**DIALOGUE ON BUILDING RESILIENCE TO HUNGER IN SOUTH SUDAN: PANEL DISCUSSION;**

***Question 2 (to Nellie Kingston): We have heard about what works but we are also interested to learn from what does not work so well in South Sudan. So, what are the traps that we must avoid?***

* **NOT HAVING LEADERSHIP** at to ensure that resilience programme does not become diluted; and that resilience building is embedded in organisational understanding and is communicated externally to programme participants, stakeholders and actors.
* **NOT HAVING** **A SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF RESILIENCE PROGRAMMING**, its scope, depth and reach – time consuming, process orientated, multi-level, multi-stakeholder. It requires a long-term commitment outside of the many programme funding cycles. The lens or focus of a specific programme: hunger, climate change or conflict which were mentioned is sub-ordinate because building resilience seeks to address the hazards identified by those who are vulnerable. Activities should therefore not be prescriptive as they are designed following the identification of hazard and risk.
* **NOT DOING A ROBUST, MULTI-HAZARD RISK ANALYSIS** – considering human derived and natural hazards. Reducing the vulnerability of people to hazards requires an understanding of and addressing the **causes of vulnerability** (usually socially constructed): poverty, hunger, climate extremes, inequality and conflict. **DRR is a cornerstone of community resilience building** and helps communities cope with shocks and stresses, adapting to changes and transforming the risk context; making it **a critical component of sustainable alleviation of extreme poverty and eradication of hunger.**
* **NOT ENGAGING** **WITH VULNERABLE PEOPLE, COMMUNITIES, AND LINKING COMMUNITIES TO ALL LEVELS AND STAKEHOLDERS**, including and especially government. Where this is not possible, linking with governance structures that exist –traditional and political-administrative. Community governance structures must be recognised by meso and macro level institutions. The degree of acceptance from the wider community will influence how well these institutions will function. It is better to use established community governance institutions, rather than creating new institutions, although government policies should be followed if they exist; and developed through support if they do not. Within weak government institutions and systems are capable staff who are willing to engage and this is an important sustainability factor. Positive engagement at the local level especially is possible.
* **NOT INVESTING IN THE CAPACITY OF MULTIPLE ACTORS** if the underlying causes of risk and vulnerability are to be addressed. Strengthening institutions is a major component DRR and resilience building - directly and indirectly providing institutional bodies with greater economic, physical, political, or social resources to implement DRR.
* **NOT IMPLEMENTING COORDINATED APPROACHES** and integrating short- and long-term interventions and to work in multiple sectors. Strategic partnerships with other organisations add value and introduce different capacities. Ensuring that DRR received adequate support from government, and a DRR institutional structure is in place and functioning, often requires high degrees of advocacy at national level, and consortium approaches (joint ventures) can be a vehicle for this. A consortium can be a platform for a unified voice, messages, and sets of practices, and can improve the chance that approaches get adopted by governments at either local or national levels; and importantly one which can bring scale.
* **NOT PROMOTING PROTECTION MECHANISMS**: safety nets, contingencies, and social protection may act as mechanisms to stop people falling into crisis without resorting to harmful behaviour or negative coping strategies. Vulnerable people should be linked to national social protection mechanisms where they exist, but safety nets can also be community based such as grain and fodder banks or saving circles.
* **NOT ADDRESSING INEQUALITY (including gender)** bytackling the power imbalances that keep people poor and vulnerable. Factors such as gender inequality or lack of access to power often lie at the root of more visible causes of vulnerability. Risks and hazards affect men, women, boys and girls differently.
* **NOT LINKING TO EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS** - early warning early action. The anticipation of hazards, and allowing for emergency responses to happen, if possible, before a crisis occurs (the principle of EWEA). Coping and recovering capacity are the capacities to ‘live through’ a disaster, and then return back to the pre-disaster situation or, hopefully, a better one. Coping capacity can be significantly improved if vulnerable people can anticipate an event which allows them to take appropriate action such as seeking shelter, and safeguarding their productive assets. There will always be hazards whose impacts overwhelm community resources, requiring an emergency response[[1]](#footnote-1).
* **NOT DEVELOPING AN EXIT STRATEGY FROM THE OUTSET** prevents institutions from becoming fit for purpose in taking on the challenge of resilience building. This is a critical component of sustainability. Fostering a culture of innovation and learning is equally critical. The social, political, economic and environmental contexts change, and institutions and the people that they represent need to keep up with these changes, address the unexpected, and learn from experiences. This is especially important when considering the impacts of **climate change and uncertainty** regarding the future.
* Resilience is the ability of an individual, a household, a community, a country or a region to **withstand, adapt and to quickly recover** from stresses and shocks. (EU Communication on Resilience)
* Disaster **Resilience** is the ability of countries, communities and households to **manage change**, by **maintaining or transforming living standards** in the face of shocks or stresses - such as earthquakes, drought or violent conflict - without compromising their **long-term prospects**. **(DFID)**
* The ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to **mitigate, adapt to, and recover** from shocks and stresses in a manner that **reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth**. (USAID)
* *Community* resilience is ‘*the ability of all vulnerable households or individuals that make up a community, to* ***anticipate, respond to, cope with, and recover from the effects of shocks, and to adapt*** *to stresses in a timely and effective manner without compromising their long-term prospects of moving out of poverty.* (Concern Worldwide)

1. A trap can be to focus on **preventing hazards from occurring** not **reducing impacts**, particularly those which are purely natural in origin. **Engineered** preventative or scale limiting solutions are **expensive** and should only be used when hazard exposure is high enough to warrant the expense, and when they cannot be sufficiently reduced with **NRM**. It is important to also consider that community asset creation should focus on a natural resource base rather than on artificially created ‘assets’ which are only sustainable as long as a programme is in place. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)