BUILDING COMMUNITY LEVEL RESILIENCE

South Sudan
Alarming Trends: GDP growth

- Heavy reliance on oil.
- In recent years, decline in global oil and reduction in oil production preceding the outbreak of civil war by end of 2013.
- Sharp decline in GDP

Source: Trade Economics; National Bureau of Statistics, South Sudan
• Overall, the proportion of people facing severe food insecurity (Phase 3 or worse) in South Sudan has increased from 19 percent in September 2014 to 58 percent in September 2018
• The absolute number of food insecure peaked in 2017 and 2018.

Partnerships for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR)

• **Vision:** To simultaneously resolve the political impasse, deal with increasing humanitarian needs, and build the resilience of citizens, communities, and institutions.

• **Links and coordinates diverse partner activities** working with the same people in shared locations.

• Coordinates and integrates complementary humanitarian and development assistance activities allowing for donors, UN entities, and NGOs to **adjust as communities increase resilience over time.**

• **Focuses on cooperation, co-location, and coordination** across four pillar areas:
  - Re-establish Access to Basic Services
  - Rebuild Trust in People and Institutions
  - Restore Productive Capacities
  - Nurture Effective Partnerships

• **Common data sets for baselining, benchmarking and priority-setting**
What data was collected for Resilience Profiles?

- Community Household Resilience Surveys completed by Management System International (MSI) in 2018;
- Data collected from the seven Counties in South Sudan: Yambio (570), Awiel West, (643), Torit (445), Wau (622), Bor South (704), Yei (748) and Rumbek East (445);
- Data were collected on basic services, trust and local institutions, and productive capacities;
- Qualitative data gathered from FGDs with farmer groups, adult females, adult males, male youth, female youth, schoolteachers, community-based organizations (CBOs), government peace committees, faith-based organizations (FBOs), and key informant interviews with local leaders, chiefs, executive directors, teachers and peace committees.
Key descriptive findings

- In Torit, Bor, Yei and Rumbek, over 75% of households experienced food shortages in the past year.
- Conflict remains the primary cause of food shortage; however climate shocks play a significant role.
Key descriptive findings

- Most households buy food or rely on relatives in times of shortage (bonding capital).
- Food Aid and foraging for wild plants and animals also help curtail food shortages. Government food aid plays almost no role.
PILLAR 1: TRUST IN PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS
Traditional Chiefs are cited as most important in Bor, Aweil, Yambio, Torit, followed by the Paramount chief. Only in Rumbek, the Paramount Chief is cited as most important followed by the Traditional Chiefs. Local Governments are also commonly cited as second most important institutions after the Chieftaincy.

Major institutions

**TRADITIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ARE THE CORNERSTONES OF ALL THESE COMMUNITIES.**
THE CHIEF(S) SERVE CORE FUNCTIONS INCLUDING PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, RULE OF LAW AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION.
Overall, more trust in chiefs than political leaders across areas. However, in Yambio, Bor, Torit and Yei there is greater confidence, and in Rumbek, Aweil and Wau more ambivalence.
Almost all conflicts are solved by dialogue. Most often by the Traditional Leaders. In Yei, Aweil and Yambio, the UN played a significant role. In Yambio, Bor and to a lesser extent Torit, the FBO played a role; in Yambio, Torit and Bor also Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms were used. In Rumbek and Bor the Police played a role; judiciary is present but weak across CPAs.

Conflict mitigation is a resilience capacity that involves cooperation among institutions centered on dialogue, rooted in elders and traditional leaders. With UN, police and faith-based organizations playing a complementary role.
In Torit, Yambio and Yei, between 40% - 55% believe some people benefit from war.
In Wau and Bor, 30% - 40% believe some people benefit from war.
In Aweil and Rumbek, less than 25% believe some people benefit from war.

Marked differences in people’s perception of who benefitted from the war reflect the war time alliances.
Patriarchal society, elite patronage and elite politics are not seen to play a big role in conflict. Only in Bor and Yambio do over 20% of respondents express concerns about elite politics. Those two locations also ranked highest for trust in chiefs and lowest for trust in politicians.
With the exception of Aweil, over 30% of respondents across all CPAs consider unemployment as a significant driver of conflict. Respondents cite weak conflict resolution mechanisms at a rate of below 30% except for Bor where their concern reaches 40%.
All CPAs cite tribalism, availability of fire arms, and lack of rule of law as significant conflict drivers.
A majority in all CPAs – between 50-90% said lack of trust was a bottleneck to conflict resolution.
A majority in all CPAs – between 50% - 75% said dishonesty among parties.
In Yambio and Yei, 45% - 55% cited external influences.
Very few people said greed by politicians.

Conflct bottlenecks

BottleNecks of trust more so than greed are considered to drive conflict. Trust accrues along ethnic bonds, inter-communal bridges and state-society links.
Bor, Torit, Wau, Yei and Yambio all have a mix of criminal activities. Rumbek and Aweil report the least crime, except in the case of robbery in Rumbek.

Significant variations in crime across areas, which need to be better understood. There appears possible correlation with markets and locations most affected by the civil war.
Teen pregnancy is reported to be most prevalent in Torit, Bor, Wau, and Yei. Prostitution is reported to be most prevalent in Bor, Yei, and Yambio. Rape is reported to be most prevalent in Bor, Yei and Yambio. Rumbek and Aweil report the least gender-related problems.
Alcoholism is high and most prevalent in Torit, Bor, Yei and Wau. Substance abuse was reported as a problem in Bor and Yei. Domestic violence is common, and worst in Torit, Bor, and Yei. Child abuse is common, and worst in Torit, Bor, Yei and Yambio. Rumbek and Aweil display the least prevalence of domestic problems.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS APPEAR MOST SEVERE WHERE SOUTH SUDAN’S CIVIL WAR WAS MOST INTENSE. CHECKING FOR CORRELATIONS WITH OTHER VARIABLES MAY BE USEFUL.
The most cooperation is reported within community (bonding)
Intercommunal Cooperation (bridging) is weak but more so in Torit and Yei and strongest in Rumbek, Wau and Aweil.
State-society (linking) is weakest in Torit and Yei and strongest in Bor, Rumbek and Yambio.

SOCIAL CAPITAL ACROSS ALL ASSETS
SOCIAL CAPITAL ALONG THE BONDS, BRIDGES AND LINKS DIFFER WITHIN AND BETWEEN AREAS. THIS MAY INDICATE DIFFERENCES IN INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIAL CONTRACTS ACROSS AREAS.
For agriculture, inter-community cooperation (bonding) is relatively strong. State-society cooperation (linking) is moderate. Inter-communal cooperation (bridging) is moderate but weakest in Torit and Yei.

For forests, bonding is strong in Torit and Bor, moderate in Aweil and Yambio, and weakest in Wau, Yei and Rumbek. Bridging is only moderate in Wau and weak elsewhere, especially Torit, Wau and Yei. Linking is only moderate in Bor, but weak elsewhere, with conflict in Torit, Yei and Rumbek.

**AGRICULTURE DRIVES MORE COOPERATION THAN FORESTS, WHICH SEEM TO DRIVE MORE CONFLICT.**
Except in Bor and Torit where bonding around land is high, there is only weak intra-communal cooperation. Cooperation significantly drops when land is considered inter-communally (bridging). When the state is involved, land becomes a driver of conflict.

Markets show strong inter-communal bonding across areas except Wau where cooperation is moderate. For bridging, markets continue to promote moderate inter-communal cooperation except in Torit and Yei. For state-society cooperation, markets promote mostly moderate cooperation but strong in Rumbek and Bor.

Land and forests show much less cooperation than agriculture and markets.
Examples of Qualitative Data – causes of conflict

- Female youth - “The actors of this war are youth, especially the men and boys.”
- Male Youth - “Young people are not involved in any activities, which is why we are facing conflict in South Sudan.”
- Peace committee - “When youth of South Sudan see that they have no jobs, they take up arms and go to the bush and do any bad things by a panga, axe, knife or gun.”
- Farmer - “Crimes are committed by unemployed because they don't have jobs. They are looting because they don't have what to do and yet they hold the gun. There are things I have seen.”
- Chief - “Some people need to get power now that is why they go to confuse the youth because they want to get power. Then from the youth, also they need to get power, which is the start because most of them are with the SPLA.”
- Teacher - “The politicians who made arrow boys were against the Government before IO. That’s why I said because of personal interests, politicians used these illiterate boys. That’s the fact I can tell you.”
- Civil servant - “Some big people who are struggling for power and who are from us are involving these boys, telling them that when you fight for me, I will do for you this, when I become this... They are drawing numbers of young people who could have been involved in education.”
- Peace committee - “After the LRA, those boys did not know what do with their guns. Hence they turned the guns against the Government and then the problem erupted and the conflict sparked and spread all over western Equatoria.”
Spatial typology for targeted food and nutrition security interventions

Wim Marivoet a,*, John Ulimwengu b, Fernando Sedano c
RESILIENCE AND DEVELOPMENT TYPOLOGY

Source: Adapted from Pangaribowo et al. (2013).
## PROFILE FOR PA COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA Counties</th>
<th>Agricultural potential</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Efficiency Access</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renk</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>low_struc</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
<td>low_struc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torit, Aweil West, Yambio, Rumbek East/North/Centre</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>medium_struc</td>
<td>low_struc</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yei, Aweil South/North, Wau</td>
<td>lower/higher</td>
<td>medium_struc</td>
<td>low_stoch</td>
<td>medium_stoch, high_stoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aweil Centre</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>medium_struc</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
<td>low_stoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bor South</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aweil East</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>medium_struc</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
<td>medium_stoch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The defining set of inefficiencies for each cluster of CPA counties is indicated in bold. The post-scripts “_struc” and “_stoch” respectively refer to structural and stochastic efficiency levels.
RESILIENCE MEASUREMENT
NOTE:
- FCS: Food consumption score
- HDDI: Household Dietary Diversity
- BASIC: Basic services
- ASSET: Assets
- SSN: Social Safety Net
- ADC: Adaptive Capacities
Note: These variables were constructed from the predicted numbers of household assets and of landholdings, based on asset holdings of similar households in the more detailed FAO-WFP dataset.

NEED TO IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION ON THIS
NOTE: NEED TO IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION ON THIS
ADC

RANKED BY IMPORTANCE

- Number of agricultural livelihood activities
- Number of crop types planted
- Number of non-agricultural livelihood activities
- Educational attainment of head
- Information about natural disasters
GENDER UNBALANCED?

- BASIC: Male 0.7, Female 0.7
- SSN: Male 0.0, Female 0.0
- ASSET: Male 0.5, Female 0.4
- ADC: Male 0.5, Female 0.4
- FCS: Male 0.5, Female 0.3
- HDDS: Male 0.4, Female 0.3

Male and Female categories are indicated by blue and orange bars respectively.
RANKED BY IMPORTANCE

Elasticity: a measure of how much resilience is expected to change as a result of 1% change in individual pillar.

IMPORTANCE OF PILLARS FOR RESILIENCE
Elasticity: a measure of how much resilience is expected to change as a result of 1% change in individual pillar.

Food Security Response to Resilience

Elasticity:
- FCS: ε = +.88
- HDDI: ε = +1.08
- BASIC: ε = +.06
- ASSET: ε = +.12
- SSN: ε = +.01
- ADC: ε = +.03
RESILIENCE AND GENDER

The graph illustrates the resilience index for males and females. The resilience index for males is higher than for females.
Note: We found that the relationship between resilience and pillars is quadratic instead of linear: $y = a + bx + cx^2$; it follows that the minimum value of $y$ corresponds to $x = \frac{-b}{2c}$.
LEVEL OF PILLARS FOR MINIMUM RESILIENCE

Current average

Required for minimum resilience
RESILIENCE AND GOVERNANCE
RESILIENCE AND CONFLICT
RESILIENCE MATTERS FOR FOOD SECURITY
RESILIENCE IS NOT DRIVEN BY ONE FACTOR ONLY;
NOT ALL DRIVERS HAVE SIMILAR EFFECTS;
- ASSETS, BASIC SERVICES AND ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES ARE LEADING THE WAY
PARAMETERS IN EACH PILLAR HAVE DIFFERENT EFFECTS
CROSS-CUTTING FACTORS SUCH AS CONFLICT AND GOVERNANCE MATTER
EVIDENCE CALLS FOR HOLISTIC RECOVERY AND RESILIENCE INTERVENTIONS
CALL FOR IMPROVEMENT OF DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM
What Results Were Prioritized?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision: To simultaneously build a basis for peace, meet humanitarian needs, and build the resilience of citizens, communities, and...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 1: Trust in People and Institutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 1.1</strong> People’s confidence and trust in local and traditional governance institutions that sustain peaceful social co-existence increase by 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 1.2</strong> Maintain the effectiveness of peace and conflict resolution mechanisms for peace and social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 1.3</strong> Increased intra- and state society cooperation on peace by 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 1.4</strong> Increased participation of women in community decision making to 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 2: Restoring Access to Basic Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.1</strong> 25% of the population have access to sustainable, quality, equitable and comprehensive health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.2</strong> 20% increase in school going children (boys &amp; girls) have access to quality, basic, and inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.3</strong> School drop-outs have access to quality and inclusive vocational skills and ALPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.4</strong> 100% of children associated with armed groups are demobilized, capacitated and integrated in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.5</strong> Increased access to basic safe drinking water, sanitation and improved hygiene and sanitation behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.6</strong> Returnees (IDPs and refugees) have access to food and non-food packages to ensure sustainable Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 2.7</strong> Women groups have access to established and functional “women empowerment” centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 3: Strengthening Productive Capacities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 3.1</strong> Increased production and productivity by 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 3.2</strong> At least 75% of surplus producing farmers have access to market and market information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 3.3</strong> Increased and strengthened private sector engagement, financial services and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 3.4</strong> Increased employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 3.5</strong> Sustainable use and management of natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar 4: Nurturing Partnership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 4.1</strong> Colocation in geographic areas based on application of geographic selection criteria to choose x # of bomas as Partnership areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 4.2</strong> Coordination through joint work planning, monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 4.3</strong> Collaboration by performing complimentary tasks to achieve common outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.R. 4.4</strong> Commitment to uphold mutual accountability and put community first</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Joint Work Plan

**Objective:** Operationalize the four Cs (colocation, coordination, collaboration and commitment) in Yambio.

**Overarching theme:** Convergence of people, ideas, resources and efforts.

**A working tool:** Includes Results, Logical Frameworks, Cooperation Mechanisms, Key terms, relevant institutional architecture, M&E and other instruments for planning and operations.

**Inclusive, participatory process** directed by Co-Leads and Pillar Leads with professional facilitative support (53 agencies, 95 participants).
### How was Evidence factored in to JWP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar 1:</th>
<th>Rebuild Trust in Institutions and People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Result 1.1</strong></td>
<td>People’s confidence and trust in local and traditional governance institutions that sustain peaceful social co-existence in Gbudue state increase by 10% by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline levels %</strong></td>
<td>(60% for traditional Authority)( 50% for local government) (38% for Paramount chiefs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% increase targeted</strong></td>
<td>10% of each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>% of respondents who cite various institutions as relevant in their daily lives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intermediate | Maintain the | 90% (Dialogue) | Maintain | • Baseline (90% of dialogue) |
### How was Evidence factored in to JWP?

|Intermediate Result 1.2| Maintain the effectiveness of peace and conflict resolution mechanisms for peace and social cohesion | 90% (Dialogue) | Maintain % | • Baseline (90% of dialogue)  
• Indicator for peace- IGAD CTYSAM- # of violations on the peace agreement.  
• Number of incidents of intercommunal conflicts |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Result 1.3</td>
<td>Increased intra- inter and state society cooperation on peace by 5% in 2019</td>
<td>0.147, -0.24, 0.147</td>
<td>5% increase</td>
<td>Social capital scores for inter-communal (bonding), inter-communal (bridging) and state-society (linking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Result 1.4</td>
<td>Increased participation of women in community decision making to 25% by end 2019</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25% increase</td>
<td>percentage of women respondents who report having been seriously involved in decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institutional Architecture for Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absorptive Capacity</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions are present</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional roles are clearly defined</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have Human resources</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have clearly defined roles</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have access to resources</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have social bonding capital</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Architecture for Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive Capacity</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions are shock aware</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional know early warning signs and stages of shocks</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have emergency response plans</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have access to resources for emergency plans</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have social bonding and linking capital</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institutional Architecture for Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformative Capacity</th>
<th>33.3</th>
<th>38.9</th>
<th>27.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions’ stakeholders participate in preparedness and response planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions employ evidence-based approaches</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions action ready</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions employ a cooperative approach</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have a and use resilience feedback loops</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions are inclusive</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions have social bonding and linking capital</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“You who are gathered here deal with a lot of papers whereas in our tradition, we enter through the front door to face an issue. So, I am happy to see these papers, but I will be even more happy when the Partnership enters through the door and begins this work in our villages. That is why we established the community development committees CDCs.”
Next Steps

1. Engage CDCs at boma level to ensure clear understanding of the Partnership and the JWP.
2. Work through the CDCs to secure the statistics of targeted Bomas to refine baselines and indicators.
3. Begin working towards establishment of a data center that can continue surveys.
4. Further prioritize key results and convergence points in targeted Bomas for collaboration.
5. Use Food for Work / Assets for Work as the model for how assets can be converted into community labor within a convergence framework thereby linking humanitarian inputs to other activities, particularly.
6. Map partners’ activities against the selected bomas and payams.
7. Train and accompany CDCs and Champions to uphold and implement the JWP, including facilitation of the convergence process.
8. Formalize rules and procedures governing structures and processes laid out in this JWP.
9. Align JWP M&E system and Partnership M&E system, including harmonizing the learning agenda.
10. Formulate a strategic communications plan that will document the learning in Yambio.
The JWP is only as good as its practical application. If the JWP can now serve as a living document, convergence of people, ideas, resources and efforts around agreed upon priorities will be more likely. That is why in addition to the results, a mechanism is proposed for more flexible and adaptive management.
Thank You