudan profile—http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/sudan
24 Economist article “Their day in the sun: South Sudanese are gaining independence on July 9th but have yet to build a fully functioning state “, July 2011, http://www.economist.com/node/18929477
26 OCHA South Sudan Weekly Humanitarian Bulletin, 2–8 September 2011
to reconcile differences, and to combine this with a sensitive programme of disarmament and provision of more active protection for civilians.

7. People continue to arrive from South Kordofan to Unity State and from Blue Nile State to Upper Nile State as a result of the ongoing fighting there. The high number of returnees that have travelled to the South places a high burden on the host communities, whose own coping mechanisms are already stretched.

8. The context in South Sudan has remained poorly defined and there is a lack of understanding among all actors as to whether the response should be emergency/humanitarian, recovery, or development. In reality it is a mix of all of these and needs to be carefully determined when approaching any project. Humanitarian needs look certain to continue for several years to come in South Sudan and it is important that these needs are met through adequate resources and emergency preparedness. But at the same time, emergency responses can exacerbate the situation and make communities more vulnerable rather than less so, as their dependency on relief/handouts grows and their self-sufficiency decreases. The delivery of emergency, recovery and development interventions needs to carefully balance these tensions.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

9. Water and sanitation coverage in South Sudan is very low. In 2009 village assessments in Northern Bahr el Ghazal highlighted insufficient access to water in communities as the most pressing issue across the population across all five counties in the State.27 In 2010 in Aweil Centre County 66% of the population had a round trip of 30–90 minutes to collect water and only 10% of the population collected 20 or more litres of water per person per day.28 A recent knowledge, attitudes and practises (KAP) survey carried out by UNICEF in April 2010 indicated that only 7.4% of the population washed their hands with soap and water.29 Tearfund’s KAP surveys in our project areas reported that 65% of households surveyed indicated that they practised open defecation in nearby fields, a majority (67%) did not have access to hand washing facilities and 48% said that they disposed of their rubbish on the road side. One-third of the existing water points in South Sudan are known to be non-functional due to the weak operation and maintenance capacity and less than 50 percent of existing basic primary schools—and even fewer health facilities—have access to safe water and sanitary latrines.

10. The lack of safe drinking water, inadequate excreta disposal and poor hygiene practices leaves a large portion of the population at persistent risk of preventable waterborne diseases. Morbidity data from Aweil Centre Hospital compiled January–November 2010 showed that 29% of illness was exclusively related to WASH and a further 61% could have been reduced significantly through improved WASH.30 Diarrhoea is cited as one of the most prevalent diseases in Northern Bahr el Ghazal State and this is attributed to the statistics cited above (hand washing practises, access to toilets etc) as well as the fact that 60% of households rely on water from untreated sources without boiling or treating prior to consumption. If poor sanitation and unsafe drinking water supplies continue there is a risk of cholera outbreaks.

Food security & Nutrition

11. Food security and nutrition conditions in South Sudan are extremely poor in absolute terms, as evidenced by malnutrition rates and poor dietary diversity. However, current conditions are vastly improved from war and even pre-war conditions. Such progress is threatened, however, by recurring household shocks (some annual, others more sporadic) such as drought, flood, crop disease, pests and death or theft of livestock. These shocks are of concern due to the importance of farming and raising livestock in the country; 83.7% of households in the poorest quintile of the population are chiefly occupied in agriculture.31 According to the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) a Rapid Crop Assessment conducted in August 2011 predicted a best case scenario of a 30–40% fall in cereal production in 2011 compared with the year before with Northern Bahr el Ghazal being the worst hit and only one in three persons reported to be food secure.32

12. Those recently displaced from various conflicts in South Sudan have also exerted addition pressure on household and market food stocks and community support mechanisms during the lean season (July–September). Most Internally Displaced People (IDPs) are not yet engaged in food production and thus have not cultivated for the June–September cropping season.33 Other external factors that influence the food security situation include high fuel prices and regional shortages in food stocks. The blockage of the three main trade routes with Sudan is a major factor that affects areas like Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Upper Nile. Our teams in the field report that food prices have risen four-fold over the last three months, making it difficult at times to procure adequate food.
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Disaster response

13. In 2010, 100,000 people were affected by floods, which resulted in the destruction of many houses, and the need for emergency distributions of food, shelter, and medical supplies. Tearfund works in Northern Bahr el Ghazal where communities are particularly impacted and have noted that it often forces many to live in make-shift shelters for some two to three months, during which time the availability of safe water and proper sanitation worsens leaving the affected groups more susceptible to water-borne diseases and at heightened risk of hunger due to the devastation of poor harvests. As a result, high levels of malnutrition and disease outbreaks are common. The government, donors, and NGOs need to ensure all supplies are pre-positioned in advance of the rains and hardware such as latrines are built especially in areas that will not flood, or with special flooding design.

14. The Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management, which deals with issues such as flooding, is less than a year old and there needs to be concerted efforts on the part of donors to build its capacity in terms of emergency preparedness. This could include training in contingency planning as well as assessment and coordination mechanisms. Good road and air strip infrastructure would also make a significant difference in the government being able to provide supplies in response to disasters such as floods.

Health

15. NGOs currently run and maintain approximately 85% of health services in rural areas. The problems are many, ranging from a lack of funding, investment and poor infrastructure and services, large operational areas, widespread populations, to more specific problems such as lack of qualified or literate staff and high prevalence of communicable diseases. Community awareness of the importance of hygiene practices, sanitation and health issues is low.

South Sudanese returnees

16. The above picture of various existing humanitarian needs is set against a backdrop of increased number of returnees arriving in South Sudan from Sudan, many needing urgent humanitarian aid. The total number of returnees who have arrived since the end of October 2010 is 346,000. Many pass through transit sites, some in Sudan such as Kosti (White Nile), and others over the border into South Sudan (eg Mina, Abayok and Agany, all near to Renk, Upper Nile).

17. Most make the journey to return to South Sudan with very little or no money or possessions and need food, plastic sheets, mosquito nets, vaccinations and blankets upon immediate arrival. Several transit sites have become overcrowded resulting in unsanitary conditions with outbreaks of disease (diarrhoea etc) as well as malnutrition. This overcrowding is due in part to an absence of transport to carry people further into South Sudan (or the means to pay for it when it is available) or a large amount of luggage/commercial goods that some returnees are carrying which has significantly tied up barge space originally planned for passengers. As some people have been stranded for many weeks new needs, such as education for children, arise. At present there are 10,912 people in Kosti and the sites in Renk are reported to be at full capacity.

18. Following their journey from Sudan many returnees have predominantly settled in the border States, with Unity hosting the largest number (83,851), followed by Northern Bahr el Ghazal (66,128) and then Upper Nile (56,251). Central Equatoria (home to the nation’s capital Juba) and Warrap also host a large number. This number is anticipated to continue to rise as more await transportation from Sudan and other transit sites. This recent influx of returnees has put renewed strain on states and not all are equally equipped to cope. For example where Tearfund works, in Aweil Centre County in Northern Bahr el Ghazal, the area has seen little to no meaningful increase in WASH service provision post-CPA.

19. To give a specific example, in 2009, our surveys showed 828 people accessed water per each hand pump in Aweil Centre County. By October 2010 it was estimated to have risen to 1,207 people and then in January 2011 to 1,456 people. The number of people using each hand pump has already fallen short of Sphere capacity in terms of emergency preparedness.
20. As large numbers of returnees are confronted by poor water and sanitation facilities, this is likely to have an adverse impact on their health in terms of increased rates of water-borne diseases, weakened immune systems and malnutrition. Moreover the increase in food prices across South Sudan means many returnees are finding basic foodstuffs unaffordable and so can’t meet their needs. Households in the host communities are equally experiencing food shortages as a result of the traditional hunger period between March and August and now share the little remaining food they have with their returnee relatives.

21. Whilst some returnees have returned to their respective villages in rural areas or to extended family, the vast majority have preferred instead to relocate close to towns and are now concentrated in the major population centres. Many returnees have come from Khartoum and other urban locations, and are used to city-dwelling. In Aweil town, in addition to the registered returnees, the population is likely to increase as returnees who settle with extended family bring in other members to join them without formally registering them. This will place even more pressure on already insufficient resources, especially water.

22. Transit sites have been set-up on the outskirts of many towns, such as Aweil in Northern Bahr el Ghazal, to temporarily accommodate returnees. However the process of reintegrating and allocating them land to settle has been slow, which means people are not then in a position to farm and plant. Reasons for this are a combination of delays in surveying the land as well as the onset of the rainy season, both of which have put transporting and resettlement on hold. Additional sites have been identified and confirmed but there has been resistance from returnees and host community members about moving, as they do not feel they have been adequately consulted.

23. Reports have emerged that local government in some areas allocates land only if the recipients can build shelters but these can be quite expensive and returnees may not be able to afford this immediately. Some returnees have been reportedly allocated land, but in insecure or inappropriate areas (eg women and children were allocated land near Joint Integrated Unit (JIU) of the armed forces in Melut, Upper Nile in February 2011). Slow rates of land allocation are also reported in parts of Lakes State. In Warrap the Governor has discontinued land allocation in Kwajok town, requesting that all returnees proceed directly to their home counties in order to avoid drawing more people to an already congested area. In Maduany and Apadta transit camps in Northern Bahr el Ghazal NGOs have been prohibited by the government from creating permanent structures, such as new boreholes or digging of shallow wells, with the focus being on maintenance and protection of existing water sources as well as activities like hygiene promotion. This also caused some problems with the host communities who already lived in the area before it became occupied temporarily by returnees. They felt discriminated against as they wanted to benefit from and participation in projects such as latrine construction but were forbidden due to their location being deemed a transit site.

24. In some other cases the returnees final destinations are currently inaccessible due to rains and landmines, which will mean there needs to be an intermediate plan to support these returnees until they can proceed home. In general the government need to start to work out the allocation of land and the plan for the movement of returnees now, so when the dry season comes the final stage of resettlement won’t be delayed any further. Donors should support the Government in this task.

25. Whilst some new agencies have come in to the area of Northern Bahr el Ghazal to work on the issue of returnees, most are over-stretched in the areas of highest return compared to the needs of the communities. Authorities and agencies are continuing to scale-up assistance but there are still some areas where very few NGOs are working, especially on longer term interventions such as water and sanitation (Aweil Centre County and Aweil Town are two such examples). Thus these areas remain underserved. In the area of Apadta, which is the key receiving point for returnees in Aweil, it has no clinic and no school.

26. Tearfund has agreed to support the government’s resettlement strategy for returnees in Aweil, whilst also ensuring that the needs of the most vulnerable returnees are met. For Tearfund this approach involves establishing new permanent WASH facilities such as boreholes at the sites earmarked for returnees to settle in permanently (thus supporting their integration into host communities by meeting demand), maintaining WASH services in transit camps for returnees eg through repairing and constructing new household and institutional latrines, and working to address the WASH needs of the most vulnerable amongst both returnee and host community populations. The aim is to add additional resources and build local capacity to meet the needs of both host community and recently arrived returnees and thus mitigate potential conflict over scarce resource. It is particularly important that locations for additional water sources and latrines etc are decided in collaboration with both returnees and host communities, to minimize resentment and tension between the groups.

27. During focus group discussions that Tearfund conducted with returnees in the transit sites around Aweil town, it was noted that their expectations in terms of water consumption per household per day far exceeded the levels used by local residents in these areas. Some returnees from Khartoum quoted that before returning to South Sudan, they were accustomed to using a 200lt barrel of water per day for the family’s household water and sanitation needs. The equivalent figure for family’s living in Aweil South, Northern Bahr el Ghazal,
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is 45 litres per household per day, highlighting the disparity between returnee expectations and the current standards of living for locals within Northern Bahr el Ghazal state, and the inability for local water sources to cope with this level of demand which could potentially become a source of conflict with host communities.

28. There is a considerable gap in the County’s ability to manage its water sources and a need for capacity building so that WASH interventions will be sustainable in the long term. Many of the returnees have benefited from education and other opportunities in Sudan and it is possible that educated, skilled individuals who perhaps have worked previously on water committees or as hygiene promoters have returned to places such as Aweil Centre.

29. Tearfund wishes to reiterate that a degree of flexibility needs to be retained when running projects for returnees, to remain responsive to the areas of greatest humanitarian need and dependent on the changing situation. As the flow of returnees continues NGOs and donors need to maintain a state of readiness to support emergency WASH and health interventions in transit sites should the need arise. The returnees’ situation requires a higher level of planning, coordination, resources and creativity between concerned stakeholders than previous scenarios. There should be a focus on area-based recovery of rural areas (including security, provision of basic services etc), that includes the host and returnee populations without distinction and encourages people to move out of the towns and back to their areas of origin.

Humanitarian access in South Sudan

30. At present Tearfund is recognized as a humanitarian organization by the South Sudan Government and staff continue to be granted work permits to access the country. In general our access has not been limited by political or repressive security orders and full humanitarian access has been possible. The government is keen to restructure and reform the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA). However, despite these efforts, soldiers sometimes lack resources (salaries, equipment, and supplies) and so resort to harassing communities, NGOs and the UN to secure supplies and commandeering transportation. The central SPLA command lacks control over the periphery to deal with such issues and its integration remains slow and poorly managed.

31. Humanitarian access to communities can be restricted due to long rainy seasons and poor infrastructure. Heavy rainfall and flooding is expected in many of the areas we work in, that lie in the western flood plain. There are prolonged periods during the rainy season where transport is seriously hampered and this often frustrate humanitarian activities. Roads often become impassable for weeks, if not months on end, and landing strips become waterlogged preventing air freight from being distributed. However to mitigate this risk Tearfund prepositions supplies ahead of the rainy season to ensure that essential stocks are available and schedules project activities taking into account seasonal factors. Tearfund would encourage other NGOs and implementing agencies as well as government authorities to do likewise. That being said, the Government and donors should prioritise improving infrastructure to increase humanitarian access, and more importantly spur more widespread economic development.

32. International assistance can sometimes have unintentional effect of focusing on easily accessible areas to the exclusion of others. As donors want to see the quick utilisation of funding and for NGOs to deliver on their commitments made in proposals, those organisations that are willing to work in more remote areas get penalised, as the inherent risks often cause delays. Therefore the risk is high for NGOs targeting inaccessible areas, especially when dealing with international donors, even if the humanitarian need is very serious. Donors must appropriately target aid according to geography so as to promote equitable social and economic development.

Question 2: The provision of basic services, essential infrastructure and DFID’s efforts to reduce extreme poverty and promote sustainable livelihoods

Government Provision of Basic Services

33. At present NGOs in South Sudan provide 85% of basic services and there is a need for clear transitional planning and discussion as well as government capacity building, before basic service provision can be handed over to Government Ministries without there being a break in services. The Government of the Republic of South Sudan has stated its intention to meet the expectations of its people, including through the provision of security, law and order, basic services and the effective management of public resources. International partners will need to support the establishment of a viable governance system in South Sudan that is able to deliver on these objectives and make progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.

34. There are a number of key issues linked to this, including the importance of developing and implementing an appropriate regulatory framework for continuation/facilitation of humanitarian and development assistance by and through international aid agencies. There is currently a lack of clarity regarding the bureaucratic requirements applicable to NGOs operating in South Sudan—including issues such as registration, taxes, work permit and visa requirements for international staff and social insurance for national staff—and there is some concern that the operating environment could become more restrictive. Such a shift could jeopardise the critical role played by NGOs in the provision of humanitarian and development assistance—and particularly the delivery of basic services—to the people of South Sudan. Such a framework should be informed by consultation.
with NGOs, and should clarify in particular: which government ministry is the primary interlocutor for NGOs; NGO registration requirements; immigration requirements for international staff and employment requirements for national staff; and applicable tax exemptions.

35. Much international attention is currently focused on building the capacity of the Government at the central level, to handle certain priority core state functions, and this is undoubtedly important. However, there are also great dangers in approaches which focus on a country’s capital city. It must be recognized that capacity building at state, county and payam level is also important—and these lower levels have received far less attention and support so far than the central level. As responsibility for provision of basic services has been delegated to county level, it is vital that this level of government is given long term sufficient support and capacity building to deliver such services. Donors should be willing to fund projects with capacity building elements over a longer period of time than they currently do. At present government staff in rural areas are often of low capacity or absent altogether and it is difficult to find suitable Sudanese staff for rural areas. There are people on ministry payrolls who do not report for service and/or have left their positions but due to lack of follow up still receive pay (known as “ghost workers”). Despite the Government making a concerted effort to reconcile payroll at different levels of administration, this is still a significant problem.

36. In any provision of basic services undertaken by the government they need to ensure equitable distribution of development. This also counts for international assistance, in that it should be equitable targeted. Assistance should specifically be given to support the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning to develop a system for a more equitable and transparent distribution of wealth between and within the states. The Government need to increase their budget allocation to the social sectors, ensuring that donor support for social protection does not result in a reduction of support for essential services, and support greater for programs targeting vulnerable groups.

Tearfund Health projects

37. Tearfund currently runs 14 primary health care units (PHCU) and two primary health care centres (PHCC) in Jonglei, Upper Nile and Northern Bahr el Ghazal. Our current activities cover curative services and maternal care through primary health care facilities, preventive health services including expanded programme of immunisation, health promotion, infrastructure and equipment, medical supplies, integrated nutrition programming, specific Voluntary Counselling and Testing (VCT) and Prevention of mother to child transmission (PMTCT) services, human resources for health, capacity building and training and monitoring and evaluation. Tearfund also runs a School for Community Midwives which is based in Kodok, Upper Nile in order to provide increased human resources for health.

38. Tearfund plans to exit from the health sector within the next 18 months. After working closely with the MoH to build their capacity we will hand over to another NGO who will continue this before they hand over completely to the Government. The MoH is one of the strongest Ministries at a central Juba level and even at State level in most States. They recognise their weaknesses in terms of budgets and resourcing and work closely with NGOs to provide basic health services. There are now clear policy and guideline documents and while these will need reviewing in time they are a good foundation for establishing a health sector in the country. Tearfund is helping the government in rolling these policies down to the PHCU level and supporting their implementation. The biggest barrier to the MoH running the clinics is payroll.

39. The MoH has certain advantages and opportunities for strengthening management and restoring services. The latest set of government guidelines is the “Health Sector Development Plan for South Sudan 2011-15” and this, building on cumulative policies and strategies since 1997, coupled with more effective partnership among the health authorities and international partners, provides a strong foundation upon which a modern sector-wide health care delivery system can be developed, though this is still some years away in terms of support to the current system.

40. There have been notable successes in slowly handing over this basic service provision to the government. In the period up until 2007 Tearfund was fully responsible for supplying all the drugs and supplies that are used at the health facilities. By late 2007 MoH began sending medicines and now the medical kits are received from them reasonably frequently though there are often delays. Through County Health Departments (CHDs), where they are operational, monitoring and evaluation of facilities takes place and weekly monitoring reports and statistics are sent to MoH from each site. There has been an increased number of MoH guidelines (eg for management of malnutrition) and the number of standardised tools available eg clinic registers, project indicators, clinic assessment checklists has also increased. There has also been better UN and NGO coordination with the MoH and a health surveillance system is being set up and rolled out (using “District Health Information System”, a health surveillance software).

41. Tearfund encounters various challenges in working in heath. Infrastructure is poor in many places and some health structures can easily collapse. There is also a lack of shaded waiting areas in facilities. Resources need to be found to ensure that handover of clinics is done when they are in a good condition ie permanent
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structures with adequate water and sanitation provision and fenced compound areas as well as incinerators. The MoH is not able to absorb health staff onto their pay roll as quickly as expected. However NGOs should continue their commitment to ultimately handing over to the MoH, through resources, training and skill development of the County Health Department and donors should support longer term programmes to achieve this.

42. Other challenges include local level authorities not always being completely committed to health promotion activities, limited transport which affects proper implementation and coverage, expectations of incentives to mobilize communities for health promotion and large areas of operation (which limits coverage and makes supervision of Community Health Extension (CHE) Workers difficult, especially during the rains).

Civil society provision of basic services

43. As well as working operationally in South Sudan Tearfund also supports seven partners, some faith based organisations (FBOs) and some church denominations, each undertaking a variety of development projects. Several of these partners work on various aspects of basic service provision (school construction, HIV, water and sanitation, health work etc). Tearfund supports a process called church and community mobilisation which involves mobilising a local church to act as a facilitator in mobilising the whole community to address their own needs. Once the local church is mobilised, it becomes a facilitator rather than the provider and seeks to envision and empower community members to identify and respond to their own needs, using the resources they have, rather than meeting those needs for them. The local church therefore works with rather than for the community. The result of such mobilisation is that communities write action plans, sometimes for 15–20 years, and undertake a variety of projects including building bridges, installing latrines, protecting wells, running schools, nurseries and health centres and renovating houses. They also take on initiatives of hiring of health staff and teachers (paying wages and supplying accommodation and food) and procurement of medical supplies. The communities have established saving and farming groups and are expanding their agriculture.

44. The role of such groups in basic service provision should not be underestimated in developing South Sudan's infrastructure, the capacity of its people and getting communities to break free of dependence and work together. Efforts should be made to understand such work, and support it, especially in the area of capacity building, keeping in mind at the same time that FBOs are not there to provide basic services instead of the government, but can be a good interim service provider whilst the governments own capacity is built, its responsibility in this area is acknowledged, and the country transitions out of poverty.

Infrastructure

45. Throughout South Sudan infrastructure coverage is poor and this makes access to communities challenging, especially during the rainy season when the ground becomes too muddy to allow access by vehicle. Access issues and lack of resources and transport in local Government and communities make monitoring and Government support challenging. In Tearfunds area of operation in Northern Bahr el Ghazal one of the reasons for the lack of interventions in Aweil Centre County by other NGOs is poor access during rainy season. Roads in the county are poor to non-existent, and the county headquarters in Arroyo is cut off for months as it is situated on the other side of a river without a bridge. This often means project activities are focused on the areas around Aweil town and only in the more rural regions of the county during the dry season. However road improvements are currently underway on the road to Arroyo. The Government, supported by donors, needs to make adequate investments in general infrastructure such as roads, communications and rehabilitation of airstrips, especially in remote areas. This will also enable them as the authorities, as well as UN peacekeeping operations, to reach unstable locations quickly.

DFID efforts to reduce poverty

46. Tearfund welcomes the recently published DFID Operational Plan for South Sudan 2011–15, in particular the emphasis on governance, health and ongoing humanitarian work. However one of the areas Tearfund has experience in, from a South Sudan perspective, is water and sanitation and this is therefore what we have chosen to focus our attention on below, in regard to DFID’s efforts to reduce poverty.

47. Tearfund is currently undertaking a five year programme entitled Capacity Building to Improve Humanitarian Action in the WASH Sector, which is funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (2008–12). One of the countries it covers is South Sudan and the goal is sustainable improvements in the health and well-being of communities in a complex political and disaster-affected environment. Its five outputs are:

(a) Increased quality of WASH service delivery (good practice, gender, conflict and HIV sensitive, accountable to beneficiaries, and environmentally sustainable).
(b) Capacity building intervention implemented to increase the quality of public health and environment (PHE) service delivery of local Government and civil society health institutions.
(c) Low cost, sustainable, innovative and contextualised alternatives for WASH researched and piloted and implemented.
(d) Improved policy environment and service provision at local and national levels.
50. Tearfund’s DFID WASH programme in South Sudan has now concluded and DFID have made it clear, as confirmed in their Operational Plan, that they do not intend WASH to be a big focus for them in next few years. Whilst this is disappointing, we would urge DFID to play a part in championing investment in WASH, by ensuring that the rest of the donor community in South Sudan overall continues to cover this area adequately. This is in light of the ongoing pressing needs that still exist in South Sudan and the clear value for money that such investment in WASH demonstrates. For example there are reports that the Basic Services Fund will not continue to fund WASH activities after December 2011 and Tearfund is concerned that it is not clear who will pick up this work after that. DFID should share past learning it has acquired through investment in WASH and encourage others to do likewise.

Question 5: The role of the UN development and humanitarian organisations, the World Bank, other bilateral donors and the extent of leadership and coordination between them

51. Much international assistance provided to South Sudan over the past six years has been characterised by an absence of realism, including: an absence of accurate assessments; a lack of understanding of the situation on the ground (especially the growing disparities between Juba and the rest of the south); unrealistic assumptions by international actors; and high expectations from local communities and authorities. Associated with this, flaws in the design of the post-CPA aid architecture for South Sudan have resulted in long delays in implementing urgently needed projects. There is growing frustration amongst communities at the lack of improvement in their living conditions since the CPA was signed. It is important to learn the lessons from past experience and to maintain a focus on real, on-the-ground results, recognizing that the expectations of local communities are most likely even higher post-succession than they were post-CPA.

52. Many of the current funding mechanisms are coming to an end and new ones are in the early stages of development, including a DFID-led “Health Pooled fund” (HPF), a World Bank “South Sudan Transitional Trust Fund” (SSTTF) and an International Organisation for Migration (IOM) “Rapid Response” Fund. It is important to note that aid architecture has to be appropriate to the environment and discussions in Juba can quickly become utopian and idealistic. In a context which is complex, like South Sudan, an efficient and effective response requires a range of funding mechanisms. This should include providing bilateral funds directly to implementing agencies as it is an approach proven to result in timely and effective responses. Funding mechanisms need to have realistic starting points and baselines driven by engagement with communities and these should set the priorities for funding. The HAP (Humanitarian Accountability Partnership) 2010 report on engagement has interesting perspectives about what communities in South Sudan think of NGOs and donors. It also needs to be recognized that NGOs and the Government might not be able to deliver everything the communities need/want at once and those needs will have to be prioritised.
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Government budgeting of their own resources also needs to play a part in the development of the aid architecture. Finally whilst new mechanisms are being designed donors must make sure there is a continued flow of funds for basic services.

UN development and humanitarian organisations

53. UN development and humanitarian organisations have been responsible for administering a range of funding mechanisms in South Sudan, in an effort to bring about more timely, predictable finance. The Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) and the Sudan Recovery Fund (SRF) are two cases in point, both pooled funds run by UNDP. The UN has administered pooled funding citing benefits such as reducing administration costs, increasing coordination and making it easier to share learning. Donors have therefore supported and contributed to such funds seeing this as a way of meeting commitments to Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) principles for engagement in fragile states, the Principles and Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative and other statements of good practice. However in reality UN bureaucracy within such mechanisms has ended up reducing efficiency and increasing operating costs for NGOs as there have been considerable delays encountered in trying to access funds as well as little money to cover overheads, short timeframes to implement and a lack of general engagement.52

54. The Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) is one such fund that been hampered by disbursement delays. Although grants run on a January to December basis, NGOs usually get given the funds around April/May which leaves little time for programmatic activities (no longer than seven months) and means they can’t synchronise properly with the various seasons. Some NGOs do resort to pre-financing activities to cover the gap before funding arrives but for those who are smaller this isn’t possible and they have to wait. The UN’s own evaluation of CHF (by OCHA) confirms the above issues.

55. When designing a new CHF for South Sudan it is crucial that lessons are learnt from the previous period, especially in relation to the issues mentioned above; delays in funding, short windows to implement and NGOs being unable to synchronise with the various seasons. Suggestions for how this could be achieved could include extending the timeframe of CHF projects from one to two years and aligning the funding schedule to match the seasons. If donors are able to commit multi-year funding and commit funds before the start of the project year this will equally result in less delays and uncertainty.

World Bank

56. The main pooled fund in South Sudan is the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), administered by the World Bank and mandated by the CPA. Although originally envisaged to enable a quick expansion of basic services it ended up taking a longer term focus on development and its aim, according to the World Bank website, is a focus “on rebuilding the southern states of Sudan and providing capacity-building support to the newly formed Government of South Sudan”.53 Although one of the largest funds in South Sudan, it is also cited as “the slowest and most bureaucratic” according to the recent NGO forum report. The report continues saying:

“At the end of 2009, four years after the establishment of the fund, donor contributions amounted to $526 million. Of this, just $212.5 had been disbursed to partners and $190 million actually spent. Performance in the health sector was particularly poor. The MDTF-funded multi-agency program for health sector development was supposed to deliver the governments Basic Package of Health Services to 37 counties across all states in South Sudan. Four years in, just three out of ten lead agent contracts were active and not a single subcontract had been signed nor dollar disbursed.”54

57. The World Bank, as administrator of the fund, has come in for some criticism over the years for establishing the fund but then failing to manage expectations that it would quickly deliver (a combination of start-up, structural, staffing and management issues). Contributing donors to the fund have not proactively held it to account in terms of progress or supporting it to establish more effective delivery mechanisms. Although there have been some credited successes such as better donor coherence and coordination, reduced transition costs for donors, Government increased capacity at central level and also ownership of programmes, various critiques point out that these successes are meeting donor objectives rather than producing good results on the ground.55 NGOs and civil society have not been sufficiently involved in the design, implementation and monitoring of MDTF programmes.

58. One area of concern is for Tearfund is the World Bank’s role in the new health funding mechanism that is being proposed to start in 2012. Several donors (USAID, DFID, World Bank) will take responsibility for funding health services in a specific number of states, instead of by NGO. The World Bank will be responsible for Jonglei and Upper Nile and in recent discussions it has emerged of their intention to adopt an approach of Performance Based Financing and charge beneficiaries for health care. Performance based financing will move to an output based system which means the local people would be responsible for the health clinic budgets, drug supplies, logistics etc. They would need to prove their results by “outputs” eg number of children
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immunised, number of latrines built etc. In response to the measured outputs, they would then in turn be rewarded with cash payments. This presumes there is the local capacity to undertake such things and also a certain level of infrastructure, which South Sudan simply doesn’t have in many places. NGOs would take on the role of purchasers and there would be four to five per state which means one NGO would be expected to cover approximately 200,000 people. However the information about what this role would involve is still being decided. In addition, charging for health care goes against the Ministry of Health sector development plan and would deter many from accessing health centres and getting the vital services they need. We would urge DFID to take a lead role in these ongoing discussions around this health funding mechanism in order to bring about an amendment of this World Bank proposal but also to bring more clarity to the table in regard to what funding will be able to bridge the gap between the current donor system and the new system.

Other bilateral donors

59. Some donors fund NGO programmes bilaterally, although these are relatively few. A case in point for Tearfund would be our DFID WASH programmes and our CIDA bilateral funding. But on the whole as NGOs were not able to access MDTF funds readily they have more resorted to short-term humanitarian funding (from donors such as United States Agency for International Development, ECHO, CHF). Funds such as Basic Services Fund (BSF) have also made an important contribution to supporting service delivery through NGOs. Originally created by DFID, in late 2008 it was expanded into a new multi-donor fund with additional contributions from Norway, Canada and the Netherlands. It has been credited with working exceptionally well, being professional, functional and well managed. The proposed extension of the Basic Services Fund is welcome however the details of the extension must rapidly be finalised so as to ensure appropriate continuity of service delivery56.

60. Tearfund wishes to commend the UK approach of working in South Sudan, in having a joined up Unit comprised of the Foreign Office and DFID. The Sudan Unit has engaged well with NGOs, both at a UK and Juba level, always being open and willing to meet and discuss. We have equally been pleased with the high level of ministerial engagement on South Sudan. In recognising the success of this approach we would suggest that this be used as a template for DFID’s engagement in other fragile states in the future.

The extent of leadership and coordination between donors

61. Whatever new funding mechanisms are created it is clear they will require better donor coordination on a number of fronts: between donors who work in different sectors and between those working in humanitarian relief and development, including the humanitarian and development offices of the same donor. In order to enable a smoother transition of projects donors should participate in the clusters and better coordinate discussions regarding gaps in coverage and where their responsibilities begin and end.57

October 2011

Written evidence submitted by DFID

1. Introduction

1. This memorandum addresses the birth of South Sudan, and the role that the Department for International Development (DFID) and the broader international community can play in enhancing the country’s prospects for peace and development. It focuses on:

(a) The extent of humanitarian need, especially among returning South Sudanese and those displaced by fighting in Abeyi and South Kordofan; and any problems with humanitarian access;

(b) The provision of basic services, essential infrastructure and DFID’s efforts to reduce extreme poverty and promote sustainable livelihoods;

(c) How DFID can help to improve governance, including at the county and local level;

(d) The management of oil and oil revenues for development;

(e) The role of the UN development and humanitarian organisations, the World Bank, other bilateral donors and the extent of leadership and coordination between them;

(f) The security situation including the effectiveness of the UN peacekeeping force, UNMISS, and the prospects for a non-militarised border;

(g) The implications of potential membership of the Commonwealth and the East African Community.

2. The UK has long standing ties with the people and politicians of South Sudan based on engagement, support and constructive criticism. The UK’s huge commitment to the future of South Sudan is underlined by frequent Cabinet-level engagement. The Secretary of State for International Development has visited Juba two times, in November 2010 and again in May 2011, as part of the Troika with his US and Norwegian counterparts. In July 2011 the Foreign Secretary attended South Sudan’s Independence Day celebrations. The UK was the first country to appoint an Ambassador to Juba, Dr Alastair McPhail. Dr McPhail was the first diplomat invited

---
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to present his credentials, and is now Dean of the Diplomatic Corps in Juba—testimony to the high value South Sudan places on its historical ties with the UK.

3. The UK first established a development presence in South Sudan in 2005 as a member of a six country Joint Donor Office. In November 2010, the Secretary of State for International Development opened a DFID sub-Office in Juba, reporting to DFID Sudan in Khartoum. This became a full DFID Office in July 2011 when South Sudan gained its independence. The last year has seen a rapid increase in staffing in Juba (from two staff in August 2010 to over 30 by December 2011) in response to the daunting challenges presented by the birth of the world’s newest nation.

4. The UK has a fully joined up presence in South Sudan with DFID and FCO operating from a joint office, with the platform managed by DFID. The objectives for the UK’s development assistance to South Sudan are central to wider UK Government objectives of achieving peace, stability, inclusive and accountable governance, respect for human rights and more equitable growth in South Sudan.

2. Overview

Country Context

5. The new Republic of South Sudan, established on 9 July 2011, achieved statehood facing a huge development challenge. A protracted civil war, which came to a formal end with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005, had left two million dead, many more displaced, a population dependent on humanitarian aid for their survival and a highly militarised, fractured society. The Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS), created in 2005, inherited none of the institutions of a state and possessed virtually no infrastructure and very limited human resources.

6. The six years since the CPA have seen important progress. The basic institutions of a state have been established, and most of the multiplicity of military forces in the South have been incorporated, if not fully integrated, into a single military structure. The Republic of South Sudan (RoSS) formally seceded from The Republic of Sudan (RoS) following a peaceful referendum in January 2011.

7. However, the new nation of South Sudan faces significant and complex challenges:

   - Years of conflict have left South Sudanese society highly militarised, and fragmented. In 2011 alone more than 3,000 people have died from violent conflict within South Sudan and 300,000 displaced. Arms are readily available and some armed rebel groups are still active. The military has a long way to go to complete the transition from a guerrilla army to an appropriately sized, and resourced, national army with effective civilian oversight.

   - Relations between Juba and Khartoum are rocky. Despite South Sudanese President Kiir and Sudanese President Bashir publicly pledging to commit to peaceful dialogue when they met in Khartoum on 9 October 2011, little progress has been made on resolving key areas of difference, particularly on oil, citizenship and border demarcation and the status of the disputed region of Abyei. With each side accusing the other of supporting rebel groups in its territory and ongoing violence in Sudan’s Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile state that could spill over into full scale war.

   - Government capacity is extremely limited. Although basic state structures have been established, delivery systems across all sectors are either absent or dysfunctional. Nearly half of all civil servants in South Sudan only have a primary education. Law enforcement structures have little if any capacity to access or intervene if conflict occurs.

   - Corruption is widespread. Corruption impacts virtually every level of Government. Accountability mechanisms are weak or non-existent. After the protracted period of conflict, civil society is relatively thin and largely engaged in service delivery.

   - The public infrastructure required for growth does not exist. There are very few all weather roads and only a single bridge links the east and west banks of the Nile. Only slightly more than a third of the more remote parts of the country can be accessed during the rainy season.

   - The economy is highly dependent on oil revenues. 98% of government revenues come from oil revenues. Revenues from existing fields located in South Sudan peaked in 2009 and will decline over time. The diversification of the economy is an urgent priority, to help address high unemployment, and to strengthen the predictability of future revenue flows.

8. The new country has some of the worst social indicators globally. Eight out of 10 people live on an equivalent of less than one US$ per day. Six out of every 10 have no access to any form of health care. Half of all children do not attend school. The maternal mortality rate is the highest in the world. A fifteen year old girl in South Sudan is more likely to die in childbirth than to complete secondary school. Over the last years, many Southerners have returned from the north and there are many displaced internally due to the conflicts—adding to the strain on limited services and infrastructure.

9. South Sudan has now achieved independence, but faces daunting peacebuilding and statebuilding challenges. President Kiir outlined in his 9 July Independence Speech many of the problems that his Government faces: the high levels of poverty, massive development and humanitarian challenges, corruption...
and the lack of accountability. The Government has set out its vision for the country’s transformation in the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP). The SSDP is built around four pillars (or “core building blocks”).

- Improving and expanding education and health services.
- Achieving rapid transformation to improve livelihoods and expand employment opportunities.
- Improving governance.
- Deepening peace building and improving security.

10. The Government of South Sudan has achieved a degree of peace and stability through a “big tent”strategy, but the nature of the political settlement may need evolve in order to secure a more sustainable peace. The Government currently has substantial resources with which to develop the country. The challenge is to support a demilitarisation of public expenditures and to build the capacity and the political will to direct the resources away from the core groups at the centre to a more equitable distribution focusing on productive and social sectors in the states as well as safety and justice. The likelihood of disillusionment is high and the possibility of renewed conflict over access to resources or power is significant.

UK Development Assistance in South Sudan

11. The UK is amongst the largest Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) bilateral donors in South Sudan. UK assistance for the current Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) cycle (2011–15) will total over £376.6 million including £69 million in planned capital expenditure. The annual trajectory is as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK ASSISTANCE (2011–12 TO 2014–15)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 90.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict Pool funds are additional.

12. UK support is grouped around five clusters: strengthening governance including anti-corruption efforts, support for basic services, wealth creation and food security, security, justice and peace building, and humanitarian. These clusters are aligned with the four pillars of the Government’s SSDP. We are working to ensure that our approach draws from the World Bank’s 2011 World Development Report and emerging international thinking on peacebuilding and statebuilding. We aim to follow best practice aid effectiveness principles for working in fragile states, and the international humanitarian donor principles.

13. The UK works closely with other donors. Thus far, the bulk of our programming has been funded via multi-donor trust funds and other pooled mechanisms. The Joint Donor Partnership (Canada, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and UK) established in 2006 has a common office in Juba. We work in close partnership with the European Union and the World Bank. We have signed a bilateral development agreement with USAID (the US development agency), and are also looking to engage more with important non-traditional donors such as China. The main oil investors are China, Malaysia and India, while some Gulf States also invest in real estate, infrastructure and services.

14. South Sudan remains an expensive and high risk environment for development programming, but the potential return on investments is very high. The UK does not currently channel any money through the government in South Sudan, instead routing funds through Non-Governmental Organisations, private sector firms and multilateral agencies that have robust financial management systems. However, the UK will prioritise work with state and sub-national institutions, aligning UK funding with their priorities, and building their systems so that they can manage and administer the delivery of services. We will continue to work closely with other donors, including through joint programming and shared advisory/technical resources.

Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

15. South Sudan faces significant challenges in making progress towards the MDGs. Although it has made progress in certain areas, such as education enrolment, other areas are lagging significantly. For example, South Sudan’s maternal mortality rate is the worst in the world.
Table 2
KEY STATISTICS

**South Sudan: Key Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (Thousands of km²)</td>
<td>644.3 sq. km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>8.26 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population less than 18 years of age</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population less than 30 years of age</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population literate</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (2010)</td>
<td>US$1,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government budget (2010)</td>
<td>SDG 5.6 bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil revenues as % of total revenues</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

**MDG PROGRESS SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1 Poverty and hunger</td>
<td>In South Sudan, chronic hunger was reduced from 48% to 33% between 1995 and 2004. However 50.6% of the population lives below the national poverty line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 2 Universal primary education</td>
<td>Net enrolment in primary school was 46% in 2010, but far fewer children complete all eight years. The qualified teacher to children ration stands at 1:117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 3 Gender equality</td>
<td>Girls make up only 36.9% of primary school enrolment. One positive development is that 34% of all seats in the South Sudan Legislative Assembly are held by women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 4 Child mortality</td>
<td>There has been a decrease in under-five mortality from 250 per 1,000 live births (2001) to 135 per 1,000 (2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 5 Maternal health</td>
<td>South Sudan has the highest maternal mortality rate in the world—2054 per 100,000 live births. This means that there is a one in seven chance of a woman dying during her lifetime of pregnancy related causes. Currently there is one qualified midwife per 30,000 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 6 Diseases</td>
<td>HIV prevalence among the 15–24 yr population was 3.1 in 2006. Malaria is hyper-endemic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 7 Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Access to safe water and sanitation rose from 47% in 2006 to 67% in 2010 and from 6% to 14% respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Key enquiry issue: The extent of humanitarian need especially among returning South Sudanese and those displaced by fighting in Abyei and South Kordofan; and any problems with humanitarian access

3.1 Extent of humanitarian need

16. Humanitarian needs in South Sudan remain acute—characterised by widespread chronic vulnerability and pockets of acute humanitarian need. The lack of basic service provision and livelihoods opportunities, when coupled with the large scale return of South Sudanese from the North (346,000 since October 2010 according to the International Organisation for Migration (IOM)), has lead to a fragile humanitarian situation.

17. The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) assess that insecurity remains the single most significant factor impacting the humanitarian situation.

— January to September 2011 saw more than 420 conflict incidents, resulting in over 3,100 deaths (three times the number for all of 2010) and the displacement of more than 310,000 people.

— UN agencies also report widespread and chronic food insecurity affecting an estimated 36% of the population (almost three million people) in 2011.
Table 4

UN OCHA ESTIMATES FOR THE HUMANITARIAN CASELOAD IN 2012
(Caseload for Most-Likely Scenario)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internally-Displaced</th>
<th>Returnees</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
<th>Indirectly affected and others requiring assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some 300,000 or more people displaced by inter-communal, rebel-militia group violence, and Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) attacks</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>250,000 South Sudanese returning from Sudan</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>110,000 displaced returning to Abyei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Estimates by the wider humanitarian community for the rest of 2011 and 2012 suggest that these trends will continue with further large-scale returns from Sudan; high levels of internal displacement as a result of inter-tribal, rebel militia and inter-communal conflicts; continuing food insecurity due to the anticipated poor 2011 agricultural harvest, inflation and Sudan border blockages; predictable annual flooding crises and periodic disease outbreaks; as well as a continued reliance by the GoSS on humanitarian agencies to provide life-saving frontline services. The GoSS has already stated it will take a generation before it can provide its own frontline social services and taking this into account, the next decade for South Sudan is likely to see slow progress, checked by frequent reversals.

3.2 Returnees

19. Between October 2010 and early October 2011 over 346,000 returnees arrived in South Sudan. Meanwhile at least 17,000 people are known to be waiting in open areas in Khartoum to return to South Sudan and it is estimated there may be 800,000 more who may decide at some point to move south. The nine-month window for Southerners to determine their citizenship/residency status expires at the end of March 2012. In August the President of Sudan signed amendments to the Sudan Nationality Act that closed the door to any South Sudanese wishing to retain Sudanese citizenship. Article 10 (2) states: “A person will automatically lose his Sudanese nationality if he has acquired, de jure or de facto, the nationality of South Sudan.” Since then South Sudanese in Sudan are experiencing manifold problems with nationality documentation. Old documents are no longer recognised and there are reports of IDs being confiscated and the Government of Sudan (GoS) land department ceasing the issue of documents required to legalise land ownership.
The administrative units and their names shown on this map do not imply acceptance or recognition by the Government of Republic of South Sudan. This map also only support the work of the Humanitarian Comunity.
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20. Many returnees are arriving in Renk just across the border from White Nile State in Sudan. The town currently hosts approximately 30,000 returnees and is becoming increasingly congested. Many families are choosing to stay there because of perceived insecurity in their home areas, while others are willing but unable to travel onwards due to impassable roads and the high cost of barge transportation, resulting from the huge volumes of luggage families are bringing with them. Given Renk’s proximity to the border, government authorities are unwilling to allow returnees to concentrate there, or to provide additional land.

21. Meanwhile a joint north-south committee was recently established to develop common plans to increase the speed and efficiency of return movements and devise ways of reducing luggage and supporting return operations over the coming year. The committee is advocating for increased collaboration and monetary or in-kind contributions from both the GoS and GoSS to realise the plans.

22. As more families arrive, competition for already scarce resources within communities of return has exacerbated while land allocation processes, particularly in peri-urban areas, are slow and in many places contentious. State reintegration plans covering five sectors (education, water, livelihoods, health, and community policing), developed following a survey in January have not been acted upon. In order to move the process forward and avert the potential for conflict the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) recently tasked IOM to consult with all potential stakeholders and develop an implementation strategy. Despite this, it is unlikely the plans will be actualised until mid 2012 at the earliest. However, DFID and other donors such as USAID and the EU, have started to address reintegration needs through their current programmes.

3.3 Abyei, South Kordofan and Blue Nile

23. Most of the 110,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) who fled Abyei in early June are in the border town of Agok. Many of these have returned there, having originally fled further South, following the initial deployment of Ethiopian troops from the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei (UNISFA). It is unlikely that the conditions for returns to Abyei, including the full deployment of UN troops, and the withdrawal of the Sudan Armed Forces (SAF), will be in place before at least January 2012. As of 09 October both SAF and SPLA forces are reported to still be present in Abyei.

24. People affected by the conflict in Southern Kordofan began to cross over into Unity State in South Sudan in mid-August. As of October 2011 that number now exceeds 12,000. New arrivals relate experiences of five to nine day walks amid continued aerial bombardment, and journeying through swamplands from the border point. Those arriving are in an increasingly poor medical condition, reporting that food stocks in their home areas have run out. Due to the lack of roads and the rains, humanitarian agencies continue to struggle to provide even limited services. Although UNMISS helicopters have been used to provide food, agencies have to use quad bikes to ferry supplies and personnel from the nearest accessible point, a return journey that takes at least six hours. The development of a temporary settlement over 100 kms from the border is underway as are efforts to persuade the refugees to transfer there and avail of way stations being established to provide resting points during the journey.

25. Armed clashes between the SAF and SPLM-N in Blue Nile that erupted in early September are ongoing and the UN estimate that as many as 6,000 people have been displaced into Upper Nile state in South Sudan. Confirmation of this number is still awaited as rainy season access constraints have delayed plans to carry out a detailed assessment. Many more have moved into Ethiopia.
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3.4 Conflict related displacement

Fig. 2

CUMULATIVE FIGURES OF NEW CONFLICT RELATED DISPLACEMENT IN 2011

Cumulative figures of new conflict related displacement reported in 2011 - Status 31/09/11: 311,615 IDPs
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26. By the end of September 2011, more than 311,000 people were newly displaced in South Sudan. In addition to people from Abyei, Southern kordofan and Blue Nile, others have been displaced primarily as a result of either (or a combination) of inter-tribal, rebel militia and inter-communal conflicts that occurred in Warrap, Unity, Upper Nile, Jonglei and Lakes States, where revenge cattle raiding and resistance to the Government’s Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) are typical conflict catalysts. The most significant in-country clashes that took place this year were those between the Murle and Lou Nuer tribes in Jonglei where 340 were killed and 26,800 were displaced in mid-August. The presence of George Athor’s rebel militia group, one of at least three such groups still operating in South Sudan, has been observed in Jonglei in recent weeks and tensions are high that further attacks both there and in Upper Nile state are imminent. All of the above has significant implications for the humanitarian situation.

3.5 Humanitarian access and constraints

27. South Sudan remains one of the most challenging environments for delivering relief. Many vulnerable communities live in remote locations which are cut off during the rains (April–November) and are generally inaccessible due to poor road infrastructure, and/or the limited presence and poor condition of air strips.

28. Interference with humanitarian operations has increased. By the end of September 2011, 97 incidents had occurred during which the SPLA or other state actors had commandeered relief assets; occupied relief premises; physically assaulted staff, or restricted access to beneficiaries. These incidents have negatively impacted humanitarian operations, resulting in the loss of vital relief supplies; the evacuation of staff and associated impediments and delays in supporting affected populations quickly and safely.

29. The Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management (MoHDM) and the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC) have taken a firm position on interference, strongly condemning abuses and committing to investigate attacks.

3.6 UK Response

30. The UK will make a significant contribution to meeting essential humanitarian needs in South Sudan throughout 2012 and is working with OCHA to establish a Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) with other donors to serve the new nation. The value of this support will be based on DFID and the UN’s assessment of need and response capacity. We expect this to be in the order of £15–20 million. DFID also maintains a watching brief on rapidly emerging humanitarian issues in the country, in particular related to acute food insecurity and conflict.

4. Key enquiry issue: The provision of basic services, essential infrastructure and DFID’s efforts to reduce extreme poverty and promote sustainable livelihoods

4.1 The provision of basic services

(a) Access to health

31. Decades of war have left South Sudan’s health system extremely weak. The GoSS is unable to deliver basic health services due to lack of capacity, infrastructure, staff and other resources. It is estimated that less than 40% of the population has access to basic primary health care services in South Sudan, and that about 70% of functional health facilities are reliant on NGOs for operational support.

32. South Sudan’s health outcomes reflect this weak capacity and infrastructure. It has one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the world with more than one in fifty women dying during pregnancy or delivery, only 14.7% of deliveries are assisted by skilled staff and just 5.1% of couples using a method of contraception. Teenage pregnancy is common with 41% of girls married before their 18th birthday. Under-5 mortality is significantly higher than sub-Saharan Africa as a whole at 135 per 1,000, a result of the heavy disease burden in malaria, diarrhoea, respiratory infections and malnutrition. Immunisation rates are still low, with only 20% of one-year olds immunised against measles. Sudan as a whole ranks fourth globally for maternal mortality rates in the world with more than one in fifty women dying during pregnancy or delivery.

(b) Access to education

33. South Sudan started at the bottom of world league table for education. The net enrolment rate at primary level is only 44% and it is slightly over 9% at the secondary level. There are only seven girls for 10 boys at primary schools and five girls for 10 boys enrolled in secondary schools. Only 16% students enrolled at grade one complete primary education. This rate for girls is 9%. The average score in a sample mathematics test was 38 for grade 6 South Sudanese students. In comparison, grade 5 Sudanese students scored 47 and grade 4 Yemeni students scored 34 in the same sample test.

34. Education infrastructure and staffing are critically inadequate. Only 23% of the existing classrooms are of permanent construction; less than 5% of teachers have pre-service training, and 9% have in-service training. The average pupil classroom ratio is 134:1 and pupil teacher ratio is 194:1. Textbooks are also in short supply; average pupil textbook ratio is 1:4, in Unity State it is 1:9.

(c) Access to water and sanitation
35. Poor water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) conditions are major contributing factors to the high mortality rate and low nutritional status in South Sudan. Although comprehensive data on present levels of WASH service delivery are difficult to obtain, studies indicate that the current coverage rate of safe drinking water is estimated at 67%. The estimated number of people per water point currently ranges from 1,000 to 6,000 and the average time spent collecting water can be up to eight hours in areas without WASH services.

The high number of returnees has increased this demand as well as the burden on existing services and there is a risk that competition for scarce resources could trigger conflict. Women and girls continue to carry a disproportionate burden for the collection of household water, with adult women carrying 60% of the burden and girls 8.3%.

36. Water related diseases are a major cause of mortality in southern Sudan. Widespread acute watery diarrhoea across southern Sudan reached a cumulative reported total of 27,000 cases and 35,000 cases in 2008 and 2009 respectively. Communities situated along river banks that rely on unsafe surface water for domestic purposes, and large communities with poor sanitary facilities, were the most affected. Adequate sanitation coverage rates are a mere 14% in South Sudan. In eight of the 10 states, less than 10% of residents use improved sanitation facilities, whereas less than 50% of existing basic primary schools, and even fewer health facilities, have access to safe water and sanitary latrines.

37. Almost all donor funding in the WASH sector in South Sudan has been aimed at basic service delivery of water and sanitation services. Only limited funding has been put into improving water resource management systems and structures.

(d) Current UK support for basic services

38. Over the last five years the UK has made a significant contribution to basic service delivery in South Sudan through the Basic Services Fund (BSF)—one of the most effective pooled funds to date in Southern Sudan.18,19 Since 2006 the BSF has funded NGOs to support government health services for 2.2m people (or approximately 20% of the country) across 35 counties in 186 government health facilities.20 It has also funded NGOs to support school construction and pre-service and in-service teacher training. Almost 70,000 children have benefitted from going to schools supported by the Fund. And over 648,000 South Sudan citizens now have access to safe drinking water and improved sanitation thanks to non-governmental organisation managed initiatives funded by the BSF.21 The Fund also supports training for sanitation and hygiene promotion (3,250 training sessions have been completed to date).

39. We plan to extend the Fund for one more year (until December 2012) to address the needs of returnees from the Republic of Sudan and to ensure that there is not a gap in service delivery while sector funding mechanisms are put in place.

40. In addition to the Basic Services Fund we are also supporting efforts to strengthen education through two key programmes. The South Sudan Education Programme will construct 33 primary schools and four secondary schools in four states of South Sudan in collaboration with the communities. It will also operate alternative learning programme for out of school youth. The total value of the programme is about £37 million over four years. Textbooks for South Sudan will print and distribute over 12 million textbooks, develop a national textbook policy for South Sudan. The total value of the programme is £11 million.

(e) Plans for future UK support

41. In the period 2011–2015, the UK will scale up our work to support improved basic service delivery, seeking to support the move from humanitarian services to a stronger emphasis on Government ownership and delivery.

42. In the health sector, the UK will be the lead agency for the planned Health Pooled Fund (HPF) which will deliver life-saving essential health care services to an estimated four million people in six states, while helping the Ministry of Health to take over responsibility for health care from NGOs. The Health Pooled Fund will increase coverage to 60% nationally aiming to provide adequate health care to cover all the payams22 in counties across six of the 10 states in the country. The UK will be the lead donor for the pooled fund with contributions from four other donors (Canada, Australia, Sweden and the European Commission) to an estimated size £114 million in the first phase of three years and £36 million in the second phase of two years. The fund will also support up to 15 county hospitals. Over the next four years key results from our health portfolio will include:

- 1.4 million under five year olds are seen for a curative consultation;
- 260,000 children receive three doses of DTP3 immunisation; and
- 120,000 women have at least four antenatal visits, 120,000 pregnant women receive at least two doses of intermittent presumptive treatment of malaria as part of their antenatal care and 60,000 women deliver in a health facility with a skilled birth attendant.

43. Additional health sector support will complement the Health Pooled Fund. The Human Resources for Health Fund (led by the EC) will train nurses/midwives and strengthen management capacity of the Ministry of Health. The Integrated Community Case Management programme (led by the Canadian International Development Agency) will roll out life-saving treatment by trained volunteers of children under five in villages which are outside walking distance of a health facility in 35 out of 79 counties.
44. In the education sector, we are at the design phase for two new programmes. The Support to Girls’ Education programme will improve access to education for girls by addressing the economic, social and cultural barriers to girls’ education. The Support to teacher development programme will improve the quality of education through support for in-service teacher training at 14 county education centres. Over the next four years key results from our education portfolio will include:23
   — Up to 240,000 children including 180,000 girls are supported by the UK at primary schools.
   — Up to 7,000 children including 4,000 girls are supported in secondary schools.
   — Construct 328 classrooms in 33 primary and four secondary schools.

45. Future UK support on water, sanitation and hygiene issues (WASH) will be integrated into our approach to school and clinic construction. Within the EU, Germany has taken the lead on WASH, and Germany, the Netherlands, France and the EU are working to develop an “Urban Water and Sanitation Sector Fund.”

4.3 Infrastructure: needs and response

46. As a result of years of marginalisation and conflict, South Sudan, was born into a virtual absence of infrastructure. The gaps in critical infrastructure present binding constraints to market access, agricultural growth and food security and hamper the state’s ability to deliver effective governance, security and basic services for its population.
   — South Sudan has approximately 100 km of paved road. There are very few all weather roads and only a single bridge links the east and west banks of the Nile—only slightly more than a third of the more remote parts of the country can be accessed during the rainy season. Poor transport infrastructure results in extremely high transportation costs.
   — There is no electricity grid. Unless tackled poor electricity provision will become a barrier to the development of agro-processing operations and to improved storage of produce. Mobile penetration is still limited—although there has been progress with five GSM providers licensed and three million lines active.
   — The lack of police and government buildings and road access leaves the population vulnerable to violent conflict perpetrated by cattle raiders and armed rebel groups. Acute shortages of water as a result of limited boreholes and water conservation infrastructure weaken livelihoods and expose communities to the risk of resource conflict.

47. The SSDP sets out the Government’s plans for US$5 billion of infrastructure expenditure over the period 2011–13 (US$4 billion of development expenditures and US$1 billion of salaries and operating expenditures). The African Development Bank (AfDB) undertook an Infrastructure Needs Assessment during April-August 2011, which also identified around US$4 billion of expenditure needs. The AfDB proposed priorities are somewhat different from those in the SSDP (with, for example, a greater focus on spending on roads as compared to civil aviation). In view of the large volume of development expenditure required and the limited implementation capacity available, the AfDB also suggested a slightly longer time frame for the proposed investments (with spending out to 2016). At the request of the Government the AfDB is now working to develop an Infrastructure Action Plan, which should help to shape an agreed course for future investment in the infrastructure sector.

48. The UK is working with US, Canadian, Dutch and EU partners to invest in developing state and community infrastructure. The UK has invested £50 million into the South Sudan Recovery Fund (SSRF), led by the South Sudan Government, administered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and designed to tackle insecurity, strengthen governance and improve livelihoods across four conflict prone states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure components</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Direct costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>591kms</td>
<td>£23,329,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>£2,033,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haffirs (reservoirs)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£2,751,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>£234,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County government buildings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>£3,732,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£774,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Radio Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£1,929,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£34,785,546</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. The UK is now developing a four year rural feeder roads programme with the GoSS and other partners. UK support will help to construct up to 550 km of rural feeder roads, providing employment for up to 11,000 people by 2015. The roads will improve access to markets for South Sudanese farmers leading to increased incomes from agricultural production and reduced levels of food insecurity in South Sudan.
4.4 Poverty reduction, wealth creation and food security

50. The National Household Budget Survey in 2009 found that 47% of the population of South Sudan did not have enough food to eat. Between one-third and half of the population was either severely or moderately food insecure over the past three years.\(^{24}\) 50.6% of the population fall below the national poverty line (of Sudanese Pounds 72.9/person/month).\(^{25}\) The population is predominantly rural (83%), and poverty is significantly higher in rural areas. More than half of the rural population falls below the poverty line compared to slightly less than a quarter of the urban population. Poverty rates are highest in the Greater Bahr el Ghazal region (60%).

51. Currently, the international response to food insecurity in Southern Sudan is dominated by emergency food aid distributions. While effective at saving lives, food aid does not increase resilience to future shocks or address chronic food insecurity. At present the oil sector provides a critical source of public revenue and foreign exchange earnings, but it contributes little direct employment and production is expected to start to decline very soon (see section 6).

52. Diversification of income generation from oil revenues is essential for sustained and broad economic development. The development of the country’s agricultural and livestock potential represents the best engine for this important transformation in the medium term.\(^{26}\) Across the country, four out of every five households depend on crop farming or animal husbandry as their primary source of livelihood. But agriculture provides less than 30% of gross domestic product and large fertile areas remain untouched—only about 4% of potential agricultural land is presently utilised.\(^{27}\) Poor road infrastructure and market access is a key binding constraint to agricultural development and improvements in food security.\(^{28}\)
53. Private investment is low with potential investors deterred by the risk of conflict, lack of infrastructure and weak security of ownership. Only around one in 10 people earn their living as a paid employee and there are only 7,333 registered formal businesses in South Sudan. The World Bank 2011 study, “Doing Business, Juba” ranks Juba 159 out of 183 in ease of starting a business.29 One of the key challenges is that Southern Sudan’s legal and regulatory framework remains incomplete; several laws important for the private sector—such as the Labour Bill and the new Companies Bill—have been drafted but not yet enacted. Other important barriers include poor infrastructure, a confusing legal system, and overlaps and gaps in the institutions responsible for regulation of the private sector. Together these factors generate significant costs for business. For example the World Bank calculates that South Sudan is the third most difficult country in the world to trade from (after Afghanistan and Central African Republic). It takes an entrepreneur in Juba 11 documents, 60 days, and US$9,420 to import a standardized container cargo from the port of Mombasa in Kenya, and nine documents, 52 days, and US$5,025 to export one.

54. The UK is supporting the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF) to help catalyse private sector investment in agriculture. The project which is launching a South Sudan window in October 2011 will competitively select and co-finance private sector led projects in agri-business. The chosen projects will be expected to have a direct positive impact on poor people in rural areas, in the form of jobs and cash incomes. The UK is also developing a range of interventions targeted at addressing food security supporting broad based economic growth. These include a Feeder Roads Programme (see para 49), an intervention to build household assets and improve food security for poor agricultural and pastoral households through a multi-year productive safety net, and support through Trade Mark East Africa to help the Government to establish a Customs Service and reduce the cost of trading across borders, improving trade competitiveness, and potentially reducing consumer prices.

5. Key enquiry issue: How DFID can help to improve governance including at the county and local level

55. South Sudan faces daunting Governance challenges. The capacity of the administration in South Sudan to govern, at all levels, is extremely circumscribed. At the county and local-payam-level, the actual presence of formal government institutions is limited. Throughout the county, governance is frequently extremely poor, with nascent institutions often becoming overwhelmed by the demands placed on them or by security challenges. Four key areas of focus for the UK are security and justice, economic governance (including public financial management), tackling corruption and building government capacity.
5.1 Strengthening Security and Justice

56. Improving security for the people of South Sudan is one of the critical challenges facing the Government. While there are still a number of armed rebel groups at large, there are currently no strong opposition movements. However, on-going, low-level conflict, both inter-tribal and intra-tribal, is widespread in South Sudan. The security context is further complicated by the difficult relationship with the Republic of Sudan and the potential for spillovers from the conflict in Abyei, South Kordofan and Blue Nile.

57. Finding permanent solutions to South Sudan’s violence is likely to take many years and will require political and military responses combined with Government action to meet people’s expectations. Success is likely to be dependent on a more accountable, transparent and inclusive political system at the centre, combined with the capability to deliver security, justice, and opportunities on the ground in the states and counties.

58. A key pillar of the UK approach is therefore support to strengthen the core security and justice functions of the state. The Security Sector Development and Defence Transformation Programme is working to ensure that the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) is better managed in non-combat related areas, more accountable, and becomes less of a drain on Government resources (currently up to 40% of the national budget is defence related). This programme works with Parliament and civil society as well as with the SPLA and the Ministry of Defence. In parallel the Safety and Access to Justice Programme is working to build capacity in the South Sudan Police Service (SSPS) so as to improve its functioning as an institution and the nature and quality of services offered to citizens. These programmes are complemented with funding through UNDP to support the Government of South Sudan with a range of stabilisation recovery measures in Warrap, Lakes, Eastern Equatoria and Jonglei States (South Sudan Recovery Fund); with support to reduce the vulnerability of communities to localised conflict and instability in South Sudan (Community Security and Arms Control Programme); as well as work through NGOs to improve the effectiveness of key institutions (including Government bodies) to mitigate conflict and foster peace in South Sudan (South Sudan Peace Building Fund). Our funding for the South Sudan Recovery Fund is augmented by the deployment of two UK stabilisation advisers (through the Civilian Stabilisation Group) to support state level delivery.

59. One of the key security challenges facing the new government will be the transformation and rightsizing of the SPLA to ensure it is both more effective and less of a drain on Government resources. The SPLA has expanded since the signing of the CPA as members of other armed groups active during the civil war were absorbed into its structure. While this has helped to manage the risk of organised threats to the state in the short term, it is unsustainable in the longer term. Currently the SPLA has somewhere between 180,000 and 220,000 soldiers, and there are up to an additional 120,000 members of the other armed services (prison service, fire service and wildlife service, all of which are over-staffed): in total around 360,000 people out of a population of about 8 million.

60. Following unsuccessful attempts at Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) in the period since the CPA, a credible new process is crucial. The UK has been working with the other key actors—the SPLA, the South Sudan DDR Commission and the UN—to develop a new DDR strategy. This process is still underway. Indicative planning figures are 80,000 SPLA and 70,000 from the other armed services to be demobilised over the next five years.

61. South Sudan’s low economic base, the low skills profile of most ex-combatants and the limited capacity of the economy to absorb ex-combatants are challenges which the new programme will have to address comprehensively. The Government has committed to pay ex-combatants during the year-long process of demobilisation and reintegration. The issue of DDR has been recognised as a cross-government priority and is working to ensure it is both more effective and less of a drain on Government resources. The SPLA has expanded since the signing of the CPA as members of other armed groups active during the civil war were absorbed into its structure. While this has helped to manage the risk of organised threats to the state in the short term, it is unsustainable in the longer term. Currently the SPLA has somewhere between 180,000 and 220,000 soldiers, and there are up to an additional 120,000 members of the other armed services (prison service, fire service and wildlife service, all of which are over-staffed): in total around 360,000 people out of a population of about 8 million.

62. South Sudan is the fifth largest economy in East African, but has by far the highest GDP (US$1,546 in 2010) and GNI (US$984 in 2010) per capita rates.30 The relatively high rates are largely explained by oil production (exports of oil amounted to 71% of the total GDP in 2010), and GNI per capita is likely to rise further if a greater amount of oil revenues are kept in South Sudan after oil negotiations with Khartoum are concluded.31 However, the relatively high GNI per capita is the result of very recent rises in oil production and South Sudan currently lacks the strong systems needed to use these resources to address the enormous gaps in human and physical capital. Moreover, the relatively high GNI per capita is likely to be short lived—unless more oil is found or investment is made to improve extraction rates from existing oil wells, oil production is forecast to decline quickly from 2016.

63. The Government resource allocation for 2011 focused on the security sector (28% of the budget in 2011), public administration (13%), rule of law (10%), infrastructure (11%) and accountability (3%). Allocations to the education and health sector were limited (7% and 4%, respectively). Salaries made up 42% of total spending. Transfers to the States made up 26% (both block and conditional grants). Operational and capital spending took up 36% and 22% respectively. The central level accounted for approximately 80% of total government expenditure.
64. Strengthening economic governance to ensure that resources are used effectively is therefore a crucial priority. There are high fiduciary risks related to all aspects of the Public Financial Management (PFM) system.

---

The PFM system is not supporting the achievement of a stable and sustainable fiscal policy and does not lead to aggregate fiscal discipline or predictable funding. There are very significant annual deviations between allocations and actual budget out-turns due to a lack of hard budgetary constraints.

---

Expenditures are not based on policy priorities and budgets do not provide predictability to policy-making and sectoral funding. There are very considerable in-year reallocations at the level of sectors and agencies; institutional arrangements are absent or not adhered to.

---

The expenditure system neither requires performance from public actors nor does it ensure that funding reaches service delivery entities in a timely and predictable manner (as evidenced by significant under-spending on social services, inadequate accounting and reporting on inputs, lack of controls, and no performance management).

65. The poor performance of the PFM system reflects shortcomings in the legislative and regulatory frameworks, weak institutional structures, processes and procedures, and a lack of capacity across most aspects of the PFM cycle. The governance environment and the many challenges faced by the Government create fiduciary risks for public funds (including aid funds, if provided on-budget), while at the same time making reforms difficult.

66. The Government has signaled a strong desire for donors to move to financial aid through government systems. Significant improvements are needed in these systems before financial aid could be provided at a reasonable level of risk. Donors are providing support to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MoFEP) in various PFM areas, including planning and budgeting, budget execution, and aid management. However, further donor support is needed to address weaknesses in the PFM system. This will require a strengthened focus by the Government starting with the development of a PFM and accountability reform programme. Key weaknesses to address include improving expenditure control (which can help to address the lack of budget credibility as well as funding predictability), budget execution (including internal control procedures, procurement and internal audit), external scrutiny and audit, and comprehensiveness and transparency (including access to key fiscal information).

67. The UK is already supporting work to strengthen PFM systems, including through the ODI Budget Strengthening Initiative (BSI) programme which promotes more effective, transparent and accountable budget policies, processes and systems in South Sudan, and through support for ODI Fellows who are seconded to key ministries including the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MOFEP). In addition the Capacity Building Trust Fund (CBTF), for which the Joint Donor Office acts as the Secretariat, provides harmonised support for a range of institutional capacity building measures at both federal and state levels. This has included technical assistance such as economic advice, the development and introduction of payroll systems within the civil service and the SSIS, and support for the purchase software essential for the operations of the new Bank of South Sudan. The UK’s South Sudan Defence Development Transformation project is supporting payroll and financial management systems within the SPLA and the Ministry of Defence (MoD), including procurement and auditing systems. It is also institutionalising MoD financial control over the SPLA. The Health Pooled Fund will help drive improved PFM at all levels.

5.3 Action to tackle corruption

68. Direct action to tackle corruption is a key priority in South Sudan. The President’s Independence Day speech identified corruption and a lack of accountability mechanism amongst the main challenges facing the country. Corruption is widespread and serious. A current focus for the international community’s concern is the Government’s Foreign Exchange policy. The Government’s decision to suspend foreign exchange auctions and to replace them with allocated sales at a rate far below the current market rate, generates significant opportunities for corruption: the Government is effectively selling the nations wealth at 75% of its value with no benefits to the general population.

69. During a joint troika (Norway, UK, US) visit in May 2011, the Secretary of State for International Development offered UK leadership of a initiative to develop a robust approach to tackling corruption in South Sudan, drawing in the support from the wider international community. The coordinated international approach will include work to strengthen accountability institutions, support systems and institutional development, stimulate demand for accountability and civil society oversight (including in service delivery), and develop the media and enabling environment that can help to keep a check on corruption.

70. The UK is supporting a range of programmes—which is currently being expanded—to help tackle corruption. These are implemented in a variety of ways. Support to accountability institutions is largely being developed and delivered through the Joint Donor Office and a UNDP-led programme—covering the South Sudan Anti Corruption Commission (SSACC), the Auditor General, the South Sudan Legislative Assembly and state legislative assemblies (in particular the public accounts committees and budget committees). Support to strengthen PFM systems is integrated into much of our ongoing planned programming (for examples see para 67). We are about to carry out a mapping process to identify key strategic gaps, based on previous grand corruption cases, and inform a coordinated inter-donor strategy. Identifying champions within Government,
strengthening international linkages, and work to enhance the transparency of natural resource revenue reporting are likely to be important components of our approach.

5.4 Strengthening Government service delivery capacity

71. The UK recognises that strengthened capacity at all levels of Government will be crucial for South Sudan’s stability and for sustainable action to address human suffering and promote poverty reduction. We have therefore integrated support to strengthen government capacity across our development activities in South Sudan.

72. We are providing direct support to the central executive and to the functioning of the state level administrations. The former project entails high level mentoring to key personnel within the Ministry of Cabinet Affairs, the Office of the President and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. This has focused on enhancing the functioning of government at the highest levels, and has included the provision of training of all Ministers and Deputy Ministers in Cabinet procedures and the development of systems and procedures for the functioning of the Cabinet. The second project, implemented through UNDP, has entailed supporting budgeting and planning within the state-level administrations and supporting mechanism to enhance the constitutionally-approved process of decentralisation and interaction between the capital and the state administrations.

73. The primary beneficiaries to date of much UK capacity-building support have been Ministries and personnel based in Juba. This was inevitable given both the political need to develop central institutions and their extremely weak capacity. The focus, across much of the international community, is now broadening to embrace lower levels of government. For example, the police project is focusing on four states as well as the centre. This, however, is complex, resource-intensive (as it entails deploying personnel throughout the country) and dependent on the existence of effective implementation capacity (which is extremely stretched at present). But it is a priority. For example, our health and education programmes will help to support a transition from humanitarian to development programming and in doing so gradually strengthen the capacity of local government.

6. The management of oil and oil revenues for development

6.1 Oil revenues: important but volatile

74. Oil is an important but volatile part of the South Sudanese economy. Oil revenues are the dominant source of government income, constituting 98% of the budget in 2011. The IMF has forecast that 2011 oil revenues will be SSP10.5bn, and non-oil revenues SSP0.3bn. Such heavy dependency is dangerous. Oil is currently near peak production and from the middle of the decade it is expected to begin declining rapidly. New oil finds and new investment to improve extraction rates from existing wells could prolong the period of high production levels, though probably not quickly enough to prevent a serious decline in revenues for some years.

---

**Figure 4**
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6.2 Management of Oil Resources

75. The oil sector is under the supervision and regulation of the Ministry of Petroleum and Mining (MPM). There is a lack of capacity in the ministry, and technical assistance is being provided by Norway and USAID. MPM has responsibility for the marketing/selling of oil, and working together with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MoFEP) and the Central Bank in a marketing team.

76. South Sudan’s oil resources are under-explored and potential reserves are poorly documented.32 The country is divided into prospective Blocks and oil companies holding the concessions for them are only contractually bound to modest exploration obligations. The MPM has stated that existing commercial contracts with oil companies will be respected post independence.

77. Oil is currently only being produced in four of the blocks. Most of the rest are leased by inexperienced companies. Oil production is managed by consortia made up of both Sudanese and international oil firms. These include Sudapet, CNPC, Sinopec (both Chinese) and Petronas (Malaysia). Total (France) has a large stake in the Block thought to have greatest potential for new finds.

6.3 Management of Oil Revenues

78. Under the CPA, oil revenues from production in South Sudan were split 50:50 with Khartoum. However a final settlement on oil revenues has been one of the key sticking points in the ongoing negotiations between South Sudan and Sudan. While there is agreement that South Sudan will pay Khartoum a fee for use of the pipeline rather than a share or revenues, the two parties have very different views of what the fee rate should be. The Government of South Sudan is also willing to make additional financial transfers to help the Republic of Sudan through its current economic crisis, linked to a settlement of the Abyei issue, the sums are much less that Sudan is demanding. The lack of agreement led Khartoum to temporarily halt sales earlier this year. However, Khartoum then re-opened sales and allowed South Sudan usage without any immediate payment, but rather agreed to retrospective payment once a deal had been negotiated. MPM has recently announced that between July and October it contracted the sale of 22 million barrels of crude oil, with an estimated value of $2.14 billion.

79. To date the Government of South Sudan’s management of oil revenues has been weak. In particular the Government of South Sudan has varied spending from budgeted levels to match oil revenues: a driver of ad hoc and inefficient expenditure. As oil revenues are forecast to decline rapidly from 2016, it crucial that the Government saves to smooth consumption beyond the period of the oil windfall and invests in the basic infrastructure that will form the foundations for non-oil growth. The South Sudan Development Plan contains commitments to establish, and save part of oil revenues, in: (i) an oil price stabilisation account (to help break the link between volatile revenues and spending); and (ii) a future generations savings account. Limited progress has been made on either of these mechanisms and no decision has yet been made on how oil revenues will be divided between annual budgets and the savings accounts.

7. Key enquiry issue: The role of UN development and humanitarian organisations, the World Bank, other bilateral donors and the extent of leadership and coordination between them

80. Total committed Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) to South Sudan in 2010 was approximately US$1.15 billion, including reported humanitarian funds. Since 2005 ODA has averaged between approximately 30% and 40% of the approved government budget.33 The UN is by far the most established multilateral actor but risks overstretched. Since the signing of the CPA in 2005 the donor community has, in general, been slow to establish technical expertise in Juba. Donor coordination mechanisms in Juba are still at an early state of their evolution although the Joint Donor Office is an important example of closely coordinated working.

7.1 The role of UN development and humanitarian organisations

81. The UN is renewing its strategic frameworks for South Sudan following the country’s independence. UN plans for development assistance are set out in the draft United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) South Sudan (2012–13) while humanitarian assistance plan for 2012 will be set out in the Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP)—which is currently at concept stage.

82. The draft UNDAF is aligned with the SSDP and structured around four outcomes (although it is likely that following consultations with the Government a fifth outcome will be added covering access to justice). The four key outcomes are:

— Core governance and civil service functions are established and operational.
— Chronic food insecurity is reduced and household incomes increase.
— Key service delivery systems are in place, laying the groundwork for increased demand.
— Violence is reduced and community security improves.

83. The draft UNDAF is highly ambitious—both in breadth (covering work by 19 UN agencies34 across much of the agenda set by the SSDP) and scale (the total estimated resource requirement is US$1.1 billion
over two-year of which US$310 million is currently available). In part this stretch reflects the range of requests for assistance from the UN’s partners in Government. Our overall assessment is that the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) is well led in South Sudan, but that at times it has overpromised and struggled to deliver.

84. OCHA plays a key role in South Sudan’s complex humanitarian situation, ensuring a well-coordinated response by the more than 362 humanitarian agencies present in the country. Positive progress has been made in establishing coherent coordination structures, including the establishment of the Humanitarian Country Team—Juba Satellite and the roll-out of the cluster approach to strengthen preparedness and response capacity. OCHA has also driven an innovative process of establishing “cluster focal points” in all 10 of South Sudan’s states.

85. At present OCHA has a country office in Juba and sub-offices in six states. The South Sudan country office focuses on the key areas of OCHA’s mandate—coordination, policy, advocacy, information management and humanitarian financing. OCHA leads the production and resource mobilization of contingency and preparedness plans to ensure a swift response, including the Consolidated Annual Appeal and the pre-positioning of six core emergency pipelines. In 2011 access monitoring capacity has been improved through the adoption and roll out of a global OCHA database on access. Humanitarian access constraints are regularly analyzed to inform targeted high-level advocacy including by the Emergency Relief Coordinator. Concrete outcomes have included commitments by the GoSS to halt harassment of relief workers.

7.2 The role of the World Bank and IMF

86. The World Bank has a small but expanding presence in South Sudan. As South Sudan is not yet a member of the World Bank there is no International Development Association (IDA) lending, but since the CPA the Bank has administered the Multi Donor Trust Fund for South Sudan (MDTF-SS). The MDTF-SS has funded 20 projects in 10 sectors. The top three sectors funded are infrastructure ($240 million), health ($150 million), and water & sanitation ($60 million). As of 20 September 2011, $453 million (84%) was disbursed of the total $541 million committed to the Trust Fund projects. DFID has had concerns about the performance of the fund, in particular in the education sector, and has worked with the Joint Donor Office and the World Bank to ensure that this is improved. DFID will continue to monitor the performance and dispersal rates of the MDTF to ensure that the funds are disbursed and utilised promptly and effectively. All projects will be completed by June 2012.

87. The Bank is expanding its program of technical and analytical support in South Sudan. Work has included support to the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP), ongoing support for a poverty assessment, infrastructure diagnostic, regional trade analysis, analysis on constraints to agricultural growth, and regular macroeconomic briefs. The IMF has also posted a resident adviser to South Sudan and intends to establish a Trust Fund which will help South Sudan build the capacity, institutions and systems needed to enable sound macroeconomic policy making.

88. South Sudan has applied for membership of the World Bank and, once it gains membership, it will be eligible to receive IDA resources. However it is likely that its allocation of IDA funding will be relatively small. In anticipation of IDA resources, a US$75 million South Sudan Transition Trust Fund (SSTTF) was established in June to help provide health care, infrastructure, and employment for the people of South Sudan.

7.3 The role of the European Union (EU)

89. The EU is likely to play an increasingly important role in the development architecture in South Sudan. It intends to open a new delegation shortly. It is currently developing a joint programming document, which aligns with the SSDP. The draft identifies six sectors where a joint approach should contribute to institution building at the central level while improving effectiveness through better harmonisation and pooled instruments. These sectors are security, health, education, water management, urban development and rural economy.

90. The EU has already committed, Euro 285 million (approximately £255 million) of “de-committed” funds from European Development Fund 9 (EDF9) and previous EDFs (essentially left-over funds which were yet to be allocated, and were earmarked to South Sudan while it was still part of the Republic of Sudan), to be targeted at South Sudan’s most vulnerable populations, especially those in conflict-affected areas. Furthermore, if and when South Sudan signs up to the Cotonou Agreement, it will become eligible for funds from future EDFs. We are keen to see rapid steps to strengthen the technical capacity of the EU team in Juba to ensure that it can effectively shape and oversee the use of these increased resources.

7.4 The role of the bilateral donors

91. The bilateral donor community in South Sudan is relatively small, although USAID has been a notable exception a very large presence supplemented by staff from major USAID contractors. South Sudan will be added to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list of ODA recipients in 2012 for 2011 contributions and data will be reported to both the DAC and the Creditor Reporting System (CRS). There will be no retrospective data for South Sudan available before 2011. However, Government statistics on development and humanitarian assistance record total commitments of US$1.152 billion in 2010, with the United States,
Netherlands, UK, EU Institutions and Norway as the top five donors. Together these five donors were responsible for almost 64% of commitments.

92. Donor support is relatively fragmented. While donors have taken some steps towards applying the Fragile State and Paris principles, there is still a considerable distance to go. However one important example of coordinated working is the Joint Donor Office (JDO) which was established in 2005 by the Governments of the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Denmark joined in December 2005 and Canada in May 2007. The office is made up of technical experts who provide policy advice, coordination, and liaison with the Government, analysis for donors, and oversight of pooled funds and other joint donor activities. Furthermore, at a technical level, staff of different agencies generally work very closely together to reduce the risk of overlap.

93. The SSDP provides an important foundation for stronger Government ownership and closer alignment of donor funding with Government priorities, but the failure to tackle corruption, and the weakness of PFM systems means that there is limited use of Government systems. Coordination is mainly informal and there have been relatively few joint assessment missions or planning exercises, although sector wide approaches are starting to develop—for example the UK led Health Pooled Fund.

7.5 The extent of leadership and coordination between donors in South Sudan

94. Effective donor coordination, led by Government, is an urgent priority in South Sudan. The South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP) provides a useful framework to guide donor interventions. In October 2011 the Government presented its vision for the donor coordination architecture, based around an Annual High Level Partnership Forum (HLFP) and a Quarterly GoSS-Donor Forum (QGDF) which together would provide a central mechanism for coordination and information exchange between the Government and development partners. These high level forums would be supported by sector working groups which would bring together Government and development experts to drive forward sector based approaches. The proposed mechanisms should help to strengthen the donor architecture, but it will be crucial that Government and donors focus on outcomes not just inputs or alignment, and that progress against both Government and donor commitments is rigorously reviewed.

95. Coordination within the donor community is also crucial. In May 2011, Development Ministers from the three Troika countries (Norway, UK, US), including the Secretary of State for International Development, visited the then Southern Sudan (before independence). During the visit the three Ministers agreed that the UK would lead a Troika initiative to develop a robust approach to tackling corruption in South Sudan, the Norwegians would lead on ensuring transparency in the oil industry, and the US would lead on setting up an international conference in Washington (currently scheduled for 14/15 December) during which the Government of South Sudan could present its vision for the future, inviting private sector investment and development partnerships.

8. Key enquiry issue: The security situation including the effectiveness of the UN peacekeeping force, UNMIS, and the prospects for a non-militarised border

8.1 Security Situation

96. Security in South Sudan is fragile. Four of South Sudan’s 10 states are currently experiencing significant internal conflicts and upsurges. Of eight significant rebel groups, three have recently signed peace agreements with the Government, but the others remain outside the fold. The SPLA has had some success at mounting operations against these groups—it has implemented security cordons around rebel areas and has attempted to drive the rebel militia groups away from population centres. However we are concerned by reports of SPLA human rights abuses where militia groups have been operating from within the local civilian population.

97. Government tactics have broadly focused on trying to cajole the different militia to the negotiating table. Unfortunately the peace and integration agreements which result are often difficult to implement. All the rebel militias have agreed to talk to the Government at some point but have played a duplicitous game. While a ceasefire is in place, they use the time to recruit fighters, rearm, and resupply in an attempt to increase their negotiating position and the terms of their reintegration.

98. However, the rebel militia groups have been, so far, unable to successfully unite their cause. They remain distinct from one another and are largely fuelled by localised grievances, both political and tribal in nature, and linked to a pastoralist-militarised culture and lack of opportunities or employment. As such they do not, at present, pose a direct threat to the national security of South Sudan.

99. Tribal fighting, linked to cattle raiding, continues in a number of states as it has done for hundreds of years. In recent years, in a country awash with small arms, the stakes have been significantly raised. For example, in Jonglei state alone, hundreds of people have been killed and displaced and tens of thousands of cattle stolen in attacks this year.
8.2 UNMISS

100. The new United Nations Mission in South Sudan, mandated on 9 July, is deploying in difficult circumstances. It is understaffed and urgently recruiting. It has been heavily tasked in its first three months. It currently has 7,000 peacekeeping troops deployed and is mandated to support rather than replicate local security; it needs to act in an agile and flexible way to achieve its mandated tasks. President Kiir repeated an amnesty to illegal armed groups at South Sudan’s independence on 9 July and UNMISS was immediately called on to assist their reintegration into the SPLA. A major outbreak of violence in Jonglei state followed in August. UNMISS provided a company of troops to patrol the area and conducted aerial reconnaissance. It is clear that UNMISS will require the international community’s steadfast support if it is to fulfil a wide ranging mandate focussed on conflict prevention and mitigation and human rights monitoring.

8.3 Prospects for a demilitarised border

101. The disputed border area of Abyei is a key obstacle to any prospect for a demilitarised border. Following the military takeover of Abyei by the Sudanese Armed Forces, the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei was mandated on 27 June to deploy to Abyei. It was intended to pave the way for the withdrawal of Sudanese Armed Forces and the Sudan People’s Liberation Army from Abyei and create the political space for the parties to reach agreement on Abyei’s final status. However, contrary to the Abyei Interim Agreement signed by the parties, neither side has yet withdrawn its troops in response to UNISFA’s partial, but declared operational, deployment.

102. The parties agreed in principle to a demilitarised common border zone as early as 29 June this year. This zone was to be monitored by an international Border Monitoring Support Mission with force protection from UNISFA. The Safe Demilitarised Border Zone was designated the area within 10 km either side of the 1.1.36 border line and in disputed areas 10 km either side of the administrative common borderline. However in practice, the parties have yet to agree the specifics of where the border lies and how the Border Monitoring Support Mission should operate. With such a lack of clarity, the UN Security Council has not yet mandated UNISFA to carry out this task.

103. Overall, the prospects for a demilitarised border will remain slight unless the political will can be found from both sides to define their common border and settle the issue of Abyei.

9. Key enquiry issue: The implications of potential membership of the Commonwealth and East African Community

9.1 Commonwealth

104. Even before 9 July, the Government of South Sudan had clearly signalled that Commonwealth membership would be a priority after independence; the Vice-President of Southern Sudan (as it was then called) even attended a Royal Commonwealth Society meeting in Malaysia in May 2011. After independence, one of the first actions taken by the new Government was duly to apply for membership.

105. With its commitment to democracy and economic and social development, and its partnership-based approach, the Commonwealth appears made for South Sudan. In accordance with the 2007 Kampala Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) communiqué, aspiring Commonwealth countries must demonstrate commitment to: “democracy and democratic processes, including free and fair elections and representative legislatures; the rule of law and independence of the judiciary; good governance, including a well-trained public service and transparent public accounts; and protection of human rights, freedom of expression and equality of opportunity”. These values are entirely consistent with the messages which the donor community is already giving to South Sudan. Membership of the Commonwealth would enshrine them and allow fellow members to hold South Sudan to account against them, with the ultimate penalty of suspension. And it would enable South Sudan to draw on support networks from parliamentarians and lawmakers in neighbouring countries, thus helping to embed best practice.

106. Although it is a global organisation, the fact that four of South Sudan’s neighbours—Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and Rwanda—are Commonwealth members, further strengthens the case for South Sudan to seek to join. The challenges it faces in meeting the Harare Principles are considerable. But the very process of preparing for membership would in the meantime allow (non-governmental) Commonwealth organisations such as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and the Commonwealth Local Government Forum—both of whom have already expressed an interest in working in Sudan—to offer technical assistance by drawing on regional and international expertise.

9.2 East African Community

107. The East African Community (EAC) is the fastest-growing regional economic community in Africa. The current EAC member states have a combined population of 125 million people, land area of 1.82 million sq kilometres and a combined Gross Domestic Product of $73 billion (2009), (equal to that of Angola, the 3rd biggest economy in Africa). The discovery and commercialisation of oil and gas resources in the region will
only accelerate the region’s economic growth. We expect that the continual lowering of barriers to doing business in the EAC will further encourage regional trade and growth.

108. Membership of the EAC could bring both economic and political benefits to South Sudan. However there are risks associated with (i) the reduction of tariffs that EAC would require, which would make the Government’s strategy of developing productive capacity through import substitution more difficult, and (ii) the potential impact on employment opportunities for local people, particularly soldiers and youths, of more workers from the EAC migrating into South Sudan. On the other hand, greater economic interdependency should over time also lead to greater political stability within the region, and encourage greater cooperation to that effect. EAC membership has clearly had an impact on stability in Rwanda and Burundi since they joined in 2007. If carefully managed accession to the EAC has the potential to bring benefits to both South Sudan and its neighbours. DFID will help the Government of South Sudan assess the case for, and timing of, EAC membership as part of a trade and customs development programme currently under design.
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1. Overview

1.1 Introduction

1. This note provides supplementary information in support of the evidence provided to the International Development Committee (IDC) by DFID in October 2011. It is structured to respond to four specific questions raised by the IDC following their visit to South Sudan in December 2011:

— key developments in South Sudan since DFID’s initial submission of written evidence;

— where DFID believes there is particular capacity to grow its programme, should additional resources be available;

— UK views on how UNMISS could be more effective; and
1.2 Overview of key developments

2. South Sudan has been the focus of continuing international attention in the three months since DFID submitted its initial evidence paper in October 2011. While the Government has continued the process of establishing the essential legislation, processes and systems required for the effective management of core state functions, three events in particular have focused international attention:

- exacerbated tensions between Sudan and South Sudan including along the un-delineated border between the two countries and on the sharing of oil revenues (see section 2.1);
- the ongoing violence between the Lou Nuer and Merle ethnic groups which has affected over 120,000 people and (see sections 2.2 and 2.3); and

3. President Kiir used his speech at the IEC to set out the people of South Sudan’s aspiration to build a nation “that is educated and informed; prosperous, productive and innovative; compassionate and tolerant; free, just and peaceful; democratic and accountable; safe, secure and healthy; united and proud.” His speech focused on three key themes. First, recognition that South Sudan’s history of fifty years of conflict, marginalisation and war, has created great challenges that must be overcome in order for the country to move forward towards peace and development. Second, a commitment that South Sudan’s road map for development was based upon an inclusive national vision anchored on democracy and good governance. Third, acknowledgement that South Sudan must deal with its security challenges, which although not intractable will take time to address to ensure a lasting peace.

4. DFID Ministers have remained very closely engaged on South Sudan. At the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, the Secretary of State for International Development, offered DFID’s support to help South Sudan implement the New Deal with its donor partners (see section 2.6). He also urged the Government of South Sudan to take steps to strengthen accountability and transparency so as to ensure the most effective use of the government’s own resources.

5. In December, DFID’s Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Stephen O’Brien, led the UK delegation to the Washington IEC on South Sudan. The Minister chaired a key session on Transparency, Accountability and Governance, with the Government of South Sudan Finance Minister, Kosti Manibe, the IMF Africa Director, Antoinette Sayeh, and Kenyan Anti-Corruption Campaigner, John Githongo. Minister Manibe stated that the Government of South Sudan would initiate a high level dialogue on accountability, transparency and anti-corruption with the donor community (see section 2.5).

2. KEY DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH SUDAN SINCE DFID’S INITIAL SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN EVIDENCE

2.1 Developments in the relationship between Sudan and South Sudan since DFID’s October submission

6. Raids along the border with Sudan have continued. Both governments have escalated the rhetoric with letters to the UN Security Council. A series of aerial bombardments by the Sudanese Armed Forces culminated in an attack on Yida refugee camp in South Sudan on 10 November, which the UK condemned. Ministers from both FCO and DFID have called on both parties to exercise restraint, and to cease support for proxies in the other’s territory.

7. Despite continued attempts by the African Union High Level Implementation Panel (AU-HIP) and prompting from the international community there has been little progress in negotiations between the two governments on post-Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) issues. Both retain a military and police presence in Abyei, despite commitments to withdraw once the UN Interim Security Force in Abyei (UNISFA) had deployed. They have been unable to reach agreement on the formation of an Abyei Area Administration. UNISFA’s mandate was renewed for another five months in December, and broadened to allow it to take part in joint border monitoring with Sudanese and South Sudanese Armed Forces of a Safe Demilitarized Border Zone (SDBZ). But without agreement by the governments on a temporary line of administration, which would allow the SDBZ to be established, UNISFA will be unable to fulfil that part of the mandate.

8. There has still not been an agreement between Sudan and South Sudan on oil revenues sharing. In the absence of an agreement, both sides have taken unilateral steps. In December, Sudan announced that it was taking payment of transit fees in kind, in other words, siphoning off part of Juba’s share. It has also begun preventing ships from leaving Port Sudan until (the disputed) arrears are paid. Ships are being allowed to load up with oil, but not to leave the port. On 13 January, the Republic of Sudan reportedly seized South Sudanese oil. On Friday 20 January, South Sudan said that it would stop the flow of oil through the pipeline. If implemented this decision would have serious consequences for both Sudan and South Sudan. The two governments need to agree both on the nature of any transitional financial arrangements for Sudan to help it deal with the economic shock of losing oil receipts, and on a future commercial deal covering the payment by South Sudan of transit fees for use of the oil pipelines. At the moment they are negotiating from different perspectives.
2.2 Update on conflict dynamics

(a) Rebel Militia Group (RMG) activity

9. October to December saw a series of further serious RMG attacks in South Sudan. Amongst the most serious of these was an attack on 29 October by the South Sudan Liberation Army (SSLA) on Mayom town in Unity state, which left at least 50 fighters and civilians dead. Aid agencies were warned to leave a week previously. Further clashes between the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) and the SSLA have killed relatively small numbers of fighters since. Upper Nile has also been seriously affected by RMG activity over recent months. During Oct there were reports of militia movements under Shilluk leader Captain Olonyi. Fighting was reported in Renk and Manyo counties of Upper Nile state between Olonyi’s militia and the SPLA on 9–10 November.

10. The Government of South Sudan has continued its policy of “talking and fighting” with RMGs. The killing of George Athor, dissident SPLA commander and unsuccessful candidate for the governorship of Jonglei, on 19 December was high profile, but he has reportedly already been replaced. Many RMGs claim that their objective is to topple the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM)-dominated government. However, the motivations for militia activity may often relate more closely to strengthening local power bases than political exclusion and competition. See the accompanying FCO paper for analysis of Sudanese support for RMGs in South Sudan. Local populations have generally demonstrated a mixed response to militia activities.

(b) Inter-communal violence in Jonglei State

11. The period between Christmas and New Year saw an attack on Murle communities in Pibor county (Jonglei State) by thousands of heavily armed members of the predominantly Lou Nuer “White Army” militia (see map at Annex 2). This marked the latest in a cycle of killings reaching back to 2009 when the nature and scale of violence between the Murle and Lou Nuer communities significantly increased. Over 120,000 people have been affected by the most recent attacks and an unknown number killed. 50,000 to 80,000 heads of Murle cattle were seized. On a more positive note, the attacks have seen the SPLA—for the first time in recent Jonglei history—ordered to stand up to Nuer fighters and protect civilians. There have already been reported retaliatory attacks by Murle groups against Lou Nuer communities around Akobo.

12. There is a long tradition of violent conflict between tribes, clans and subclans in Jonglei caused by cattle-raiding and competition for resources including food, land and water. In recent years however, this has been exacerbated by the supply of arms and activities of rebel militia groups. In the final run up to the most recent attacks the killing of George Athor on 19 December—alleged supplier of the White Army—contributed to a misplaced belief that any Lou Nuer retaliatory attack would be postponed.

13. The attacks saw the break down of the peace process being led by Archbishop Deng and the Sudan Council of Churches (SCC). The church will continue to have an important role to play in Jonglei (eg in grassroots peace mobilisation and delivery of local “peace dividends”) but most likely as part of a “twin track” approach led by the Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRSS). Vice-President Riek Machar has been at the forefront of GRSS mediation efforts. He travelled to the most insecure area of the state, at great risk during late December but failed to halt the tide of violence.

14. The GRSS has set out a five point response plan:

(a) an investigative committee led by Vice President Riek Machar to ascertain facts;
(b) creation of a security buffer zone between the warring parties across the state, manned by the SPLA. Consideration is being given to supporting UNMISS deployment;
(c) holding political leaders who supported the attack to public account;
(d) voluntary then forced civilian disarmament; and
(e) putting in train a twin track peace process: government and church-led incorporating compensation and restitution mechanisms.

15. The top UK priorities are a continued robust and coordinated SPLA/South Sudan Police Service (SPSS)/UNMISS security response to protect civilians, humanitarian assistance for affected communities, and engagement to help deter retaliatory attacks and restart a credible mediation process. We are exploring how the ongoing security and justice programme, Security Sector Development and Defence Transformation (SSDDT), could provide support to security planning at state level.

2.3 Update on humanitarian needs and UK humanitarian response

16. The humanitarian situation has deteriorated significantly since October. The inter-communal violence in December and January in Jonglei State has led to mass displacement, including large numbers of unaccompanied children, and an unknown number of deaths. Fighting in Sudan’s Blue Nile and South Kordofan States, and aerial bombardment along the border between Sudan and South Sudan have resulted in significant refugee influxes to Upper Nile and Unity States that are still ongoing. Meanwhile the humanitarian community has continued to serve over 30 humanitarian operations in the country, including the 110,000 people displaced from Abyei since last May and the continuing large-scale returns operation from Sudan.
17. Humanitarian agencies are stretched to capacity in dealing with these responses. Key current challenges include acquiring sufficient airlift capacity to reach difficult to access areas, the risk of significant food insecurity from March, and increasing insecurity (including the re-laying of land mines in Unity State). It is likely that 2012 will present the biggest challenge to humanitarian operations since the signing of the CPA in 2005. The UN recently earmarked US$20 million for humanitarian work in South Sudan from the underfunded window of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). These funds will be used to buy core humanitarian supplies in preparation for the rainy season.

(a) Inter-communal violence in Jonglei State

18. On 5 January, following attacks by an armed Lou Nuer militia on Murle communities in Pibor county, the Government of South Sudan declared Jonglei State a disaster zone and asked humanitarian agencies to accelerate life-saving assistance. The humanitarian community has launched a massive emergency response to meet the needs of over 120,000 people affected by the inter-communal clashes and established a coordination hub in Pibor town where agencies are rapidly scaling up their presence. There are not yet any firm estimates for the number of civilians who died during the violence.

19. The logistical challenges of meeting the needs of a large number of people scattered over a vast, remote area are enormous and will have huge cost implications as most areas are only accessible by air. Heavy airlift capacity is needed to accelerate the humanitarian response and reach those displaced quickly. Meanwhile the security situation in Jonglei remains a source of serious concern as inter-communal attacks between the Murle and Lou Nuer continue.

20. Since 3 January, the population around Pibor has started to return to towns and villages. As of 21 January, the total number of people registered as affected in Pibor County was 76,600. Large groups of displaced people have also been observed heading for Boma, a seven to 10 day walk south of Pibor. Most of those who need assistance, have been in the bush for up to two weeks, in many cases without food, clean water or shelter. A rapid response plan to ensure emergency needs are met in all affected areas is in place. A first six-truck convoy of aid carrying 20 metric tons of food, 1,500 non-food item (NFI) kits, water, sanitation and hygiene supplies (WASH), child protection kits and nutritional supplements reached Pibor on 13 January.

(b) Refugee flows from South Kordofan and Blue Nile States

21. The UK Government remains seriously concerned about the condition of civilian populations in South Kordofan and Blue Nile, and specifically—in the context of the IDC’s current inquiry—the needs and safety of refugees in South Sudan. Limited reports received to date suggest that indicators of critical humanitarian need in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile may already have been reached and exceeded. Food stocks prepositioned within the two states have been almost completely exhausted, and there is growing, credible evidence that malnutrition levels may have exceeded the critical threshold for food distribution.

22. In Sudan, the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) has made a number of applications to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on access to South Kordofan and Blue Nile State without success. A proposal for UN agencies and International NGOs to have cross-line access to Sudan Peoples Liberation Movement-North (SPLM-N)-held areas has been with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs since the week of 27 November. There has been a request for a joint UN and government Humanitarian Aid Commission (HAC) assessment mission to visit Kadugli pending since 20 November. A visit by Valerie Amos, Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), to discuss these issues with the Sudanese government was postponed three times during November and December. In early January the ERC’s visit was facilitated and she met with the Minister for Social Welfare but beyond agreements on information sharing and continuous dialogue, there was no specific progress on achieving humanitarian access to either Southern Kordofan or Blue Nile State. The UK Government continues to press for humanitarian access to these areas and the ERC is due to visit both Sudan and South Sudan again at the end of January.

23. Within South Sudan, the humanitarian community is providing food, health, shelter and protection assistance to 22,854 refugees from South Kordofan at the refugee site in Yida, in Unity State. The humanitarian community, including the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, António Guterres, who visited Yida on 8 January, has been urging the Yida population to relocate away from the volatile border area with Sudan. The Unity State Governor has also called on refugees to move further south. Refugees continue to arrive in Yida and from Sudan’s Blue Nile State into Maban County in Upper Nile State. As of 12 January there were over 28,000 people at the Doro refugee site—with around 200 new arrivals each day. 11,000 refugees are being hosted at the Jammam site, and a further 15,000 refugees are at the border area of El Foj. Unconfirmed reports suggest that a further 25,000 refugees are located in other border areas.

(c) Returns to South Sudan

24. As of 10 January 2012, 362,127 South Sudanese have been assisted to return from Sudan to their final destinations in South Sudan since return operations began in October 2010. During January a further 3,000–4,000 will begin their return journeys from Khartoum, Kosti (White Nile State in the Republic of Sudan), and Renk (Upper Nile State in the Republic of South Sudan).
25. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and its partners have registered 100,000 of the estimated 700,000 people in Sudan who wish to return to South Sudan. A bilateral agreement between the two countries on the conditions and modalities for future return operations is expected to be signed before the end of January. However, there are concerns about what will happen if the nine-month transition period for South Sudanese to determine their residency status in Sudan is not extended when it expires in early April.

26. We remain concerned about the vulnerability of returnees. A Protection Assessment by International Rescue Committee (IRC) in November identified multiple obstacles facing returnees, ranging from land disputes and security concerns to early and forced marriage, due to economic hardship and lack of livelihood opportunities, and tensions over access to food, water and firewood. A January inter-agency assessment of returnee conditions in Northern Bahr el Ghazal State found that in the areas where returnees planned to settle, there was a lack of essential drugs in all health facilities, limited access to safe drinking water, an acute food shortage due to poor crop performance and a lack of shelter and non-food items. If current crises elsewhere in the country persist and tangible support to reintegration is not forthcoming, there is a risk returnee populations will lose patience.

(d) Humanitarian access and constraints

27. The operating environment in South Sudan remains extremely challenging, impacting agencies’ capacity to respond to emergency needs across sectors. Insecurity, mining and remining, poor road infrastructure, harassment, destruction and looting of humanitarian premises affect operations regularly, delaying the provision of assistance and inciting significant additional costs to programmes. Most recently during the Lou Nuer attacks in December the premises of two humanitarian agencies were looted and destroyed. Operations in Maban in Upper Nile and several areas in Unity State are regularly impeded by landmines which are frequently replaced after mine clearance teams have cleared roads.

28. Non Governmental Organisation (NGO) operations have also been hampered by GRSS visa and work permit requirements, which are making it more difficult for NGOs to plan for new staff and staff rotations, and to respond quickly to new needs. The UK is working with the US and other donors to seek to resolve the situation.

(e) UK humanitarian response

29. In December the Secretary of State approved a two year package of support for the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) in South Sudan. In 2012, the UK will provide £2 million to ICRC and £15 million to launch the CHF, with the UK committed to providing an additional £16 million when other donors step up. Over two-years our support will provide:

- primary health care for 204,000 people;
- the treatment of 113,000 malnourished children;
- provision of emergency shelter and non-food items to 56,500 beneficiaries;
- provision of food and agricultural supplies to 134,500 people;
- clean water and sanitation for 163,000 people; and
- provision of physical rehabilitation support for at least 300 survivors of weapon-related disabilities.

2.4 Update on UK support for basic service

(a) Extension of the Basic Services Fund concluded

30. Since the submission of the initial evidence paper, the Secretary of State has approved a £20 million extension of the Basic Services Fund (BSF), which will help to address the needs of returnees from the Republic of Sudan and to ensure that there is not a gap in service delivery while sector funding mechanisms are put in place. The BSF extension will have a direct impact on the health and education of the people of South Sudan including through the following results:

- 29,000 pregnant women attending at least one ante-natal care visit; 15,000 women attending four ante natal care visits; and 5,000 births attended by a skilled health worker;
- 760,000 outpatient consultations and 33,000 children under the age of one receiving a full course of immunisation (DPT3 level).
- 8,000 additional children directly supported by DFID in primary schools.
- 160 new classrooms to be constructed with two latrines per classroom.
- 900 teachers completing in service training and 133 teachers completing pre service training.

31. Sweden has been confirmed as a co-donor for the BSF extension and we are continuing to press for other donor support. Mott MacDonald has been re-commissioned as Fund Manager on the basis of their good previous performance. In order to secure a smooth transition to future sectoral funding mechanisms, the UK is in regular discussion with USAID (which is currently providing support to primary health care in some of the
states within which the new Health Pooled Fund will operate via the Sudan Health Transformation Programme 2) and with the Government of South Sudan.

(b) Update on the development of the Health Pooled Fund

32. Detailed design work on the new UK-led Health Pooled Fund (HPF) is nearing completion. We expect that the HPF will be at the cutting edge of the transition from humanitarian funding mechanisms to sectoral mechanisms. It will be closely aligned with Government policy and has been developed to support and strengthen Government systems. It will help build Ministry of Health capacity both centrally and at state and county level with a particular focus on effective service delivery in six of the 10 States in South Sudan (Eastern Equatoria, Western Bahr el Ghazal, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap, Unity and Lakes States). It is based on an efficient model—with a single fund manager contracting a single lead NGO to deliver health service for the whole of a county. Our ambition is that the Fund should bring together five donors with total funding of £156 million over five years and that it should support the following results:

- 135,200 children receive a full immunisation (DTP 3 level).
- 62,400 women have at least four antenatal visits and 31,200 women deliver in a health facility with a skilled birth attendant.
- 62,400 pregnant women receive at least two doses of intermittent presumptive treatment of malaria as part of their antenatal care.
- 15,600 additional people start a family planning method.
- 12,480 pregnant women receive testing for HIV.

33. The UK is now working on ensuring that the HPF is harmonised with World Bank (WB) and USAID initiatives in the other four States. Whilst all three programmes are slightly different, in December the three programmes and the Ministry of Health reached agreement on common goals and objectives, a common basic package of health services and commitment to working towards harmonised approach to Monitoring and Evaluation in support of government systems. Harmonisation negotiations are ongoing and will continue as the three programmes are set up. The three programmes will hold quarterly lesson sharing workshops to help optimise the impact of assistance on the health of the people.

(c) Update on UK support in the education sector

34. DFID has agreed additional to bring forward funds to this financial year (within an originally agreed project budget) to accelerate schools construction by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) in order to help meet President Kiir’s 100 days pledge on new school construction.

2.5 Developments in key governance issues

(a) Economic Management

35. Some key macroeconomic indicators have improved over the past month or so. Inflation fell in December (65.6%, down from 78.8% in November), with price rises in a number of areas moderating somewhat, including, crucially, food and non alcoholic beverages. The exchange rate differential between the official and black market also fell, with the black market rate now close to 3.5 US Dollars (USD) : 1 South Sudan Pound (SSP), down from a high of 4.2 in October (the official rate remains at 2.95:1).

36. Neither of these improvements should be seen, however, as proof of significantly improved macroeconomic management. While the black market exchange rate may have been affected by the Bank of South Sudan’s decision to sell more foreign exchange than previously, the Government still persists with a dual exchange rate system, and is resistant to any discussions regarding alternative regimes. This is particularly worrying given the corruption possibilities opened up by the dual exchange rate system for those able to buy currency at one rate and sell at another. And while inflation is moderating somewhat—likely contributed to by the drop in the black market exchange rate—65.6% is still far too high. It also isn’t clear that there is a strong drive to control inflation further, or strategies in place for doing so.

37. The budget (due at Independence) has still not been passed, although we understand it was agreed by the Council of Ministers last week and will be presented to the legislature within the next few days. Key aspects to watch will include total overall spend; whether a supplementary budget is also passed, and if so its total size and items; and to what extent the draft oil revenue management bill’s savings provisions are followed. One positive development in relation to the budget is that budget allocations are now being met via the imposition of expenditure limits, which ensure that lower priority ministries receive their allocations. Previously this was not always the case. The system was introduced before Christmas and continues to operate successfully now, suggesting some technical and political progress in relation to public financial management.

(b) Accountability and transparency

38. Following the GRSS’s decision to announce a High Level Dialogue on Accountability and Transparency with the Donor Community at the IEC in December, the UK intends to embark, jointly with other Troika members, on a dialogue with the GRSS. The dialogue will serve as a forum of communication between senior
members of the GRSS, as nominated by the President, and the international community. The focus of the forum will be on corruption and on how best to support the President’s efforts to combat it. This forms part of the Joint International Approach on Corruption which the UK leads.

39. The UK is also in the final stages of designing a programme which will support United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to provide support to the South Sudan Anti-Corruption Commission (SSACC) to assist with capacity building and is also expected to support the Ministry of Justice in its drafting of anti-corruption legislation.

(c) Update on UK support on governance

40. We have agreed a contribution of £ 5.9 million for a new Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) programme which will place volunteers to support capacity building in Education, Health and Civil Society. We are also working to develop a bundle of support that will help to both strengthen Government systems and build public accountability mechanisms. This support will address a range of key capacity issues including Public Financial Management, strengthening key ministries such as the Ministry of Finance, and training Cabinet Ministers of the new nation in how to perform their duties.

2.6 The Government’s aid strategy and plans to improve aid coordination in South Sudan

41. Over the last months we have seen important progress towards the evolution of more robust aid coordination architecture in South Sudan. Two key developments have been the Government’s announcement of its aid strategy and the launch of the New Deal for Fragile States at the Fourth International High Level Dialogue on Aid Effectiveness in Busan.

(a) The new aid coordination architecture

42. In mid October GRSS presented its aid strategy which is intended to provide a framework for the Government and its partners to improve the effectiveness of development assistance and humanitarian aid delivery in South Sudan. The proposed mechanism will have four main components.

43. An annual High Level Partnership Forum (HLPF) will provide an opportunity for Ministers and Senior Donor Representatives to discuss high level policy issues and aid commitments. It will be conducted under the auspices of the President and will provide an opportunity to monitor the overall implementation of the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP), review the previous years’ budgetary performance, discuss priorities for the following year, and for donors to provide presentations on planned financial allocations and activities.

44. A quarterly Government of South Sudan–Donor Forum (QGDF) will provide the central forum for technical engagement on aid coordination between the Government of South Sudan and its donor partners. The QGDF will take place three times a year (with the HLPF in the fourth quarter). It will be chaired by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and will provide a regular opportunity for discussion of donor and Government performance against the aid strategy, and technical discussion of budget and planning cycle issues.

45. Sector Working Groups (SWGs) will help drive a sector based approach so that policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring are brought together under a single coherent sector dialogue. They will meet at least three times a year and will be the key mechanisms for aid coordination at the sector level. The groups will support strategic prioritisation at the beginning of the budget cycle, and help strengthen the systems for monitoring sector performance. Each SWG will be chaired by Government with a lead donor acting as co-Chair. The donors have provided Government with a list of proposed donor leads, (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>PROPOSED SECTOR WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Functions</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>African Development Bank (AfDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Rural Development</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Humanitarian</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) The Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan

46. A key outcome of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan was the agreement of the “New Deal” for fragile states. The New Deal, which was developed in partnership by fragile states and
major donors, recognises that substantially different ways of working may be need to deliver results in fragile states because donors cannot just focus on delivering the MDGs.

47. The New Deal sets five new Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals: legitimate politics, security, justice, economic foundations of employment and livelihoods and revenue management for service delivery, which will help country governments and their donor partners to deliver better and more sustainable results. Perhaps most importantly the New Deal has introduced the idea of a compact between the Fragile State Government and its donor partners based on mutual commitments around transparency, risk-sharing and risk management, use and strengthening of country systems, efforts to strengthen local capacity, and the provision of timely and predictable aid.

(c) Looking ahead

48. The UK was very active in the development of the New Deal, and during the High Level Forum the Secretary of State offered the UK’s support to South Sudan in piloting the implementation of the New Deal. The UK views the GRSS’s proposed aid coordination architecture as an important step towards ensuring better alignment and coordination between government and donor efforts in South Sudan.

49. We have already structured the framework for our development programme around the peacebuilding goals and programmes such as the Health Pooled Fund are completely consistent with the principles on which the New Deal is based. A Compact would offer an opportunity to further strengthen aid effectiveness in South Sudan, if it were based on clear mutual commitments that cover both the steps that donors will take to improve the predictability and timeliness of aid, and move towards use of government systems, and also the steps that government will take to strengthen their systems, accountability and transparency and to implement their own development strategies.

50. Work is going ahead internationally to further define the New Deal Compacts and, if the GRSS wishes us to do so, we will work to support South Sudan in piloting the implementation of a New Deal compact with its donor partners.

3. AREAS WHERE DFID BELIEVES THERE IS PARTICULAR CAPACITY TO GROW ITS PROGRAMME, SHOULD ADDITIONAL RESOURCES BE AVAILABLE

51. As the Committee saw during their field visits in South Sudan, the scale of development and humanitarian needs is daunting. Both Government and donors must focus limited national and international capacity on priority areas where investment will have the greatest impact in helping to build the foundations for peace and development during the first few fragile years of South Sudan’s statehood.

52. We have reflected on the conclusions of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (2011), the World Bank’s World Development Report 2011, and the UK Building Stability Overseas Strategy (2011) and used them to help review our Operation Plan priorities. We are confident that our assistance is focused on five priority pillars (strengthening security and access to justice; improving service delivery in health and education; supporting food security, jobs and wealth creation; building accountable, capable and responsive government; and humanitarian assistance), which map onto, and directly respond to, the Government’s own SSDP. Within these priority pillars we are confident that we are engaging with credible opportunities to support transformational change. As part of the UK’s overall approach to supporting South Sudan, a key overarching priority is to help ensure that South Sudan uses its own resources as effectively as possible. The table attached at Annex 1 sets out the main planned and approved areas of DFID programming over the coming years.

53. Programming in South Sudan is difficult. We face a complex and insecure operating environment and a government budget that is overwhelmingly dependent on significant but unpredictable oil revenues. Helping to build effective government systems held accountable by an active Parliament, media and civil society represents a huge challenge. In this context we believe that overall it will be crucial to take a step by step approach and maintain our focus on the priorities that we have already identified. There is however one area of programming in which we recognise that there may be a strategic case for expanding our investment. Support for the private sector and wealth creation is urgently needed to help diversify the economy (and thus reduce the likelihood of a sudden collapse of government revenues if additional oil reserves are not identified) and to generate jobs and economic opportunities and help reduce the likelihood of grievances and civil conflict. We will continue to monitor the opportunities to expand our support closely, particularly if there are early indications from our new programmes that UK support can help to catalyse local and international private sector capacity and will not overwhelm the stretched absorption capacity.

4. HOW UNMISS COULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE
4.1 Mandate, staffing, structure and budget

54. The United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), was established on 8 July by United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1996, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, for an initial period of one year. It has an extensive mandate covering support to the Government of South Sudan in three broad areas, namely:
4.2 Peacebuilding plan and benchmarks

57. The breadth of UNMISS’s mandate makes it imperative that it defines quickly those areas where it can best add value. In that light, UNSCR 1996 called for UNMISS to develop, within four months, “a plan for UN system support to specific peacebuilding tasks” and, in the context of setting “realistic and achievable targets against which its own progress can be measured”, asked for the Secretary General to “present (to the Council) benchmarks for the mission”. UNMISS now aims to present both peacebuilding plan and benchmarks to the UN Security Council in the Secretary General’s Report due in March.

58. In developing both the Peacebuilding Plan and Benchmarks, our view is that UNMISS can draw from and complement the SSDP. However the two documents should be distinct from each other. We believe that the Peacebuilding Plan needs to set out the approach that UNMISS will take to delivering on its mandate, bringing together the political, security and development capabilities of the UN. It needs to: identify clear, sequenced results based on priorities drawn from the SSDP; establish a clear division of labour, and, where appropriate, an integrated approach between UNMISS and the UN Country Team (UNCT); and set out a long-term vision for a transition from UNMISS to the UNCT and/or the Government of South Sudan. Benchmarks should be realistic, time-limited (possibly no more than six to 12 months), and clearly spell out UNMISS’s role as distinct from that of other parties.

59. It is important that both documents are generated in a timely way to meet the February deadlines. UNMISS needs to avoid an over-complicated, cumbersome or bureaucratic process. The Peacebuilding Plan and benchmarks will be crucial in ensuring the strategic focus of UNMISS support for peacebuilding in South Sudan, including through an appropriate balance of uniformed and civilian staff and support.

4.3 Responding to inter-communal violence and the lessons from Jonglei

60. UNMISS has regularly been stretched in responding to specific crises: most recently the latest round of inter-communal violence between the Lou Nuer and Murle in Jonglei in late December and early January. On balance, the UK assessment is that by helping the GRSS in its attempts to mediate between the two sides, by reminding GRSS of its responsibility to protect civilians, by evacuating civilians, and by bolstering its own military presence in Pibor Town, UNMISS made a valuable contribution to the Protection of Civilians in Jonglei State.

61. However, with over 60,000 people affected, and hundreds of homes destroyed, UNMISS needs to look carefully at how future responses could be improved, including through better use of its early warning systems and, together with the SPLA, more robust troop deployment and posture. The crisis also highlighted UNMISS’s need for more helicopters and heavy-lift assets. Going forward, the challenge for UNMISS will be to ensure that its engagement with the GRSS’s security sector forms part of a wider process of conflict prevention and reconciliation.

4.4 Decentralisation

62. Given South Sudan’s size, lack of infrastructure and rural-based population, the SRSG envisages a heavily decentralised civilian model, with field offices established in each of the ten states able to respond more effectively to the needs of local people. These offices will be led by a State Coordinator who will have a high degree of authority to manage day-to-day operations and coordinate the different functions of the Mission. Although this is not a new concept, UNMISS is the first UN peacekeeping mission to trial this
approach on such an ambitious scale. We are supportive of the concept but want to see UNMISS working in support of locally-led coordination mechanisms and development processes.

5. SOUTH SUDAN FIDUCIARY RISK ASSESSMENT (FRA)

5.1 Status of FRA

63. DFID is currently completing a Fiduciary Risk Assessment (FRA) for South Sudan. We have shared the FRA document with the Government of South Sudan, but we have not yet reached an agreement that it can be made public. As soon as we reach such an agreement we will share the Assessment with the Committee.

5.2 Overview of the conclusions of the FRA

64. The overall conclusion of the assessment is likely to be that there are high fiduciary risks related to all aspects of the Public Financial Management (PFM) system.

   — The PFM system is not supporting the achievement of a stable and sustainable fiscal policy and does not lead to aggregate fiscal discipline or predictable funding. There are very significant annual deviations between allocations and actual budget out-turns due to a lack of hard budgetary constraints.

   — Expenditures are not based on policy priorities and budgets do not provide predictability to policy-making and sectoral funding. There are very considerable in-year reallocations at the level of sectors and agencies; institutional arrangements are absent or not adhered to.

   — The expenditure system neither requires performance from public actors nor does it ensure that funding reaches service delivery entities in a timely and predictable manner (as evidenced by significant under-spending on social services, inadequate accounting and reporting on inputs, lack of controls, and no performance management).

65. The poor performance of the PFM system reflects shortcomings in the legislative and regulatory frameworks, weak institutional structures, processes and procedures, and a lack of capacity across most aspects of the PFM cycle. The governance environment and the many challenges faced by the Government create fiduciary risks for public funds (including aid funds, if provided on-budget).

5.3 Looking Ahead

66. The Government has signaled a strong desire for donors to move to financial aid through government systems. Significant improvements are needed in these systems before financial aid could be provided at a reasonable level of risk. This will require a strengthened focus by the Government starting with the development of a PFM and accountability reform programme. A draft has been produced by the Ministry of Finance and is expected to be provided to stakeholders soon.

67. Addressing key weaknesses such as those set out above will not be simple, as the capacity constraints that contribute to current poor PFM performance also make reform difficult. Progress is being made, however, as evidenced by some concrete changes (eg the imposition of "expenditure limits", as discussed earlier), and the drafting by the Ministry of the PFM reform agenda. DFID will seek to support Governments efforts to continue this progress.
OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS AS AT JANUARY 2012

The UK is the second largest OECD bilateral donor in South Sudan after the USA. Our Programme allocation for the current Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) cycle (2011–15) will total £376.6 million including £69 million in planned capital expenditure. The annual trajectory is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£74 million</td>
<td>£91 million</td>
<td>£96 million</td>
<td>£99 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables summarise our portfolio of projects and their current status. Please note that three of the projects (where indicated) are funded from central (not country specific) DFID resources, and one programme which will be mainly funded by the Africa Conflict Prevention Pool (ACPP) which is shared between DFID, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Ministry of Defence.

PROJECTS IN IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector/title</th>
<th>Summary of purpose and current status</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Funding contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Access to Justice</td>
<td>This aims to support the Sudan People Liberation Army (SPLA) to be better managed in non-combat related areas, more accountable, and less of a drain on GoSS resources (currently approximately 40% of the national budget is defence related).</td>
<td>01/02/2009–31/03/2012</td>
<td>£12.5m (ACPP funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Sector Development and Defence Transformation (SSDDT)</td>
<td>The SSRF aims to accelerate recovery in South Sudan through high-impact, quickly disbursed programmes. The first two rounds focused on four key areas: a) consolidating peace and security; b) delivering basic services; c) stabilising livelihoods and d) building capacity for decentralisation and democratic governance. The third round concentrates specifically on improving security in core areas affected by conflict and provides support to four particularly insecure states. The funding (approximately USD 15–17 million per State) is being targeted towards stabilisation and recovery activities. Jonglei State was the first state identified to receive support, followed by Lakes, Eastern Equatoria and Warrap State.</td>
<td>2008–13</td>
<td>£50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan Recovery Fund (SSRF)</td>
<td>The purpose is to improve the effectiveness of key institutions, including Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRSS bodies) to mitigate conflict and foster peace in South Sudan. The programme runs at different levels: working with central government and at the State level. The programme also works at community/village level to facilitate dialogue on local conflict resolution.</td>
<td>01/03/2009–29/02/2012</td>
<td>£5.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan Peace Building Programme (SSPBP)</td>
<td>This programme seeks to reduce the vulnerability of communities to localised conflict and instability in South Sudan. It supports capacity-building and policy-making in government, including on small arms control, as well as funding quick impact projects that mitigate conflict risks.</td>
<td>01/03/2008–31/12/2010</td>
<td>£2.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector/Title</td>
<td>Summary of purpose and current status</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Funding contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Peace Agreement</td>
<td>This covers the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan. The South Sudan component “Strengthening Executive Government” focuses on capacity building support for the GRSS Office of the President, Ministry of Cabinet Affairs, and the Ministry for Information and Broadcasting</td>
<td>Extended until mid-May 2012 (then will be subsumed under the GRSS Capacity Building project)</td>
<td>£3.9m (South Sudan components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Access to Justice Programme (SAJP)</td>
<td>SAJP works on the institutional development of the South Sudan Police Service (SSPS) and includes the development of a practical community policing system (through model police stations in three target states). The project is also supporting activities including; the construction of an officer training college, provision of training for middle ranking leadership, and development of a Research and Planning Unit within the SSPS HQ to oversee training policy and strategy.</td>
<td>2009–14</td>
<td>£6.4m (South Sudan components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Partnership Programme through UNDP (Strategic Partnership II)</td>
<td>To strengthen democratic governance and equitable delivery of public services through capable, accountable and responsive government, at Federal, State and local levels resulting in a reduction of poverty</td>
<td>Ends March 2012</td>
<td>£5.2 m (South Sudan components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td>DFID created the first version of the BSF four years ago. The current Interim Arrangement phase has helped to expand coverage and use of health, education and water and sanitation across Southern Sudan and the BSF is now the largest single source for the regular provision of primary health care (via non government actors). In addition over 1,100 teachers have been trained through BSF-IA projects. Co-donors of BSF are the EU, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden (DFID acts as lead donor). DFID and the Government of South Sudan have now agreed an extension of the BSF in to 2012 which will focus particularly on returnee populations and on filling a gap on primary health coverage prior to start up of the Health Pooled Fund (see programmes under development). Specific targets for the 2012 extension include: — 760,000 outpatient consultations — 29,000 pregnant women attending at least 1 ante-natal care visit and 15,000 women attending 4 ante natal care visits — 5,000 births attended by skilled health workers — 33,000 under 1 children receiving immunisation to DPT 3 level — 160 new classrooms to be constructed with 2 latrines per classroom — 900 new teachers to complete In-Service training — 133 teachers to complete Pre Service training — 8,000 additional children directly supported by DFID in primary schools</td>
<td>01/12/2005– 31/12/2012</td>
<td>£60.2m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following approval of this latest phase in November 2011, the cumulative total of funds committed to BSF will be £ 60.2m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector/Title</th>
<th>Summary of purpose and current status</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Funding contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan Education Project</td>
<td>Supports increasing access to primary and secondary education for 28,000 children (currently out of school) through construction of 33 primary schools and 4 secondary schools. Creating more opportunities for alternative education for out-of-school youth and adult learners. Over 1,000 children have been enrolled in the alternative education centres</td>
<td>02/2011–01/2015</td>
<td>£36.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Books</td>
<td>This project will print and distribute 12.5 million school text books, construct storage facilities and develop a national textbook policy for South Sudan</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>£11m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Service Overseas</td>
<td>A programme to cover the provision of Health, Education and Civil Society Capacity Building. This 3 year programme will:</td>
<td>3 years initially with an extension to 5 years contingent on review</td>
<td>£10.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Increase the proportion of student teachers and nurses passing their final exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Support the implementation of national plans in Health and Education at State and Country levels where VSO volunteers are operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Increase the number of platforms for communities to engage in health and education planning and delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Assist national Civil Society Organisations to implement advocacy strategies in a range of sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable, responsive and accountable government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building Trust Fund II (CBTF II)</td>
<td>This fund provides harmonised support, mainly technical assistance, for a range of GoSS institutional capacity building measures. Also, it funded the purchase of essential software for the operations of the new Bank of South Sudan. Other Donors include the Netherlands, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Spain and Sweden. The Joint Donor Office acts as the Secretariat for the Fund. A proposal for a two year extension is being taken forward.</td>
<td>01/03/2011–01/02/2012</td>
<td>£4.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to the Joint Donors Office (JDO)</td>
<td>The JDO provides project management support for Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) and the Capacity Building Trust Fund (CBTF) and a range of other advisory and coordination functions. DFID funds two secondments (the head of post and an economist) in addition to contributing towards core costs of the office</td>
<td>2010–12</td>
<td>£1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Fellows</td>
<td>The ODI Fellows are seconded to key Ministries including the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MOFEP)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>£686,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI Budget Support Initiative (BSI)</td>
<td>The ODI Budget Strengthening Initiative (BSI) programme promotes a more effective, transparent and accountable set of budget policies, processes and systems, working with MOFEP.</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>£1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security and Wealth Creation</td>
<td>Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF) will competitively select and co-finance private sector led projects in agri-business with a direct positive impact on poor people in rural areas, in the form of jobs and cash incomes. 50% of AECF funding will be in the form of grants and 50% in the form of interest free loans, the exact distribution of which will be determined by the fund manager.</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>£6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINSCOPE Study</td>
<td>A study to identify constraints on access to finance in South Sudan, especially the poorest, as well as opportunities to address them</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector/title</td>
<td>Summary of purpose and current status</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Funding contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP Environmental Sustainability Programme in Sudan</td>
<td>This programme provides technical assistance, mainly to central government, to strengthen environmental management including impact assessments to inform the design of the government’s policies for environmental sustainability, forestry and solid waste management...</td>
<td>10/08/2009–30/06/2012</td>
<td>£1m (5% South of cross Sudanese budge of £20m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian South Sudan Humanitarian Aid 2012–13</td>
<td>Emergency Response across South Sudan (eg shelter, health, food security, water and sanitation, protection, humanitarian coordination). Delivered through ICRC and establishment of a Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) (implementation by 35 NGOs/UN Agencies). The indicative results could include: — Primary health care for 204,000 people; — Treatment of 113,000 malnourished children; — Provision of emergency shelter and non-food items to 56,500 beneficiaries; — Provision of food and agricultural supplies to 134,500 people; — Clean water and sanitation for 163,000 people; — Provision of physical rehabilitation support for at least 300 survivors of weapon-related disabilities.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>£35m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red R training programme</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of delivery of Humanitarian programming in South Sudan</td>
<td>01/04/2011–31/03/2013</td>
<td>£3.2m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projects at Concept or Design Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Proposed project purpose</th>
<th>Estimated duration</th>
<th>Estimated DFID budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and access to Justice South Sudan Defence Development Transformation successor</td>
<td>Continuation of the work/current approach of the SSDDT</td>
<td>Approx 3 years Sep 2012-March 2015</td>
<td>Up to £13m (to be ACPP funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) Improved Access to Justice</td>
<td>Project currently under design. The purpose is to support the reintegration of ex soldiers back into the communities.</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Approx £20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project currently under design. The purpose will be to enable more poor people, especially women, to access justice systems.</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor to the South Sudan Peace Building Programme</td>
<td>We are considering how we can help to tackle the internal drivers of violent conflict in South Sudan. This may include: i) sustainable settlements with rebel militia groups and targeted support to local populations vulnerable to their actions and presence, ii) prevention of escalation/spread in inter-communal violence in high risk zones (eg Sobat river, Wunlit Triangle); iii) building consensus on approaches to dealing with the past.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title</td>
<td>Proposed project purpose</td>
<td>Estimated duration</td>
<td>Estimated DFID budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Education</td>
<td>To accelerate girls’ enrolment, retention and completion at primary and secondary levels of education in South Sudan. Approximately 200,000 girls will benefit.</td>
<td>6 year</td>
<td>£52.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Education Centres</td>
<td>Work with USAID and UNOPS to support completion of 14 County Education Centres for in-service training of teachers. This programme will improve teaching skills of 2,800 In-Service teachers annually.</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>£21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Community Case Management (ICCM)</td>
<td>Roll out and extension of the Ministry of Health’s community based management of malaria, pneumonia and diarrhoea programme. This is focussed at getting basic care for these diseases out to villages—especially to the children under five who are most prone to morbidity and death.</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>£10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Pooled Fund (HPF)</td>
<td>The aim is to increase overall access to regular health services in South Sudan from the current 40% to 60% and will focus on capacity building in the Ministry of Health and other institutions. The programme will cover 6 of the 10 States: Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Western Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap, Lakes, Unity and Eastern Equatoria. The results that will be attributable to DFID are:</td>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>£82m from DFID plus funds from other donors to reach a target of £156m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources for Health</td>
<td>This programme will train staff in a range of health specialism including midwifery. It will also provide technical assistance to build the capacity of the Ministry of Health and central and State level for HRH planning and management. The European Union (EU) is the lead donor for this intervention.</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>£5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Mortality Rate (MMR) Survey and Emergency Obstetric and Neo Natal Care (EMONC) needs assessment</td>
<td>A financial contribution for a baseline Survey on the current maternal mortality rate (in view of absence of such data from 2010 national Household Survey) and a needs assessment of Obstetric and Neo Natal Care services to be conducted by the UNFPA (UN Fund for Population Activities)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Provisionally £2.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected Tropical Diseases (NTD) Programme</td>
<td>Outcome should be improved MoH capacity to handler treatment and prevention of NTDs (12 NTDs are endemic to South Sudan). An immediate focus will be on eradication of Lymphatic Filariasis for which pharmaceuticals may be available.</td>
<td>3 years for initial phase</td>
<td>£4.7m Centrally funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Maternal Deaths and Unwanted Pregnancies (PMDUP)</td>
<td>South Sudan strand of a global programme which will target nine African countries in total.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Approx £5m Centrally funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Capable, Responsive and Accountable Government

**Government of South Sudan Capacity Building**

Umbrella programme which will cover UK contributions to the proposed new IMF Technical Assistance Fund, as well as a third phase of the Capacity Building Trust Fund, and other initiatives (such as the placement of ODI Fellows) that help the GRSS build functioning State institutions.

Duration: 3 to 5 years (TBC)

Budget: TBC

### Anti-Corruption Support in South Sudan

Support for DFID’s leadership of Troika work to strengthen accountability and transparency in South Sudan; providing technical assistance to the Anti-Corruption Commission through UNODC; supporting the legal drafting of the Anti-Corruption Bill; assessing scope to support other accountability institutions; increasing DFID’s capacity to develop its own anti-corruption programmes and strengthen sectoral accountability work and to support other donors in their programme development.

Duration: 2 years

Budget: £1.6m

### Food Security and Wealth Creation

**Feeder Roads**

Contribution, probably via a Special Operation by the World Food Programme, to build 550 kms of rural feeder roads. Will work with GRSS to ensure that road maintenance is well managed post completion.

Duration: 4 years

Budget: £50.2m

**Food Security & Livelihood**

Three possible elements: increased production and marketing of 2–3 agricultural products for each of 8–10 county towns, vocational training in county towns to support market chains and social protection for those without labour in three States. Target beneficiaries are farmers, youth and returnees. Will complement CIDA and EU support to the programme.

Duration: 5 years

Budget: Up to £100m

**Trade Mark East Africa**

This will support GRSS to establish a Customs Service and reduce the cost of trading across borders, improving trade competitiveness, and potentially reducing consumer prices.

Duration: 3 years

Budget: £6m

**Global Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Financing Programme**

A programme of support for SME development expected to involve South Sudan to be channelled through the International Finance Corporation (IFC) Global SME Financing Facility. The programme would be targeted at the constraints of financing SMEs and would look at risk sharing mechanisms; technical assistance to commercial banks to address commercial financing of SMEs; and technology based solutions to address issues such as lack of credit history by SME customers.

Duration: 5–7 years

Budget: Approx £5 million

Centrally funded

---

*January 2012*
Further written evidence submitted by DFID (Annex B)

SUMMARY

— Tensions between Sudan and South Sudan have heightened following the latter’s secession in July 2011. Both countries continue to use or threaten military actions in order to achieve their political and economic objectives.

— The Government of Sudan (GoS) has accused the Government of South Sudan (GoSS) of continuing to provide support to the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement—North (SPLM-N), which is involved in a protracted conflict with Sudanese Armed Forces in Sudan’s Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states.

— Sudan has carried out a number of aerial attacks on targets in the border area since South Sudan’s independence, some of them inside South Sudan.

— The GoS has been accused by the government in Juba of supporting rebels’ groups in South Sudan, particularly those active in the border region, and providing them with direct military support. There have been reports of Southern civilians in Khartoum being forcibly recruited by the GoS and forced to fight for rebel groups in South Sudan.

INTRODUCTION

1. The governments of Sudan and South Sudan have a history of using proxies. The Government of Sudan (GoS) has accused the Government of South Sudan (GoSS) of continuing to provide support to the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement—North (SPLM-N), although the GoSS denies this. The SPLM-N has been involved in a conflict with Sudanese Armed Forces in Sudan’s Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states since mid-2011. The GoS has also been accused by the government in Juba of encouraging the activities of various rebels groups operating in South Sudan against the GoSS, particularly those active in the border region, and providing them with direct military support.

SOUTH SUDAN’S ACTIVITIES IN SUDAN

Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states

2. In June 2011, fighting broke out in Sudan’s ethnically-mixed Southern Kordofan state. It was precipitated by disputed elections for the State Governor in May 2011, which were won by the National Congress Party (NCP) candidate, Ahmed Haroun, an International Criminal Court (ICC) indictee, together with a subsequent decree by the GoS that SPLA forces in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states must redeploy to south of the River Kiir. Conflict began in Sudan’s Blue Nile state in September 2011. Although the fighting is largely between those whose loyalties lie with either Khartoum or Juba, it incorporates significant ethnic and tribal dimensions.

3. Many within the “southern” camp in Southern Kordofan are ethnic Nubans, who sided with the South during Sudan’s civil war and whose identification with the Sudanese state has traditionally been tenuous. They are fighting under the guise of the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement—North (SPLM-N), which incorporates elements of the former 9th and 10th Divisions of the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA). Along with the Sudanese Armed Forces, Khartoum loyalists include militia elements belonging to the Arab Misseriya tribe, which has long-standing tensions with the Nubans.

4. Although the 9th and 10th Divisions—which mainly consist of natives of Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States in Sudan—no longer formally exist, Sudan has accused the GoSS of continuing to support the rebels and of supplying weaponry and materiel to them. The GoSS insists that it has severed its ties with its former colleagues in the north, and that continuing accusations to the contrary are a product of Khartoum’s “propaganda”.

5. In Blue Nile state, support for the SPLM-N is concentrated in the southern half of the state. In November 2011, the rebels suffered a number of military setbacks, culminating in the loss of the town of Kurmuk, which it has held since 1997. The SPLM-N reportedly now has no control of urban areas in Blue Nile.

6. Located between Bahr el-Ghazal and Southern Kordofan, Abyei sits just above the January 1956 boundary between Sudan and South Sudan. It is home to the Ngok Dinka tribe and bordered to the north and north-east by the Misseriya, pastoral Arab cattle herders who pass through on a migratory basis in order to access grazing land. The two communities were on opposite sides during the Sudanese civil war.

7. The future status of Abyei is disputed. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement signed in 2005 granted Abyei a special administrative status and the prospect of a referendum in January 2011 to decide whether to join what might then become an independent south. But the referendum was blocked by the GoS over the question of whether the nomadic, Arab Misseriya should be eligible to vote, and the area remains a recurrent flashpoint. Both governments currently have forces deployed there.
Darfuri groups

8. In November 2011, the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), (the militarily strongest Darfuri militia group), announced that it had joined the Sudanese Revolutionary Front, an affiliation of Darfuri groups and SPLM-N formed in November 2011 with a stated aim of overthrowing the GoS, preferably by political means but through the use of force if necessary. The GoS has claimed that South Sudan facilitated the creation of the alliance, hosting the rebel groups in Juba in what a GoS spokesman described as “a clear declaration of hostility towards the GoS”. The GoSS has denied this.

Eastern opposition groups

9. The main Sudanese eastern opposition groups signed an agreement with Khartoum in 2006 (the Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement, ESPA) under the banner of the Eastern Front. Since then, a number of the groups have argued that the provisions of the treaty have not been put into practice, and there has been growing opposition to the GoS in the region as a result. Some elements of the Beja Congress, a loose alliance of eastern opposition factions, advocate the abandonment of the political track in favour of joining the Sudanese Revolutionary Front (aka Kauda Alliance). The GoS has accused Juba of supporting the eastern opposition, something denied by the GoSS.

Sudan’s Activities in South Sudan

Cross-border attacks

10. Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) have been fighting a guerrilla campaign conducted by the SPLM-N in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile states since June and September 2011 respectively. In November and possibly December 2011, SAF carried out a number of aerial attacks on SPLA-related targets in and around the border with South Sudan, including in South Sudan itself. These largely followed the pattern of previous attacks earlier in the year, in which some of the same targets were hit. The attacks were carried out by adapted Antonov transport aircraft, with bombs being rolled manually from the rear of the aircraft. Most notably, on 10 November, up to five bombs were dropped near Yida refugee camp in Unity State, with one landing on the camp. A local South Sudanese official claimed 12 people were killed and 20 injured. Sudan suggested that the attack was a legitimate response to ongoing SPLA support for rebels fighting in Southern Kordofan.

Southern rebel groups

11. A number of militia groups oppose the government in Juba. They include breakaway factions of the SPLA and/or those motivated by ethnic or tribal grievances. The most significant group is the South Sudan Democratic Movement/Army (SSDM/A), led by former SPLA Deputy Chief of Staff Lt Gen George Athor until his death in December 2011. South Sudan’s largest opposition party, the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement—Democratic Change (headed by Lam Akol, a former SPLA commander and SPLA Foreign Minister under the Government of National Unity between 2005–07) has also been accused by the government of operating as a militia group in Upper Nile state.

12. South Sudan has long claimed that Sudan has been arming and supporting rebel groups active in the country. This is vehemently denied by Sudan. It is notable that the UN Security Council expressed concern about the sophistication of the weaponry that was used in inter-tribal fighting in Jonglei in late December and early January. However, the wave of insurgencies which have occurred across the south since early 2010 have often had inter-tribal tensions as the driving force.

Forced conscriptions

13. Reports emerged in late 2011 of Southern civilians in Khartoum and the border region being forcibly conscripted and trained, ostensibly to fight for rebel groups in South Sudan. Young men were reported as having being taken from the street and being sent to training camps and on to South Sudan to fight. Some were reportedly released after payment of a ransom fee. South Sudan sources have claimed the GoS has condemned the abductions. The GoS has denied any involvement.

The Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA)

14. Despite regular allegations of continued support/linkages, there is no evidence that Sudan continues to support the Lord’s Resistance Army or maintains any contact with the group. However, there is a widespread perception in South Sudan that LRA activity forms part of broader systematic efforts by Sudan to destabilise South Sudan, and to present the GoSS as being unable to govern or provide security for its people.

February 2012
RESPONSE TO FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

1. You are developing a new £20 million DDR programme to support the reintegration of ex-soldiers back into the communities. Re-integration is arguably the most difficult aspect of the DDR programme. How do you intend to achieve this particular ambition?

2. The private sector is almost non-existent in South Sudan—yet diversifying the economy away from oil must be a priority over the next decade. What are the key steps that the Government of South Sudan, and international donors, must take to facilitate the expansion of the sector?

3. What progress has been made with bids under the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund?

4. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the UNDP in South Sudan?

5. Re the table in Annex 1 of the Department's previous evidence: Could the Department clarify whether the total programme spend for 2011–15 is expected to remain at £376.6 million (given that the 2011–12 expenditure will be about £74 million rather than £91 million)?

1. We are working closely with the South Sudan Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) Commission (SSDDRC) and UNDP to ensure that their planned DDR programme is as well designed as possible. We have been clear with both the UN and with SSDDRC that UK support for DDR will be dependent on the development of a credible programme.

2. South Sudan currently spends around 40% of its budget on security. A sustainable reduction in the size of the armed forces would release resources for investment in development. The Government of South Sudan (GRSS) is currently developing a programme to put 150,000 ex-combatants through a DDR process over the next eight-years. However, the challenges, particularly around reintegration, are likely to be huge.

   — South Sudan has a weak domestic economy, and private sector job opportunities are limited.
   — An estimated 80% of ex-combatants are illiterate with poor numeracy.
   — South Sudan is already affected by widespread insecurity, which will add to the risks of a poorly thought out DDR process.

The current oil crisis is likely to further exacerbate the challenges.

3. The SSDDRC is developing its DDR programme with support from UNDP and UNMISS. It is likely that demobilised ex-combatants will initially enter a transition facility where they will receive intensive training for three months. They will then return to their communities, and during this phase will need effective reintegration support from the DDR programme. As a first step the programme will need a systematic understanding of the skills of the ex-combatants in order to prioritise the types of training that will be required, and the types of reintegration support that will best suit them. Specific responses may include support for vocational training programmes tailored to suit the aptitude of the ex-combatants as well as the demands of the local economy (for example carpentry, plumbing, masonry, electrics etc); ongoing literacy and numeracy training of ex-combatants to enable them to reach a level that allows them to function effectively; and support for agricultural development.

4. The UK will only invest in a DDR programme if we are confident the design phase has identified the key barriers and risks, and has developed appropriate and realistic ways of mitigating them.
2. The private sector is almost non-existent in South Sudan—yet diversifying the economy away from oil must be a priority over the next decade. What are the key steps that the Government of South Sudan, and international donors, must take to facilitate the expansion of the sector?

5. The most urgent step is to resolve the current oil crisis in a way which does not lead to macroeconomic crisis and a major deterioration in the climate for doing business. Inflation was already very high, fiscal control limited and currency management poor before the Government decided to shut down oil production. Each of these trends has the potential to spiral if oil production is not restarted or if alternative sources of revenue are not found. Alongside this it is vital that the oil crisis does not lead to a substantial increase in conflict. Without economic and political stability, domestic and international investment is likely to be very limited. Indeed if the current crisis is not well managed there is a risk of capital flight and a retrenchment of the private sector in the short run.

6. The oil crisis further emphasises the need to facilitate the development of the non oil sector and to generate non oil revenues. Making it easier and simpler to trade will be a key part of helping to facilitate private sector development. DFID’s planned intervention to help facilitate trade and support the development of a modern, capable customs service in South Sudan is arguably even more important in this context.

7. Private sector development also requires the development of a supportive investment climate and regulatory framework. Core components of this include rules around land ownership and use; business establishment, ownership and closure; contract enforcement and commercial justice; taxation; and access to finance. Donors including IFC and USAID are very active in these areas. Access to finance, which will be central to unleashing the potential of South Sudan’s private sector, is currently very limited, commercial banks are barely making any loans and the microfinance sector is very small.

8. An additional important step will be to continue to invest in economic infrastructure. Despite some progress South Sudan languishes very near the bottom of most measures of infrastructural development. Roads will be a central part of this (including DFID’s planned support to feeder roads), but so will be the development of other transport infrastructure, energy, and communications. The African Development Bank has said that it will help the Government to develop comprehensive infrastructural development plans.

3. What progress has been made with bids under the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund?

9. The Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF) window for South Sudan received 116 eligible applications for South Sudan. 41 applications have been selected to be forwarded to the independent Investment Sub Committee (ISC) for South Sudan, which will make the investment decisions.

10. About 50% of the concept notes come from foreign investors. Of these, about 10 are already involved in some activity in South Sudan and the other ten are yet to establish there. The concept notes are spread across a range of agribusiness sectors:

   - Input Supply—10.
   - Processing—10.
   - Agricultural Production—12.
   - Production Services—2.
   - Rural finance—5.
   - Supply Chain Logistics—2.

11. Of the local companies shortlisted many firms were established recently (2010–11). Few applications from women came in, but three businesses owned by women have been shortlisted.

12. The ISC will identify around 20 proposals to progress to the business plan stage. AECF will then engage with the companies on their business plan development, including visiting their operations. Business plan development and finalization will take three to four months. The ISC for South Sudan will then meet again to consider the business plans. Contract negotiation will then begin with the selected companies, which could include all 20 proposals if they qualify.

4. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the UNDP in South Sudan?

13. The UK sees UNDP as a crucial partner in South Sudan. DFID South Sudan is carrying out regular monitoring of UNDP performance as part of the Multilateral Aid Review process. This will help to inform our engagement with UNDP in country and in New York.

14. Examples of highly regarded UNDP work over the last few years include: its support to South Sudan’s Referendum process during 2010 and 2011 (which was widely acknowledged as being of a very high standard); the UNDP/IGAD Regional Capacity Initiative—an innovative south-south capacity building initiative; and the adoption of fast-track procedures for operating in fragile environments.

15. UNDP’s leadership at the senior level in South Sudan has been strong. The HC/RC/DSRSG and Country Director have both played influential roles in shaping international engagement. UNDP has a broad range of activities in South Sudan, reflecting both the legacy of limited direct bilateral donor engagement and the extent
of needs. UNDP has focused its effort (reducing the total number of projects from 28 to 15) but it is still widely spread. It has made recent progress with recruitment but has been operating under capacity for some time.

16. Measuring delivery against objectives has been a weakness at country level. UNDP is working to address this through its new country planning process. In particular UNDP currently has limited capacity to monitor at outcome and impact level. We also continue to have concerns about the quality of some UNDP delivery—for example in relation to the appropriateness and effectiveness on some of its justice and governance work. Improved Monitoring and Evaluation processes should help UNDP to identify problems early. We expect the new UNMISS Peacebuilding plan to clarify the roles and responsibilities between UNDP and UNMIS in some crucial areas such as Rule of Law.

5. Re the table in Annex 1 of the Department’s previous evidence: Could the Department clarify whether the total programme spend for 2011-15 is expected to remain at £376.6 million (given that the 2011-12 expenditure will be about £74 million rather than £91 million)?

17. The Department does not currently plan to reallocate the resources that DFID South Sudan did not spend in 2011–12 to the later years of the Spending Review 2010 period. Total programme spend for 2011–15 is therefore expected to reduce to around £360 million.

18. However, the Government of South Sudan’s decision to close the oil wells means that we cannot currently give firm figures for future expenditure. We are very concerned by the Government’s decision, and have been clear that we will not bail South Sudan out. We are also very concerned by the potential for a rapid rise in humanitarian needs. We will update the IDC if the situation changes.

March 2012

Further written evidence submitted by DFID (Annex D)

IDC REQUEST FOR ANSWERS TO FACTUAL QUESTIONS

1. Girls’ Education—some of DFID’s figures may be inconsistent and it would be helpful to know which to use. The Annex in your Jan 2012 evidence said that the Girls Education project will benefit approximately 200,000 girls (primary and secondary level). The answer to the PQ by Andrew Rosindell on 20 December 2011 said that the Girls Education Project will support 150,000 girls through primary school. Are both these statements correct? (ie are they talking about different things)? You also have a target to support 180,000 girls through primary education by 2015

They are not inconsistent. The planned girl’s education programme is a six year programme which we intend will support 200,000 girls at primary and secondary levels by 2018. This includes 150,000 in primary and 50,000 in secondary levels. The 180,000 girls supported by 2015 includes both the 150,000 girls which will be supported by girls education and 30,000 girls supported through the South Sudan Education Project (SSEP).

2. The GRSS estimates that the UK spent about £50 million in Southern Sudan in 2010 (Donor Book). We intend to cite this figure with the caveat that this is the best estimate available and the difficulties involved in finding exact figures due to pre-independence etc. If the Department strongly objects to this, we would appreciate DFID providing us with its own estimate of 2010 spend in Southern Sudan.

There are not official OECD DAC figures for donor spend in Southern Sudan in 2010. Overall the UK spent £125.7 million in Sudan in Financial Year 2010–11. Our internal estimate is that around £60 million of this spend benefited Southern Sudan.

3. The Donor Book also estimates that DFID spent about 76% of its funds in 2010 through pooled funds. We have assumed this includes through multilateral institutions, such as the UN and World Bank.

Our estimate for Financial Year 2010–11 is that we spent around 80% of our programme through pooled funds. This included contributions to South Sudan Service Delivery, CHF 2011 (disbursed in 2010), the Capacity Building Trust Fund, UNDP Strategic Partnership and WFP Emergency Operations.

4. The school construction contract awarded to UNICEF/UNOPS rather than the ECS—was this as part of the £36.6m South Sudan Education Project (which will construct 33 primary schools and four secondary schools in four states) or something else?

Yes. It was part of SSEP. The total value of the SSEP project is £37 million. Of this the total value of the Pavilion Schools programme is £20.437 million, including £8.292 million of Programme Capital (for pure construction). In addition, £1.3 million of the Alternative Education Centres support is classified as programme capital. Therefore the total capital element is just under £10 million. Non capital elements include the training of headmasters, teachers and Alternative Learning Programme tutors; Youth Education Pack (YEP) vocational training; technical assistance on the Education Management and Information System; the formation of parent teacher associations; and community mobilisation.
5. The plans to use the Health Pooled Fund to build the capacity of the Ministry of Health and other institutions, would it be fair to summarise that this will be achieved through training and some channelling of funds through local government institutions, but not budget support

We are currently finalising the design of the Health Pooled Fund (HPF), which has not yet been approved by Ministers:

— We are not planning to provide budget support at this stage. The recent Fiduciary Risk Assessment (FRA) assessed the risks associated with the use of government systems for financial transfers as high, and identified the need for benchmarks against which the Ministry of Health’s capacity and systems can be assessed. If all these benchmarks were met, we could conduct additional state-level FRAs and would consider moving to channelling some funds through Government systems (through a parallel system rather than budget support). In a best-case scenario, this would likely take a minimum of two to three years. In reality we expect it would take longer.

— We are concerned that the oil crisis will limit the capacity of the Ministry of Health (central, state and county level) effectively to absorb technical assistance (TA). Under current plans, if/when we are confident that the Ministry of Health has the capacity to absorb TA, the Fund will start to provide capacity building assistance. This may include TA at central and state level to help strengthen Ministry of Health capacity and systems and to support the management and prioritisation of health services, and support through NGOs to build the capacity of the County Health Departments to assess and plan for the needs of the county.

6. Number of hospitals in South Sudan [if this data is available]

There are 37 hospitals in South Sudan. Of these, three are teaching hospitals, seven state hospitals, and 27 county hospitals.

7. Estimate of the amount of funding you expect to channel through UNDP and UNDP-administered funds in 2011-15 (we already know £30 million to CHF in 2012 and 2013)

We cannot provide a robust estimate of funding to be channelled through UNDP for the period 2011–15 as the shape of our programme will need to continue to evolve depending on the humanitarian, political and security environment. We disbursed £32.87 million through UNDP in 2011–12 through the South Sudan Recovery Fund (SSRF), Community Security and Small Arms Control (CSAC), the UNDP-Strategic Partnership and Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF). We expect to contribute a further £16.3 million in financial year 2012–13 through the CHF and CSAC.

8. We have the UK contribution to UNMISS as being £60 million—is this correct?

Yes.

1. DFID often quotes the 40% figure re SPLA payroll—sometimes you say it represents “security”, other times “defence-related”. The GRSS’s own figure in the SS Development Plan say “security” accounts for 29%. It would be helpful to know broadly what the 40% covers. Does the SS Gov’s 29% figure not include the SPLA payroll?

The South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP) figure you quote for security related expenditure (29%) is a planning figure rather than a statement of actual expenditure. As you have noted, page 29 of the South Sudan Development Plan states: “In the years 2006–10, 40% or more of central government expenditure was allocated to conflict prevention and security.” Our assessment is that this trend continues. The MoD’s and SPLA’s budget, as per the latest 2012–13 budget circular, is SSP 2.74 billion out of SSP 7.8 billion. This is 35% of the total budget. Approximately 80% of this goes on salaries.

2. Number of rebel militias still in operation (DFID said there were five in Nov 2011)

It is difficult to give an exact number. The key groups remaining are primarily in Upper Nile (Shilluk under Olony, Roberto and other smaller commanders) and Unity (those who split with Peter Gadet). They are not currently a strategic threat. Of the other main groups:

— George Athor (formerly active in Jonglei) was killed and his group has surrendered.
— Peter Gadet (formerly active in Unity) has reconciled and most of his group has joined the SPLA with a small rump remaining.
— Abdul Baqi (formerly active in Northern Bahr El Ghazal) has reconciled and his group has joined the SPLA.
— Gabriel Tang (formerly active in Upper Nile) is under arrest and his group inactive.
— David Yauyau (formerly active in Jonglei) has reconciled and his group has been integrated into the SPLA (The SPLA correctly refused to accept the large number of children that were associated with his group).
Gathluak Gai (Formerly active in Unity) was killed and his group integrated into the SPLA.

3. Any figures on the number of deaths caused by rebel militias in 2011?

    The best source of figures for conflict related deaths and displacement is UN OCHA. I am not aware that there are robust figures for deaths specifically caused by rebel militias.

4. The target to provide couples with 143,000 cumulative years of protection from unintended pregnancy. Does this only apply to couples?

    Cumulative Years of Protection (CYP) is the estimate of protection provided by contraceptive methods during a one-year period, based upon the volume of all contraceptives sold or distributed free of charge to clients during that period. The CYP is calculated by multiplying the quantity of each method distributed to clients by a conversion factor, to yield an estimate of the duration of contraceptive protection provided per unit of that method. It is not only applicable to couples but provides an indication of the distribution of contraception and is a way to estimate coverage providing an immediate indication of the volume of program activity.
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Further written evidence submitted by the Department for International Development (Annex E)

SOUTH SUDAN: IMPLICATIONS OF THE OIL CRISIS FOR OUR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

    I know you will be close to finalising the upcoming IDC report on South Sudan and I am glad that DFID PUSS Stephen O’Brien was able to give evidence to your committee last month. I am sure that you, like me, have been following developments in the country with grave concern. I therefore thought you might find it useful to have an update on the implications for the UK’s aid programme of the government of South Sudan’s decision to halt oil production.

    As you know, oil revenues make up around 80% of GDP and 98% of government revenues in South Sudan. It will be extremely difficult for the government to cover essential expenditures using non-oil revenues, without entering into risky debt obligations that could severely disadvantage the new country.

    There is, therefore, a real possibility that the government will deplete its financial reserves, with an associated sharp reduction in the ability of government to carry out core functions; and that we will see an uncontrolled depreciation of the South Sudanese Pound, spiralling inflation and a rapid increase in poverty. In the scenario, many of the gains made since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005 could be wiped out.

    This would not only be a disaster for development, it would also impact on the international community’s broader regional and security interests. The UK and other major donors are communicating our concerns clearly to the government of South Sudan. Since the decision was announced, I have met with the Ministers of Cabinet Affairs, Finance and Petroleum and told them that the UK will not be able to fill the gap in their budget. My colleagues and I will continue to press these messages home at every opportunity.

    The immediate UK priority is to encourage Sudan and South Sudan to negotiate in good faith on the remaining post CPA issues. Last week’s progress in Addis Ababa in securing provisional agreements on citizenship and border demarcation was important. The next step will be to ensure that these agreements are signed by the two Presidents and use them as a foundation for securing progress on the other unresolved issues, including oil.

    At the same time I have decided that we need to start a sequenced process to refocus our development programmes away from the government’s longer term development agenda towards supporting the most vulnerable and addressing life saving needs. If the current shut-down persists, this will entail a substantial redirection of resources away from the longer-term priorities set out in the South Sudan Development Plan.

    The details of the changes are still being considered. But we will with immediate effect, for example, put on hold plans to move from NGO-led to government-led approaches in the health sector; fast track work on food security with a focus on strengthening community resilience; work up options for additional humanitarian support to deal with a looming food shortage, refugees and returnees from Sudan; delay plans for the construction of centres for in-service teacher training (government may not be able to afford to run them); and delay plans for support to Disarmament Demobilisation and Reintegration (an ordered programme would be impossible in an economic crisis). Although we will continue, for now, with some capacity building work, for example to help build up functioning Customs systems and tackle corruption, we will keep these programmes under close review. We also prioritise increasing the conflict sensitivity of all DFID’s programmes.

    This change in focus will send a strong signal of our concerns to the government, while putting the UK in a position to respond in a fast and flexible way to either a serious deterioration of the situation or positive progress with the negotiations. A deal on oil between Sudan and South Sudan on oil will trigger a return to a longer-term developmental approach, while more open conflict with Sudan, clear evidence of dysfunctional
government, widespread chronic insecurity, and/or economic collapse will trigger a tighter focus on basic services and humanitarian support.

March 2012