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Figure 1: Map of South Sudan and northern Uganda

(Source: http://www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/southsudan.pdf)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*Background: Insecurity and Food Insecurity*

In July 2011, South Sudan became independent. In December 2013, a vicious armed conflict broke out, which subsequently led to severe human suffering. South Sudan’s economy has been devastated and food insecurity has worsened considerably. In 2014, the UN Security Council modified the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) by giving it a protection mandate, including assisting the many internally displaced persons (IDPs). Currently, about 1.6 million people are internally displaced in South Sudan. In addition, 912,000 South Sudanese have fled to northern Uganda. In 2018, peace negotiations took place and the security situation stabilized somewhat in some parts of the country, while it deteriorated in others. The peace agreement is stronger on paper than in practice. In recent months, COVID-19 has further aggravated this dire situation. Food insecurity has increased due to closed borders, reduced transport of food commodities, and rising food prices.

*Evaluation Objective*

This field evaluation assesses three projects of three implementing organizations—the Mary Help Association (MHA), the Bishop Gassis Relief and Rescue Foundation (BGRRF), and Caritas Gulu—supported by Caritas Germany, which in turn received funding from Phineo, a German funding organization. The 3-year Phineo program started in May 2018. Its three projects differed in their set-up and regional focus, but all aimed to enhance food security. Hence, the overall objective of the current evaluation is *to assess the degree of realization of the objectives of the three food security projects, including the Rucksack projects, in particular in terms of food availability and access* for the whole project duration, but with special emphasis on the period April 2020 to March 2021*.* As indicated, this evaluation will also assess the so-called Rucksack projects, which were small follow-up projects with new activities based on lessons learned from the Phineo-supported projects. In addition, it examines what the three implementing organizations, MHA, BGRRF, and Caritas Gulu, can learn from each other in both their humanitarian and developmental work in order to further achieve their respective goals and strengthen their management.

*Outcomes*

Overall, target communities are now better equipped to meet the challenge of food insecurity.

* The provision of food aid to approximately 11,900 people (6,000 (MHA) + 5,190 (BGRRF)) has functioned well during the Phineo program.[[1]](#footnote-2) The measures to improve agricultures of the Phineo-projects have reduced the need for food aid for approximately 37,940 members of farming households (5,040 (MHA) + 7,700 (BGRRF) + 25,200 (Caritas Gulu)).[[2]](#footnote-3) Nevertheless, some food aid remains necessary because most people cannot fully bridge the hunger gap. Since March 2020, COVID-19 has negatively influenced food security.
* The agricultural/agronomic training was popular, because it enabled higher productivity, better dietary diversity, and some produce could be sold on the market.
* The provision of seeds, tools, and seedlings enabled agricultural progress. Planting seedlings, as part of reforestation, can also help fight climate change at the micro-level. All organizations have begun working in reforestation.
* Despite cultural resistance, ox-plowing has rapidly gained in popularity during the second half of the Phineo program. Farmers see that it leads to greater acreage under cultivation and higher productivity with less work than before. Caritas Gulu is now also using ox-plows on a limited scale.
* The increase in production as a result of ox-plowing can, by and large, offset the negative consequences of lower harvests due to climate change. A further increase in ox-plowed fields to approximately 5 *feddan* per farming household may lead to regular food security. At the moment demand for ox-plows and ox-plow training is rapidly increasing.
* The demonstration gardens function as multiplication sites and provide seeds, seedlings, cassava cuttings, as well as produce. They also function as training grounds (e.g., for ox-plowing and agronomic techniques). Some farmers also cultivate a piece of land of the demonstration garden for themselves, in exchange for which they work to maintain—and learn in—the demonstration garden. The seeds, seedlings, cuttings, and produce can be used to earn money or can be distributed to people in need. In this way, the demonstration gardens constitute a step towards *sustainability*, and make the three organizations less dependent on—although certainly not yet independent of—donor funding.
* The other forms of training, for example in peacebuilding and conflict resolution, village savings and loan associations (VSLA), and vocational skills, are useful too. They are a form of capacity-building that facilitates better social organization within and among displaced and host communities. The VSLAs also create income-generating opportunities that contribute to food access.
* The Rucksack projects contributed to the long-term impact of the Phineo-funded activities. On the one hand, they fill gaps that came to light during implementation of the project activities (e.g., by providing more seeds and additional food support to mitigate the impact of dry spells and flooding, as well as addressing COVID-19). On the other hand, they offer a higher number of beneficiaries a wider range of support (e.g., by establishing additional vocational and agronomic training opportunities and creating (more) demonstration gardens and seed storages, as well as by working on reforestation, soap production, and energy-saving stoves). These activities can be expanded further. They directly contribute to a higher degree of food security and indirectly lead to a higher degree of *environmental* and *economic sustainability*.
* The independent audits showed that management and accounting were generally in good shape. The recommendations, on-the-job training, and follow-up by the auditors allowed the internal administrative controls of all three organizations to be improved. These audits are a valuable tool for professionalizing their management.
* Strengthening management of the three organizations has been an important part of both the Phineo and the Rucksack projects, and was enabled by the three-year funding period of Phineo. Progress has been made in the areas of accounting, human resource management (HRM), and Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL), but further professionalization still needs to occur within the organizations. The organizations can learn from each other in terms of strategy formulation, succession planning of central staff, and training, as well as in substantial areas, such as responding to climate change.

All in all, full *food security* has not been achieved, but serious progress has been made, despite climate change, armed conflict, crime, poverty, and COVID-19. Most participants are increasingly able to bridge the hunger gap and their dietary diversity has increased. Still, needs are high among the many people that could not participate in the Phineo project. Understandably, there is a widespread desire on the part of these people in these communities to improve their livelihoods, which has resulted in a great pent-up demand for more services. The three projects could still easily triple in size, and the full demand would not be met. The *relevance* and *impact* of the three projects are very high. Their degree of *sustainability* is improving, but has not yet been fully ensured.

*Capacity Sharing*

Through the 2019 Wau workshop and the subsequent Rucksack projects, the organizations have begun to build and share capacities in the cross-cutting areas of improving agriculture, climate change adaptation and reforestation, monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL), and establishing linkages (e.g., with markets, banks, transport companies, and international organizations (UN and NGOs)). The organizations have begun learning from each other[[3]](#footnote-4), for example through joint training and mutual field visits or joint evaluations. However, due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, some of these activities had to be delayed.

*Contingency plans*

Despite peace-overtures, it is not clear when—or whether—the armed conflict will end. At the moment, WFP is reducing its food rations and UNMISS wants people in the Protection of Civilians sites (POC) in Juba to return “home.” However, violence has not ended and homes, villages, livestock, and fields have often been destroyed. It would be ideal if the three organizations, in cooperation with Daughters of Mary Immaculate (DMI) Juba, and Caritas Germany, prepare (contingency) plans for return, which could include emergency food aid and food security projects.[[4]](#footnote-5)

*Next Steps*

This evaluation report shows for each project’s objective some of the implementation issues, and results, as well as challenges and recommendations. In addition to determining the follow-up to the recommendations, the organizations currently prepare for the Juba partner Workshop in October 2021, where the final lessons learnt from all projects and Phineo activities will be analyzed in order to strengthen their future activities. They can also use this workshop to develop follow-up projects, plan learning visits to each other, and think about joint lobby and advocacy activities targeted at local administrations, UN organizations, NGOs, and donor agencies.

*Conclusions*

In sum, the three projects have achieved solid results under the adverse conditions of insecurity, climate change, crime, and COVID-19. The synergy between the Phineo and Rucksack projects has been very high. They have improved food availability, access, and utilization, but under these adverse conditions, it has not been possible to achieve full *food security* or full *sustainability* among the targeted population(s). The three organizations will intensify their cooperation and continue their activities, despite the fact that Phineo will not support a next round of projects. Managerially, they are in a much stronger position to further improve food security with a higher degree of *effectiveness* than before the Phineo program.

# INTRODUCTION

## Background

South Sudan gained independence from the Republic of the Sudan in July 2011 after a referendum in line with the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, which ended the long armed conflict between the Arab-dominated regime in Khartoum and the mostly Christian and animist majority in the South led by the Sudanese People’s Liberation Army. In the same month, the UN Security Council established the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) as a continuation of the United Nations Mission in Sudan. The original mandate of UNMISS was to promote capacity-building of the new national institutions, to carry out relief and rehabilitation, and where possible to work on development.

In December 2013, armed fighting broke out in the capital, Juba, between troops loyal to President Salva Kiir and supporters of his former deputy Riek Machar. A bloody war ensued. As a consequence, the Security Council reviewed the mandate of UNMISS, adapting the Mission to better respond to the protection and humanitarian needs of the South Sudanese population.

Despite an initial peace agreement in 2015 and a “revitalized” one in 2018, the conflict, which to some extent follows ethnic fault lines, has not stopped. In February 2020, the main warring factions officially came together in the Transitional Government of National Unity, but several rebel forces did not join. Elections are supposed to take place within three years. Although South Sudan has achieved some stability over the last three years, political progress has stalled and armed violence continues in several parts of the country.

Soldiers and police receive their wages with considerable delays, if at all, and continue preying on the population. Gangs and other armed groups raid the country, and efforts to fight crime have ceased in all but name. South Sudan has a warlord economy, where violence sustains itself through the expropriation of resources.

Since 2013, thousands of lives have been lost due to direct violence and many more through the breakdown of social services (e.g., health and education), agriculture, transport, and markets. Currently, out of a population of more than 12.1 million people, approximately 2.2 million people have become refugees in the region (Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo), and about 1.6 million have become IDPs. Food insecurity is high and malnutrition remains shockingly common. In 2020, out of 8.3 million people in need, about 7.2 million are “acutely food insecure”.[[5]](#footnote-6) The latter number includes 1.4 million malnourished children.

Both international and local humanitarian organizations are attempting to address the emergency and the needs of the refugees and communities in the affected areas. In 2018, the government issued its National Development Strategy (July 2018-June 2021) and the UN System presented its Cooperation Framework (2019-2021). These are broad policy frameworks for international and national actors, and the UN Cooperation Framework has a section on food security. However, COVID-19 has hampered the realization of these policies, because the borders were officially closed, which led to a sharp reduction in the transport of essential goods such as food commodities and medicine. The pandemic also contributed to a reduction in oil-related government revenues. Consequently, the South-Sudanese Pound (SSP) has devaluated, so that the purchasing power of South-Sudanese people has declined. Many people cannot or can only barely afford the increased food prices. In addition, UNMISS is now slowly withdrawing from some Protection of Civilian sites (a.k.a. IDP camps), and suggests that the IDPs return to their place of origin. Yet, most of these have been destroyed.

In Uganda, where the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the World Bank lead the international aid community, the government has set up the Refugee and Host Community Empowerment (ReHoPE) strategy.[[6]](#footnote-7) In line with the Uganda National Development Plan II, ReHoPE focuses on progressively enhancing social service delivery in refugee hosting areas, with the aim of integrating services with local government systems and empowering refugee hosting communities. Currently, Uganda hosts almost 912,000 South Sudanese refugees.[[7]](#footnote-8)

Finally, donors are decreasing their funding to a dismally low level. In South Sudan, funding for the 2020 Humanitarian Response Plan was at 65%—the lowest level since 2011.[[8]](#footnote-9) Funding for the Regional Response Plan was indicated at 21% in the 2020 mid-year report.[[9]](#footnote-10) Currently, only 34% of 2021 Humanitarian Response plan has been covered.[[10]](#footnote-11) Funding for ReHoPE is also falling short.

## Food Security

This report studies the food security projects of three organizations: Mary Help Association (MHA) in Wau, South Sudan, Bishop Gassis Relief & Rescue Foundation (BGRRF) in Agok, close to the border with Sudan (still regularly referred to as the North), and Caritas Gulu in Uganda. Briefly,

A person, household or community, region or nation is food secure when all members at all times have physical and economic access to buy, produce, obtain or consume sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for a healthy and active life.[[11]](#footnote-12)

Table 1: Food security components: availability, access, and utilization**[[12]](#footnote-13)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Food availability** in a country, region or local area means that food is physically present because it has been grown, processed, manufactured, and/or imported. For example, food is available because it can be found in markets and shops; it has been produced on local farms or in home gardens; or it has arrived as part of food aid. This refers to all available food in the area, and includes fresh, as well as packaged, food.  Food availability can be affected by disruptions to the food transport and production systems, due to blocked roads, failed crops or changes in import and export tariffs, amongst other factors. Such occurrences can influence the amount of food coming into an area. In addition, food availability is dependent upon seasonal patterns in food production and trading.  **Food access** refers to the way in which different people obtain available food. Normally, people access food through a combination of means. This may include: home production, use of left-over stocks, purchase, barter, borrowing, sharing, gifts from relatives, and provisions by welfare systems or food aid. Food access is ensured when everyone within a community has adequate financial or other resources to obtain the food necessary for a nutritious diet. Access depends on a household’s available income and its distribution within the household, as well as on the price of food. It also depends on markets, and on the social and institutional entitlements/rights of individuals.  Food access can be negatively influenced by unemployment, physical insecurity (e.g. during conflicts), loss of coping options (e.g. border closures preventing seasonal job migration), or the collapse of safety-net institutions which once protected people on low incomes.  **Food utilization** is the way in which people use food. It is dependent upon a number of interrelated factors: the quality of the food and its method of preparation, storage facilities, and the nutritional knowledge and health status of the individual consuming the food. For example, some diseases do not allow for optimal absorption of nutrients, whereas growth requires increased intake of certain nutrients.  Food utilization is often reduced by factors such as endemic disease, poor sanitation, lack of appropriate nutritional knowledge, or culturally-prescribed taboos (often related to age or gender) that affect a certain group’s or family member’s access to nutritious food. Food utilization may also be adversely affected if people have limited resources for preparing food, for example due to a lack of fuel or cooking utensils.  Any imbalance in the above-mentioned factors can lead to food insecurity. |

This evaluation focuses mainly on *food availability* and *access*. *Food utilization* will only be discussed to the extent that cultural barriers, limited resources for preparing food, and a trade-off between eating or storing seeds exists.

## Organizations

Caritas Germany has collaborated for many years with the three organizations participating in this program. In 2017, it learned that a German donor, Phineo, was interested in funding projects for food security in South Sudan. Caritas Germany and its three local partners (see below) submitted a proposal to Phineo. Their application was successful.

The Phineo program funded a period of three years (2018-2021) and focused on emergency and transitional aid. It provided relief for the hunger gap, which can last from April to August. Before the harvest in August, most households are highly food insecure, and sometimes people have less than one meal a day. The program also fostered agricultural development in the hope of making the communities food secure. This evaluation looks at the whole program, but pays special attention to the third year of its activities.

### Mary Help Association, South Sudan

Mary Help Association is an NGO set up by Sr. Gracy Adichirayil, an Indian-Salesian sister, together with a group of Catholics from Kerala, India, in 2000. MHA works closely with the Catholic Diocese of Wau. In 2007, MHA established the first Nursing and Midwifery School in South Sudan. In 2016, together with the governmental Western Bahr el Ghazal University, it also started offering degree courses in Nursing and Midwifery. Importantly, it operates a hospital in Alel Chok, just outside of Wau. Several departments of the hospital are currently being completed. MHA also carries out development and humanitarian projects in and close to Wau.

### Bishop Gassis Relief & Rescue Foundation, South Sudan

The Bishop Gassis Relief & Rescue Foundation was founded in 2016. It has its Head Office in Nairobi, Kenya. This organization has grown out of the pastoral services and humanitarian and development programs implemented through the Diocese of El Obeid in both Sudan and South Sudan. Emeritus Bishop Macram Max Gassis established this foundation in order to continue the humanitarian work in the Diocese, as well as to be able to respond to other areas of humanitarian need. BGRRF has been responding to the conflict in the Nuba Mountains in South Kordofan (Sudan) with a large-scale emergency program. It also continues to run development, humanitarian and pastoral service activities in the Abyei Special Administrative Area (ASAA), and in Twic County[[13]](#footnote-14) in South Sudan. Its activities include Health, Education, Women’s Groups, a radio station, WASH, and food aid and security. BGRRF also runs two primary schools and a secondary school in Agok and five primary and two secondary schools in Twic. In 2021, BGRRF began moving its main office from Nairobi to Turalei.

### **Caritas Gulu Archdiocese, Uganda**

Caritas Gulu, the Emergency Relief and Development arm of the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Gulu, has become one of the operating partners of OPM and UNHCR involved in providing life-saving relief and livelihood projects to the refugees and host communities in the Amuru, Nwoya, Omoro, Adjumani and Lamwo districts. It has branch offices in Kitgum, Gulu, Pader, and Adjumani. In addition, it also continues its more developmental work for Ugandans.

## The Three Projects

This field evaluation compares the projects of these three organizations, namely:

1. Mary Help Association: “Agriculture Training and Nutrition Support for 9 Villages North of Wau, South Sudan, 2018-2021.”
2. Bishop Gassis Relief & Rescue Foundation: “Food Aid Relief and Food Security Project – Agok, Abyei Special Administrative Area and Turalei, Twic County, South Sudan – 2018, 2019, 2020.”
3. Caritas Gulu: “Integrated Post-Conflict Support for South Sudanese Refugees in Adjumani and Lamwo Districts, 2018-2020.”

In addition, this report assesses the so-called Rucksack projects for each organization. The activities of these projects build on the recommendations of the 2018-2019 evaluation and the subsequent 2019 Wau workshop, in which all three organizations and DMI together with Caritas Germany discussed the lessons learned in the Phineo program so far.

All three organizations also carry out several other projects and activities that are not part of Phineo and this evaluation, but will occasionally be indicated as background information.

## Objectives of the Evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is

*to assess the degree of realization of the objectives of the three food security projects, including the Rucksack projects, in particular in terms of food availability and access.*

In addition, we examine what the three organizations can learn from each other about food security in order to achieve their goals and strengthen their management. Subsequently, we indicate where and how the three organizations can learn from each other and perhaps cooperate with each other.

## Scope of the Evaluation

In line with its objective, this evaluation:

1. assesses the challenges the organizations and projects face in bringing about their intended outcomes and what the unintended consequences are;
2. provides recommendations for strengthening the three organizations and their future projects;
3. identifies areas in which they can learn from each other;
4. prepares the October 2021 partner workshop in Juba.

## Set up

The next chapter explains the methodology of this evaluation and can be skipped by the readers that are solely interested in its outcomes. Chapter three presents the empirical findings for each objective of the Phineo and the Rucksack projects. The fourth chapter compares the organizations and their activities to draw lessons for future activities. Subsequently, chapter five discusses some steps forward for Caritas Germany in the areas of climate change, food security, and cooperation with other organizations. Finally, the conclusions summarize the main results of this evaluation regarding food security and the ways forward.
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# METHODS

## Introduction

This evaluation is mainly based on a mixed research method. Combining both qualitative and quantitative data collected from sampled subjects gave information on an array of variables on food security.[[14]](#footnote-15) Further, the IFRC guide *How to Conduct a Food Security Assessment: A Step-by-Step Guide for National Societies in Africa*,[[15]](#footnote-16) was used to guide data collection methods because of its practical utility and insights on food security and livelihoods matters. In a nutshell, the main data collection that this study employed were a desk review of secondary data of project documents and expert interviews, field visits by the local consultant to the project sites to collect primary data with community focus group discussions (FGDs) with project beneficiaries, usually with separate male and female groups, individual key informant interviews (KIIs) with local leaders, observation tours of the project sites, and household interviews (HHIs). We always triangulated data from these data collection methods.

## Desk Review

An array of secondary reference materials was consulted before and during the evaluation assignment on this project. These materials consisted of scholarly literature on food security and livelihoods, project documents from Phineo, Caritas Germany, and the three participating organizations. Also reviewed were scholarly literature on the current political and economic situation of both South Sudan and Uganda and in addition, the review focused on updates, policy or strategy documents, and evaluations of international organizations, in particular from UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). We also reviewed documents from the 2017 mid-term evaluation of the Caritas Gulu refugee projects in Northern Uganda, the 2018 project evaluation of DMI in Juba, and the 2018 Caritas Gulu humanitarian strategy, as well as the Phineo program documents, the 2019 and 2020 evaluations of the three projects, and the 2019 Wau workshop report.

## Key-Informant Interviews with Staff Members

Twenty-one (eight by Reagan and thirteen by Dennis) semi-structured KIIs were carried out during primary data collection period with staff members of the three organizations. The aim was to have a broad understanding of project achievement, challenges and their perspective recommendation for future programming inclusion. Usually only one respondent at a time would be interviewed. Reagan carried out his interviews in either the field or in the respondents’ offices. Dennis’ KIIs took place via Skype, WhatsApp, or Zoom. A key informant guide was the main tool used to inform the specific question inquired (see Appendix 2).

## Focus Group Discussion

The local consultant also held FGD meetings, mainly with project beneficiaries. Participants for these FGDs were purposively sampled and, when necessary, discussions were conducted with male and female participants separately. The aim was to obtain a deeper explanation of the project evolution and impact and further examine how sustainability can be achieved beyond the project life. An FGD guide was developed to structure these discussions (see Appendices 5 & 6).

## Field Visit and Observation Tours

As part of triangulating and corroborating the data collected, the independent local consultant carried out field visits and made personal observations at the project sites through the use of a checklist to ascertain presence of project activities as documented in the project plans and progress reports. These field visits enabled the local consultant to gain an insight into the respondents’ workplaces, cultivation and living areas. For example, farmers showed their fields, irrigation and planting methods, harvests, storage, and tools.

## Household Interviews

The HHIs were carried out by a team of five enumerators who were enlisted to assist with primary data collection. They were individuals from the local community who understood the local language, and the political and cultural dimensions of the community. Prior to their deployment, the enumerators were trained on the survey, the purpose of evaluation, how to record responses on an electronic devise, and general research ethics. Questionnaires were developed for each of the three organizations. Data integrity was further enhanced using technology by incorporating robust validation techniques and skip logics within the survey. The survey covered a wide array of topics depending on the respondents’ experiences with the program, including food aid, tools and equipment received, seeds distributed, food security and livelihood components, as well as a description of the respondents’ demographic and background information. A total of 533 HHI respondents were interviewed during this evaluation (see Appendices 3 & 4).

Table 2: Number of respondents interviewed by region and country

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **South Sudan** | | **Uganda - Gulu** | | **Total** |
| **Agok/ Turalei** | **Wau** | **Adjumani** | **Palabek** |
| **KII** | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| **FGD** | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 13 |
| **HHI** | 175 | 190 | 63 | 105 | 533 |

## Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed. In analyzing the quantitative data, three types of measurement were used, namely: nominal data (for example male or female), ordinal data (for example strong or weak capacities), and interval data (for example Likert scale – ranking satisfaction on scale of 1-5). The data was analyzed using computer aided software (Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) and Excel 2016), through tabulations (for frequency and per cent distributions), and furthermore, the data was also disaggregated across different variables and subcategories of variables using cross tabulations.

The qualitative information from the observations and questionnaires was analyzed during desk research in the “field”, Bochum and Nairobi by the two consultants. These analyses focused on the description of the project activities, their results, strengths and weaknesses in implementation, and possible improvements.

## Limitations

One major limitation cutting across the three projects is that none of them had a base-line study, as such it was impossible to ascertain empirically the project impact through pre-post analysis of project results. To overcome this limitation, the assessment focused mainly on a comparative assessment of the current degree of realization of their objectives and the management issues that were identified. Moreover, one of the organizations has begun to collect data that can function as a (partial) baseline.

# FINDINGS

## Introduction

This chapter describes the objectives of the three food security projects, their implementation processes and results, and their main challenges and recommendations, as well as the Rucksack projects. The latter projects have received their name because they piggyback and build on the Phineo program.

## The Mary Help Association

The overall objective of Agriculture Training and Nutrition Support for 9 Villages North of Wau, South Sudan, 2018-2021 is *to contribute to the survival, food security, and improvement of health status of the most vulnerable communities in the Greater Wau area*. The 9 villages lie in a predominantly Dinka area, but there are also some predominantly Luo villages. Traditionally the Dinka and Luo were “pastoralists by inclination, and agriculturalists by necessity.”[[16]](#footnote-17) Nowadays, they live increasingly as agriculturalists; some already for several generations. This cultural sea-change has proven very challenging for them.

Table 3: Respondents for Each Project Objective (MHA)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Villages** | **Obj. 1**  **Food Aid** | **Obj. 2**  **Ox-plow** | **Obj. 3**  **Seeds** | **Total** |
| Kormolang | 23 | 23 | 14 | 60 |
| Malwil | 29 | 29 | 30 | 88 |
| Marial-Agith | 35 | 35 | 33 | 103 |
| Numpal | 17 | 17 | 12 | 46 |
| Nyanpath | 35 | 35 | 36 | 106 |
| Waradoth | 48 | 47 | 19 | 114 |
| **Total** | **187** | **186** | **144** | **517** |

**Objective 1: 720 farmers in 9 villages around the settlement of Alel Chok, north of Wau, successfully commence with sustainable agriculture and are able to feed themselves and their 450 most vulnerable individuals throughout the year**

*Implementation Process*

The 2018-2019 project villages were Nyanpath, Khartoum Jedid, and Marial Agith. They are located relatively close to the hospital, so they were easy to reach even though the project facilities (truck and office) were not fully operational at the beginning of the project. In March 2019, the work in the next three villages, Baryar, Zokolona and Malwil, started. In March 2020, MHA began project activities in the final three villages: Waradoth, Numpal, and Kormolang.

Every year, this project aims to provide 240 families (approx. 1,680 individuals)[[17]](#footnote-18) and 150 vulnerable individuals (some with dependent children), equally spread over three villages, with food aid (sorghum, beans, and cooking oil) during the hunger gap, which lasts from April to early August.[[18]](#footnote-19) This hunger gap is the most critical nutrition period of the year, and the local population calls it “the terrible months” before the first harvest takes place. In this hunger period, people often eat only one meal a day or less.

A *selection committee* identified the actual farmer families for each village. The committee consists of the chief of the village, a farmer representative, a women’s group representative, a youth representative, a teachers’ representative, a local church representative, and an MHA representative. The representatives are chosen every year. MHA hopes that the selection committees can evolve into *rural development committees*, which can function as its counterparts at the village level.

240 families were able to participate (80 in each new village in the last project year).[[19]](#footnote-20) Their selection was difficult, because the number of needy households was close to 600. The participating households received the basic food items and seeds for the cultivation of staple foods (sorghum, beans, groundnuts, maize, sesame, and millet), and two selected tools (from long and short spades[[20]](#footnote-21) to rakes, axes, hoes, and machetes) (see objective 2). After the harvest, the 240 farming families were supposed to support the weakest individuals in their community with food. In addition, the families were expected to produce and store seeds for the next planting season and to replace damaged tools.

*Results*

In 2020-2021, the rains were late but then reasonably good, and the project achieved the first two indicators of this objective. Waradoth and Nyanpath experienced minor flooding, which did not impact the project much. Generally, dry spells were a bigger problem. After the selection of the families, MHA successfully provided food relief, so that the farmers had enough energy to start farming their fields. In addition, 50 vulnerable persons and their dependents received food aid in each village. Respondents were satisfied with the aid (food aid, seeds, seedlings, tools and training) they received. Table 5 shows quantities of different crop seeds distributed to 240 HH by MHA in the month of April 2020 for planting. In addition, each farming household received 50 g each of tomato, okra, pumpkin, *jiirjiir*, *rijula*, and kudra seeds.

Table 4: MHA Food Item Distribution List April-July 2020

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Items Distributed** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** |
| Sorghum | 12.5 kg/month | 240 HH & 150 vulnerable persons |
| Beans | 1.5 kg /month | 240 HH & 150 vulnerable persons |
| Oil | 0.9 kg /month | 240 HH & 150 vulnerable persons |

Table 5: MHA Crops Seeds Distribution List 2020-2021

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop Seeds** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** |
| Sorghum Seeds | 12 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Beans | 3 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Groundnuts | 30 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Maize | 5 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Green Beans | 0.5 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Sim Sim | 0.5 kg/HH | 240 HH |

The FGDs with a section of the selection committee noted that MHA distributes food items to the community in a fair and transparent manner, in which the most vulnerable, including the elderly and persons with chronic diseases, were prioritized. Depending on their household size, food aid provided by MHA would last the recipients between 2-5 months. Most (36%) noted that the food aid would last them for 4 months. Given the fact that this distribution takes place during the hardship months which runs from April to August (approximately 4 months), food aid did contribute to its intended objective of providing household food security during the hardship months.

Figure 2: Period Food Aid Last Households

Although the farming households now do have more food, which also last longer into the hunger gap (until the end of June/mid-July), and earn a little money to pay for school fees and medical care, they do not always produce enough food to carry them fully through the hunger gap and produce seeds for the next planting season.[[21]](#footnote-22) As a result, they cannot support the vulnerable people in their community sufficiently *and* they will need some seeds for the next planting season. The demonstration garden at the rural development center is now helping to address this problem (see below). Interestingly, the local population likes to harvest and weed together in groups on both their own land and in the demonstration garden. It seems that the more they work in groups, the more food they provide for vulnerable people.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

The dry spells and irregular rains are commonly reported, and in all likelihood related to climate change, which is a *force majeure*, but with an impact that can be expected to occur more regularly.

* *Continue to further develop a climate change adaptation policy (e.g., with water harvesting, drip irrigation, moisture retention, and solar panels);*
* *Teach the local population drying more foodstuffs for the hunger gap.*

In principle, the idea of developing a *rural development committee* is very useful. MHA could study the farmers’ and women’s associations of DMI in Juba and the peacebuilding committees of Caritas in Northern Uganda to see how these forms of social organization function.

* *Assess how the selection committee is functioning, particularly the extent to which it has functioned or can function as a rural development committee.*

Caritas Gulu now has a strong approach of incorporating local communities and refugees into its work. It provides them with a free piece of land to cultivate on its vast demonstration farm. Participants then take care of Caritas Gulu crops and land while also harvesting their own crops. DMI also innovatively helps indigent people with obtaining land for agriculture.

* *Check to which extent the approaches by Caritas Gulu and DMI can be taken over.*

As stated, no baseline study took place before the project. Nevertheless, MHA has already been collecting data, such as MUAC (see table 7) and a rough measurement of the increase in land under cultivation on the basis of the growth in produce, that gave indications about the situation before and during the project. Moreover, MHA has carried out its own study on acreage under cultivation (to show the increase due to ox-plowing), crop yields, income, number of animals (cows, goats, chickens, others) and the number children going to school. In principle, this study and its data collection method provide a sound method to establish a baseline upon which the next project can be designed and evaluated.

* *Check whether more indicators should be included (e.g., on the number of persons participating, dietary diversity, number of meals a day, water availability, or seeds produced for the next season). The set of indicators will help further assessing both the components of, and the main obstacles, to food security.*
* *Review how the MHA internal study can become the basis for regular MEAL in the next (round of) projects.*
* *Check the extent to which this study can become an example for the other Phineo partner organizations).*

**Objective 2: 720 farming households have significantly improved and broadened their skills and agricultural techniques and have measurably increased their food consumption and the variety of consumed food**

*Implementation process*

In an effort to enhance beneficiaries’ skills and knowledge on farming, MHA trained the participants on land preparation, weeding and weed managements, harvesting, post-harvest management and entrepreneurship. The table below summarizes the types of training conducted in the 2020-2021 project year.

Table 6: Farmers' Trainings Conducted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE OF TRAINING** | **MALE PARTICIPANTS** | **FEMALE PARTICIPANTS** | **DATE OF**  **TRAINING** | **PROJECT**  **YEAR** |
| Land Preparation and Planting | 104 | 136 | 1/04/2020-15/04/2020 | 2020-2021 |
| Ox-Plow Training | 46 | 29 | 10/05/2020-20/05/2020 | 2020-2021 |
| Weeding and Weeds Management | 104 | 136 | 20/05/2020-05/06/2020 | 2020-2021 |
| Training on Harvest and Entrepreneurship | 104 | 136 | 25/10/2020-05/11/2020 | 2020-2021 |

In addition, MHA also provides training for tree planting and nursery. Most training took place at either the hospital compound or at the large demonstration garden in Nyanpath[[22]](#footnote-23) (see below). At the hospital compound, MHA has a staple food section (e.g., sorghum, maize, millet), a vegetable garden, and a fruit-tree nursery.[[23]](#footnote-24) The demonstration gardens will start to play a bigger role, because they provide food, seeds, and seedlings, as well as training grounds (e.g., for ox-plowing), while WFP is reducing some types of its food rations. These gardens have the potential to make the food security work of MHA more autonomous and the organization a bit less dependent on donor support. MHA is also working more with drought resistant crops. In terms of food utilization, people are sun-drying an increasing array of staple crops and vegetables as food reserves for the next hunger gap.[[24]](#footnote-25)

The training with oxen was further intensified in 2020-2021. MHA trained 25 instead of 20 people for each of the new villages at the large demonstration garden. Farmers were enthusiastic about the training and use of ox-plows, and particularly about their new-found ability to increase the acreage under agriculture, which helped to increase output (all other factors, such as the amount of rain and destruction by pests, being equal). Farmers also appreciated that they did not have to do all the plowing manually with a *maloda*, because this is exhausting, back-breaking work that wounds their hands. About 20% of the families receiving training in ox-plowing were female-headed households.

To some extent, the increase in acreage and growth in production due to ox-plowing can offset the negative effects of climate change and insecurity. Currently, ox-plowing faces two main constraints: 1) most people do not own oxen and need to rent them, which is expensive; and 2) the number of metal plows that MHA can provide is limited, because they are expensive and need to be imported. In Waradoth, Numpal and Kormolang five participating households received one metal plow. Last year, in Zokolona, six families had to share one plow due to the increased number of participating households.

Respondents highlighted that many animals fall ill or die during the heat/dry spells, but they can now better afford veterinarian services. During these dry spells, pests and diseases also afflict crops, which severely decreased production. The natural method to fight pests, introduced by MHA, does not function well enough yet, partly because people lack tobacco leaves and need to pay for them, partly because people have not routinized its use yet. Moreover, the natural method does not remove all pests.

Moving herds are welcome, as long as they do not intrude when the crops are growing. But when the land is lying fallow, their manure can fertilize it. As more land is being plowed and used (as well as being exposed to the sun and other elements), farmers may increasingly need crop rotation, and other forms of fertilization, such as compost or artificial fertilizer.

Moreover, lack of water, including drinking water, has become a general problem. Many wells are running dry. The Jur river was once permanent, but at the end of the dry period you can now cross it without getting your feet wet.[[25]](#footnote-26)

*Results*

Farmers were able to participate in the training and visit and learn from the demonstration sites. With the seeds, the farmers were able to increase the number and quantity of vegetables and staple crops, but less than originally hoped for due to the dry spells and floods caused by erratic rainfall.

MHA’s own study indicated that in Malwil, Baryar, and Zokolona the harvest of groundnut, sorghum, sim sim and maize tripled between 2018 and 2019 (335% in Malwil, 447% in Baryar, in Zokolona 120%, on average 300%). In Waradoth, Numpal, and Kormalang the amount of the same crops quadrupled from 2019 to 2020 (420% in Waradoth, 338% in Numpal, 455% in Kormalang, on average 404%).[[26]](#footnote-27)

The participating farmers also increased the land area for cultivation. In the three (Baryar, Zokolona, and Malwil) villages, which had already increased their cultivated land in the second project year, they continued to increase it further, from about 3.44 *feddan* on average in 2018 to 7.32 *feddan* in 2019.[[27]](#footnote-28) The internal MHA study found that in the three new villages (Waradoth, Numpal, and Kormolang), farmers cultivated about 1.72 *feddan* in 2019 and 9.74 *feddan* in 2020.

Table 7: Nutrition: Randomized MUAC Studies of Infants (6-59 months) in 9 Villages 2017-2021[[28]](#footnote-29)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Month** |  | **Nyanpath** | **Khartoum Jadid** | **Marial Agith** | **Malwil** | **Baryar** | **Zokolona** | **Waradoth** | **Numpal** | **Kormolang** | **Overall Malnutrition Rate** |
| **May 2017** | GAM | 20% | 18% | 23% | 19% | 18% | 17% |  |  |  | 19.2% |
| **October 2017** | GAM | 17% | 17% | 21% | 18% | 17% | 17% |  |  |  | 17.8% |
| **May 2018** | GAM | 17% | 17% | 21% | 17% | 17% | 16% |  |  |  | 17.5% |
| **October 2018** | GAM | 10% | 14% | 17% | 16% | 16% | 15% |  |  |  | 14.7% |
| **May 2019** | GAM | 10% | 12% | 15% | 16% | 15% | 15% |  |  |  | 13.8% |
| **October2019** | GAM | 6.6%  (5/75) | 10%  (5/50) | 12%  (6/50) | 10% (5/50) | 10%  (5/50) | 9%  (5/55) |  |  |  | 9.6% |
| **May 2020** | GAM | 6.7% (2/30) | 10%  (3/30) | 13.3% (4/30) | 10% (3/30) | 10% (3/30) | 6.7%  (2/30) | 12.5%  (4/32) | 13.3%  (4/30) | 13.3%  (4/30) | 10.7% |
| **October 2020** | GAM | 5.71%  (2/35) | 8.57%  (3/35) | 13.88%  (5/36) | 8.57%  (3/35) | 11.1%  (4/36) | 8.57%  (3/35) | 8.57%  (3/35) | 11.1%  (4/36) | 8.57%  (3/35) | 9.4%  (30/318) |
| **May / June 2021** | GAM | 5.71%  (2/35) |  | 11.43%  (4/35) |  |  |  | 8.57%  (3/35) | 10.0%  (3/30) | 10.0%  (3/30) | 9.1%  (15/165) |

Since the introduction of ox-plowing in 2018, its use by farming HHs increased from 14% in 2019 to 57% in 2020. The last evaluation occurred just when farmers were beginning to preparing their farms hence only 28% had used their ox-plow by this time (see figure 3). Importantly, increasing agricultural productivity with ox-plowing can off-set some of the negative effects of climate change and insecurity. Of course, this is easier in rural areas like Nyanpath, where land is still available, than in semi-urban areas, such as Zokolona and Baryar. MHA estimates that when *all* households in the villages would cultivate more than 5 *feddan*, food security would become common.

Figure 3: Percentage of HHs Using Ox Plow

In addition to ox-plows, 88% of the respondents were also provided with cereal and vegetable seeds (mainly sorghum, beans, groundnuts, maize, beans and sim sim) to plant. According to primary data obtained from MHA, 240 HHs benefited from these seeds.

Table 8: MHA Cereal Seeds Distribution List

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop Seeds** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** |
| Sorghum Seeds | 12 kg /HH | 240 HH |
| Beans | 3 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Ground nuts | 30 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Maize | 5 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Green Beans | 0.5 kg/HH | 240 HH |
| Sim Sim | 0.5 kg/HH | 240 HH |

Additionally, MHA also distributed different vegetable seeds to households for planting on their plots. The vegetables are mainly for household food consumption, but in case of surplus production, they can also be sold on the market.

Table 9: MHA Vegetable Seeds Distribution List

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Vegetable Seeds** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** |
| Tomato Seeds | 50 Gram | 240 HH |
| Okra Seeds | 50 Gram | 240 HH |
| Pumpkin Seeds | 50 Gram | 240 HH |
| Jiirjiir Seeds | 50 Gram | 240 HH |
| Rijula Seeds | 50 Gram | 240 HH |
| Kudra Seeds | 50 Gram | 240 HH |

Despite growing success with farming with ox plows, there are challenges that come with its use; most respondents (38%) cited the lack of operational know-how on the use of ox-plow, repair costs were also cited as another major challenge by 33.5% of the respondents. The need to serve several farmers at the same time was another challenge. This is because all farmers begin to prepare their land at the same time, but they only have one plow available for five to six families. Lack of oxen is also a challenge for 9.5% of the respondents. This is further exacerbated by the fact that at times thieves come (mostly from the pastoralist communities) to steal oxen that are meant for plowing, leaving such households without any ox for plowing.

Table 10: Challenges Using Ox-Plows

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ox-Plow Challenges** | **Responses** | |
| **Number** | **Percentage of Cases** |
| No challenge | 54 | 34.2% |
| Repair Cost | 53 | 33.5% |
| Many people require ox plow at the same time | 32 | 20.3% |
| Lack of oxen | 15 | 9.5% |
| High operational technology | 60 | 38.0% |
| Other | 3 | 1.9% |
| Total[[29]](#footnote-30) | 217 | 137.3% |

In terms of *food access* and *availability*, the farmers were able to increase the amount and variety of their food consumption, but by less than originally hoped for. Nevertheless, a comparison of random nutrition surveys from May 2017 to May 2021, which measure mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of young children (5-59 months), shows that although the global acute malnutrition (GAM) fluctuates seasonally, it has declined in the nine supported villages (see table 7).[[30]](#footnote-31) In addition, in 2019, the feeding center at the hospital was closed, and it has not been necessary to reopen it because malnutrition has declined to a comparatively low level.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

Ox-plowing increases agricultural production in two ways. First, production per unit land increases through better soil preparation. Second, more land can be cultivated and thus planted until a new bottleneck (such as the availability of sufficient land, the availability of sufficient oxen and plows, or the availability of sufficient seeds) comes up.[[31]](#footnote-32) It would be useful to take these two factors into account when measuring the increase in harvest. MHA can continue to assess the project outcomes in the nine project villages over time.

* *Conduct a follow-up study on agriculture and food security in all villages, including the randomized MUAC/nutrition surveys.*
  + *Distinguish more exactly between the increase in acreage due to ox-plowing (and perhaps tractors), and the increase in productivity due to better soil preparation;*
  + *Measure more exactly the negative effects of ox-plowing, such as soil degradation and (potential) tensions among farmers with oxen and those without.*

Renting oxen, as stated, is expensive. One woman used a donkey to plow. Donkeys are cheaper than oxen and easier to feed, especially during the long dry season. Both farming tribes and pastoralist tribes accept donkeys, but unlike cows they are not likely to be stolen by the pastoralist tribes.

* *Examine whether an ox-breeding and distribution program is possible;*
* *Assess whether or to what extent donkeys can be used for plowing and which kinds of plows would be or could be made available to do so;*
* *Assess whether different types of plows can be either be purchased and distributed or produced locally.[[32]](#footnote-33)*

Pests and diseases are a serious problem reducing the harvest and hampering food security. Lack of tobacco leaves limits the effectiveness of natural pest control. Some farmers grow tobacco plants locally, but there are not many of them.

* *Continue to teach the target groups natural and low-cost methods of pest and disease control;*
* *Examine whether alternative methods of pest control (e.g., with ashes or tobacco leaves) are possible;*
* *Investigate whether more tobacco plants can be grown locally. What inputs and other incentives do local farmers need?*
* *Check whether veterinary services can be provided on a more regular basis;*
* *Examine with Caritas Gulu the advantages and disadvantages of post-harvesting bags.*

Table 11: Mary

|  |
| --- |
| Mary (*not her real name*), 45 years old, from Marial Agith is a widow with 5 surviving children. She is in a group of six households, identified by the selection committee for ox-plowing in 2019. Prior to 2018, Mary and her children would cultivate about 1.5–2 *feddans* of their farm land. This was tedious and back breaking work and only a small piece of land could be cultivated. She cultivated 5 *feddan* in 2019 and planted maize, beans, and some okra and pumpkin. Fortunately, weather conditions were favorable with enough rainfall for a bumper harvest, which was able to sustain her household food consumption throughout the year—which had never happened before she started using the ox-plow.  Mary did not sell any harvest to augment her household income but is very happy to have realized such a big harvest. She now plans to cultivate more land, so that she can sell part of the harvest to take care of other household needs, such as medicine and her children’s education.  Despite this success, she also experiences considerable challenges with her farming activities such as pest and diseases, as well as increasingly erratic weather conditions. At times, floods or drought strike, which reduce the harvest. Addressing these challenges, Mary explains, would make her a self-reliant individual able to take care of her family’s needs. |

**Objective 3: The participating farmers generate surpluses and successfully market a part of their products**

*Implementation process*

The participating farmers have harvested and sold a small part of their produce on the market, either in their village or in Wau. They usually can fetch a better price in Wau. MHA has put the farmers in touch with customers in Wau (e.g., markets, hotels, or restaurants). Some farmers now have regular customers in Wau. In other words, limited cash-production is now possible.

*Results*

The farmers judged the fact that they could sometimes sell their produce at the market positively. For example, *rijula* could be harvested quickly and regularly, and then sold for a good price. Some farmers indicated that it was difficult to determine the right price for their goods. The sold produce helped them pay for school fees, school uniforms and materials, as well as buy things on the market, such as clothes, shoes, salt, sugar, soap, and meat. As stated, there was no study on baseline income. However, MHA’s own study participants in Kormolang, Nhompal and Waradoth argued that they had been able to increase their income by 474% on average from 2019 to 2020.[[33]](#footnote-34) This is a large increase, but from a very small base.

As indicated above, although food diversity has increased and the farmers could occasionally buy a few more products on the market, the farmers were often unable to produce enough seeds for the next planting season or to produce enough food to bridge the whole hunger gap. Similarly, some families still cannot afford the school fees. Nor are the farming families able to support the most vulnerable people in their communities throughout the year. Interestingly, some farmers participate have set up local saving associations.[[34]](#footnote-35) MHA could investigate whether it can help them expand these into VSLAs and ultimately into farmers’ cooperatives.

In addition to the provision of cereal and vegetable seeds by MHA, farmers were able to plant other traditional crops (such as *rijula, kudra*,andpumpkin) in their fields which were primarily used for household food consumption. A full list of the different crops planted by farmers is provided in appendix 7. Through this effort, most households were able to obtain diverse food types that fulfill their dietary requirements (as a result of the diversity of crops planted and harvested). This evaluation further assessed usage of crop seeds by farmers and their crops production level. 91% (n=112) of the farmers stated that they planted all the seeds that had been provided, 6.5% (n=8) stated that they consumed part of the seeds while the rest were planted, and 2.4% (n=3) stated that they consumed all the seeds as such did not plant anything.

Table 12: Usage of Crop Seeds Provided

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Frequency** | **Percentage** | **Valid Percentage** |
| **Valid** | Planted all the seeds | 112 | 58.9 | 91.1 |
| Consumed part of the seeds | 8 | 4.2 | 6.5 |
| Consumed all the seeds | 3 | 1.6 | 2.4 |
| Total | 123 | 64.7 | 100.0 |
| **Missing** | No response | 67 | 35.3 |  |
| **Total** | | 190 | 100.0 |  |

In terms of production level, sorghum and groundnuts were the most harvested crops from the seeds provided at 15 and 10 bags respectively in the recent harvesting season. Sim sim and green beans’ harvest are the smallest of all the crops cultivated, and are not sold in the market, probably the small quantity harvested is primarily used for household food consumption. Despite being the crop that is produced most, very little sorghum is sold, which signifies its importance in household food security.

Figure 4: Average HH Farm Produce and Sales Data

Crops grown are not only used for consumption but surpluses are also sold in the local market to earn income. Among the crops grown, beans fetched the highest market price at SSP 22,000 per bag of 90 kg (approximately USD 0.25), while maize fetched the lowest market price of SSP 8,000 per bag of 90 kg.

Figure 5: Average Sales Income in SSP for a 90 kg Bag of Cultivated Crops

Sim sim and green beans are consumed faster than other crops. They do not last beyond 12 months. The rest of the crops (beans, maize, sorghum and ground nuts) last a household on average between 9–12 months (see figure 6). Ground nuts last the longest. 20% of the households consume their harvest for over 12 months. In other words, the participating farmers have now begun to bridge the hunger gap for a limited set of crops, so that this gap is now being bridged to a greater extent than before the project.

Figure 6: Period Cultivated Crops Last to Meet HH Food Requirements

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Check regularly whether/when the most vulnerable people, as well as farmers, require additional emergency aid due to recurring droughts and flooding;[[35]](#footnote-36)*
* *Assess whether there are any unmet training needs (on pest and disease control or entrepreneurship training (e.g., setting an optimal price, packing, transport, and presentation of the produce));*
* *Learn from VSLA methods and experiences of Caritas Gulu to train already existing local saving associations in the project villages.*

**Objective 4: MHA as an institution has improved institutional/physical structures to support future (intended or intensified) agricultural activities (e.g., in addressing more villages/villagers or introducing more advanced technologies, like irrigation)**

*Implementation process*

During the first project year the cruiser and small truck arrived and the office and storing spaces for the project were finalized. MHA also employed a new motorbike, bikes, and laptops. Having a dedicated office facilitated project work (e.g., writing reports using computers) and the holding of regular meetings. MHA expanded and diversified over the course of the project; its food-security projects, educational programs, the hospital, and now the rural development center (see below) are growing impressively.

As part of their Phineo program, MHA and its activities were audited each year. Most recommendations focused on improving internal controls. The auditors provided on-the-job training and examples as well as a follow-up visit to their recommendations. This follow-up showed that MHA had implemented the recommendations well. The audit became an important learning process for its administration and reporting. With the last audit in 2021, the auditors only made minor suggestions that were implemented easily.

Several staffing changes have also occurred. Sr. Reena replaced Sr. Ruby to lead the Phineo project. The accountant from India, Anitta Babu, stayed on, but the field officer, Mr. Ceasar left. MHA also hired a driver and a field assistant. Five paid community volunteers are also part of the team. COVID-19 caused delays as staff members that had gone on leave could not return, whereas others were forced to stay longer in Wau. Importantly, MHA is increasingly cooperating with the Holy Family Sisters, which contributes to its continuity in the long run. Similary, the new Bishop in Wau supports MHA.

Some local staff remarked that their remuneration was lower than that of other international NGOs. However, MHA is mainly a South Sudanese organization with some international funding, which limits its financial space. Nevertheless, MHA can evaluate how it can offer “in-kind” incentives, such as training, as well as visits and on-the-job training/internships at partner organizations from the Phineo project. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19 such visits could not take place in 2020-2021.

MHA also cooperates with Malteser International on a three-year project to support 600 people in two villages with seeds and non-food items (NFIs). These villages are not part of the Phineo project. Dorcas, a Dutch ecumenical organization, also works with MHA on a food and relief project, which includes support for survivors of gender-based violence and abandoned children, called South Sudan Joint Response 5 (SSJR5) in rebel-held areas (Greater Baggari Region). Dorcas also supports MHA’s capacity building and professionalization. It helped to formulate new HRM Guidelines and Accounting Guidelines, and MHA started working with Quickbooks accounting software. Save the Children and Dorcas also support raising awareness on COVID-19 (See also chapter 4).

Importantly, UNICEF and WFP also cooperate with MHA. UNICEF supports the hospital (e.g., cleft palate operations) and provides milk, plumpy nut and medicine for severely malnourished children and immunization programs, as well as education materials and training of teachers for 9 primary schools, which are managed by MHA. WFP supports moderately malnourished children (<5), pregnant and lactating mothers and TB and HIV patients (and their families) with food and NFIs. However, due to a lack of funding, WFP has been cutting back on its food rations.

*Results*

MHA worked flexibly to achieve its objectives; for example, in 2018 it responded flexibly to the delay in starting the project. During the project, it was able to help 60 more households with food aid and 80 households with ox-plowing than planned.

It has finalized the infrastructure for this project and is rapidly professionalizing its management further. As a result, the organization is now better placed to extend its activities to other villages and to include new techniques, such as irrigation. Its MEAL capacities, accounting and administration have become considerably stronger. In particular with collecting data (e.g., MUAC and its own study), MHA is increasingly able to establish base-lines for new projects. All in all, it has made great strides forward in its capacity building and professionalization.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

Importantly, MHA should discuss with Caritas Germany how it can professionalize further, because this would also help in maintaining and expanding the project benefits once funding has ended.

* *Assess the areas for further capacity-building and professionalization within MHA (e.g., strategy formulation), and include a time-schedule for implementation.*

MHA and Caritas Germany have to

* *Discuss synergies and hand-over strategies with WFP, FAO, UNICEF, Dorcas, and Malteser (and possibly how to work together more closely), so that the long-term benefits of the Phineo and Rucksack projects can be safeguarded or even extended.*

Finding good staff in South Sudan is challenging and international organizations generally offer higher wages. In addition, COVID-19 has shown that MHA needs a broad base of staff in case people cannot travel or, in the worst case, pass away.

* *Discuss the possibility of sharing replacement and/or succession plans for all crucial management positions (also as examples with Caritas Germany and the Phineo partner organizations). This could become part of a broader risk reduction strategy.*

***Rucksack project***

This project is funded by Caritas Germany to implement the joint decisions of the September 2019 Wau workshop. The decisions were based on the recommendations from the 2019 evaluation. The Rucksack project complements the Phineo project and has two objectives.

**Objective 1: Raising awareness and prevention of COVID-19 transmission among the patients and caretakers of Mary Help Hospital and within the surrounding villages**

*Implementation*

This part of the project focused on COVID-19 prevention within the populations of the nine villages, as well as among patients, staff, and caretakers at the hospital. It had a three-month food aid component for patients and their caretakers, because the latter now also had to stay at the hospital.[[36]](#footnote-37) MHA also installed ten tippy-taps to help prevent transmission at water-points. (Dorcas and Save the Children also supported other infection control measures).

*Results*

Normally families provide food for patients and eat together with them, which could have led to a rapid spread of COVID-19. Instead patients were only accompanied with one care-taker, who had to stay at the hospital. Over three-months 6,000 non-COVID patients and their care-takers received two meals a day, and 54 staff-members received one meal during their 8-hour working day.

**Objective 2: Establishment of a Rural Development Center and the start of hygiene and environmentally-friendly income-generating pilot activities for the 9 villages involved in the Phineo project**

*Implementation*

MHA has established a Rural Development Center next to its large, 60 *feddan* demonstration garden in Nyanpath, which is at the geographic center of all nine project villages. Since February 2021, MHA has been teaching (medical) soap production, constructing and maintaining two types of energy-saving (mud) stoves, and vocational and agronomic skills at the Center. Due to COVID-19, only 20 persons at a time could be trained. Still, MHA succeeded to train all beneficiaries as planned. These beneficiaries also help to keep the center neat.

MHA uses the large demonstration garden for ox-plowing, and producing seeds and seedlings, including aloe vera, neem, and moringa for medical soap production at home. The participants learn in groups the agricultural techniques for working in the demonstration garden. In line with the Phineo project, some of the food produced is for the vulnerable people. The rest are kept as seeds for the next year in the Mary Help seed storage.

Currently, soap making training is in progress. Graduates (210 women) will be able to sell soap to the local community. Beneficiaries expressed their excitement about supplementing their income with selling soap. Proceeds of the sales will be divided among the women in their respective groups: one half will be plowed back into the project to support buying of raw materials, and the other half will be shared among the beneficiaries. Similarly, some participants (10 of 210 men) now earn additional money with making energy-saving stoves for others.

MHA is now also introducing bread, biscuit and noodle making[[37]](#footnote-38), as well as needle work, tailoring, embroidery and craft work for women. It will also start a rabbit- and chicken-breeding program at the Rural Development Center (but will not work with guinea pigs, which are not accepted by the local population because they look a bit like rats). It already operates a sorghum and groundnut paste mill, with which it will also earn some income to continue its activities. In addition, the demonstration gardens are used to teach about growing vegetables and fruits. The demonstration garden is important in this respect, because it shows people the benefits of these trees. Otherwise, they would not notice them. Just like tree growing itself, understanding these benefits takes time. Training participants receive fruit tree seedlings (mango, cashew nut, jackfruit, gista, and guava) to plant close to their home village. These activities complement the existing education, health, and food security projects. They will also make MHA and the Phineo project outcomes more sustainable.

*Results*

Participants have now started their own soap production and production of energy-saving stoves, and some are earning a small income with it. Over 100 households in the nine villages are now using such stoves and their number is growing, so that by the end of the 2021 almost all households in the villages will have such a stove. The activities at the Rural Development Center will either enhance food availability or help with more hygienic food utilization, or they will increase access to food, partly through saving time and money (e.g., less fuel wood) and partly through small income-generating activities. They have useful synergies with the other Phineo food security activities and they help MHA to continue its food security activities in a somewhat more autonomous and less donor-dependent manner.

Illustration 1: Women Learning Soap Making Techniques at the Rural Development Center



*Challenges and Recommendations*

The fruit tree seedlings are important, but they cannot address the (growing) need for timber, firewood, and charcoal. The future activities at the Rural Development Center are also crucial in terms of the overall strategy and sustainability of MHA.

* *Make plans for future activities for the Rural Development Center in Nyanpath (and perhaps also at the hospital). For example:*
  + *Check which other animals, e.g., guinea fowls, can become part of the animal-breeding program;*
  + *Plant fast-growing woodlot trees and distribute their seedlings, which can be used for timber, firewood and charcoal production in order to reduce deforestation in the long term;*
  + *Identify which other types of vegetables and fruits can best be sun-dried and start with teaching about sun-drying more food;*
  + *Start with moisture retention, water harvesting and drip irrigation;*
  + *Introduce solar panels;*
  + *Think through the indicators for each of these activities and establish base-line data for later impact assessment. Assess the impact of the tree-growing activities in a few years, for example in two and five years, to see whether the trees survive and how they are being used.*

## The Bishop Gassis Relief and Rescue Foundation

Abyei Town was destroyed in 2008 and 2011. Many IDPs, mostly Ngok Dinka, settled in Agok, which grew into a town of 130,000 people with administrative facilities, a large market, a Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF)-supported hospital, a government hospital, and several schools. Twic County borders on the Abyei Special Administrative Area (ASAA). Abyei has its own UN force, the United Nations International Security Force (UNISFA), that is supposed to stabilize the area and ensure that cattle raiding, in particular by the Misseriya of Sudan, is being stopped.

The overall objective of the Food Relief and Food Security Project for the Agok & Abyei Special Administrative Area and Turalei, Twic County, South Sudan (2018-2021) is that *targeted households have improved access to essential food requirements at the household level through provision of food and agricultural inputs in both areas*. BGRRF works with three project objectives.

During the assessment, a total of 163 respondents were interviewed based on the different intervention support they received from BGRRF shown in the table below.

Table 13: Respondents for Each Project Objective (BGRRF)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrative area** | **Intervention type** | | | **Total** |
| **Obj. 1**  **Food aid** | **Obj. 2**  **Ox-plow and Seeds** | **Obj. 3**  **Kitchen Garden and Tools** |
| Agok | 51 | 3 | 33 | 87 |
| Abyei | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Turalei | 23 | 16 | 0 | 39 |
| Mayen Abun | 1 | 31 | 0 | 32 |
| Total | 75 | 50 | 38 | 163 |

**Objective 1: Each year 350 households from Agok/Abyei and Twic County (including returnees) have improved health and well-being through access to essential foods**

*Implementation Process*

This objective essentially entails a relief operation for 2,450 (=350\*7) people a year. Just as in the previous years, the local relief and rehabilitation commissions (RRC)[[38]](#footnote-39) together with BGRRF staff, selected the 350 most vulnerable households for 2020. They received a basket of sorghum (50 kg), lentils (25 kg), cooking oil (7.5 ltrs), and 1 kg of salt in both July and August, which are the worst hunger months. The relief operation needed to be repeated each project year, but as the economic status of the beneficiaries of the first year changed, the actual beneficiaries also changed from year to year. Over the three project years, 1,170 households instead of just 1,050 (3\*350) received relief.

10% of the relief goods were distributed by the Missionaries of Charity (Sisters of Mother Teresa) in Turalei. The sisters verified “their” households, but reporting was done by BGRRF.

*Results*

In 2019, BGRRF sampled 50 beneficiaries for interviews.[[39]](#footnote-40) They all confirmed that they had received the items, which helped them to get through the hunger period and improved their health and nutritional status because they had enough food and did not go hungry. Children were also able to stay in school (until the schools were closed due to COVID-19).[[40]](#footnote-41) The focus groups and household interviews showed that many people outside the project still struggle and only have one meal a day or less at the end of the hunger gap.

Several communities reported that the Misseriya Arabs and the Nuer stole their cows and goats, during armed raids. Occasionally, people were murdered, for example when they went to fetch firewood. The raids severely threaten lives and livelihoods and worsen the already insecure food situation. Moreover, with COVID-19, people have started moving to Wau, Juba, and Khartoum, because they cannot make ends meet with rising food prices. When people go without food for four days, they then resort to eating tree leaves, billet—an edible grass—, and lalop—a wild fruit. In sum, the relief was necessary due to the overall situation of poverty, insecurity, raids, thefts, and high food prices. Hence, the beneficiaries needed and appreciated the food aid.

Table 14: BGGRF Food Aid Items Distributed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Year 1  2018-2019** | | **Year 2  2019-2020** | | **Year 3  2020-2021** | |
| **FOOD ITEMS DISTRIBUTED** | **UNITS** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs receiving** |
| Beans | Malwas | 2,187.5 | 350 | 2,187.5 | 470 | 2,187.5 | 350 |
| Sorghum | Malwas | 4,375.0 | 350 | 4,375.0 | 470 | 4,375.0 | 350 |
| Oil | Liters | 2,625.0 | 350 | 2,625.0 | 470 | 2,625.0 | 350 |
| Salt | kg | 350.0 | 350 | 350.0 | 470 | 350.0 | 350 |

*Challenges and Recommendations*

WFP works more with other organizations than BGGRF, but it helped BGRRF with school feeding until COVID-19 struck and the schools had to close. BGRRF prefers to concentrate on sustainable agriculture over emergency food distribution and would like to leave this task to WFP as much as possible. FAO provided sorghum seeds in 2019 and vegetable seeds in 2020, but they did not germinate well enough. IOM did some WASH, but only drills about four boreholes a year. The Adventist Development and Relief Agency left, but may come back. BGRRF shared the Agok office with the Green String Network, a peacebuilding organization, but they had to leave due to differences with the local authorities. As a result of the limited aid by other actors, BGRRF is often the only organizations active in parts of ASAA.

* *Discuss the future plans of WFP and its partner organizations, because WFP is limiting itself to supporting school feeding programs in public schools. To what extent can FAO or international NGOs take over or initiate follow-up projects?*

High bride-prices (e.g., more than 40 cows) cause the raids. It would be a crucial contribution to peace and economic development, as well as food security, if these raids stopped. It is therefore essential that the number of cows included in dowries be lowered.

* *Discuss with local partner organizations, local administrations, and religious officials, as well as traditional leaders how to reduce the bride-price, for example with an awareness-raising and peacebuilding campaign on stopping raids among the different ethnic groups (Dinka, Nuer, and Misseriya Arabs).*

**Objective 2: 100 households are provided with ox-plows to support increased capacity for food production in order to improve household level food security**

*Implementation process*

Unfortunately, the so-called black cotton soil in Abyei is too hard in dry periods, and in rainy periods the rain cannot drain properly. As a result, ox-plowing is not possible in Abyei, and therefore BGRRF focused on Twic County. Despite cultural barriers to using oxen and their limited availability, BGRRF expanded its ox-plowing from 20 HHs in Mayen Abun in 2018 to 20 HHs in Mayen Abun and 20 in Turalei in 2019. In June 2020, it supplied 40 more ox-plows, so that objective 2 was reached. As farmers shared the ox-plows, 173 people were trained and used the ox-plows during the course of the project. People are becoming more positive about ox-plowing, because it saves time and effort, and they appreciate the higher productivity. In the end, many farmers that wanted to participate in the training had to be rejected and they were very disappointed.

In some cases, BGRRF distributed crops seeds to some farmers even if they did not receive ox-plows. The majority of farmers, however, received both seeds and ox-plows. The table below shows the quantity of seeds distributed to household over the 3 years of the Phineo project.

Table 15: BGRRF Seeds Distribution List 2018-2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SEEDS**  **DISTRI-BUTED** | **UNITS** | **2018-2019** | | **2019-2020** | | **2020-2021** | |
| **Quantity Distri-buted** | **HHs Receiv-ing** | **Quantity Distri-buted** | **HHs Receiv-ing** | **Quantity Distri-buted** | **HHs Recei-ving** |
| Sorghum seeds | Malwas | 1,312.5 | 350 | 1425 | 380 | 1,387.5 | 370 |
| Okra | Malwas | 4.75 | 350 | 12.5 | 380 | 10 | 370 |
| Kudra | Malwas | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 380 | 10 | 370 |
| Rijula | Malwas | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 380 | 10 | 370 |
| Jiirjiir | Malwas | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 380 | 10 | 370 |
| Tomato | Pcs | 4.75 | 350 | 12.5 | 380 | 7 | 370 |
| Eggplant | Malwas | 4.75 | 350 | 12.5 | 380 | 1.25 | 370 |
| Onion | Malwas | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 380 | 0 | 0 |

*Results*

In 2019, the project revealed its first full-scale results from working with the ox-plows. An internal 2018-2019 study compared ox-plowed plots with plots that had been hand cultivated with a hoe and revealed that the plowed areas had a 50% increase in harvest. However, no such study could be carried out in 2019-2020. Training and showing the positive yields of ox-plowing was crucial to overcoming cultural resistance. “*Working with an ox-plow is good and we want to try [it].*” The quality of the plows is also important: lost nuts and bolts[[41]](#footnote-42), as well as spare parts are hard to obtain.

Prior to introduction of ox-plows by BGRRF, farmers would on average cultivate 2.5 *feddans* mainly with *maloda* and hoe. After the launch of the ox-plow project, households who benefited from this intervention could now cultivate an average of 6 *feddans,* which is equivalent to a 140% increase in land put under cultivation as a result of ox-plows.

In terms of production, sorghum seeds did well; households were able to harvest an average of 18 bags. Okra and kudra followed at an average of 12 and 10 sacks respectively. Few households sell their harvest because it mainly serves their household food requirements. Okra and sorghum are the two major crops that last a household for 6 to 12 months. This is partly explained by the good harvest that households received from these crops in 2018, when rainfall was good and the growing number of plows reached 100, so that a larger area of land was put under cultivation thereby increasing household food supply.

Figure 7: Average HH Farm Produce and Sales Data

Figure 8: Period Cultivated Crops Meet HH Food Requirements

The early stages of introducing ox-plowing faced cultural barriers. Especially the pastoralist Dinka community highly values its cattle and disliked having its oxen trained to plow as it considered this burdening to their oxen, which are primarily used to pay bride-prices. This perception is changing quite rapidly at the moment as more and more households are embracing the use of ox-plows as they are able to cultivate more land and produce more food. The ox-plow as opposed to the traditional *maloda* or hoe is able to till the land better. It digs deeper (30–60 cm), which enhances crops’ roots penetration, enhances soil aeriation, water percolation, and allows a greater mix of soil organic matter which in turn improves crop growth and production.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Continue with training and discussing cultural barriers to ox-plowing with participating households/farmers. Show the positive outcomes of ox-plowing;*
* *Invest in tractors for those areas where the (black cotton) soil is too heavy for oxen;*
* *Examine whether an ox-breeding and distribution program is feasible;*
* *Build capacity to repair plows quickly and to make spare parts available;*
* *Assess gender-ascribed roles for food production, including ox-plowing, to find out whether one gender overburdens the other.*

**Objective 3: 1,000 households are provided with seeds and tools to support increased capacity for food production and provide a more nutritionally diverse household food basket**

*Implementation process*

This objective has two components: *sorghum production* and *joint vegetable gardens*. During house-to-house visits in 9 different villages in June 2020, BGRRF staff, RRCs, and community leaders identified 380 vulnerable HHs. Each of these received 15 kg of sorghum seeds and two hoes. (Table 15 above shows list of all seeds distributed by BGRRF in this project). During the whole project a total of 1,100 farming households benefitted from the seeds and tools. This is 100 households more than initially planned, because many households shared seeds and tools.

The joint vegetable gardens were established close either to the river Kiir, to wells, or to boreholes, so that they would always have enough water. Starting in November 2019, after the rainy season, BGRRF formed 17 local groups (with a total of 380 healthy individuals[[42]](#footnote-43) that were able to work). Just as in the MHA project, participants each have their own plot in the joint garden. BGRRF buys seeds locally, because these are generally more drought resistant and the targeted households prefer these vegetables (see table 15).

Table 16: List of Training Sessions in 2020-2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Village | Number of HH | Trainings done |
| 1 | Nyintar | 40 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 2 | Ninijoe | 40 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 3 | Nyialchuor | 30 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 4 | Ganga | 40 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 5 | Mijak | 40 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 6 | Duop | 40 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 7 | Wundop | 40 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetable 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 8 | Mayen Abun | 50 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 9 | Turalei | 30 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 10 | Ajakthong | 30 | 1. Economic and nutritional value of vegetables 2. Planting methods. 3. Practical demonstrations in the gardens |
| 11 | Total | **380** |  |

The trainings explained the economic importance and nutritional value of vegetables, garden planning, land preparation, seed varieties, planting dates, spacing, and planting methods, as well as irrigation methods, weed and insect control, harvesting, storage, distribution, and sales. The actual implementation was led by the BGRRF agricultural officer, who helped with fencing, land preparation, planting and irrigation, weeding, and monitoring of project progress. Close monitoring ensured that they followed the right planting methods to obtain good yields.

Respondents almost always mentioned that the chicken wire is not strong enough, to stop goats and other cattle from entering the gardens. Hence, they need more and better-quality wire. Some farmers actually slept in their garden in order to prevent cow herds from coming in at night. In addition, they frequently mentioned pests and would like to use insecticides. They also would like to have pumps and more water-cans, because fetching water from rivers and wells is heavy labor.[[43]](#footnote-44) All participants mentioned the late, irregular rains and intense heat (above 40°C) as serious problems. They seem to help some pests survive, make crops whither, and make animals and people seriously ill. The Kiir river is now also at a lower level than ever before, and older coping mechanisms, such as hunting hippos and crocodiles, are simply not feasible anymore, as these animals have left the river for most of the year. Fishing, however, continues.

Respondents close to Abyei indicated that they could not collect enough seeds for the next planting season themselves. As long as seed storage facilities are not rebuilt (see below) and seed markets do not function, they will need seed provision by organizations like BGRRF.

BGRRF also changed its *management*. When both Fr. Biong and Ydo Jacobs left the organization at the end of May 2019, their replacements were already working in Agok and Nairobi. BGRRF also successfully incorporated the auditors’ suggestions to improve its accounting and administration. Like MHA and Caritas Gulu, it also did a refresher training on MEAL. At the moment, there is criticism calling for all staff to be present more often “on the ground” and in the Agok office. BGRRF has already shifted some of its work (and staff) from Nairobi to Agok and Turalei, but BGRRF needs to move more (or all) of its Nairobi office to either Turalei, Juba or Wau in order to reduce costs. It also needs to think strategically about how much the organization should focus on Agok, Turalei, and Abyei. Finally, just as with MHA, COVID-19 has shown that the organization cannot depend on a few senior people. As a result, it needs to establish succession plans and replacement rosters. BGRRF has recently developed a risk strategy that also took succession and replacement into account. In this vein, it would also be a good moment to review its overall strategy, and accounting and HRM policies in order to determine how BGRRF can professionalize further. It could learn from the approaches to professionalization taken by MHA and Caritas Gulu.[[44]](#footnote-45)

*Results*

In 2019, rains were good. As a consequence, most of the households needed less food relief. Unfortunately, in summer 2020, rains were late again, although they improved over time. Some kitchen gardens did not have enough water during the whole year. In response, BGRRF staff is paying greater attention to ensure that the selected sites for kitchen gardens are near water points that run all year round.

Generally, people were happy with the seeds they received, but some did not germinate well. Just as with the MHA community gardens, the vegetable gardens in this project seem to have a varying impact on income, food access and food availability. There are participants who mention that they have enough food for their households and can sell some surpluses, and use the money either for school fees, medicine, clothing or shoes, or to buy other types of food. Others have indicated that the harvests so far have been rather poor (also due to the heavy rains, pests, and goats or other animals that enter because of weak fences), and that they could only feed their families and not sell any surplus. Overall, “*beneficiaries are able to harvest more than four times from their gardens*,”[[45]](#footnote-46) but there are differences among the households. 83% (n=30) of the respondents agreed that the kitchen garden project contributed towards their household food supply, while the remaining 17% were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed). Although participants are able to better cope with the hunger gap, they cannot do so without some relief in July and August. In other words, food access and availability have increased, but not enough for all participants. Regarding food utilization, the respondents pointed out that they could not yet produce enough seeds for the next planting season. They faced a hard choice between immediate consumption and saving seeds for future plantings.

Currently the kitchen gardens, which are located next to a water point, measure about 0.5 *feddan*. A group of about 30 farmers work on one kitchen garden. While the size of land made sense in the initial stages when these groups were being set up over two years ago, it is now advisable to scale up the size of these gardens to at least 1 *feddan* to take advantage of economies of scale in production. As one respondent remarked: “*The plots are small and we would like to cultivate more land to enable us to produce more and sell more to increase our household income.*”

Nearly all respondents interviewed had attended all trainings, which 60% of respondents rated excellent in terms of effectiveness to their farming activities.

Figure 9: Type of Trainings Received by the Respondents

Figure 10: Rating of Trainings

Table 17 provides a list of all tools distributed over the three-year period during the life of the project. During a FGD, farmers expressed their satisfaction with the tools provided. However, chicken wire was singled out as being too weak to effectively prevent animals from intruding and destroying crops. They thus recommended using chain link fences and barbed wire fences, which are more durable and stronger. Watering cans were also identified as few in number, and small in volume, so that participants must make several trips to the water point as well as consuming time in irrigating the land. Therefore, a foot-pump was recommended as an alternative which would make irrigation much easier and serve more farmers.

Table 17: BGRRF Tools Distribution List

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Year 1  2018-2019** | | **Year 2  2019-2020** | | **Year 3  2020-2021** | |
| **TOOLS DISTRIBUTED** | **UNITS** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HH Receiving** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs Receiving** | **Quantity Distributed** | **HHs receiving** |
| Ox-plow | Pcs | 20 | 20 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Hoe | Pcs | 1,050 | 700 | 380 | 380 | 370 | 370 |
| *Maloda* | Pcs | 0 | 0 | 760 | 380 | 740 | 370 |
| Sickle | Pcs | 0 | 0 | 380 | 380 | 370 | 370 |
| Spade | Pcs | 350 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water can | Pcs | 40 | 350 | 85 | 380 | 75 | 370 |
| Chicken wire | Pcs | 280 | 350 | 170 | 380 | 150 | 370 |

BGRRF claims that “many cases of death used to be reported … linked to hunger and related causes … mostly during the most difficult months [of] May-August … Gradually, the cases have begun to reduce in the project area during the project period. It is worthy to note that no case of death in the project area has occurred and been linked to hunger. The project has had a positive impact on the community as the vulnerable groups/HHs have been cushioned with relief food during the hunger periods.” Unfortunately, from an evaluation perspective, neither the local government nor BGRRF has quantitative material on the mortality rates before and during the Phineo project to back up its claim. Providing such data will be one of its main MEAL challenges in the future.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Discuss with Caritas Germany and Phineo partners the possibility of (recurrent) temporary relief food distributions;*
* *Discuss with Caritas Germany and Phineo partners the possibility of alternative forms of (improving) pest control (ashes, tobacco leaves, other traditional means);*
* *Elaborate a climate change adaptation strategy beyond reforestation with fruit trees. For example, include fast growing trees for timber, firewood, and charcoal, as well as biogas, water harvesting and drought resistant crops;*
* *Assess the management areas where BGRRF should professionalize further. Develop a plan for relocation to Turalei and/or Wau or Juba. Include more detailed mortality (or MUAC) data in the evaluations of the food security projects;*
* *Improve fencing of kitchen gardens by replacing chicken wire with barbed wire and chain-link fences;*
* *Introduce foot-pumps to enhance irrigation process;*
* *Increase land under cultivation for kitchen gardens to at least 1 feddan;*
* *Infuse food aid within the kitchen garden project participants during the hardship months (April–July) so that farmers have food to eat, and strength to cultivate during this period. This food aid should take into account that the actual period and intensity of food insecurity can differ from village to village.*

Table 18: Ajok

Ajok (not her real name) is 38 years old. She is from Gong Chol village and is married with 7 children. They live next to river Kiir. She joined the project in early 2019.

“*I have greatly benefited from this kitchen garden project, I come here every day with my group members to look after our crops, irrigate and weed them. We usually get an average harvest which we share for our household needs, occasionally I sell some and I get about SSP 2,000 from such a sale. I use the money for other household needs such as paying off debts, buying other food stuff and medication. Prior to joining this project my main source of income was from charcoal and firewood sales, I would occasionally also cut grass and sell it for house construction. Sourcing all these products was not easy, the forest were we would get firewood, grass or even wood for charcoal burning is very insecure with Misseriya Arabs and when they find you taking these resources all they do is kill. I have lost some of my women friends to the Misseriya Arabs in these circumstances. Our men are equally killed when they go to herd their cattle, we constantly live in fear should our enemies strike. Thanks to the kitchen garden project, I now spend lots of my time in this project, the returns are also good compared to my earlier sources of income. This place is safe as I no longer worry about being killed by the Arabs and I have made a lot of friends who besides working together in this project, can cushion me with some money or even advise on my business.*

*Our farming activities are not all rosy; pest and diseases are a big problem. We also get invaded by roaming livestock, so we need to constantly watch out as the chicken wire we used for fencing is short and weak, it did not even go round the kitchen garden, making the fence porous and we have to use local bushes to add to the fence. I, however, thank BGRRF for supporting us, I have attended training and now I know how to farm vegetables as a livelihood activity which I never used to do before. BGRRF has also provided us with tools and seeds and from this we are able to not only derive income but also household food which is very important to be able to feed me, my seven children and my husband. My only request is for BGRRF to continue supporting us the way they are doing, to give us more tools and we shall increase our land for doing this kitchen garden project. I am sure my friends also like this project a lot*.”

***Rucksack project***

As a follow-up to the Wau workshop, BGRRF decided that it wanted to strengthen reforestation as well as build a seed storage in order to further contribute to improved food security. Deforestation and climate change are worsening and require countermeasures. The old seed storage facilities had been destroyed systematically during the war.

**Objective 1: Construction of a seed storage to assist in seed recollection for redistribution in the next planting season for 1,000 HHs**

*Implementation*

Ten per cent of assorted food crops will be collected and stored after each harvest season for each HH. The community will be informed about the need for seed recollection and storage. The main purpose is to improve access to seeds for more sustainable food security. The seeds store is now complete. It is neatly constructed in line with the local standards, well painted both inside and outside. Further, shelves have already been fitted in the room which will be used to store the seeds. The seeds will be returned before or during the next planting season. Through this arrangement, BGRRF will be able to contribute to food security at the household level with seeds in good condition for planting to supply food. FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture supported public sensitization meetings on the agricultural production cycle, seed multiplication, including recollection and proper storage, in five communities to 1,050 farmers.

*Results*

Sensitization has been completed. Farmers will begin utilizing the store in August 2021, when they harvest sorghum. Later they can also include other seeds, for example of other grains and legumes. Vegetable seeds are less bulky and are often stored at home.

Illustration 2: The Seed Storage (Inside)[[46]](#footnote-47)



Illustration 3: The Seed Storage (Outside)



*Recommendations:*

* *BGRRF can explore putting up a seed storage in Turalei to support farmers and rely less on the storage in Agok.*
* *Evaluate the quality of the seeds and the functioning of the seed storage in August 2022.*

**Objective 2: Distribution and planting of tree seedlings (1,500 seedlings)**

*Implementation*

This objective contributes to the improvement of livelihoods and increased resilience to climate change. The project activities include community sensitization (which includes taking note of their preferences for specific types of trees (fruit trees, short-rotation trees, or shrubs for fuel wood)), tree nursery establishment, and distribution and planting of the trees. The seedlings will be distributed to 500 HHs and 11 schools. In time, some of the trees will also function as windbreakers for schools. In recent years, strong winds have destroyed buildings and tore the roofs of schools off.

Finally, the Rucksack project also provided funding for recruiting a MEAL coordinator, who will assist the program manager in monitoring project process, and who will compile project reports and data using project indicators. At the time of this evaluation, this position had not been filled yet.

*Results*

After sensitization and identification of the preferred trees, BGRRF purchased and distributed 1,500 drought-resistant fruit tree seedlings. It is still too early to tell what the outcomes of this reforestation project are, simply because trees take time to grow, but the project’s objectives reinforce and complement the Phineo project activities.

Due to limited funds and an interest in the position by local authorities, BGRRF was not able to recruit a MEAL coordinator on time. This position will be filled in the last quarter of 2021.

*Recommendation:*

* *Carry out an impact assessment of the reforestation activities after two and five years, to establish the health and use of the trees and measure their impact on food security and their role as wind breakers.*
* *Check whether it makes sense to have a MEAL coordinator position for all Phineo partners together.*

## Caritas Gulu

Uganda is well-known for its relatively liberal refugee policies, in which refugee households receive a small plot of land for agriculture. However, these “individual arable plots of land … do not produce enough yield for refugees to become wholly self-reliant.”[[47]](#footnote-48)

The overall goal of this project is *to contribute to addressing the humanitarian needs of the South Sudanese refugees in Adjumani and Lamwo districts through an integrated approach with the aim of improving welfare and ensuring minimal living conditions*. In line with the official government strategy, 70% of the project resources go to the refugees and 30% go to the host community. Caritas Gulu has carried out similar projects since 2013. As a result, it knows the project components very well and its staff has considerable experience in implementing them.

Table 19: Respondents by Project Objective (Caritas Gulu)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Obj 1: Vocational Skills** | **Obj 2: Peace Building** | **Obj 3: PSN** | **Obj 4: Farmers** | **Total** |
| Male | 42 | 17 | 13 | 27 | 99 |
| Female | 43 | 26 | 21 | 56 | 146 |
| Total | 85 | 43 | 34 | 83 | 245 |

**Objective 1: Empowerment of 360 South Sudanese refugee youths through offering short vocational skills training**

*Implementation process*

Caritas Gulu planned that each year, 120 youths would receive a 4-month intensive vocational training in seven thematic areas: 1) Block laying and concrete practices; 2) Hair cutting and hair dressing; 3) Tailoring and garments; 4) Carpentry and joinery; 5) Driving and basic motor vehicle mechanics; 6) Metal fabrication; and 7) Catering and hotel management. Entrepreneurship was a cross-cutting theme in the curriculum of this training. Upon graduation, each student received starting capital and a start-up kit. Most settlements now have enough tailors, so that in the next round of vocational skills training, there will be fewer tailoring students. At the same time, Caritas Gulu and the youths would have liked to lengthen the vocational training period to six months in order to be able to enhance the knowledge and skills of the participants and to conform to Ugandan education policies. In this way, the vocational skills diplomas will be recognized throughout Uganda.

Demand for this training, and secondary education in general, is high, so that Caritas in cooperation with local leaders is able to select the most promising students. From mid-August to December 2019, 72 men and 48 women took part in this training course. Half of them studied in Adjumani, and the other half in Palabek. However, due to COVID-19, the training of a cohort of 120 youths could not take place in 2020-2021.

*Results*

Table 20: Number of Vocational Skills Students

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **YEAR** | **MALE STUDENTS** | **FEMALE STUDENTS** | **TOTAL** |
| 2018-2019 | 40 | 80 | 120 |
| 2019-2020 | 42 | 78 | 120 |

A total of 85 respondents were interviewed; they were alumni of the vocational training program who had had taken the different courses offered under this program. The respondents were of varying age group and socio-economic background. 40% out of these joined the program in 2018 while the rest joined in 2019.

Table 21: Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HH Characteristics** | **Frequency** | **Response** |
| Gender | Female | 43 | 51% |
| Male | 42 | 49% |
|  | | |
| Marital Status | Divorced/Separated | 4 | 5% |
| Married | 64 | 75% |
| Single/ Never married | 17 | 20% |
|  | | |
| Age group | Below 20 years | 4 | 5% |
| 20 -25 years | 33 | 39% |
| 26 - 30 years | 36 | 42% |
| 31 - 35 years | 8 | 9% |
| 36 - 40 years | 3 | 4% |
| No response | 1 | 1% |
|  | | |
| Household head status | FHH | 11 | 13% |
| MHH | 74 | 87% |

The male respondents have taken more diverse courses than their female counterparts as shown in the table below.

Table 22: Type of Vocational Skills Course Participation by Gender

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Course Pursued** | **Frequency** | **Response** |
| **Female** | Catering & Hotel management | 9 | 11% |
| Hair cut & hair dressing | 13 | 15% |
| Tailoring | 21 | 25% |
| **Male** | Block laying & concrete practices | 8 | 9% |
| Carpentry & joinery | 10 | 12% |
| Catering & Hotel management | 6 | 7% |
| Driving & Mechanics | 6 | 7% |
| Hair cut & hair dressing | 7 | 8% |
| Tailoring | 3 | 4% |
| Other | 2 | 2% |
| **Total** |  | **85** | **100%** |

The training structure and content also met participants’ needs and expectations, they were able to secure jobs within the local market of Adjumani and its surroundings, and support their families from the income they made from their businesses. Their perception of the training curriculum was positive: 65% noted that the training was good, 26% rated the training as very good, 6% rated the training as excellent while only 4% noted that the training was fair.

Figure 11: Perception of Training

When asked about changes in income as a result of participating in the project and subsequently running their business, respondents noted that their income had improved. They feed their family and take care of other household needs from the proceeds of their business. A closer examination of the returns of their businesses revealed that all the businesses made profits, with great variety among the categories of skills. The table below shows average income received from each business in a week disaggregated by gender.[[48]](#footnote-49) Vocational skills training constitutes a form of diversification of the local economy which supports non-agricultural income that is more resistant to weather shocks than income based on agricultural activities.

In 2020-2021, UNHCR paid brick layers and carpenters, who had completed the vocational skills training, to construct shelters for persons with special needs (PSNs). Similarly, vocational skills trainees who had learned tailoring made face masks. They earned UGX 1,000 for each face mask. Some of them said they had made “*100,000 masks*.” These vocational skills graduates were able to make a living and support their families. In addition, some graduates from carpentry and joinery have set up their own workshops, which are profitable. They partner with other refugees and host community members to share knowledge, skills, and tools, and they market their products to other refugees and the host communities.

Table 23: Average Income Received per Week by Gender and Course Type

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Course Type** | **Frequency** | **Average Income/ Week (UGX)** |
| **Female** | **Sub-total** | **42** | **41,714** |
| Catering & Hotel management | 9 | 28,333 |
| Hair cut & hair dressing | 12 | 44,583 |
| Tailoring | 21 | 45,810 |
| **Male** | **Sub-total** | **42** | **43,168** |
| Block laying & concrete practices | 8 | 44,375 |
| Carpentry & joinery | 10 | 56,504 |
| Catering & Hotel management | 6 | 20,833 |
| Driving & Mechanics | 6 | 47,500 |
| Hair cut & hair dressing | 7 | 30,714 |
| Other[[49]](#footnote-50) | 2 | 75,000 |
| Tailoring | 3 | 39,333 |
| **Total** |  | **84** | **42,441** |

*Challenges and Recommendations[[50]](#footnote-51)*

* *Assess how and to what extent the graduates benefit from the start-up kits and start-up capital;*
* *Extend vocational training to six months, so that the diploma can be accepted throughout Uganda;*
* *Discuss how to create more opportunities for secondary education with partner organizations, as well as OPM and UNHCR;*
* *Further develop vocational skills training. Which new types of vocational skills are necessary (e.g., digitalization and transport)?*
* *Work with UNHCR to regularly identify areas in which vocational skills graduates can earn money by assisting PSNs;*
* *Increase the course duration from 4 months to 6 months for better mastery of skills and further prepare participants adequately for the labor market in line with the Ugandan recognition of diplomas.*

**Objective 2: To strengthen 360 refugees and host community members in peacebuilding and conflict resolution**

*Implementation process*

The training of community leaders, especially from the Refugee Welfare Committees and Local Councils, (252 refugees and 108 host community members in 2020-2021) aimed to build bridges between leaders of ethnic groups among the refugees, as well as between refugees and host communities, in order to help them promote peace and reduce violence. Community Development Officers, who are civil servants from Adjumani and Lamwo, provided the training with support from Caritas Gulu staff. Representatives from OPM and UNHCR were also present. Topics included understanding different types of conflict, conflict causes and effects, steps and methods of conflict resolution, mediation, and referral pathways (e.g., to the police), and activities to promote peace.

Together with Sub-County Leaders and the Community Development Officers, these leaders engaged in peace dialogues with approximately 840 refugees and 360 host community members on the conflicts between their communities. The dialogues entail understanding context and root-causes of conflicts and tensions, acknowledging abuses and crimes on all sides, and mitigating (or preventing potential) conflicts. At the end of the dialogue, the participants pledge to address tensions surrounding issues such as water point use, fire-wood sites, food distribution centers, stone quarries, gender-based violence, alcoholism and drug abuse, and land conflicts, in a peaceful manner. In addition, Peacebuilding Committees (PBC) are set up to address: 1) Domestic violence; 2) Land disputes with host communities; 3) Drug abuse in the settlements; and 4) Theft and violence at water points. The PBCs used to work at the settlement level, but they are now operating at the block level to work closer with the communities.

In cooperation with OPM and UNHCR, Caritas also contributed to the so-called “peace weeks”, in which refugees from different ethnic and religious backgrounds carry out joint activities in which they imagine what a peaceful future in South Sudan would look like.

Finally, Caritas also produced information, education, and communication (IEC) materials, as well as radio spot messages. In 2019-2020, the IEC materials consisted of banners, and flyers on peacebuilding and conflict resolution. A nearby radio station broadcasts the spot messages in two local languages to 1,500 refugees and host-community members.[[51]](#footnote-52)

*Results*

Peacebuilding/conflict resolution is a lengthy process that requires continuous reinforcement. The peacebuilding and conflict resolution training brings together people from the various refugee groups and host communities, who get to know each other better and focus on issues of joint importance, such as responsible use of scarce natural resources, sustainable development, and mitigation of existing conflicts. “*Some refugees have been intolerant and have fought over minor issues, especially during food distribution, at bore holes, in the market, and at health facilities. As leaders we have now been empowered to intervene before the conflict escalates to the community.*” “*We have also solved several disputes between refugees and host communities, especially on the issue of land. As a way of survival, some refugees hire land to cultivate crops. After tilling the land and planting crops, the landlord takes possession of the crops, which results in fights.*” Given the high level of violence that many refugees have experienced previously and the high level of violence in the camps, which hampers in particular food access, peacebuilding is an important but indirect way to enhance food security.[[52]](#footnote-53) Interestingly, now that the host and refugee populations know the work of the PBCs better, they increasingly request their help when conflict arises. The following table summarizes trainings that Caritas Gulu conducted for the peacebuilding committee members.

Table 24: Number of Trainings by Peace Committee Members

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE OF TRAINING** | **GROUP CATEGORY** | **MALE PARTICIPANTS** | **FEMALE PARTICIPANTS** | **YEAR** |
| Conflict Resolution | Peace Committee | 144 | 336 | 2018-2019 |
| Conflict Resolution | Peace Committee | 144 | 336 | 2019-2020 |
| Conflict Resolution | Peace Committee | 144 | 336 | 2020-2021 |

Table 25: John Deng

John Deng (not his real name), 34, is a peace committee member in Adjumani settlement. He arrived in late 2018 from South Sudan following another outbreak of war and animosity between the Dinka and the Nuer. He vividly remembers the animosity between the Dinka and the Nuer back then in the camp where none of the community would welcome the other in their compound. Moreover, their children would fight most of the time having been taught by their parents which community to hate and reject at all cost. “*In 2018 the Dinka and the Nuer would not sit at the same table*” says John. “*We would fight most of the time whenever we met*.”

However, following Caritas Gulu’s peacebuilding effort, a lot has changed. Now not only do the two communities come together but *“they all participate the in the peace-building process to bring the perennial animosity between these communities to an end”* added John.

He explained that Caritas Gulu was very patient and at the same time persistent with the refugees and all communities within the camp when they began the program. They preached peace and encouraged everyone to forgive their enemies. At the initial stages, there was a lot of resistance to this call, but due to Caritas Gulu’s persistence over time, there has been a great change and people now embrace peaceful coexistence with each other.

Today Nuer can invite Dinka to share a meal and vice versa—something which was unheard of earlier. John concludes by thanking Caritas Gulu and all donors to this project which he describes as a success that positively impacts on their lives by bringing peace within their settlements.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

Several people involved in the peacebuilding activities mentioned that they sometimes had to get up in the middle of the night, or during rains, or had to walk long distances. Some CDOs are involved in training in peacebuilding and co-existence, but have not had much training themselves.

* *Study whether it is possible to provide these people with tools, such as bicycles, flashlights, and stationery for recording their activities, and add pre-paid cell phone cards to the communication package; so that they can carry out their activities more effectively;*
* *Develop capacity-building for CDOs, including peacebuilding. This could include the contract approach that DMI uses to prevent land conflicts for marginal people and/or traditional conflict resolution mechanisms of host communities and/or refugees (see also objective 4);*
* *Consider issuing training certificates whenever one attends their peacebuilding/conflict resolution training. This would enable participants show their capability to the world and subsequently help secure more formal jobs to sustain their families;*
* *Coordinate communication between Caritas Gulu and block leaders better, so that participants from all blocks are mobilized to attend the training.*

The effect of the radio broadcasts and IEC materials on peace is not clear.

* *Assess the impact of the radio-spot messages and IEC materials.*

The latter assessment could be part of a broader impact assessment of all peacebuilding and conflict resolution in the settlement camps. In all likelihood, the impact of the peace activities can only be assessed in cooperation with the other organizations, especially UNHCR and OPM, that engage in these activities.

* *Carry out a joint impact evaluation of the peacebuilding and conflict resolution activities with OPM/UNHCR and their implementing partners (DRC and LWF).*

**Objective 3: Support 3,600 South Sudanese Refugee Persons with Special Needs**

*Implementation process*

Each year, 1,200 PSNs receive non-food items. The PSNs are identified either when they cross the border or during the annual joint PSN survey under the leadership of UNHCR. Each PSN receives several non-food items (NFI), namely 1 jerry can, 1 blanket, 1 saucepan, 1 mosquito-net, 1 basin, 3 pieces of assorted clothes (for men, women and children), 2 plates, 2 bars of laundry soap, and 2 cups. As written above, participants from the vocational skills courses can also help PSNs, including the elderly, through building housing, which would also help to reduce theft of their remaining possessions.

During the 2019 evaluation, it appeared that the PSN system does not always work well: for example, when a single parent dies but the remaining children do not become listed as PSNs. As only the head of household is allowed to receive goods (e.g., food and NFI), this severely complicates their already difficult lives. Although this research could not identify how frequently this happens, several respondents suggested that this still happened regularly.

*Results*

According to Caritas, these “essential household items [go] a long way to reduce the vulnerability of particularly unaccompanied girls, women, and male youth.”[[53]](#footnote-54) During a FGD, participants indicated that they appreciated the support given to them, especially the NFI, which were important during the early stages of their arrival in the camp. They have now fully settled and are looking for economic projects to support their daily life. Most women preferred establishing a village savings and loans association or a business for selling farm produce within the settlement or in the nearby market, while the majority of male participants mentioned the provision of food vouchers.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

In some cases, refugees were not notified in time when distributions would occur and missed out on them. This delay in relaying this information mostly occurred from the block leader who receive such information from Caritas Gulu since the block leader is the one with direct contact with beneficiaries. Proper channels of communication with PSN beneficiaries should therefore be established. Some members also complained of having misplaced their identification cards given by OPM & UNHCR. This makes them miss out on the NFI support since Caritas uses the list from UNHCR to identify them. Caritas should also address the issues of whether and when the criteria for becoming listed as PSNs are fulfilled, in particular for PSNs that do not receive aid:

* *Check whether block leaders communicate the distributions well enough.*
* *Identify whether some persons with special needs do not get on the PSN list. Is the problem caused in the settlement or should Caritas enroll these PSNs at the UNHCR office in Adjumani?*
* *Address the problem of misplaced or lost identity cards. This should be done in cooperation with OPM, which has the mandate to replace identity cards.*

In addition, in corporation with OPM and UNHCR, Caritas should continue to assess and address specific vulnerabilities, such as those of children and survivors of gender-based violence:

* *Raise awareness on GBV and reporting mechanisms, including referral pathways;*
* *Continue with basic and/or community-based assistance for vulnerable individuals such as children and GBV survivors;*
* *Invest in infrastructure and assets, including security lights in common areas, safe spaces, child-friendly spaces, and counselling centers for women, as well as psychosocial, medical and legal support for GBV-survivors;*
* *Strengthen empowerment and livelihood support for GBV-survivors;*
* *Support elderly people and other PSNs with housing.*

**Objective 4: To support 3,600 refugees and host-community members with agri-based enterprises for sustainable food security and livelihoods**

*Implementation*

With support from refugee leaders, Caritas identified 120 farmers (84 refugees and 36 host community members) for training on agronomic best practices regarding the seasonal calendar, land preparation, nursery bed preparation, watering and moisture retention, transplanting, weed control, thinning, pest and disease control, and post-harvest handling. These farmers established their own demonstration gardens in order to transfer knowledge and practices to other community members. In addition, 36 lead farmers and 4 Caritas staff members visited two demonstration farms to learn more about growing crops and raising animals.

A total of 3,600 farmers (1,200 per year) received support during the project period. They were all supported with agricultural inputs, in particular vegetable seeds, farm tools, and trainings. They also visited and learned at the demonstration gardens of the farmers that had received the agronomic best-practices training. In terms of food utilization, special attention was paid to sun-drying vegetables as additional foodstuff for the off-season.

As in earlier evaluations, many farmers mentioned that long dry spells, pests, and diseases make gaining a livelihood far more difficult than ever before. Lack of water and late rains, as well as small plots, also hamper agriculture. Moreover, refugee farmers stated that they had rented uncultivated land from host communities to make it ripe for agriculture. However, the local owners would terminate the rent, sometimes even before they could harvest, so that the refugee farmers could not reap the benefits of their work. As indicated above, this has led to serious conflicts.

*Results*

New and effective agronomic practices have been introduced, but due to structural problems beyond the scope of the project (small plots, rent, COVID-19, etc.) food access and availability have not improved as much as intended. During the assessment a total of 83 refugees were interviewed and had been supported by Caritas Gulu to improve farming activities to strengthen their livelihoods. The respondents exhibited different demographic characteristics as summarized in the table below.

Table 26: Respondents' Characteristics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HH Characteristic** | **Frequency** | **Response** |
| **Gender** | Female | 56 | 67% |
| Male | 27 | 33% |
|  | | |
| **Marital Status** | Divorced/Separated | 1 | 1% |
| Married | 72 | 87% |
| Single/ Never married | 3 | 4% |
| Widowed | 7 | 8% |
|  | | |
| **Age group** | Below 20 years | 1 | 1% |
| 20 -25 years | 10 | 12% |
| 26 - 30 years | 13 | 16% |
| 31 - 35 years | 17 | 20% |
| 36 - 40 years | 41 | 49% |
| No response | 1 | 1% |
|  | | |
| **Household head status** | FHH | 11 | 13% |
| MHH | 72 | 87% |

Within the camps, the refugees have been given a plot, which measures 30 feet by 30 feet (through the arrangement between OPM and UNHCR). On this plot, they are able to construct their houses, and use the remaining piece to grow some crops. Most refugees grow vegetable crops with seeds provided by Caritas Gulu. In addition, almost 60% of the refugees indicated that they have made arrangements to lease additional land from the host community that is larger than their “own” plots. A person leases a piece of land based on his/her financial ability. The majority of the respondents has leased between 1–2 acres for a period of 12 months. The lease fee for a one acre of land ranges between UGX 100,000–150,000. Different forms of land acquisition were noted under the lease system. 59% of the refugees lease land from the host communities. The majority of these refugees individually lease the land from the host, while another 23% of the refugees come together and lease the land as a group. Finally, 14% of refugees lease the land jointly with the host communities and fellow refugees.

Figure 12: Percentage of Refugees Who Lease Land from Host Communities

Figure 13: Structure of Leasing Land with Host Communities

The crops planted are primarily used for household consumption with the surplus being sold for income to cater to other household needs. Crop production is not very high due to the small size of garden plots within the settlements.

Table 27: Quantity of Crops Harvested and Sold

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Crops** | **Average Quantity Harvested (kg)** | **Average Quantity Sold (kg)** |
| Beans | 6 | 0 |
| Cowpeas | 5 | 4 |
| Dodo | 10 | 3 |
| Eggplant | 24 | 20 |
| Okra | 10 | 4 |
| Onion | 9 | 8 |
| Peas | 7 | 4 |
| Sukuma wiki | 6 | 5 |
| Tomatoes | 20 | 15 |
| **Total** | **91** | **64** |

*Challenges and recommendations*

Although last year’s recommendations to help refugees protect land that they have started working on have now been taken on in the Rucksack project (see below), three recommendations required continued attention:

* *Establish guidelines and initiate action for dealing with stray animals to prevent destruction of crops;*
* *Introduce natural methods of pest control (perhaps in cooperation with the other Phineo partners and DMI).*
* *Support refugees to increase their crop production and diversify crops planted by leasing additional land within host communities and procuring farm input.*
* *Engage refugees who have leased additional land to grow cereal crops, since leased land then gives higher returns than their allotted plots would in household food supply.*

It remains important to help farmers diversify further and to identify additional crops and/or improve crop protection: for example, drought resistant crops and types of moisture retention and irrigation for climate change adaptation. In addition, farmers need support with post-harvest handling and getting their produce to the markets. For instance, with help from Caritas one successful farmer obtained a tricycle for transport.

* *Examine which other crops local farmers are profitably growing and selling (e.g., red chili peppers, sunflowers, and avocados);*
* *Check which farmers are interested in establishing medicinal herbal gardens;*
* *Identify and implement forms of climate change adaptation (e.g., moisture retention and simple drip or other forms of irrigation;*
* *Apply (new) forms of transport (e.g., tricycles).*

Similarly, in other parts of Africa, people can improve their protein intake with guinea pigs and rabbits, which they can tend close to their homes. As these are rodents, they procreate quickly but require relatively little space and food. If specific groups (e.g., pregnant women) suffer from a protein deficiency or anemia this would be a possible durable solution.

* *Introduce breeding of guinea pigs, rabbits, guinea fowls or other sources of animal protein;*
* *Carry out a study on the incidence of malnutrition in the refugee and host communities over the course of the year. If there is malnutrition, the reasons for it should be determined, so that the food security program can respond and achieve its objectives. Such studies could be carried out in cooperation with other organizations.*

This study could benefit from MHA’s experience in studying malnutrition and agriculture. Such a study is also important for Caritas Gulu because it will help to examine the outcomes of its work more regularly, in particular as they relate to behavioral changes in the target groups, which are harder to assess than the direct outputs. In particular, it is not yet clear how the logframe indicators (in percentage points) will be measured. This issue will come back during impact assessment. Hence, such studies would also improve monitoring and evaluation. In a similar vein, the effectiveness of agronomic training is hard to measure because it is an outcome, not an output. A separate study could measure the impact that the training has in changing agricultural practices towards sustainable farming, food access and availability, and marketing of surpluses.

* *Carry out an evaluation study on the impact of agronomic training, which can help to identify how the training can be improved in the future and will simultaneously explain to Caritas Germany and Phineo the broader impact of the project.*

As in the two preceding years, Caritas Gulu also received an independent audit, which recommended strengthening some internal controls, which Caritas was able to implement. The organization started working with QuickBooks accounting software at the end of 2020.

Table 28: Sulhafa

|  |
| --- |
| In 2016, Sulhafa Abdulrahman (not her real name), 24, came to Adjumani as a refugee from South Sudan together with her ailing 85-year-old grandmother and her 4 siblings. Together they live in Maaji II camp block A2 and Sulhafa is the head of this household.  When Caritas Gulu came and she was identified to join the farming project, she was given cowpeas, okra, eggplant and onion seeds to plant. She planted all these in their small plot (30x30 ft) around the house. In 2020, she had a good harvest. Although she used the produce to feed her family, most of the harvest was sold in the local market. Of all the crops, Sulhafa says, eggplant was the most profitable fetching about UGX 40,000 from the 4 basins she sold. She also sold 3 basins of onion at UGX 30,000 while okra earned her about UGX 25,000. She did not sell cowpeas at all as its small harvest was used fully for household consumption.  She uses the money received from these sales to buy other household food stuff, such as oil and sugar. She also takes care of her grandmother and buys clothes for the rest of the family. Additionally, she sets aside about UGX 5,000 as her savings in case of emergency. Unlike some other refugees, she has not been as lucky to raise enough money to lease additional land for farming, despite her aim of becoming a large-scale crop farmer to supply produce beyond Adjumani town to Gulu.  Sulhafa is very excited to have participated in this project, she explains how her life changed since joining the project. “*When we came here from South Sudan, life was very hard. We did not have household items such as bedding to cover ourselves at night, neither did we have enough utensils to use at home or a stable income, grandma’s medication was expensive. Thanks to the farming, I am now able to take care of most of the household expenditures, we do not lack food, I am able to buy basic household assets and also take care of my grandmother*.”  Sulhafa explains that pests and diseases, high input prices, and occasional drought are the challenges she experiences and for which she would like to receive more assistance in order to successfully continue her farming. |

***Rucksack project***

The Rucksack project builds further on the experiences the Phineo projects. It is also deeply influenced by the COVID-19 epidemic.

**Objective 1: Support the most vulnerable people affected by COVID-19 with food items**

*Implementation*

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent lockdown, as well as a 30% reduction in food aid and cash-based assistance by WFP, Caritas needed to provide food aid (beans, maize flour, and cooking oil) to vulnerable populations. As a result of the lockdown, Caritas provides this food aid through church structures, such as parishes and chapels.

*Results*

273 extremely vulnerable households received support (1,714 liters of cooking oil, 4,500 kg of posho, and 4,509 kg of beans). Due to COVID-19 there was a much higher need for food aid than foreseen in the Phineo project. Hence, this project helped to fill a new gap.

**Objective 2: Support the handling of land disputes handling and sensitization among the local communities in the parishes**

*Implementation*

Caritas Gulu supported a legal aid program with community sensitization on Ugandan land law, and mediation, as well as demarcating and seeking land parcel titles. At first, these activities had to be postponed due to the ban on large gatherings during the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, Caritas staff members could not travel to DMI Juba to see how this organization approaches the problem of prematurely terminated rents. Due to COVID-19 many people had to leave the towns and move to their villages for agricultural work during the lockdown. This sparked numerous land-conflicts.

*Results*

962 Diocesan Land Board members from all over the Archdiocese of Gulu were trained on land reform processes in Uganda, procedures of registering customary and freehold certificates, land management institutions, the different types of court systems in Uganda, physical planning in relation to land processing, the administration of the Church, and the composition of the land board and its status. As a result, land board members were better able to address the conflicts that resulted from the growing need to work on the land.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

* *Contact DMI in Juba to learn from the ways that this organization has used negotiations with landlords and host communities, as well as group contracts, to ensure that displaced and marginalized people can continue cultivating on rented land they have started working on;*
* *Examine whether there are other (e.g., traditional) conflict resolution methods that can be used or adapted to prevent further conflicts about land;*
* *Establish new ways for community sensitization on land disputes, e.g., through radio-programs in local languages and call-in question and answer sessions.*

**Objective 3: Promote climate change adaptation through tree planting and production of drought-tolerant crops—cassava and maize**

*Implementation*

Northern Uganda suffers from prolonged droughts, severe land degradation, high levels of deforestation, and over-utilization of natural resources, which are exacerbated by climate change and the presence of a high number of refugees.

Alarmed by growing food insecurity during the COVID-19 lockdown, the government encouraged farmers to continue to farm for their own families and for commerce. Caritas Gulu planted 76 acres of mixed cassava, maize, as well as seedlings (woodlot seedlings—eucalyptus, teak, musisi, and mvule—and fruit tree seedlings—Hass avocado and jackfruit) at the St. Isidoro Farm, given by the Archdiocese of Gulu. The Lord’s Resistance Army destroyed much of St. Isidoro Farm, and it still needs to be rehabilitated. Caritas allows local community members to work on a parcel for themselves in exchange for maintaining the farm. In this way, local farmers can also learn state-of-the-art agricultural techniques.

*Results*

Recently, Caritas harvested 6.3 tons of maize, which was only a small contribution to food security. The first cassava harvest will start in January 2022. Termites and a long dry spell destroyed 385 seedlings. The remaining seedlings will mainly be used to protect the farm.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

* *Continue to expand the farm with a rural demonstration center as, for example, MHA is doing;*
* *Assess with the other Phineo partners and DMI which other drought-tolerant seeds and seedlings (woodlot and fruit trees) they are using (e.g., local sorghum varieties, mango, moringa, and banana) and how these can be used optimally. Ultimately, St. Isidoro can become a multiplication farm;*
* *Check alternative ways of agriculture that involve tree planting, such as the food from forest.[[54]](#footnote-55)*

It is important to note that neither the Phineo program nor the Rucksack project are able to address structural aspects of climate change, war, and corruption. Nor are they able to address problems such as small plot sizes (and the often rocky and infertile soil) and environmental degradation.

**Objective 4: Support staff capacity building, learning visits and consortium formation**

*Implementation*

This objective focuses especially on the managerial follow-up of the 2019 Wau workshop. First, the organizations planned to strengthen MEAL. Most of their evaluation reports focused on describing activities (e.g., the delivery processes of goods (NFI, seeds, seedlings) and services (training and peacebuilding)) and remained at the output level instead of concentrating more on (quantitative) outcomes and/or impact. In response, Caritas Gulu wanted to select new MEAL staff members and training existing ones on MEAL. However, due to funding constraints it could not recruit an M&E officer. Second, it wants to set up a consortium with the other Phineo partners and DMI focusing on:

* Joint resource mobilization;
* Joint advocacy (with church organizations and other NGOs or with UN organizations);
* Planning for joint capacity building (e.g., strategy formulation, contingency planning, MEAL, human resource management, and accounting)
* Common projects to further improve existing activities in reforestation, return of displaced people, etc.

*Results*

Just like MHA and BGRRF, Caritas Gulu also carried out MEAL, but feels that it can still improve further. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19 no mutual learning visits have been possible since March of 2020. Just before the lockdown, however, DMI had visited Caritas Gulu to learn about VSLA, food security, biogas, and climate change adaptation. Caritas Gulu and DMI agreed to form a consortium to develop a common strategy for the returning South Sudanese IDPs and refugees. Realizing objective four will be facilitated greatly by the end of the pandemic.

*Recommendations*

* *Use the October partner workshop in Juba to restart and intensify the work of the consortium of Phineo partners.*

# COMPARING THE ORGANIZATIONS

## Introduction

What does the preceding description and analysis mean for capacity development of the three organizations? We will first look at the similarities and differences among the organizations to determine in which areas they can learn from each other. Next, we will look at substantial areas where they can benefit from developing new activities and adapting or expanding old ones, particularly addressing climate change. Finally, we will look at the managerial areas, where they can support each other.

## Similarities and Differences

All three organizations are Roman Catholic organizations that provide relief and development services to displaced South Sudanese and host communities. All projects address crucial needs of these populations related to food security and forms of social organizing (e.g., vocational skills training, peacebuilding, and integrating displaced people). In this way, they promote food security as a form of self-reliance. The number and magnitude of their activities are growing, and they receive support from Caritas Germany. After the September 2019 Wau workshop, the three organizations and DMI began working on the Rucksack projects.[[55]](#footnote-56) In agriculture, the organizations all work with seeds, seedlings, and tools, but they differ in the types and amounts they provide. Similarly, they also differ in their types of training and use of ox-plowing. MHA and BGRRF are expanding ox-plowing, whereas DMI also works with tractors, and Caritas Gulu is limited in using ox-plowing due to the relatively small plots in the settlement camps. All organizations now have demonstration gardens, and they can discuss how to expand these to provide more training on food security issues varying from rabbit breeding to seedlings and from peacebuilding to seed storage. The organizations can further compare the implementation and evaluation of activities, such as vocational skills training, rabbit breeding, and reforestation. In other refugee projects, Caritas Gulu works more with VSLAs and cash-based assistance. With its Rucksack project, DMI is now setting up VSLAs. MHA and BGRRF can also introduce VSLAs for more income-generating activities. MHA, BGRRF, and DMI can also discuss whether they should offer cash-based assistance. DMI and Caritas can compare their vocational skills trainings.

Regarding these similarities and differences, this section identifies two groups of cross-cutting themes that the organizations can work on. The first group is substantial ones, namely climate change, reforestation, demonstration gardens, and peacebuilding, particularly relating to dowries. The second group is more managerial: capacity-sharing, contingency planning, training, and linkages with other actors, such as (public) transport companies, banks, and international organizations (UN and NGOs). The ways in which the organizations are working on these issues requires careful comparison to tease out what works best. Generally, it is

Table 29: Comparison of MHA, BGRRF, Caritas Gulu (and DMI Juba)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization**  **Sector** | **MHA** | **BGRRF** | **Caritas Gulu** | **DMI (this information is based on research in 2018 and 2019; its activities may have changed recently)** | **Learning opportunities for all organizations** |
| **Food security/**  **Agriculture** | Food security project (food aid, seeds, seedlings, tools, training, ox-plowing). Now operates two demonstration gardens. Plans rabbit and chicken breeding. Further develop natural pest control. Introduce post-harvest handling with bags. School feeding. Has developed its own evaluation methodology. | Food security project (food aid, seeds, tools, training, ox-plowing). Boreholes need to be well fenced. Replace chicken wire. School feeding. Develop natural pest control and seed storage Introduce post-harvest bags. | Food security project (seeds, tools, training). Some food aid, Works less with ox-plowing due to small plots. Has set up a demonstration garden.  Agricultural work increasingly linked with VSLAs. Further develop natural pest control. Already works with post-harvest-bags. | Works with joint cultivation area/demonstration garden, seed and tool distributions, boreholes, and vocational/agricultural training. Ox-plowing not popular (yet).  Employs contract approach to obtain and develop land for IDPs and other marginalized landless people. Further develop natural pest control. Introduce post-harvest bags. | Many similarities, which means the various differences in execution offer important learning opportunities.  Expand working with small livestock (e.g., guinea fowls or rabbits), ox-plowing and contract approach. Compare the utility of the different combinations of seeds provided. Further develop natural pest control. Introduce post-harvest bags. |
| **Health** | Has set up a hospital, and nursing and midwifery education, and feeding center.  Carries out randomized MUAC and other studies that are relevant to study the impact of the food security project. Also, COVID-19 sensitization. | Not active (MSF and government each operate a hospital in Agok). | Works less in the healthcare sector. | Works with medical camps, including health promoters.  Carries out health and hygiene education at schools.  Carries out counseling (e.g., of GBV-survivors). | The organizations can learn from each other, but the degree to which they want to work on health is a strategic choice. |
| **Social organizing (to strengthen livelihoods and self-reliance / resilience)** | Promote joint community gardens and ox-plowing. Some women’s groups and savings associations have formed spontaneously. Could work more with VSLA methodology. | Works with RRC for identification of the target groups.  Promote joint vegetable gardens and ox-plowing. | Works with PBCs, VSLAs in other projects, and farmers that train/disseminate best agronomic practices. | Works with women’s groups, FAs, peacebuilding and reconciliation committee (PRC), health promoters, and local teacher’s incentives, parent-teacher-associations, and village education committees. Especially within women groups, FAs and PRCs, it has also promoted savings and VSLA. Also works with women’s and farmers’ federations. | Compare different forms of social organization. Focus especially on FAs, women’s groups, PRCs/PBCs and saving/VSLAs and identify the diffusion of agronomic best practices |
| **Peacebuilding** | Does not work directly on peacebuilding, could introduce peacebuilding and work on reducing bride-price(s). | Is deeply influenced by cattle raids (and large dowries). Could introduce peacebuilding and work on reducing bride-price(s). | PBCs and other peacebuilding activities could also address raids and work on reducing bride-price(s). | Peacebuilding and reconciliation committees could also address raids and work on reducing bride-price(s). | All organizations could think about what they can do reduce the number of raids and work on the pride-price(s). |
| **Professionalization / Capacity-building** | Continue working with Dorcas Aid International and share experience with the Caritas Germany and the other organizations  Develop and execute a plan for further professionalization (e.g. strategy, risk policy, including plan for staff replacement and succession, expansion of the Rural Development Center and demonstration gardens). | Use changes in staff and leadership could be used for further professionalization  Develop and execute a plan for staff replacement and succession. Continue move from Nairobi to Turalei. | Works with consultants from Caritas Germany and GIZ on strategy formulation, strengthening M&E and more generally organizational development. | Works with consultants from India and Plan International Khartoum, as well as with Caritas Germany, to improve M&E, HRM, and finance and accounting. | Compare strategy formulation, M&E, HRM and organizational change. Compare outcomes of activities.  Work with Phineo capacity-building project and link organizational change to (improving) service delivery. Caritas Germany has now started working on safeguarding (against GBV by staff-members of Caritas and its partner organizations). |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **MHA** | **BGRRF** | **Caritas Gulu** | **DMI (this information is based on research in 2018 and 2019; its activities may have changed recently)** | **Learning opportunities for all organizations** |
| **Return of displaced people** | Continue/expand food security and other programs. Develop contingency planning. | Continue/expand food security and other programs  Discuss strategic choice to which extent it should help people return to Abyei. Develop contingency planning. | Help refugees with their return. Develop contingency planning. | Continue/expand food security and other programs. Develop contingency planning. Will begin supporting return from Juba PoCs. | Develop contingency plans  Exchange information and experience in case of peace and return to help refugees prepare the return and/or help them upon arrival. Check policies of UNMISS, UNHCR, and WFP. |
| **Education** | School of Nursing and Midwifery  Degree courses in Nursing and Midwifery, supports elementary schools, Agronomic training. | Two primary schools and a secondary school in Agok and five primary schools and two secondary schools in Twic | Considerable experience with vocational training (in combination with VSLAs), less with schools. Sees need for more secondary and adult education. | Has expanded and diversified vocational training beyond masonry and beautification.  Expands schools further.  Plan secondary and/or adult education. | Compare vocational skills training activities with each other; Caritas Gulu has long experience in this area. MHA has important experience in nursing and midwifery education, BGRRF and DMI have more experience with primary and secondary education. DMI has rapidly expanded vocational skills training. |
| **NFI and cash-based assistance** | Has introduced soap production. Could do more with NFIs and cash-based assistance. | Could introduce soap production, NFIs and cash-based assistance. | Distributes soap and other NFIs; also has experience with cash-based assistance. | Education on different types of soap production very popular. Limited experience with other NFIs. No experience with cash-based assistance. | BGRRF and Caritas Gulu can expand local soap production. Compare need for and work on NFIs. Cash-based assistance could become an iimportant (new) service-delivery modality for all organizations. |
| **Safety and security**  (Also, with effects on deforestation and health). See also peace-building | Has two types of energy-saving stoves and/ provides training to make (and protect from rain) energy-saving mud stoves. Making these stoves has become an income generating activity for some people. | Has no experience with energy-saving stoves and/or explaining how to make (and protect from rain) energy-saving mud stoves  Severe problems with raids by Misseriya and Nuer. | Has experience with different types of energy-saving stoves. | Has no experience with energy-saving stoves and/or explaining how to make (and protect from rain) energy-saving mud stoves). | Learn more about best practices with different types of energy-saving stoves, so that people need less charcoal and women, and children need to fetch less firewood. |
| **Climate change / Reforestation** | Has started to do more on climate change adaptation. Introduced tree planting / reforestation. Demonstration gardens are important in this respect. | Wants to do more on climate change adaptation. Introduced tree planting / reforestation. Trees also important as windbreakers. | Would like to do more on reforestation and climate change adaptation, e.g., in agriculture and in reforestation, Introduced tree planting / reforestation. Demonstration gardens are important in this respect. | Wants to do more on climate change adaptation. Introduced tree planting / reforestation. | Compare new and already established methods and activities for moisture retention and irrigation, as well as drought-resistant crops.  Develop a reforestation approach further to include measuring its effectiveness. All organizations could work more with a locally adapted forest for food approach. |
| **Synergies among different projects** | Synergies health, education, food aid and food security, peacebuilding, and strengthening management/  professionalization. | Synergies education, and food aid and food security (e.g., school feeding), peacebuilding and strengthening management/  professionalization. | Displays important synergies, especially with food aid and food security, VSLA and strengthening management/  professionalization. | Many synergies through social organizing and combining activities and strengthening management/  professionalization. | Compare synergies among the projects and strengthening management/  professionalization. |

important to search for the optimal balance between short-term humanitarian aid and more long-term development activities. In other words, these cross-cutting themes are not just important for enhancing food aid and food security, but also have a broader economic and ecological relevance.

In addition, the four organizations need to *professionalize* further, and a comparison of their similarities and differences shows ways in which they can continue to learn from each other. Moreover, if the refugees from Northern Uganda and IDPs in South Sudan can—or are forced to—return “home”, these organizations should be in close contact in order to exchange information about the refugees, their needs and their return plans. Currently, WFP is decreasing its food rations so that some refugees will (have to) leave the settlement camps in Uganda and the IDP PoC sites in South Sudan.

Deforestation intensifies the negative effects of *climate change*, in particular droughts, and is also a manifestation of the *general lack of resources* that can contribute to local conflicts. These two issues lead to greater vulnerability of the population and could reduce, or even wipe out, the gains of the three projects. Like Caritas Gulu, MHA now promotes *energy-saving stoves*, so that people need to fetch firewood less often, which enhances their security. In the end, people can then spend less money and time on firewood or charcoal and inhale less smoke leading to fewer respiratory infections, and deforestation may also be slowed.[[56]](#footnote-57) BGRRF and DMI can do the same. Especially with the Rucksack projects, all organizations have taken up reforestation, for example with fruit trees.

## Substantial Issues

The issue of *climate change* overlaps with *deforestation* and both increase the need for food aid and food security activities. Worsening climate change also leads to more conflicts. Although this study is not a climate survey, respondents mentioned the same points as in the previous two evaluations indicating climate change:

* The weather has become more extreme with irregular and late rains and intense heat (above 40°C), but also with uncommon heavy rains. It seems like the rainy season is starting later and getting shorter;
* More dry winds from the Sahara, less humid ones from the Indian Ocean;
* Later harvests due to later rains also mean less optimal use of second planting season;
* Army worms that are not washed away by the rain and reduce the harvest;
* Wells running dry;
* Crops that are less productive (“They are withering away”);
* Armed raids in the ASAA now occur over a longer period of time, because they normally cease during the rainy season;
* Rivers are at a very low level and river vegetation is disappearing;
* Some coping mechanisms, such as hunting crocodiles or hippos, are not possible anymore.

Climate change will deeply influence farming over the next several decades (if not longer). The organizations have already taken on reforestation and drought resistant crops. They could include more irrigation and moisture retention. The organizations and Caritas Germany could set up specific policies and programs to plan for and address climate change.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

* *Develop a strategy for climate change adaptation:*
  + *Implement (new) irrigation techniques (e.g., drip irrigation) and where possible use motorized irrigation, for example based on diesel motors or solar panels;*
  + *Identify (more) drought resistant crops and implement techniques to deal with drought (e.g., rain harvesting and moisture retention);*
  + *Identify ways to have more food access and availability during longer dry spells (e.g., sun-drying vegetables, forest for food);*
  + *In line with the Rucksack projects, discuss the possibility of short, small emergency food emergency aid/relief projects that accompany the food security projects in cases of extreme weather, such as drought and floods;*
  + *Identify experts who can further develop and implement this climate change adaption strategy.*

The organizations are increasingly—and quite successfully—working with demonstration gardens, for example for agronomic training, ox-plowing, and breeding small animals, which puts them in a position of being able to provide food aid, seeds, seedlings, and cassava cuttings. These gardens are central to improving local farming and food security, and also contribute to dealing with climate change. The organizations could therefore compare the ways in which they work with the demonstration gardens and the plans they make to extend them.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

* *In addition to developing a strategy for climate change adaptation (see above) also work to:*
  + *Ensure that demonstration gardens have seed storages and/or help building seed storages (e.g., by brick laying and carpentry students from the vocational skills training);*
  + *Assess the extent to which the demonstration gardens can provide seeds, cassava cuttings, and seedlings on an annual basis. They can also be used to raise the income of the organization;*
  + *Compare the activities and plans for the demonstration gardens of the partner organizations.*

The organizations use slightly different terms for conflict resolution and peacebuilding. So far, they have not worked consistently on preventing raids. Due to the raids, people are killed and kidnapped, goods and livestock are stolen, people live in fear and are being impoverished and they sometimes have to move cattle to safer places, which undermines food security and economic development. In economic terms, their property rights are not respected, so that they either cannot or dare not invest in cattle or agriculture. Stealing cattle for high bride-prices plays a central role in the raids. The communities served by BGRRF are especially exposed to raids, but cattle theft is also common in the greater Wau area. The organizations could discuss ways to reduce the size of the bride-prices in cooperation with traditional leaders, local officials, religious authorities, traders and other people, who are influential within their own community and are able to establish linkages across communities.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

* *Identify approaches and contacts to bring down the size of dowries to help reduce or end the raids.*

## Managerial Issues: From Capacity-building to Capacity Sharing

MHA, BGRRF, and Caritas Gulu, as well as DMI, have grown rapidly until the COVID pandemic, led to budget cuts. This combination of growth and budget reduction needs to be accompanied with a professionalization/capacity-building process if the organizations want to maintain or increase the quality of their work. In response, the three organizations are *improving* their *management*: MHA with an accountant from India and support from Dorcas Aid International, BGRRF with new staff-members and now moving activities and staff from Nairobi to Turalei, Caritas Gulu with the help of the *Gesellschaft für internationale Zusammenarbeit* (GIZ). The three annual audits have also indicated useful administrative improvements.

The organizations can learn from each other in terms of substance and process. In their program management, all three organizations are working on becoming more outcome-oriented. In terms of professionalization, they could further strengthen their MEAL, HRM, strategy formulation, and reporting and accounting systems. In addition, they can carry out more needs assessments and baseline and impact studies. They are appointing MEAL staff members and engaging in training. Once the COVID-19 pandemic subsides, they can also consider more *joint training* for their staff members, and *learning visits* to each other. Such regular learning visits, for example once a year, are useful to observe and discuss changes and learning that have taken place. During such visits, members of these organizations could work out parts of comparative table 29 in more detail, for example on irrigation, demonstration gardens or seed storage.

*MEAL, Baseline and Indicators*

None of the three organizations had a baseline in their original project proposals because the needs were obvious and time for preparation was lacking. Despite this some of the organizations used percentage points to measure change with their indicators. In the course of its project, MHA has increasingly worked with randomized MUAC studies and was able to estimate roughly the growth in area under cultivation due to ox-plowing by counting the bags of produce. In addition, it has also begun studying changes cultivated acreage due to ox-plowing, harvest yields, number of animals and income. Other indicators that could provide a baseline for impact assessment in food security include

1. Number of all year usable wells/water availability;
2. Number of households participating with ox-plowing;
3. Dietary diversity, in particular at the end of the hunger gap;
4. Number of meals a day, in particular at the end of the hunger gap;
5. Amount of seeds produced for the next season;
6. Number of children who have to leave school because parents cannot pay school fees;
7. Number of people leaving the villages or camps.

Output-oriented indicators are useful because they show whether the project activities have been carried out. However, and especially with more development-oriented activities, it is also useful to include outcome-oriented indicators. This implies that measures of quality and behavioral or institutional change should be included. For evaluations, trend data such indicators would provide more information on *efficiency,* *effectiveness, impact, and sustainability*. Other examples include accounting for graduated vocational skills students who train their employees or farmers, who in turn train others in ox-plowing or employ other people, or measuring the impact of agronomic training in terms of newly applied skills and income. As the organizations are working more with reforestation, they should now think about measuring its impact. This can become challenging because its effects on food security and micro-climate can take years to come about.

Although the overall Phineo project objectives and most sub-project goals are increasingly being reached, the three organizations cannot yet sufficiently prove that they are doing so, or how specific external factors are influencing their operations. It is insufficiently clear how they are going to measure their indicators, especially when the organizations use percentage points. This issue should be clarified in the near future.

In their logical frameworks, they could include colons with the baseline value, the current value, and the goal value of such indicators so that the value of (key) outcome indicator can be tracked over time. Explaining why, how, and to what extent these objectives have been realized is as important as achieving them because this helps to draw the relevant management lessons.

More generally, the organizations are developing their M&E into monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL). They are already in the process of appointing specialized MEAL staff. As they differ in their reporting, but work on similar projects, they can learn a lot from each other. Over time, they could establish (joint?) MEAL positions or even a (joint) MEAL unit. The organizations are now increasingly use indicators to measure the (quantitative) degree of realization of their objectives, which should now be presented in their official documents.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Have baseline and trend data (preferably) based on regular data collection (e.g., MUAC)*

Taken together, these measures on internal capacity building will make these organizations more accountable to their donors and target groups. In all likelihood, they will foster more effective reporting and organizational learning when they are integrated into their daily work. Overall, working further on the internal capacity issues noted above can make the organizations more effective in obtaining funding, and in particular with diversifying their donor base.

*Contingency planning*

Nobody knows when the war will stop, or when or how many of the IDPs and refugees will return. Despite the peace agreement, violence continues. Locusts can also become a sudden pest. Simultaneously, climate change is showing its negative impact, which is likely to get worse. At the same time, international funding for IDPs and refugees is in relative decline; UNMISS and WFP seem to be providing less support and have suggested that (some) IDPs and refugees return home. The higher living costs due to COVID-19 also negatively affect food security and economic development. Hence, the organizations need *contingency planning*.

In the *worst-case scenario*, climate change and the security situation worsen, while COVID-19 continues, leading to more people requiring aid. The organizations can then intensify their projects and see whether they can help introduce more food security activities, in particular to establish more demonstration gardens for reforestation. This may also include the execution of emergency aid projects.

If the *current level of insecurity* continues, the organizations should carry out projects similar to those from the worst-case scenario but at a smaller scale. After all, it is not clear whether or how refugees and IDPs will be able to return or rebuild their lives in the areas from which they come. The organizations could help prepare visits to home regions to see whether and how they are able to reestablish their lives and livelihoods. They could also help with return kits and returnee projects. The emergency aid and climate change projects under this scenario can piggyback on the development projects.

In the *best-case scenario*, peace will be established and hold. In that case, the three organizations can, in cooperation with their partners and the clusters/sectors, help ensure that the refugees and IDPs can return and rebuild their lives. They should then build further upon their social organizing in their food security and other programs. The effects of climate change will still require long-term activities.

*Challenges and Recommendations:*

* *Start with formulating a contingency approach, which could become part of a long-term strategy.*
* *Establish whether and how IDPs and refugees can contact their source communities and/or look for family members, for example with family tracing services and telecommunications (e.g., with Telecommunications Without Borders or the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement tracing services);*
* *Organize home visits for (potential) returnees? Which areas of origin are able to receive returnees? How? And which are not?*
* *Preparing receiving/home areas: What is there to go back to? How can the situation in this region be improved? Which forms of social organization (e.g., farmer’s associations or markets) function?*
* *Can refugees/IDPs receive return funding and/or start-up kits? What should these kits include?*

*Linkages and connections*

Through their social organizing, the organizations attempt to realize long-term synergies among their various activities. An important part of such organizing involves establishing linkages among participants, for example between experienced and less experienced farmers. Such activities can be taken a step further to enhance local self-reliance.[[57]](#footnote-58) In general, establishing linkages among displaced people, other actors, activities, and markets is a strategic question about what the organizations can do in-house, and what they can leave up to other actors, including private enterprises.

*Markets*, for example for food, seeds, tools, energy-saving stoves, plows, and other products, are hard to establish, but could improve food access and availability. There are organizations working on creating markets in camps in Northern Uganda, which could offer a learning opportunity for all four organizations.

Similarly, the lack of *transport* hampers income-generating activities for the participants in vocational training and farming. The organizations could see whether they could work with regular bus companies or find other ways of transport. A successful refugee farmer in northern Uganda bought a tricycle with support from Caritas Gulu. He now brings produce from his farming plot and those of other farmers to the market in Adjumani, where they fetch slightly higher prices than in the settlement camps. In addition, the organizations could determine whether they would like to work more with banks to access financial services, including saving schemes and VSLAs.

As indicated above, this report does not discuss in detail the relationships with *other organizations*, but it is possible to distinguish two types of organizations relevant to food security, namely UN organizations that (partly) support and cooperate with (some of) the four organizations, and other international NGOs such as Dorcas or GIZ, and Caritas Germany itself, which have established long-term relationships with the organizations and also want to work at strengthening their organizational management.

This evaluation could not study in detail what other organizations are doing on the issues of food aid and food security, but it is crucial that UNHCR and WFP in Uganda, and UNMISS and WFP in South Sudan (and their partners) continue to support the forcibly displaced. However, due to low levels of international funding and the effects of COVID-19, they are currently suggesting that refugees and IDPs should slowly return home. It would be useful to know the plans of WFP, FAO, UNHCR, UNMISS and their partners for food relief and food security in more detail. At the moment, WFP is reducing some types of its food rations due to a decline in funding. To what extent is WFP withdrawing and to what extent can FAO assist (e.g., with sorghum and vegetable seeds)? These organizations may also have ideas or activities that the four organizations and their target groups can benefit from.[[58]](#footnote-59)

Another group consists of NGOs that also support (some of) the four organizations, particularly with food security and strengthening management. Malteser and Dorcas are examples of these NGOs that work on similar topics in areas close by (see table 30). As food security and professionalization require long-term investment, it would be wise to examine the synergies and potential cooperation with these NGOs.

In addition, many displaced persons move regularly among camps, while searching for jobs or looking for family members. It would considerably help them mentally and practically—perhaps even financially—if they could trace and contact their family members either in South Sudan itself or in neighboring countries.

Table 30: Programs and Key Activities of Dorcas

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project** | **Key Activities** | **Locations** |
| South Sudan Joint Response (SSJR) (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs) | WASH: Drilling and repair of boreholes, construction of latrines, general sensitization, provision of soap  FSL: Food distribution, agricultural training, provision of seeds & tools | Wau and Jur River County, Western Bahr El Ghazal State  Tonj North and Tonj South  Warrap State |
| WASH for IDPs | Distribution of handwashing facilities and soap, solid and liquid waste collection and disposal, cleaning of latrines and drainage system | Naivasha IDP Camp & Masna IDP Camp, Western Bahr El Ghazal State |
| Communities at Work are Stronger | Preparation and implementation of village development plans for increased food production and infrastructure using a ‘Cash for Work’ approach | Western Bahr El Ghazal |
| Vocational Skills and Livelihood Improvement + Pride! (Women Empowerment) | Vocational Skills Training (e.g., Bakery, Masonry, ICT), entrepreneurship training, start-up grants and coaching of businesses | Western Bahr El Ghazal and Warrap States |
| Nutrition (WFP/UNICEF) | MAM & SAM | Warrap State |
| Nazareth | Children’s home | Wau |

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Determine in which areas the organizations need to work, lobby, or advocate with other aid organizations (e.g., Dorcas, other Caritas partner organizations in South Sudan, or WFP and FAO), embassies, donors, or local actors. Prioritize areas for cooperation with these organizations (e.g., protection or reforestation).*
* *Incorporate comparative lessons from the other organizations.*
* *Select specific areas of expertise where the organizations can learn more from each other, for example in the areas of relief, development, climate change adaptation, or linkages;*
  + *Think about the optimal combination of short-term humanitarian aid and more long-term development activities.*
    - *Determine the extent to which short-term and long-term programs can be integrated and evaluate the synergies among the activities.*
  + *Examine areas where the organizations can complement or hand over activities.*
* *Indicate where and how the organizations want to build their capacities:*
  + *Professionalize further in M&E/MEAL, HRM, risk management, and reporting and accounting;*
  + *Training program for staff-members in the area of food security;*
  + *Combine this professionalization with a training program (e.g., in reforestation);*
  + *Use broader (joint) evaluations;*
  + *Use learning visits.*

Finally, the linkages, cooperation, and impact of the whole aid system for the displaced people and host communities should be studied more frequently. The organizations can evaluate/peer review each other and/or carry out (joint) evaluation(s) of the forms and effectiveness of cooperation by the organizations in communities they serve.

*Training*

Training is an important part of capacity-building and professionalization. It can take place in courses, but also on-the-job and during learning visits.

Although each organization can work alone to implement the recommendations in this and previous evaluation reports, the organizations have already begun to work together. They would like to compare progress reports and audits on the different recommendations, go on joint field visits with the aim of improving existing activities, or take up activities that the other organizations are already working on (usually with a slightly different approach). This is now happening with, for example, soap production, energy-saving stoves, and reforestation. Comparative table 29 provides an initial framework for working together, but staff should work out the activities and learning opportunities in more detail. To give an example, all organizations provide seeds, but they differ in the types of seeds that they provide. Would it be wise to learn more about the types of seeds other organizations provide, and the subsequent problems and successes in enhancing food security, so that they can offer more types of seeds and accompany or monitor the farmers better?

Regarding MEAL, training staff from the different organizations can also take place through carrying out evaluations together or exchanging staff-members (temporarily), which is also a non-financial incentive. It is crucial that staff members learn more about *reporting*, *indicators, baselines,* and *impact assessment*, in particular in the area of food security. They can then also discuss how they write their project reports, because their reports are set up differently but deal with many similar topics. They could compare, for example during joint training, which reports or parts of reports they like most, and come up with the optimal reporting procedures and outlines.

In addition, the organizations should learn more about food security, climate change and reforestation. This can be combined with courses on (participatory) *proposal development, M&E/MEAL, accounting, HRM, and reporting*. Taken together, such utilization-focused training and evaluation would help these organizations build their capacities and report in a more professionalized manner, which is also important for writing follow-up project proposals.

## Preparation of Partner Workshop “Capacity Building/Capacity Sharing II” in October 2021

The September 2019 workshop was a great example of South-South cooperation. The four South-Sudanese organizations presented their experiences with their projects, discussed lessons learned, and explored areas where they could join hands. Although no follow-up visits could take place due to COVID-19, the Rucksack projects were a tangible follow-up to the workshop.

The next workshop of the partner organizations will take place after the closing of the Phineo program. All in all, the three South-Sudanese Phineo partner organizations have made solid progress with implementing this program. They can now capitalize on this progress and build on the former workshop and the recommendations of this report, to enhance the impact of the whole Phineo program and ensure that its benefits—and their partnership—will continue. In particular, they could work on the following topics:

* COVID-19, not just in terms of morbidity and mortality, but also in assessing the consequences travel bans, transport restrictions, inflation and food security in an already fragile economy. In addition, COVID-19 hampered project implementation and exchange visits among the partners. The consortium could not be built as planned.
* Professionalization
  + Further improving MEAL: sharing experiences, baselines, proposals and reporting, as well as impact assessments, including more quantitative outcomes;
  + Strategy formulation, HRM, risk management, and accounting;
  + Contingency planning and preparation for—forced or voluntary—returnees;
  + (Joint) strategy, training program and learning visits among the partner organizations;
  + Implementing safeguarding as an important topic for all organizations that Caritas Germany is working with.
* Peacebuilding, including bride prices and forms of social organization (associations and committees);
* Climate change and reforestation:
* Forest for Food;
* Irrigation and moisture retention;
* Long-term impact:
* Demonstration gardens: How are they functioning? How can they be developed further?
* Working with other organizations (e.g., a session with Dorcas and a session on joint strategies and networking) to learn more about possible cooperation and synergy.

# CARITAS GERMANY

Phineo can also become part of a lessons learned exercise for Caritas Germany. For example, it may be desirable to work more often with longer-term projects in crisis areas and to use regular independent audits. One of the strengths of the Phineo program is that its 3-year funding period lasted long enough to build capacities within the participating organizations. All organizations work on improving their management, and when the organizations have explicit management objectives in either their Phineo or Rucksack projects, it becomes easier to work on their professionalization in a structured manner.[[59]](#footnote-60) There are several managerial issues to consider.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Prepare the final partner workshop;*
* *Include at least one managerial objective in each (new) project proposal;*
* *Continue with the audits (if the donor provides sufficient funding);*
* *Develop specific managerial areas of expertise further, such as capacity building for strategy formulation, MEAL, accounting, reporting, risk management, and HRM;*
* *Develop specific substantive areas of expertise further, which can range from reforestation to VSLA and from vocational skills and energy-saving stoves to demonstration gardens;*
* *Examine whether specific impact assessments are necessary, for example on peacebuilding or reforestation;*
* *Foster more intensive cooperation among the local organizations Caritas supports;*
* *Include safeguarding as a cross-cutting theme for all project-partners.*

At its worst, climate change can lead to permanent emergencies, but even if it turns out to be less disruptive, it will still be necessary to rethink the relationship between long-term development and short-term relief aid.

*Challenges and Recommendations*

* *Caritas Germany should develop a climate change policy. This could include:*
  + *Temporary relief projects to strengthen or maintain the benefits of ongoing development-oriented projects;*
  + *Special attention to agriculture, reforestation, irrigation, and demonstration gardens.*

The local partner organizations work with a broad array of farmers’ associations, women’s groups, village committees, and peacebuilding groups. Although it is likely that these forms of social organizing contribute to the overall success of the project, their actual functioning, impact and sustainability are more often assumed than proven.

* *Carry out a longitudinal and/or ethnographic study to make an inventory of these associations and assess their strengths and weaknesses, sustainability, and impact.*

In its peacebuilding, Caritas Germany may have to work in several countries simultaneously—in this case, in both Sudan and South Sudan, and perhaps Uganda—in order to prevent or at least reduce raids:

* *Just as with Caritas Gulu in Uganda and MHA, BGRRF and DMI in South Sudan, Caritas could support more exchange or cooperation among the organizations it supports in Sudan and South Sudan and Uganda.*

Working on climate change and food security cannot be done by Caritas Germany alone. The same holds true for further strengthening the management of the organizations involved.

* *Find ways for Caritas Germany to team up with other funding organizations, such as Dorcas or Malteser International, to be able to establish synergies among projects and make long-term investments.*

# CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation has *assessed the degree of realization of the objectives of the three food security projects in terms of availability, access, and utilization, including the Rucksack projects.* It has provided recommendations to strengthen the three organizations, as well as DMI, and their projects. In addition, this evaluation has identified areas in which MHA, BGRRF and Caritas Gulu can learn from each other through their humanitarian and developmental work.

The organizations greatly appreciate the Phineo/Caritas Germany projects because the three-year funding cycle makes long(er)-term investment and capacity-development possible. For the 2021 workshop, MEAL—in particular to the extent in which the indicators of the logframes can be measured—should receive more attention.

In general, the displaced South Sudanese and their host communities lack resources, skills, and linkages with other actors and markets, so they struggle with their lives and livelihoods. The organizations have reached their objectives in food aid, their food security objectives have almost been achieved (e.g., with more vegetables, more popular ox-plowing, and better yields). The same holds true for their management objectives.

If the current level of insecurity continues, or actually improves, the three organizations can continue working further on their food security objectives, *in particular on further improving food availability and access for their target groups*. However, this will be occurring against a backdrop of many other unfulfilled needs of the displaced people and host communities. *Food utilization* is also improving with methods such as sun-drying food, seed storage, and hygienic preparation (soap) becoming more widely utilized. All in all, the three projects have a very high *relevance; food security* has improved markedly for their target group, but full *sustainability* cannot be ensured yet. Structural factors such as climate change, ongoing insecurity and violence, and COVID-19, could wipe out project gains at any time.

MHA and BGRRF can cooperate with Caritas Gulu (and DMI) on learning visits and training. In this respect, this report provides several ideas for further capacity-building and professionalization. As no one knows how the conflict in South Sudan will develop, the organizations need to adopt a contingency approach. They need to plan for longer-term capacity and institution-building for refugees, IDPs, and host communities—and themselves—in the areas of climate change and reforestation, establishing linkages, contingency planning, and training.

It is important to note that many of the above issues cannot—and should not—be addressed by the organizations alone, and that they require cooperation with other humanitarian organizations, embassies and donors, as well as local IDP, refugee and host organizations.

Appendix 1: Food Security Questionnaire

Please note that this questionnaire was used during the first two evaluations, which were more process-oriented. It provided an input for the questionnaires developed for the last, more impact-oriented evaluation of the Phineo program.

**Personal introduction**

**Introduction of the research**

**How do people make their living (Livelihoods)?**

1. Is cash production in agriculture possible?

* Before the project?
* After the project?

2. If there are surpluses, where are they being sold?

3. Any problems with land-ownership?

4. Do you have livestock? Which ones?

5. Do herds move here?

6. Have people received aid?

* From MHA/BGRRF/Caritas Gulu?
* From other organizations?

7. Do people earn money? How?

* Agriculture?
* Pastoralism?
* Casual labor?
* Wage labor?
* Mix?
* Other?

8. Has this changed due to the project? Other reasons?

**Agriculture (more specific)**

9. What effect did the seeds and tools have on your harvest?

10. How was their quality?

11. Did you have more food for the hunger gap?

12. What agricultural problems do you face?

* Pests
* Dry Spell/Drought
* Flooding
* Other? Which ones?

13. Have you worked with the ox-plow?

* If not, would you like to work with it?
* What effects does ox-plowing have?

**Livestock (more specific) See question 4**

14. What livestock do you have?

15. Who owns them?

16. What do they produce?

17. Any problems with your livestock?

**Income**

18. What are your sources of income?

19. Are they changing?

* Due to the project?
* Other reasons?

**Expenditures**

20. How do you spend your income?

21. Is this changing? How? Why?

**How do people obtain their food?**

22. How do people obtain their food?

23. Are you able to produce seeds for the next year? How? If not, why?

**Labor (for wages or food) See question 7**

24. Is it difficult to obtain work? How?

25. Do children work? What work do they do?

**Food consumption patterns**

26. What kinds of food did you eat before the project?

27. What kinds of food do you eat now?

28. How much food do you produce yourself?

29. What food comes from the market?

30. Other food sources? Fishing?

31. Have there been any changes to your diet due to the project? Other reasons?

32. How many meals a day are you eating? How does this change over the year?

**Market prices and evolution**

33. Do you sell your agricultural surpluses on the market?

34. Do you have shortage in production that you can address on the market?

**Perception of the main problems (related to the project)**

35. How do you obtain firewood or charcoal?

36. Are there changes in the prices of firewood?

37. Are there changes in the prices of charcoal?

38. Do your children attend school?

39. Can you pay the school fees for your children?

40. Is the climate changing? How?

41. Do you feel safe?

42. Is theft an issue?

43. What about corruption?

44. Is security improving? Why?

45. Do people leave the village? Why?

**46. Do Saving Schemes exist in your village? How are they functioning? Does your family participate?**

**47. How is the Rucksack Project going? Does it affect you? If yes, how?**

**48. How is the situation of the poorest households? (Especially those who were selected to receive temporarily food support?)**

**49. Perception/Impact of the Corona/CovidCOVID-19 Crisis?**

Do you have any questions?

Thank you

Appendix 2: Semi-Structured Questionnaire for Expert Interviews with Staff-Members of the Three Organizations

**Personal introduction**

**Introduction of the research**

1. Pls explain your title & role in MHA/BGRRF/Caritas Gulu.
2. For how long have you been working now at MHA/BGRRF/Caritas Gulu?
3. Did the personnel changes in the management of your organization influence the Phineo program?? How?
4. How did the Phineo project function? How did it end?
5. Were there any important changes over the year (e.g., new villages or new activities)?
6. What are the results of the Phineo project over the last year? Overall?
7. How do you judge these results?
8. To which extent are they according to plan?
9. Which recommendations from last year's evaluations did you implement (to which extent)? Why?
10. Could you explain MHA/BGRRF/Caritas Gulu's follow-up to the Wau Workshop?
11. How has MHA/BGRRF/Caritas Gulu dealt with the COVID-19 epidemic?
12. How did the audit go?
13. What were the outcomes of the audit for your organization?
14. Do you agree with these outcomes?
15. What do you consider MHA/BGRRF/Caritas Gulu's strengths?
16. What do you consider its weaknesses?
17. What would you like to change? Why?
18. Are there any other points that should have come up during this evaluation?
19. Do you have any questions?

Appendix 3: Semi-Structured HH Questionnaire South Sudan

**PART I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION & RESPONDENT’S BACKGROUND**

1. Name of administrative area

[1] Agok

[2] Abyei

[3] Turalei

[4] Mayen Abun

[5] Marrial Baai

1. What is the name of this village?
2. What is the respondent's gender?

[1] Male

[2] Female

1. How old are you?
2. What is your highest level of education?

[1] No formal education

[2] Some Primary

[3] Finished Primary

[4] Some secondary

[5] Finished secondary

[6] College/ Tertiary

1. What is your marital status?

[1] Single/ Never married

[2] Divorced/Separated

[3] Married

[4] Widowed

[5] Widower

1. During the past 12 months, what was your main occupation?

[1] Work on own plot on refugee settlement

[2] Work on someone else's farm

[3] Domestic work in own home

[4] Domestic work in someone else's home

[5] Working in own business

[6] Formal employment (government, private business, teacher, etc)

[7] Student

[8] Other

1. How much on average is the monthly income of your household
2. How many members are you in your household?
3. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are younger than 5 years?
4. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are between 5 - 18 years old?
5. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are between 18 - 30 years old?
6. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are between 30 - 50 years old?
7. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are above 50 years old?
8. Does someone in your household have a disability?
9. How many people who suffers from disability live with you in your house?

**PART II: FOOD AID**

1. Did your household receive any food Aid in the past 12 months?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. Which month of the year did you receive this food aid?

[1] January

[2] February

[3] March

[4] April

[5] May

[6] June

[7] July

[8] August

[9] September

[10] October

[11] November

[12] December

1. In your opinion, do you think the food aid supported your household through difficult months of the year when you didn't have sufficient food to eat?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. Please explain the way in which this food aid assisted you and your family?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Have you heard cases of people dying of hunger in this community as a result of hunger?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. Kindly specify for me the type of food aid received in the past 12 months from BGRRF/MHA
2. What was the quantity of the food aid did you receive?
3. In what unit did you receive the food aid?

[1] Kg

[2] Liters

[3] Sacks

[4] Malwas

1. How long (months) did this food aid feed your family?
2. How long (Minutes) would it take you to go que and come back to the house with the food aid?
3. Why do you think you were selected to join the food aid support program?
4. Kindly state your level of agreement with the following statements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STATEMENTS** | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Good** | **Very good** | **Excellent** |
| Food aid was provided to my household during the most food insecure period of year |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food aid was of good quality for human consumption |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food aid was provided in enough quantities for all members of my household |  |  |  |  |  |
| I was provided with sufficient information about the food distribution. |  |  |  |  |  |

**OX PLOW**

1. Which year(s) did your household receive/use the ox-plow received from MHA project?

[1] 2018

[2] 2019

[3] 2020

1. Prior to receiving and/or using the ox-plow, what tool were you using to cultivate your land?
2. What size of land (*feddan*) were you able to cultivate without an ox-plow?
3. What size of land (*feddan*) are you able to cultivate with the ox-plow?
4. In your own assessment, do you think the use of an Ox-plow has contributed to increased food supply in your household?
5. What are some of the challenges you have experienced with using the ox-plow when cultivating your land?

[1] No challenge

[2] High repair cost,

[3] Many people need it at the same time

[4] Lack of oxen to use with the plow

[5] It requires high technology to operate/ technology to complicated?

[6] No spare parts for ox-plow

[7] Others (Specify)

1. Did your household also receive seeds from Mary help?
2. In which year did your household receive seeds from BGRRF/ Mary Help Association/ Sisters of Mother Teresa for planting?

[1] 2018

[2] 2019

[3] 2020

1. Why do you think you were selected to be provided with seeds under Mary help support?

*Kindly list all crops seeds that your HH has received in the last 12 months*

1. Did you plant all the seeds received or were some used for household food consumption?

[1] Yes I did plant all the seeds

[2] No I consumed part of the seeds

[3] No I consumed all the seeds

1. What Quantity (sacks) of produce did you harvest during the last harvest period?
2. For how long (months) did the harvest last your household food consumption?

[1] Less than 3 months

[2] 3 - 6 Months

[3] 6 - 9 Months

[4] 9 -12 Months

[5] Over 1 Year

1. Did you sell part of the harvest you got from ${crop\_1} last season?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. What quantity of ${crop\_1} did you sell?
2. Specify unit of sale for ${c\_1}
3. Approximately how much money (SSP) in total did you receive from the ${c\_1} sales?
4. In your own assessment, do you think the seeds that you were given provided enough food for your household for some time?

[1] Yes

[2] No

**KITCHEN GARDEN & TOOLS**

1. Which types of vegetable seeds provided by BGRRF did you plant in your kitchen garden in the last 1 year?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How long have the crops you planted in your kitchen garden been able to serve your household food requirements?

[1] Less than 3 months

[2] 3 - 6 Months

[3] 6 - 9 Months

[4] 9 -12 Months

[5] Over 1 Year

1. Do you also sell any surplus crop produce from your kitchen garden?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. How much (SSP) on average do you make from ${crops} sales whenever you sell it?
2. In your opinion, has the kitchen garden helped in providing food for your household?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. How do you think your household can be supported further to enhance crops production and sales from your kitchen garden?

­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­--\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Have you ever received any training/ demonstration on farming from BGRRF/ Mary Help Association/ Sisters of Mother Teresa?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. Please specify the kind of training you received.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Trainings Type | Yes [1] | No [2] |
| (i) Land preparation |  |  |
| (ii) Planting |  |  |
| (iii) Weed control |  |  |
| (iv) Harvesting |  |  |
| (v) Post-harvest handling & storage |  |  |
| (vi) Irrigation methods |  |  |

1. How would you rate the trainings you've received from BGRRF/ MHA/ Sisters of Mother Teresa supported projects on agricultural production?

[1] Poor

[2] Fair,

[3] Good,

[4] Very Good,

[5] Excellent

1. What are the challenges to farming in this area?

[1] Pest

[2] erratic rains

[3] Diseases

[4] Lack of farm implements

[5] Farm inputs

[6] Other

**FARMING TOOLS**

1. Did you receive farming tools from BGRRF?
2. If Yes, please list the tools received
3. How many in your farming group are supported by BGRRF?
4. Did your group receive a chicken wire from BGRRF for fencing your farm land?
5. Has chicken wire been effective in offering protection to your kitchen garden vegetable crops?
6. Which crop seeds did you receive from BGRRF for farming in the last year?
7. What quantity of harvest did you receive from ${seed\_1} in the last season?
8. How long has ${seed\_1} harvest been able to serve your household food production since the last harvest?
9. Did you also sell part of the harvest you earned from ${seed\_1} in the last season?
10. How much (SSP) on average did you make on sales from ${seed\_1}?
11. In your opinion, has the provision of crops, seeds, and tools helped in providing food for your household?

**FOOD SECURITY**

*I would like you to reflect back 1 year ago during the hardship months [between May - August 2020]*

1. During the last 3 years, when did your household not have food to eat because of a lack of resources to get food?
2. During which years?
3. During the last 3 years, were there periods when you or any household member went to bed hungrily because there was not enough food?
4. Which years were these?
5. During the last 3 years, are there periods when you or any of your household member went a whole day and night without eating anything at all because there was not enough food?
6. Which years were these?
7. During the period May - August 2020, did anyone in your household have to engage in any of the following behaviors due to lack of food or lack of money to buy food? Choose appropriately
8. Sold non-productive household assets/ goods (e.g. furniture, radio etc.)
9. Sold small household animals (e.g. chicken)
10. Borrowed money/food from a lender or friend
11. Spent on savings
12. Sold productive assets or means of transport (e.g. bicycle, motorbike)
13. Consumed seed stock that were to be saved for next season
14. Sold productive animals (e.g., cows, goat, sheep, camel etc.)
15. Relied on remittances from friends & family
16. None
17. How many of the following livestock does your household own?
18. How many bulls do you have for ox-plowing?
19. How many donkeys does your household have?
20. How many sheep does your household have?
21. How many goat does your household have?

Appendix 4: Semi-Structured Household Questionnaire Gulu – Farmers & Vocational Skills Alumni

Select a program to assess

[1] Farming [2] Vocational skills

1. District name

[1] Lamwo [2] Adjumani

1. Sub-county name

[1] Okusijoni [2] Palabek

1. Name of settlement?

[1] Maaji II [2] Zone 7

1. What is the respondent gender?

[1] Male

[2] Female

1. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your highest level of education?

[1] No formal education

[2] Some Primary

[3] Finished Primary

[4] Some secondary

[5] Finished secondary

[6] College/Tertiary

1. What is your marital status?

[1] Single/ Never married

[2] Divorced/Separated

[3] Married

[4] Widow

[5] Widower

1. During the past 12 months, what was your main occupation?

[1] Work on own plot on refugee settlement

[2] Work on someone else's farm

[3] Domestic work in own home

[4] Domestic work in someone else's home

[5] Working in own business

[6] Formal employment (government, private business, teacher, etc)

[7] Student

[8] Other

1. How many members are you in your household?
2. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are under 5 years old?
3. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are between 5 - 18 years old?
4. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are between 18 - 30 years old?
5. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are between 30 - 50 years old?
6. of the ${hh\_size} household members, how many are above 50 years old?
7. Does someone in your household have a disability?
8. How many people with a disability live in your household?
9. In which year did you join the farming project?

[1] 2018

[2] 2019

[3] 2020

1. What is the size of the land you use for vegetable farming in this project?
2. How did you acquire this piece of land?

[1] Purchase

[2] Lease

[3] Refugee plot

[4] Ancestral/ Communal

1. Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. If purchased, for how much in total (UGX) did you purchase this piece of land?
3. If leased, what is your lease period (months) for this land?
4. If leased, how much in total (UGX) did you pay for the ${lease\_period} months lease period for this piece of land?
5. Have you (as individual or group) acquired another piece of land in the host community for the purpose of farming?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. What is the ownership structure of the land you own in the host community?

[1] Fully own it by myself

[2] Me & my fellow refugees own the land jointly

[3] Me, my fellow refugee and host community own the land jointly

1. What is the size of the land you acquired in the host community?
2. Please specify unit of measure of your land in the host community

[1] acre

[2] Feddan

1. What is the lease period for this piece of land in the host community?
2. Please specify the lease period on the land owned in the host community

[1] Months

[2] Years

1. What is the total lease cost for this piece of land in the host community?
2. How much did you as an individual contribute to the lease of land in the host community
3. Why do you think you were selected to participate in this vegetable farming project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Has your household ever received any vegetable seeds from Caritas Gulu for planting?

[1] Months

[2] Years

1. Kindly specify all vegetables that your household planted in the last 12 months one at a time.

(*this question was programmed to iterate up to 5 loops of crops*)

1. What quantity of ${vegetable\_1} did you harvest during the last harvest period?
2. Please specify the measuring unit of the quantity of ${vegetable\_1} you harvested.

[1] Kg

[2] Sacks

[3] Basin

[4] Grams

1. For how long (months) did the ${vegetable\_1} last your household food consumption after harvesting?

[1] Less than 3 months

[2] 3 - 6 Months

[3] 6 - 9 Months

[4] 9 -12 Months

[5] Over 1 Year

1. Did you sell part of the harvest you got from ${vegetable\_1} last season?

[1] Yes

[2] No

1. What quantity of ${c\_1} did you sell?
2. Please specify the measuring unit of the ${qty\_sale\_c1} ${c\_1} you sold.

[1] Kg

[2] Sacks

[3] Basin

[4] Grams

1. Approximately how much money (UGX) in total did you receive from this ${c\_1} sales?
2. In your own assessment, how would you rate the contribution of the vegetable farming project to your household food supply.

[1] Poor

[2] Fair,

[3] Good,

[4] Very Good,

[5] Excellent

1. Which of the following trainings did you attend/ receive by participating in this farming project?

[1] Land Preparation

[2] Planting

[3] Weed Control

[4] Harvesting

[5] Post-Harvest Handling & Storage

[6] Irrigation Methods

[7] Moisture retention

[8] None

1. How would you rate the trainings you have received from Caritas Gulu in this vegetable farming project?

[1] Poor

[2] Fair,

[3] Good,

[4] Very Good,

[5] Excellent

1. Which trainings do you think you still need to be able to better manage your farming business?

[1] Land Preparation

[2] Planting

[3] Weed Control

[4] Harvesting

[5] Post-Harvest Handling & Storage

[6] Irrigation Methods

[7] Moisture retention

[8] None

1. What are the challenges to your vegetable farming in this area?
2. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. Which of the following farming tools have you received by participating in this farming project?

(i) Hoe

(ii) Spade

(iii) Rake

(iv) Watering can

(v) Others \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Which other tools would you require for your farming activities in the future?
2. Which year did you join the vocational skills training course supported by Caritas Gulu?
3. How many people participated in the vocational skills training course? On average?
4. Which vocational training course did you attend?

Others (specify)

1. Other than the ${course\_calc}, which other course would you have prefered to receive at the vocational skills training center?
2. For how long (months) did you take the ${course\_calc} course at the college?
3. Were you (also) provided with a startup kit upon completion of your ${course\_calc} course?
4. What business startup were you given upon completion of your course (to begin your ${biz\_type} business)?
5. How would you rate the training on ${course\_calc} you received at the college?
6. Which business did you set up upon completion of your ${course\_calc} training at the college?

Others (specify)

1. Which year did you set up the ${biz\_type} business?
2. On average, how much profit do you make from the ${biz\_type} in a week?
3. Is this profit of UGX ${profit} sufficient support your household?
4. How has the profit from this ${biz\_type} business helped you?
5. Have you employed other people to assist you in your ${biz\_type} business?
6. How many people did you employ in this ${biz\_type} business?
7. How much in total do you pay as salaries/ wages for an ${employ\_nos} employee in a week?
8. Have you partnered other people to be able to grow your business in this ${biz\_type} business to grow it?
9. How many people have you partnered with in this ${biz\_type} business?

Appendix 5: FGD Guide – Persons with Special Needs

**Instruction:**

This tool is mean for Persons with Special Needs in the camps (PSNs)

Randomly select 10 based on convenience of reach

1. What type of NFI have you received from Caritas Gulu?
   1. Blanket
   2. Sauce pan
   3. Water basin
   4. Soap
   5. Charcoal store
2. When do they normally distribute these items? *How regular are these distributions*, *how are you notified*?
3. How do they normally choose those who receive these items like you from the community?
4. Do you think Caritas Gulu is transparent and fair in its approach to choosing beneficiaries of these NFIs? Explain
5. Are the NFI you mentioned to have received from Caritas Gulu the key priority for your daily life requirement at the moment? *If NOT which are your basic requirement?*
6. What are the challenges you have noticed while accessing/ receiving the NFI from Caritas Gulu?
7. How best do you think Caritas Gulu can improve support to PSN like you?

Appendix 6: FGD Guide – Refugees Welfare Committee

**Instruction:**

This tool is mean for the Peace building Committee (Refugee Welfare Committee)

Randomly select 10 based on convenience of reach.

**About the Committee -RWC**

1. How was this committee established? *Understand the genesis of its establishment & purpose of formation*
2. How is this committee governed? *Are there officials, who, what is their composition, any diversity in the committee (male/female, youth, host, refugee, religious leader, elder etc)*
3. What is the term limit of this committee?

**RWC mandate**

1. Which are the major conflicts in this area that this committee deals with? *Water, land, assault, theft, etc.*
2. How does this committee handle different conflicts brought before it?
3. How frequent does this committee sit to address different conflicts emerging in this area?
4. How does this committee interface with the government authorities in order to maintain peace and order in this area?
5. What level of support has this committee received from Caritas Gulu to enable it to discharge its mandate?
6. Which areas would you recommend more support on in order for this committee to continue effectively addressing conflict resolution activities in this area?

Appendix 7: List of Crops Planted by Farmers in South Sudan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Crop** | **Type** |
| Beans | Legume |
| Cabbage | Vegetable |
| Cowpeas | Legume |
| Dura | Vegetable |
| Eggplant | Vegetable |
| Jiirjiir | Cereal |
| Groundnuts | Legume |
| Greenpeas | Cereal |
| Kudra | Cereal |
| Lentils | Legume |
| Maize | Cereal |
| Millet | Cereal |
| Okra | Vegetable |
| Onion | Vegetable |
| Pumpkin | Vegetable |
| Peanuts | Legume |
| Peas | Legume |
| Rijula | Vegetable |
| Skuma wiki | Vegetable |
| Sim sim | Cereal |
| Sorghum | Cereal |
| Tomatoes | Vegetable |
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1. This does not include the 6,000 patients and caretakers that received food at the Hospital in Alel Chock as part of the Rucksack project. For BGRRF some people may have been counted double, if they received food during more than one year. Caritas Gulu also provided food aid to approximately 1,911 vulnerable people (273 households), but only as part of its Rucksack project. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. These numbers about food aid and agricultural measures are based on the standard assumption of 7 persons for each household. The categories “vulnerable individuals and their dependents” are assumed to consist of 3 persons on average. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. To give a few example, MHA took up the idea of energy saving stores from Caraitas Gulu, DMI took over the VSLA methodology from Caritas Gulu, and seed storages were taken over from DMI by BGRRF. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Based on a survey in the Juba POCs, DMI will assist possible return movements. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. UNHCR (2020a), p. 6-8; OCHA (2021a); OCHA (2021b), pp. 6, 10. See also UNHCR, OPM (2020). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The government’s follow-up to ReHoPE emphasizes vocational skills training for youths and food security by training in modern agronomic practices and marketing, as well as providing large tracts of land for group farming. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. UNHCR (2021); UNHCR, OPM (2020), p 10. See OCHA (2020a); UNOCHA (2020b). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. OCHA (2021b), p. 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. OCHA (2021b) p. 10. UNHCR (2020b). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. See OCHA (2020). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. IFRC (2006), p. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Twic State became a county after administrative reforms in 2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Mugenda & Mugenda, 2019. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. I would like to thank Ydo Jacobs for suggesting this phrase. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Usually, NGOs assume that there are seven persons per household in Bar el Ghazal, in particular in Dinka families. This number is based on the 2008 census. In recent years, more organizations count with 6 members per household. This evaluation found that the households interviewed had on average of 8 members. In general, the correct number is hard to establish. With severe famines, families fall apart. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Usually, food becomes less in April, May, and June, but in July and August many people lack sufficient food. As late rains are becoming more regular, harvesting is also taking place later, so that the hunger gap currently extends into August. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Last year, 260 people were selected without increasing costs. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. The *Maloda* is a local type of long spade. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Some households with vulnerable family members (e.g., the elderly, persons with a disability) provide (some) food to them, but they rarely do so outside their family. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. This garden should not be confused with the several small fenced vegetable gardens established just during the dry season. This garden is 500 x 500 m large and is properly fenced. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. MHA also has a chicken and duck farm in the hospital compound, which is not part of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. These include sorghum, maize, sim sim, groundnuts, hardnuts, cowpeas, *muthari* (*raggi*), green peas, red beans yellow beans, and vegetables, such as tomato, okra, chili, and eggplant. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Fish, a useful, additional source of protein, are also caught in the river. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Data collected by Mary Help Association (2018-19, 2019-20). [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. One *feddan* is 60 \* 70 m= 4,200 m² (roughly similar to an acre). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Due to financial limitations, no further MUAC studies were done after the end of the project, but the number of children that need nutritional support at the hospital remains low. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Multiple answers were possible. As a result, the total surpasses 100%. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. The surveys were carried out by students of the Mary Help College of Nursing and Midwifery. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Respondents never mentioned weeding as a constraint. In contrast to Agok and Abyei, respondents did not mention fencing as a constraint. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. If NGOs would stick with one or only a few types of plows this would reduce the problem of spare parts. It seems that momentarily different types of plows are being sold locally, which enhances the problem of spare parts. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Data collected by Mary Help Association (2019-20). [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. Most local saving associations operate without interest, but its members have made clear that they are interested in more advanced forms of micro-credit associations, such as VSLAs. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. See also the Rucksack project below. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Normally, caretakers, usually family members, come with food for the patients twice a day. However, this now needs to be avoided, because it raises the risks of the transmission of COVID-19. Caretakers now also have to stay in the hospital. They and the patients, as well as the staff-members, need food. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. MHA is now also teaching energy-saving ovens. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. The RRCs were set up in a 2012-2013 project with Cordaid and Catholic Relief Services. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. The sampled beneficiaries did not include any of the beneficiaries of the Missionaries of Charity sisters. As indicated in the project proposal, BGRRF is in constant touch with the sisters, and its staff-members often go to Turalei to meet them and discuss the distributions. The sisters provide details on how they conduct the distributions and their impact. According to BGRRF staff, in many cases, the number of beggars who come to seek the sisters’ support drastically drops. The charism of Missionaries of Charity does not allow for publicity of any charitable deed by them. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. Notice that many schools also have child-feeding programs, so that children usually receive more food aid than their parents. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. The importance of tightening nuts and bolts should also be emphasized during training. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. 190 women and 190 men. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. Culturally, women usually fetch water in addition to the many other productive and reproductive tasks they fulfill. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. BGRRF should also consider integrating better in the church structure of the Diocese of Wau, which could constitute a protective umbrella. Wau now has a new Bishop. As a result, this would be a good time to reconsider the position of BGRRF with the Diocese of Wau. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. BGRRF, 2nd Interim Report, P.163-004/2018, May 1, 2018 – March 31, 2019, p. 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. Agok/Twic areas have termites that destroy crops, untreated wood, and so on. BGRRF put up a proper building with necessary treatment of the floor, wood and shelves to ensure that termites and other insects do not destroy the facility. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. UNHCR (2019), p. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. A 2018 impact evaluation also indicates that the vocational skills graduates from an earlier project are generally better able to make a living than they were before their training. See Caritas Gulu Archdiocese (2018) Integrated Post Conflict Support for South Sudanese Refugees in Adjumani District 2017-2018. Final Evaluation Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. Two respondents reported that their income was from trading in motor cycle spare part at Adjumani local market. No further inquiry was done to attribute this business to the vocational skills training program, but it is likely that they followed the Driving and Mechanics course, [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. For more information on this topic, in particular on problems during execution, see Dijkzeul, D. (2017), pp. 1-37; and Dijkzeul, D. (2019). [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. Caritas also bought a Zoom communication system to continue interaction with refugees and host communities during the COVID-19 epidemic. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. After armed inter-ethnic violence and killings in the Palorinya refugee settlement, UNHCR moved 750 people to Palabek in November 2020. UNHCR mentioned Caritas’ peace-activities there as a reason for this transfer in the hope that future conflicts could be prevented. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. Caritas Gulu Archdiocese (2018) Interim Report for Integrated Post Conflict Support for South Sudanese Refugees in Adjumani 2018-2021, p. 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. Contact Christof Ruhmich, a Caritas consultant, and see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hCJfSYZqZ0Y. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. As Caritas Germany also works with DMI on food security in South Sudan and this organization has already cooperated with the other three organizations, in particular at the Wau workshop, we have included DMI in the table below for comparison. Although we have tried to update the information, we have not studied DMI in detail and may have missed some recent developments. Similarly, Caritas Germany works with more partner organizations in South Sudan, but we do not know their work, so we cannot include them in table 29. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. The organizations should now prepare impact or trend studies on the effects of their tree-planting activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. Compare Humphrey 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. I did not have time to study the role and impact of the three organizations in the coordination clusters. A subsequent, broader evaluation should take the other organizations and their implications for capacity-building/sharing and the project activities of the three organizations into account. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
59. Several organizations are now working with QuickBooks accounting software. It may be wise to institutionalize that for all participating organizations. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)