|  |
| --- |
| **http://southsudanngoforum.org/assets/img/ngo-forum-97x67.png**  **Resilience Exchange Network Launch**  **27 March, 2018**  **Coordination**  **Networking**  **Engagement**  **Knowledge-Sharing**  **e-Platform**  **Representation**  **Collaboration**  **Advocacy**  **Learning** |

**Resilience Exchange Network - Notes**

Table

[1. Terms of Reference for the Resilience Exchange Network 3](#_Toc511144598)

[2. Key agreements of the Resilience Exchange Network 3](#_Toc511144599)

[3. NGO Presentations 4](#_Toc511144600)

[3.1. CRS: Resilience and Food Security Program Case study on resilience programming in conflict- affected Greater Jonglei 4](#_Toc511144601)

[3.2. Save the Children: Cash Plus Programming towards Building Resilience 6](#_Toc511144602)

[3.3. ACTED: BRACED: Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters 7](#_Toc511144603)

[4. Donor presentation on resilience perspective 9](#_Toc511144604)

[4.1. USAID 9](#_Toc511144605)

[4.2. DFID 9](#_Toc511144606)

[5. Donor Initiative 10](#_Toc511144607)

[5.1. Technical assistance for increased agriculture production of smallholders in South Sudan: EU TA mapping system 10](#_Toc511144608)

[6. UN perspective on coordination on resilience 11](#_Toc511144609)

[6.1. FAO: Resilience Index Measurement and analysis Model-II RIMA-II 11](#_Toc511144610)

[6.2. UNEP: Overview of National Meteorological and Hydrological Services in South Sudan 11](#_Toc511144611)

[7. Events: Suggestions and up-coming events 12](#_Toc511144612)

# 1. Terms of Reference for the Resilience Exchange Network

**Objective of the Network**

* To facilitate **networking** and **coordination** of NGOs engaged in resilience programming in South Sudan.
* To provide a **platform** through which NGOs **share knowledge, expertise and learning on resilience** programming; and potential mainstreaming of the resilience agenda within and across development and humanitarian interventions in South Sudan.
* To provide opportunities for **joint representation and communication** on resilience programming with the wider humanitarian infrastructure through internal and external collaboration and engagement.

**Structure :**

* Coordinated by a Technical Working Group of five NGO representatives
* Initial selection of the Working Group was completed during the initial discussion phase
* Will be reconfirmed (or replaced) by the end of June 2018
* Coordinate the functions of the Resilience Exchange Network as outlined in this terms of reference including meetings and minutes (on monthly basis),
* Develop plans and circulate to members to facilitate communication of events or activities organised by the Resilience Exchange Network members or other interested parties.

**Current members of the working group**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Organisation | Type of NGO | Position | Current WG Member Delegate |
| Concern Worldwide | INGO | Chair | (Nellie) Eileen Kingston |
| Goal | INGO | Member | Semalegn Belay Abdissa |
| South Sudan Grassroots Initiative for Development | NNGO | Member | Timothy Kasimolo |
| Save the Children | INGO | Member | Gezahegn Eshete |
| CRS | INGO | Member | Girma Yadete |

# 2. Key agreements of the Resilience Exchange Network

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Program resilience flexibility: Resilience programs should support communities in shifting from emergency to recovery and from recovery to development. This progression depends on community needs and the context and resilience programs will need to be tailored to communities pace. 2. Resilience program have to include multi-sectorial interventions under agriculture, livestock, WASH, NFI distribution, GFD, FFA, etc. 3. Invest in building local capacity: Programs have to be designed to facilitate and encourage cooperation with communities, manage DRR committees who can support the committees to manage the shocks. 4. Hire local staff as much as possible (from the area were the project is implemented) 5. Collaborate with local NGOs, with various partners and with government agencies. 6. Include accountability mechanisms in project design (e.g. feedback and response mechanisms) 7. Ensure the political will of the various actors in the area (specifically government agencies) before starting a project. 8. Resilience programming is a long term commitment |

# 3. NGO Presentations

## 3.1. CRS: Resilience and Food Security Program Case study on resilience programming in conflict- affected Greater Jonglei

- Jonglei Food Security Program (JFSP) 2011-2017

- Resilience and Food Security Program (RFSP) 2017-2018

These programs have been directly implemented by consortium of CRS and Save the Children in Greater Jonglei. They enabled to create:

* Strong partnerships with Government technical ministries and RRC;
* Sector activities at payam and boma level in disaster risk reduction (DRR), farming, livestock and fisheries, value chain, savings and market access, WASH and nutrition;

**Identified root causes for food insecurity in Jonglei:**

* **Conflict:** Link between food insecurity, political instability, social dysfunction resulting from conflict;
* **Extreme natural shocks:** drought, floods, and pests;
* **Extreme seasonality and** access difficulties;
* **Weak infrastructure** and under-development compared to other states;
* **High degree of relief dependence** from the 1983- 2005 war and community expectation of free handouts from donors and INGOs

Objective of resilience programming:

* Strengthen community capacity
* Expand food production
* Reduce aid dependence
* Behavior change
* Manage trauma
* Reduce revenge violence

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2011-2013**  **Resilience and development phase** | **February 2014**  **Outbreak of the civil war: From development to emergency intervention** |
| Built self-development and resilience at community level;  Expanded community assets using food for work;  Achieved behavior change in agriculture, agro-forestry, pasture and livestock sectors;  Expanded market access and increased savings and lending;  Technology transfer on improved production practices  Built technical capacity of the agriculture and livestock extension service through secondment of FEAs and training of staff.  Employed more than 420 local staff;  Secondment of 60 government field extension agents in fisheries, agriculture, livestock and forestry;  Established 413 savings and loan groups supervised by 47 field agents; | * After the December 2013 crisis, JFSP distributed food to save lives and support return of IDPs; * Provided NFIs (hygiene, household, shelter) for recovery; * Provided emergency supplementary nutrition (HEB, CSB++) and awareness raising on child feeding; * Trained communities on trauma awareness and recovery; |

Since 2013 Emergency 🡪 Recovery 🡪 Resilience and livelihood

* Pivot between activities based on changing livelihoods status of beneficiaries;
* Respond flexibly within context of local insecurity and access constraints;

**Resilience programming content:**

* Sector1: Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) through asset creation (FFA)
* Sector 2: Improved farming production
* Sector 3: Improve livestock through restocking
* Strengthen fisheries value chain
* Strengthen market linkages and access to rural credit
* WASH

**More than 80% of JFSP’s project participants are rural women, they are the one that underpin community resilience**

**CRS approach to trauma awareness with rival communities in Duk**

* Train local leaders & beneficiaries on trauma awareness;
* Facilitate peace meeting between rival communities (Dinka & Nuer);
* Support connector project (feeder road)

Resilience Programming success:

* Be local and hire local
* Embrace subsidiarity
* Adapt to local context

## 3.2. Save the Children: Cash Plus Programming towards Building Resilience

**Definition**

Household cash transfers + Complementary context-relevant interventions to address the multiple drivers of childhood deprivations and generate more powerful impacts for children.

**Programming Approach**

Objectives of Cash Plus Programming approach:

* Increase strategic use of income by poor families to invest in their children
* Decrease the likelihood of families resorting to coping practices
* Increase the usage and quality of local basic services and their impacts for the wellbeing

**Type of complementary support** that can be brought along with Cash Plus Programming:

* Components that are provided as ***integral*** elements of the cash transfer intervention
* Components that are ***external*** to the intervention but offer explicit linkages into services provided by other sectors

***Designing Cash plus interventions by adapting to the local contexts through***:

* Conducting a ***problem specific causal analysis*** to identify the combinations of “cash and plus”:
* The causal analysis should guide the ***choice of the combination*** of measures that could best respond to the causes;
* Conducting a ***participatory*** discussion process to agree on the best potential set of responses.

**Global Efforts (research brief)**

Save the Children conducts a thorough analysis of 106 studies specifically on ‘**Child outcomes of cash transfer programming: A synthesis of the evidence on survival, education and protection in humanitarian and non-humanitarian contexts**. The underlying hypothesis is that cash transfer programming (CTP) influences child outcomes by expanding households’ budgets and their capacity to spend on Health, Education, and Nutrition/food consumptions without having to resort to negative coping behaviours that are harmful to children and their development such as child labour, early marriage, neglect of their nutritional and health needs.

**Findings and Conclusions**

The study concludes its findings on the role of cash transfers’ in child outcome pathways and its contributions towards building resilience by providing the following key conclusions:

* CTP as a whole ***significantly and positively contribute to the key outcome areas*** of child survival, education, and protection
* CTP have the most ***consistently positive impact on those outcomes most directly influenced by an influx of cash*** (e.g. school enrolment/attendance, food consumption or use of preventive health-care services)
* However, extensive evidences show that cash alone is not enough in some cases.For instance, cash transfer could not be adequate in addressing malnutrition where the underlying causes are so complex. Hence, complementary interventions needed to address multiple drivers of child malnutrition.

***Building on those synthesis of evidences, Save the Children is implementing or supporting wide range of ‘Cash Plus’ Programs in different countries* by shifting its approaches from Cash alone transfer to Cash Plus.**

**Piece of works in South Sudan (Implementation) related to *Cash plus*:**

Save the Children Cash Plus Pilots:

**Location:** Aweil East, NBeG

**Funding:** Dutch MOFA & SCUK Pooled Funds

**Year:** 2017 completed

**Year:** 2018 (to start in April)

In 2017, packages of interventions provided to 9,400 HHs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | **Activities** | **Number of beneficiary households** |
| Group I | Cash (Conditional) + Agric inputs + WASH | 1,300 households |
| Group II | Cash (Unconditional) + Agric inputs + WASH |
| Group III | Agric inputs + WASH | 8,100 households |

**Preliminary findings and lessons drawn from implementation of cash plus interventions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Types of data collected** | **Type of assessments conducted** | **Findings** |
| * Household interviews (n=450) * Focus groups discussions (15) * KII (4) * Case stories (8) * Observations (20 Bomas) | * Post distributions monitoring in September 2017 * Post-harvest monitoring in January 2018 * Impact/Operational aspect of Cash distributions in January 2018 | Findings to be sharable in April-May 2018 at the appropriate platforms (FSL Cluster or Resilience Exchange Network) |

## 3.3. ACTED: BRACED: Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters

**Understanding climate: Flood impact assessment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data collection methods** | **Key findings** |
| * Detailed analysis of historical flood data; * Satellite imagery; * Assessment of long-term weather patterns; * Review of climate change literature; * Quantitative and qualitative data collection. | * There has been a shift in seasonality, especially rains, which start later and cause more damage. Flash floods damage or destroy crops before they can be harvested; * Flooding is seen by some as positive; * Dyke building is the primary disaster risk reduction activity, but is often ineffective due to tool shortages and powerful floods; * Floods can drive conflict through displacement, but can also offer a reprieve when communities are cut off. |

**Learning from people: Building resilience to climate extremes**

*Ethnographic research*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key area of research** | **Key findings** |
| * + Perceptions of climate change;   + Flood and drought;   + Coping and adaptation strategies;   Access to/perceptions of early warning/weather information | * Whilst understanding of the concept and root causes of climate change is low, there is a clear understanding that a change has occurred in weather patterns; * People rely heavily on traditional mechanisms; * Many people doubt their capacity to adapt to a changing climate and speak of the need of a higher power or NGO intervention to help them cope. * Agro-pastoralists with larger herds, those who have salaried positions or receive remittances, and those with kin support have the greatest adaptive capacity. * Widows, the elderly and the infirm are the most vulnerable to climatic shocks; * Adaptive capacity is low, anticipatory capacity is low and adaptive capacity is extremely low = high vulnerability. |

**Building resilience: IRISS-BRACED project**

First project of its kind in South Sudan, the BRACED project build resilience through the following activities:

* 1. Improved agricultural practices through APFS, CAHWs and VCD;
  2. Social protection through VSLA;
  3. Disaster management planning and adaptation through CRPCs, SECs, CLTS and weather forecast/early warning information.

Key findings from the final evaluation:

* Though facing considerable challenges, **“BRACED has demonstrated that climate change resilience…and development is feasible in South Sudan”**;
* Improved resilience to drought and floods of targeted farmers, with female participants improving at a faster rate than male participants;
* APFS have improved production (+31% in beans, 21% in mangoes, 17% in onions, 16% in millet, 15% in tomatoes…);
* VLSAs have promoted saving and diversified income (+34% saving);
* Challenges in rolling out CRPCs and weather forecasting.

# 4. Donor perspective on resilience programming

## 4.1. USAID

Knowledge about resilience will become more important in the upcoming months and years.

We are witnessing the erosion of the population’s coping capacities. Strengthening population’s resilience leads us the question: How do we rebuild the population coping capacities?

We need to stop the trend of growing vulnerability. There will be different ways to achieve this in different geographic areas. We want to see multi partner / multi agency geographically focused partnerships for recovery and resilience that can operate at scale to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience. A key criteria for identifying geographic areas to focus on, for partnerships for recovery and resilience, is:

* Readiness of local authorities to create an environment that enables partners to cooperate with and deliver services to people, households and communities to build resilience.

The expectations of actors implementing resilience programs are going to increase. Actors will need to prove the impacts of the resilience programs and the delivery of results. Among other things, there will be increased attention to measuring resilience. A strategic focus will be needed to measure the status and change of resilience.

## 4.2. DFID

The Resilience Exchange Network initiative is very welcome as there will be an increased attention on resilience in the future.

Such an initiative is important for sharing good practices, approaches to collate information on what is working and for building some evidence.

From a donor perspective: we will put an emphasis on the clarity of shared information and practices, on what work and doesn’t work.

Donors are interested in measuring if you are reaching change, through assessments but also by understanding the context.

How to work with local community: supporting communities to achieve what they what for themselves.

* Please, explain your approach.
* What is the exit strategy?
* Donors will have a preference for approaches and models that are scalable.

Keep in mind that resilience projects are implemented in a broader context. For example, if your organization increases resilience, we are supposed to lower humanitarian needs (e.g. food distribution, seeds distributions, etc.). It is important to communicate with multi-sector partners.

Explain what are the main vulnerabilities that you try are trying to address. Try to talk with communities to work with them to understand their problems and adopt a multi-sectorial approach to address their real problems. Look at options to create partnership to be more effective.

# 5. Donor Initiative

## 5.1. Technical assistance for increased agriculture production of smallholders in South Sudan: EU TA mapping system

**Critical issues and reasons for an EU TA mapping system:**

* Lack of effective **coordination** among donors and IPs.
* Lack of clear and relevant **baseline data**: these data are central to monitor and assess the EU projects.
* Field data and project reporting with no or not clear reference to **locations**.
* Data are not collected **regularly**.
* Logical frameworks need to include **realistic indicators** that require projects to capture qualitative information. Indicators should reflect achievements rather than delivery of activities.
* Discrepancies in data collection **methods**.
* Lack of common **market database** repository.
* Lack of information about **livestock**, **pastoralists** livelihood, **mortality**, **pastoral production**.

**Expected results from an EU TA mapping system:**

1. Monitoring of individual projects or the EU/SS rural development programmes ensured
2. Overall coherence of all EU/SS rural development programmes ensured
3. Effective coordination of all activities, agencies and stakeholders involved is ensured.

**System basic characteristics:**

* Web based
* Compulsory for all EU-funded projects
* Open to all other donors and agencies
* Devoted to resilience/RD initiatives

**The shared** database **will be an excel file on which the organization will have to indicate:**

* **Who:** name of the implementing organization and contacts
* **Where:** State, County, Payam, Village (with GPS coordinate)
* **What:** Activity description, expected results and percentage of completion
* **For whom:** Description of targeted group, total number of beneficiary households, total number of individuals (disaggregated female/male)
* **When:** when the activities are planned, ongoing or completed, start and end date, reporting month

All this information will be centralized on an interactive map. All the stakeholders (government agencies included) will have access to this information.

During the question period: some guests raised reservations about sharing sensitive data that could compromise beneficiaries’ security in specific contexts.

# 6. UN perspective on coordination on resilience

## 6.1. FAO: Resilience Index Measurement and analysis Model-II RIMA-II

RIMA (Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis) is an innovative **quantitative approach** that estimates **resilience to food insecurity** and generates the evidence for more effectively assisting vulnerable populations.

RIMA allows explaining **why and how some households cope with shocks and stressor better than others do** and provides rigorous framework for humanitarian and long-term development initiatives to build food secure and resilient livelihoods.

**RIMA perfectly suits several definitions of resilience:**

* The ability to prevent disasters and crises as well as to anticipate, absorb, accommodate or recover from them in a timely, efficient and sustainable manner (FAO, 2013)
* The capacity of a household to bounce back to a previous level of well-being (for instance food security) after a shock (Alinovi, Mane & Romano, 2009)
* The capacity that ensures adverse stressors and shocks do not have long-lasting adverse development consequences (Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group of the Food Security Information Network, 2014)

**For the first time RIMA enabled us to collect data at the county level.**

Household resilience relies on 4 pillars:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Social safety net (SSN) |
| 1. Access to basic service (ABS) |
| 1. Assets (AST) |
| 1. Adaptive capacity (AC) |

There is a complex procedure to calculate the RIMA score.

The Rima score enable to:

* Identify the lacks of the population
* Identify the main shocks that affect the population
* Identify resilience drivers and areas of improvement
* Gender disaggregated data enable to explain why man headed households are more resilient than female-headed households.

## 6.2. UNEP: Overview of National Meteorological and Hydrological Services in South Sudan

Background and literature review have suggested that climate change will continue to lead to new hazards, more intense and frequent weather and climate extremes. Every year natural hazards are causing significant loss of lives and economy, damage to infrastructure and erode development gains.Most commonly reported disasters are directly or indirectly related to weather or climate.

**South Sudan Households Shocks:**

* In Dec 2017, high food prices, insecurity and drought/irregular rain were the three main shocks reported by households
* In the same assessment: significant proportion of households reported shocks which could be related to climate: drought/dry spell/irregular rain, crop pest/disease, illness and epidemics.

Reasons why South Sudan is more vulnerable to Climate Change threats and hazards: SSD hasn’t built an effective resilience system and an effective disaster risk reduction (DRR) management strategy that can prevent threats from climate extremes to mature into disaster

**National weather and climate information and services**

* Mandate of the national meteorological hydrological services (NMHSs) is globally given to government; SSMD for South Sudan – Not development partners;
* All NMHSs linked to WMO global observation, modeling, forecasting and communication network systems
* Maximum gain from the WMO global systems requires:
  + Strong national MET services;
  + Adequate human and technical capacity;
  + National data, and
  + Also linked to climate sensitive institutions

All are inadequate in South Sudan MET

**Climate products and services in terms of past climatic data, short-medium-long range weather forecasting from NMHSs that can help government and development partners to build an effective resilience system. As mandated institution South Sudan Meteorology Directorate is best placed to obtain and distribute these products and services.**

**Recommendations for South Sudan NMHSs**

* Implementation of NMHSs strategy
* Capacity development needs (Human and technical) across the different levels
* Communication and networking (partners’ facilities)
* Leadership, Coordination, Collaboration
* Sustainable program and funding
* Advocacy (visibility, Education and awareness)

# 7. Events: Suggestions and up-coming events

**What kind of events would you like to attend in the future?**

* Awareness on RIMA II

**Upcoming events**

* FEED learning event in April/May (to be communicated)

**Thank you for attending the first Resilience Exchange Network!**