

JULY 3rd, 2019

**DRAFT REPORT OF INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE FOR RECOVERY AND RESILIENCE WORKSHOP IN AWEIL, SOUTH SUDAN**

Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR)

Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR)

# CONTENTS

[Executive Summary 4](#_Toc15216785)

[Background 7](#_Toc15216786)

[Institutional Architecture Assessment (IAz4R) 7](#_Toc15216787)

[Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR) 7](#_Toc15216788)

[Institutional Architecture Assessment for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R) 9](#_Toc15216789)

[Foundations for Institutional Architecture for Resilience and Recovery (IAA4R) 9](#_Toc15216790)

[Customizing Institutional Architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R) To South Sudan 11](#_Toc15216791)

[Aweil Institutional Architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R) 13](#_Toc15216792)

[Introduction 13](#_Toc15216793)

[Methodology 13](#_Toc15216794)

[Discussion of key concepts and Presentation of IAA4R 13](#_Toc15216795)

[Strengths and Weaknesses of Institutions 13](#_Toc15216796)

[Administration of the IAA4R Tool 15](#_Toc15216797)

[Developing the Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan 15](#_Toc15216798)

[Aweil Institutional Capacity Gaps and Proposed Interventions Per Pillar 15](#_Toc15216799)

[Developing Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan 16](#_Toc15216800)

[Conclusion and Recommendations 18](#_Toc15216801)

[Conclusion 18](#_Toc15216802)

[Recommendations 18](#_Toc15216803)

[Annex I: Strengths and Weaknesses of Aweil Institutions 19](#_Toc15216804)

[Annex II: Institutional Capacity Gaps and Proposed Interventions Per Pillar 21](#_Toc15216805)

[Annex III : Aweil IAA4R Action Plan 24](#_Toc15216806)

[Annex IV: Program for Aweil IAA4R Workshop 27](#_Toc15216807)

[Annex V: Aweil IAA4R Workshop Participants List 29](#_Toc15216808)

[Annex VI: Aweil IAA4R Participants by Gender 31](#_Toc15216809)

[Annex VII: Institutional Capacity for Resilience Assessment   
Framework Revised (IA4R) Tool 32](#_Toc15216810)

# List of Figures

[Figure 1: Institutional Architecture, Households and Communal Assets 9](#_Toc15217133)

# List of Tables

[Table 1: Institutions identified by Participants as critical Per Pillar 10](#_Toc15217181)

[Table 2: concrete actions for Aweil IAA4R 17](#_Toc15217182)

# Executive Summary

On June 19th and 20th 2019, Africa Lead facilitated an Institutional Architecture Assessment for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R) Workshop in Aweil, South Sudan for the Partnership for Resilience and Recovery (PfRR). A total of 37 people attended the two day event that was preceded by a Resilience Profiles Study validation. The participants included members from local NGOs, private sector, civil society, community based organizations, international NGOs, UN Agencies, and traditional and local authorities (See Annex V).

Results from the 2018 South Sudan Community Resilience Household Perception Survey conducted by the USAID-funded Monitoring and Evaluation Support Project (MESP) were used to provide a basis for discussion of Aweil Institutional Profiles. Data and information that had been collected from the field were presented and validated, thereby enabling participants to better understand the institutional architecture in Aweil. In the process of validation the four Pillars of the Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (Pillar one- Rebuilding Trust in people and institutions, Pillar two – Access to Basic services, Pillar three – Restoring Productive capacities and Pillar four – Nurturing Partnerships) were introduced.

This event marked the second time that Africa Lead tested out the Institutional Architecture for Resilience (IAA4R) tool that was created and customized for South Sudan and other fragile states. This customization was based on the fusion of the resilience conceptual framework that incorporates absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities, and the partnership for recovery and resilience (PfRR) pillars. To accommodate the concerns of Aweil participants, the initial IAA4R tool was revised and adjustments made replacing the three colour code (Red, Green and Yellow) with digits (1, 2 and 3) and a new format for choice of institutions adopted. The choice of institutions in the revised version of the IAA4R tool now focuses on assessing each individual institution on the resilience parameters.

In the first instance, participants listed the critical institutions for the PfRR in the respective pillars except for the nurturing Partnerships pillar (Pillar four) that is yet to take shape in Aweil.

**Pillar one**: County Government, Office of the commissioner, Community development, County Court, County Council, Land council, Department of co-operatives, Cotal (Council of traditional authority and leaders), Rural water department (WASH), Department of education, Department of health, Peace committees, CBOs, FBOs, women and youth groups, trade unions ,UN agencies, INGOs and Law enforcement agencies (Police and JudicIAAry).

**Pillar two**: Government line ministries [WASH, Education, Health, and Protection – Child social welfare], INGOs, UN Agencies, Traditional Authorities, Women Groups, Youth Groups, Private sector, Community structures (Peace committee, Council of Chiefs and elders), NNGOs, CBOs and FBOs.

**Pillar three**: Government Ministries (MAARF, Water and Irrigation, Infrastructure), Private sector (Financial institutions, Agro-input dealers, Extension services), Research and training institutions (Universities and colleges, Research centres) and Development Partners (UN Agencies, NGOs, CBOs, INGOs, CSOs, FBOs).

Government line Ministries were identified as critical in all the Pillars in the same vein as UN Agencies, INGOs, NGOs, CBOs, CBOs and FBOs. Traditional authorities, Peace Committees, women and youth groups are considered critical in Pillars one and two while Private sector is critical in Pillars two and three.

The strengths and weaknesses of the identified critical institutions were outlined as follows:

**Pillar one strengths:**

institutional architecture survey was administered in written form on the last day of the workshop. Sixty-two participants completed and submitted the survey questionnaire. The findings were later analyzed and the results are presented below. Based on the responses, it appears that the tool was understandable and appropriate for people to fill in. In the future, the facilitation team should hold a discussion session for participants following the completion of the survey. The results indicate that while some institutions and institutional aspects were optimal, there are several that were sub-optimal and require capacity development to ensure successful implementation of the JWP.

The role of institutions in the development and implementation of JWP and PfRR was exemplified during the workshop. The results of the administration of the IAA4R tool offer a critical validation for the institutional profiles obtained from the community resilience household perception survey. This implies that the community resilience household perception surveys are invaluable to the IAA4R just as much the IAA4R itself simultaneously informsJWP and PfRR.

The main strengths listed by Pillar one hinged on the existence of governance institutions relating to law and order, local government, State/County legislative councils and peace committees. These strengths are important peace building initiatives. The key weaknesses of the Pillar one institutions relate to inadequacy in the interpretation of all laws (specifically customary ones, Local government Act, among others), weak management and communication skills, inadequate human resources, inadequate knowledge of roles and poor gender representation. These weaknesses translate into deficiencies in performance by the governance institutions.

### Pillar Two:

The major strengths under Pillar Two were identified as the existence of basic services delivery institutions, willingness and commitment to work and the presence of technical working groups such as Clusters and humanitarian forum. These institutions facilitate the delivery of basic services to the community even in remote areas. Pillar Two institutional weaknesses identified as duplication of interventions in certain cases, limited logistics, inadequate specialized human resource (particularly Health workers and Teachers) and inadequate funding. The identification of duplication of interventions at this point relates directly to the need for a partnership approach in restoring basic services in Aweil as envisaged in the PfRR

The main strengths of PfRR’s Pillar Three identified in Aweil included the existence of coordination structures such as the Food Security Cluster (FSL), presence of agro-input dealers and the existence of extension service, research and training services structures. The strengths of Pillar Three as identified, may contribute to a smooth takeoff of PfRR in Aweil. The major weaknesses of Pillar Three were found to be of concern for the partnership especially considering that it included poor coordination ability, inadequate capacity of researchers and trainers and the absence of agro-input dealers’ association. In this case, poor coordination as a weakness implies the critical need for PfRR’s Pillar 4 on nurturing partnerships.

The key institutional capacity gaps identified by Pillar one are poor management skills, ineffective community mobilization, inadequate training on and in interpretation of laws and inadequate technical skills among government staff.

The proposed interventions for Pillar one reflect a major need for human resource capacity development with specific emphasis on management skills, community mobilization, technical skills and legislation (judiciary and customary).

Pillar two capacity gaps included low involvement of parents in school affairs, poor health referral system and high turnover of technical personnel in government institutions while the proposed interventions for the capacity gaps are formation and strengthening of Parents Teachers Associations (PTAs) to improve parents’ involvement in school affairs especially in supporting school activities targeting increased retention and completion rates.

### Pillar Three:

Pillar three were lack of clear policies on land ownership, limited technical skills of extension workers, lack of umbrella private sector associations such as Agri-input dealers and heavy focus on humanitarian and emergency support by development partners. These capacity gaps skew the development patterns in Aweil, retards self-reliance and diminishes private sector involvement in development. The proposed interventions to address the institutional capacity gaps for this pillar include clear definition of roles, formation of strong private sector umbrella associations, pursuit of alternative livelihoods and a shift toward resilience building.

### Pillar Four:

As Pillar four in Aweil is yet to be fully constituted, the capacity gaps identified are essentially requirements for setting up Pillar four. The public sector is generally perceived as having low capacity in terms of resources (human and finance) and technical expertise to deliver on its mandate, the private sector lacks the mechanisms with which to engage in the PfRR and Development Partners lack a structured coordination mechanism. The interventions proposed include investments in improving the host government’s technical capacity in key areas, address the near exclusion of private sector from development interventions by supporting their involvement and engagement in the PfRR and strengthen mechanisms aimed at nurturing partnerships.

An Aweil IAA4R improvement plan was developed and action plan proposed on the basis of concrete actions derived from the IAA4R tool.

These concrete actions are:

**Pillar one:** Enhance law enforcement (Police, Army, Judiciary, Customary Court and Traditional Authorities), Promote good governance (Local Government), Promote Effective State/County Legislative Councils, Enhance representation of women in various institutions such as peace committees, School Committees and others

**Pillar two:** Strengthen management system in schools (PTA, SMC, teachers, Back to school campaign/initiative to promote education for all, Make schools learner friendly (ECD, primary facilities), Strengthen primary health care and Back to school campaign/initiative to promote education for all

**Pillar three:** Enhance skills level of extension workers, Strengthen Agro-input dealer’s business skill and capacity to participate in development initiatives, Public awareness on food security and Capacity building for farmers, Enhance skills level of extension workers, Strengthen Agro-input dealer’s business skill and capacity to participate in development initiatives

**Pillar four:** Develop structure for the PfRR coordination platform , Lack of coordinated and joined project planning and monitoring mechanism, Strengthen PfRR networking mechanism, Develop joint funding mechanism and Improve host government technical capacity.

The IAA4R’s usefulness lies in its ability to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the institutions, establish the institutions’ capacity gaps and propose corresponding interventions. It further assists in developing an institutional improvement plan and finally an action plan.

# Background

## Institutional Architecture Assessment (IA4R)

The Institutional Architecture Assessment (IAA) framework was designed to examine the institutional capacities fundamental to policy development and implementation; and to align with the commitments and principles of the African Union’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP).

Since 2013, the USAID Bureau of Food Security, USAID Missions, local policymakers and key stakeholders have guided in-depth Institutional Architecture (IAA) assessments to better understand constraints that prevent effective policy change in the following countries: Ethiopia; Tanzania; Malawi; Ghana; Senegal; and Kenya. IAA’s have emerged as a core component of a country’s successful agricultural transformation, as it brings together local policy makers, key stakeholders, and development partners to collectively analyze a country’s capacity to undertake agriculture and food security policy reform.

According to relevant partners, there is no recourse for individual UN entities, donors, NGOs and technical organizations to act together to reverse the trends of growing vulnerability. In order to do so, this requires collaboration among all stakeholders, and the formulation of tools in the following areas: conflict resolution; basic health, education; WASH services; agriculture and livelihood support; infrastructure; and reconciliation, social cohesion, and peace building efforts.

Due to the significant efforts now underway in South Sudan to reduce vulnerability and build resilience, we can begin to achieve results that lay a foundation for recovery and future development.

## Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR)

In many parts of South Sudan, communities were calling for change, resisting conflict and focusing on recovery. To support this, a different partnership model was called for -- one which relies directly on communities and civil society to drive change in governance, health, education, food and nutrition security and economic well-being. This model calls for increased partnership and accountability between donors, UN agencies, and nongovernmental organizations at both national and local levels.

It is with this background that the Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR) in South Sudan was formed. The PfRR unites donors, UN agencies, and non-governmental organizations to ensure that support reaches the communities and households that require it. PfRR targets seven geographic areas within South Sudan, and builds on community-identified strengths and priorities, while tapping into the remarkable survival abilities of local populations.

The PfRR in South Sudan is committed to a “new way of working” that shifts the focus from “meeting needs” to “reducing needs, risks, and vulnerability”. The Partnership promotes a comprehensive approach that brings together collective efforts to address political solutions, peace building, development, humanitarian, security and environmental dimensions.

Consequently, the PfRR in South Sudan agreed to the following as the core Partnership commitments:

* Decrease vulnerability
* Work together across peace building and humanitarian development efforts to meet basic needs and protect coping capacities
* Improve coordination, collaboration and strategic integration
* Advance comprehensive frameworks and partnerships in selected geographic areas
* Scale up delivery of integrated efforts in selected geographic areas
* Enhance mutual accountability and learning.

To operationalize its functions, the PfRR developed a partnership common framework that guides communities in pursuing four pillar objectives that shape and facilitate alignment around a shared agenda: These four pillar objectives were defined as:

* Rebuild trust in people and institutions
* Re-establish access to basic services
* Restore and build productive capacities and economic opportunities
* Nurture effective partnerships

USAID supports the specialized units of the United Nations (UN) such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), whose core mandate in South Sudan is recovery and stabilization. The Partnership for Recovery and Resilience is focused on durable solutions and agenda-setting between the United Nations, donor partners, external agencies and state and local actors in various areas of South Sudan. This is a large and challenging partnership arrangement for development partners working within the resilience and recovery space in South Sudan. Significant and achievable opportunities exist to leverage these relationships, provide facilitative and collaborative support to the Partnership, bolster champions at the local level, and create a momentum toward stability and improved livelihoods.

To address these issues, Africa Lead, USAID South Sudan, MSI-MESP Project, and UNDP developed a strategic support program that is aimed at enhancing understanding and strengthening of the Institutional Architecture for resilience and recovery in South Sudan.

In partnership with the South Sudan Partnership for Recovery and Resilience, Africa Lead facilitated an Institutional Architecture Assessment for recovery and resilience session that was preceded by a validation of the Resilience Profiles study validation in Aweil, South Sudan. The IAA4R session was intended to inform the PfRR by developing an IAA4R Action Plan.

# Institutional Architecture Assessment for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R)

Based on the lessons learned and experiences with the IAA4R, Africa Lead customized the IAA tool in 2018 to respond to the institutional architecture for recovery and resilience in South Sudan. This included a bottom-up approach to resilience and recovery planning, including mutual accountability, under the partnership for recovery and resilience. The customized recovery and resilience IAA provides a framework for assessing institutional infrastructure, and the tools and approach that can be adapted and replicated by other missions and countries in contexts similar to South Sudan.

## Foundations for Institutional Architecture for Resilience and Recovery (IAA4R)

### Resilience Context and Community First Approach

The significant role of Institutional Architecture in vulnerable communities is well-documented in the community first approach that links household and communal assets to IAA4R within the resilience context through the three core resilience capacities as shown in the figure below.

Institutional Architecture   
(players, rules, practices – Capacity Building Challenge)

Critical infrastructure   
(household and communal assets – Leveraging Challenge)

Figure : Institutional Architecture, Households and Communal Assets



### Validation of Resilience Profiles Study Findings

In 2018, the USAID-funded Monitoring and Evaluation Support Project (MESP) conducted the Community Resilience Household Perception Survey that offered insights into institutional aspects in Aweil. The results from the survey led to the development of resilience profiles that provide an overview of institutional arrangements, and set the foundation for discussions on institutional architecture for resilience in Aweil.

To gain consensus on the findings of the Resilience Profiles study, a validation exercise was conducted with the key stakeholders in Aweil on 18th June, 2019. This was as a precursor to the IAA4R exercise. In the validation exercise, the stakeholders were taken through selected findings and attempts made to establish whether they are a true reflection of the situation. The Resilience profile Study findings were presented and discussed according to the PfRR Pillars. On the whole, the participants concurred that the Resilience Profiles offer a true reflection of the situation in Aweil at time. A Separate report will be provided for this purpose.

### Critical Institutions per PfRR Pillar

As part of the Resilience Profiles and as a prelude to the IAA4R session, the participants were asked to Identify and agree on the critical institutions for their Pillars. The perceived critical institutions in Aweil as identified by Pillars One, Two and Three members are shown in the table below. The institutions were however not ranked. These results are consistent with the PfRR Pillar tasks where Pillar one is governance oriented institutions including traditional authorities, peace committees, county courts and law enforcement agencies. Pillar Two is on social service delivery and includes government line ministries concerned with education, health and social welfare. Pillar Three is on Productive Service delivery and it covers government line ministries such as MARF, water and Irrigation and research and training institutions. The Private sector is listed as critical in Pillars Two and Three but not Pillar one. UN agencies, International INGOs, NGOs, CBOs, and CSOs are to be found across all the Pillars indicating their significant roles in the Aweil community development efforts.

Table : Institutions identified by Participants as critical Per Pillar

| **Pillar One Institutions** | | **Pillar Two Institutions** | **Pillar Three Institutions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County Government** | Government line ministries [WASH, Education, Health, and Protection – Child social welfare] | | Government Ministries (MAARF, Water and Irrigation, Infrastructure) |
| **Office of the commissioner** | INGOs, UN Agencies | | Private sector (Financial institutions, Agro-input dealers, Extension services) |
| **Community development** | Traditional Authorities | | Research and training institutions (Universities and colleges, Research centers) |
| **County Court** | Women Groups | | Development Partners (UN Agencies, NGOs, CBOs, INGOs, CSOs, FBOs) |
| **County council, Land council** | Youth Groups | |  |
| **Department of co-operative** | Private sector | |  |
| **COTAL (Council of traditional authority and leaders)** | Community structures (Peace committee, Council of Chiefs and elders) | |  |
| **Rural water department (WASH)** | NNGOs, CBOs, FBOs | |  |
| **Department of education** |  | |  |
| **Department of health** |  | |  |
| **RRC (Peace committee)** |  | |  |
| **CBOs, FBOs, women, youth groups, trade unions** |  | |  |
| **UN agencies, INGOs** |  | |  |
| **Law enforcement agencies (Police and Judiciary)** |  | |  |

## Customizing Institutional Architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R) To South Sudan

The vulnerability of South Sudan and the focus on recovery and building resilience necessitated the adoption of the resilience context and its implementation into the four Pillar objectives of the PfRR.

The resilience context covers the following areas: absorbing or simply coping in the short term; adapting in the medium term; and transforming structurally over the long term, resulting in enhanced absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities. The development of these capacities is the basis of the resilience context, and this guides succeeding interventions. This is premised on the fact that recovery and resilience interventions are designed to address both humanitarian and development assistance.

Absorptive capacities reflect the ability to cope with a shock and its effects. Adaptive capacities support a household or community to withstand shocks, and adapt in the face of social, economic and environmental changes. They tend to be more pre-emptive than absorptive capacities, and operate over a longer period of time. Transformative capacities address vulnerabilities at community, environment or systems levels. As a result of these coping capacities, a cycle of vulnerability caused by stressors can be disrupted, and the negative effects of shocks can be avoided. Each of these capacities is not mutually exclusive.

In 2018, the IAA food security questionnaire was modified into a conceptual framework referred to as the IAA for Resilience (IAA4R) by incorporating the Partnership for Recovery and Resilience pillars. This conceptual framework was then further developed into a traffic light rating system to identify the status of the corresponding institutions.

The IAA4R tool is therefore predicated on a framework that assesses institutions using the resilience context and the three capacities (absorptive, adaptive and transformative) to operationalize the four Pillars of PfRR. A detailed account of what constitutes each Pillar and consequently the relevant institutions is provided below:

1. **Pillar one:** Rebuilding trust in people and institutions.

This includes aspects such as:

* Local governance
* Early warning, preparedness, and early action
* Hazard, risk and vulnerability mapping and conflict analysis
* Conflict and risk informed gender responsive planning and budgeting
* Access to justice, community policing and SGBV elimination
* Local reconciliation and peace-building developments to support voluntary and sustainable return, re-integration and resettlement

1. **Pillar Two:** Re-establish access to basic services

This pillar involves:

* Re-establishing access to basic services
* Humanitarian assistance
* Social protection and safety nets
* Social service delivery strengthening (WASH, health, education, shelter)
* Capacity development for service providers

1. **Pillar Three:** Restore productive capacities

Pillar three addresses:

* Agriculture production and productivity (value chain, access to resources etc.)
* Livelihood skills development
* Employment generation and SME development
* Financial inclusion and risk financing
* Market development and infrastructure support
* Climate change adaptation

1. **Pillar Four:** Nurture effective partnerships

This aspect incorporates mutual accountability and coordination elements some of which are:

* Resilience M&E and investment tracking system
* Knowledge management and resilience analysis platform
* Multi-mode flexible financing facility
* Coordination platforms

To make the IAA4R tool (Annex VII) tractable, the three coping capacities of recovery and resilience were used as the basis for developing the proposed indicators of institutional capacities for recovery and resilience within the four Pillars of PFRR.

# Aweil Institutional Architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R)

## Introduction

On 19th and 20th June, 2019 key stakeholders in Aweil gathered to conduct the IAA4R as a next step from the Resilience Profiles validation. The objectives of the workshop were specified as:

* Build a shared understanding of institutional architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R).
* Participate together in self-assessment and deliberations within the Aweil IAA4R areas of inquiry.
* Prioritize Aweil IAA4R actions for improvement.
* Reach consensus on a detailed prioritized Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan.

## Methodology

The workshop mainly utilized Presentations to introduce concepts followed by Group discussions and Plenary to elicit and document relevant information.

## Discussion of key concepts and Presentation of IAA4R

Each table of participants was given some key words to define. These words included Adaptive capacity, Absorptive capacity, Transformative capacity, institution and resilience.

The explanation that Resilience is “the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate and recover from the effects of a disaster in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions” generated animated discussion in attempting to determine the exact meaning in the local dialect, Dinka. The group finally agreed on three words in Dinka language that can be used interchangeably to mean Resilience. These words are ‘*Gook*’, ‘*Guom*’, ‘*Ba Gook’*.

This set the stage for the introduction to IAA4R that reviewed its evolution and coverage to build a shared understanding of IAA4R. Following the introduction to IAA4R tenets, the strengths and weaknesses of the Aweil IAA4R were identified by the participants working in PfRR Pillar based groups.

## Strengths and Weaknesses of Institutions

In order to delineate and put the Aweil institutions for recovery and resilience identified in Table 1 in perspective, there strengths and weaknesses were examined and outlined by the participants through group tasks per pillar. The complete results from the Groups are in Annex I. At this point, only three Pillars exist given that Pillar four is yet to be fully constituted in Aweil. The strengths and weaknesses of the respective institutions are critical in determining the capacity of the institutions to contribute to recovery and resilience efforts in Aweil as well as in developing capacity development initiatives within the PfRR.

### Strengths and Weaknesses for Pillar One Institutions

The main strengths listed by Pillar one hinged on the existence of governance institutions relating to law and order, local government, State/County legislative councils and peace committees. The Peace Committees were considered critical to the peace building initiatives given that they exist in a structured way right from the village, Payams, state and national levels with membership drawn from a diverse background including the traditional authorities that exert tremendous influence in the Aweil society.

The key weaknesses of the Pillar one institutions relate to inadequacy in the interpretation of all laws (specifically customary ones, Local government Act, among others), weak management and communication skills, inadequate human resources, inadequate knowledge of roles and poor gender representation. These weaknesses translate into deficiencies in performance by the governance institutions. For instance, inadequate knowledge of roles often results in duplication of efforts, while inadequate knowledge of laws may result in miscarriages of justice. Similarly, poor gender representation implies that women are unlikely to receive favorable rulings.

### Strengths and Weaknesses for Pillar Two Institutions

Pillar Two institutions are focused on delivering access to basic services and the identified strengths are viewed from this perspective.

The major strengths under Pillar Two were identified as the existence of basic services delivery institutions, willingness and commitment to work and the presence of technical working groups such as Clusters and humanitarian forum. These institutions facilitate the delivery of basic services to the community even in remote areas. The presence of technical working groups is of particular interest to the PfRR for it can form a basis for transition into the partnership mode of operation.

The critical Pillar Two weaknesses that constrain contribution to recovery and resilience in Aweil were identified as duplication of interventions in certain cases, limited logistics, inadequate specialized human resource (particularly Health workers and Teachers) and inadequate funding. The identification of duplication of interventions at this point relates directly to the need for a partnership approach in restoring basic services in Aweil as envisaged in the PfRR.

### Strengths and Weaknesses for Pillar Three Institutions

The main strengths of PfRR’s Pillar Three that addresses productive capacities identified in Aweil included the existence of coordination structures such as the Food Security Cluster (FSL), presence of agro-input dealers and the existence of extension service, research and training services structures. The strengths of Pillar Three as identified, may contribute to a smooth takeoff of PfRR in Aweil.

On the other hand, the major weaknesses of Pillar Three were found to be of concern for the partnership especially considering that it included poor coordination ability, inadequate capacity of researchers and trainers and the absence of agro-input dealers’ association. In this case, poor coordination as a weakness implies the critical need for PfRR’s Pillar 4 on nurturing partnerships.

# Administration of the IAA4R Tool

The Institutional capacity for resilience assessment framework (IAA4R) tool examines institutions critical for each PfRR Pillar objective from a recovery and resilience perspective. The complete description of the resilience capacity of institutions and elements are contained in the Revised IAA4R Tool in Annex VII.

The initial IAA4R tool was found to be inadequate by the participants and a revised version developed during the session. These concerns were

The participants were then taken through the revised IAA4R tool including the specific institutions and elements covered as well as the scoring process. The participants were then requested to individually complete the IAA4R tool. The individually completed revised IAA4R tool and the responses formed the basis of subsequent Group tasks and discussions.

The IAA4R tool is intended to elicit information that can be used to strengthen institutions, assist in identifying pertinent development interventions, streamline coordination of Partners and ultimately harness collective Partner efforts.

# Developing the Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan

The Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan was developed through two stages that were conducted during the Workshop.

In the first stage, the participants identified the institutional capacity gaps and proposed corresponding interventions while in the second stage the results from the administration of the revised IAA4R tool was utilized to develop an Action Plan.

## Aweil Institutional Capacity Gaps and Proposed Interventions Per Pillar

The institutional capacity gaps and proposed interventions for each Pillar were identified during group work sessions. Pillar one and four identified the institutional capacity gaps in general while Pillar two and three identified these by specific institution. The Aweil institutional capacity gaps and interventions are in shown in Annex II.

### Pillar one institutional capacity gaps and proposed interventions

The key institutional capacity gaps identified by Pillar one are poor management skills, ineffective community mobilization, inadequate training on and in interpretation of laws and inadequate technical skills among government staff. These institutional gaps mirror the weaknesses identified earlier and indicate the need for interventions at institutional level.

The proposed institutional capacity interventions for Pillar one reflect a major need for human resource capacity development with specific emphasis on management skills, community mobilization, technical skills and legislation (judiciary and customary). There is also an element of the revision of customary laws and capacity building of customary court members. From the weaknesses of the institutions in Pillar one as earlier expressed, capacity development of traditional authorities and peace committee members is critical to the continued maintenance of peace in Aweil and ultimately the success of the PfRR.

### Pillar two institutional capacity gaps and proposed interventions

The key capacity gaps for pillar two include low involvement of parents in school affairs, poor health referral system and high turnover of technical personnel in government institutions. The low involvement of parents in school affairs results in poor completion and retention rates that inhibit skill development. From the discussions in plenary, girls are the most affected by the low completion rates. Poor health referral systems are mainly due to the absence of or few specialized staff. High turnover of highly skilled technical staff in government institutions is mainly due to poor remuneration and lack of facilities.

The proposed interventions for the key capacity gaps are formation and strengthening of Parents Teachers Associations (PTAs) to improve parents’ involvement in school affairs especially in supporting school activities targeting increased retention and completion rates.

### Pillar three institutional capacity gaps and proposed interventions

Pillar three key institutional capacity gaps were identified as lack of clear policies on land ownership, limited technical skills of extension workers, lack of umbrella private sector associations such as Agri-input dealers and heavy focus on humanitarian and emergency support by development partners. These capacity gaps skew the development patterns in Aweil, retards self-reliance and diminishes private sector involvement in development.

The proposed interventions to address the institutional capacity gaps for this pillar include clear definition of roles, formation of strong private sector umbrella associations, pursuit of alternative livelihoods and a shift toward resilience building.

### Pillar four institutional capacity gaps and proposed interventions

In taking cognizance of the fact that Pillar four in Aweil is yet to be fully constituted, the capacity gaps identified are essentially requirements for setting up pillar four. These institutional capacity gaps can be viewed from a public sector, private sector and development partners’ perspective. The public sector is generally perceived as having low capacity in terms of resources (human and finance) and technical expertise to deliver on its mandate. The private sector lacks the mechanisms with which to engage in the PfRR for instance the case of agro-dealers who provide an essential service but do not have a functional association. The Development Partners lack a structured coordination mechanism, joint funding mechanism and there is also insufficient information on new partners and projects.

The interventions proposed to mitigate the institutional capacity gaps in pillar four from a public sector perspective require investments in improving the host government’s technical capacity in key areas. Some of the key areas include water, sanitation and health, management and legislation.

The private sector will require interventions that address it’s near exclusion from development interventions by supporting their involvement and engagement in the PfRR.

It is also proposed to strengthen mechanisms aimed at nurturing partnerships by establishing a functional pillar four, better defining roles, defining partnership protocols such as entry (on-boarding), registration, declaration of commitments, joint planning, joint funding as well as establishing tracking systems for projects.

## Developing Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan

The Aweil IAA4R improvement plan was developed in three stages.

In the first stage, the individual scores on the revised IAA4R tool were reviewed within the pillar and agreed by the participants without statistical measures.

In the second stage, the participants reviewed the individual scores on the revised IAA4R tool, identified the questions that scored the lowest and which at the same time are easiest to fix (low hanging fruits). These were then used to identify and agree on the top three/four priorities that formed the improvement plan. These priorities were classified as concrete actions that need to be taken to strengthen Aweil IAA4R.

In the third stage, the identified concrete actions were consolidated into an action plan by responding to pertinent questions (who, what, where, when and how) using a provided template.

The concrete actions for improving Aweil IAA4R by Pillar are in the table below. The complete Action Plan for the improvement of Aweil IAA4R is in Annex III.

Table : concrete actions for Aweil IAA4R

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concrete Actions** | | | |
| **Pillar One** | **Pillar Two** | **Pillar Three** | **Pillar Four** |
| Enhance law enforcement (Police, Army, Judiciary, Customary Court and Traditional Authorities) | Strengthen management system in schools (PTA, SMC, teachers | Enhance skills level of extension workers | Develop structure for the PfRR coordination platform |
| Promote good governance (Local Government) | Back to school campaign/initiative to promote education for all | Strengthen agro-input dealer’s business skill and capacity to participate in development initiatives | Lack of coordinated and joined project planning and monitoring mechanism |
| Promote Effective State/County Legislative Councils | Make schools learner friendly (ECD, primary facilities) | Public awareness on food security and Capacity building for farmers | Strengthen PfRR networking mechanism |
| Enhance representation of women in various institutions such as peace committees, School Committees and others | Strengthen primary health care | Enhance skills level of extension workers | Develop joint funding mechanism |
|  | Back to school campaign/initiative to promote education for all | Strengthen Agro-input dealer’s business skill and capacity to participate in development initiatives | Improve Host government technical capacity |

# Conclusion and Recommendations

## Conclusion

The Resilience Profiles Study validation is an essential component of the IAA4R as it puts institutions in perspective prior to the IAA4R.

Institution Architecture Assessment for Recovery and Resilience is a complex exercise that identifies key institutions. It examines the strengths and weaknesses of the institutions. It establishes the institutions’ capacity gaps and proposes corresponding interventions. It further assists in developing an institutional improvement plan and finally an action plan. In the case of Aweil, these processes were conducted with slight modifications. For instance, the IAA4R tool was modified to accede to participants’ request and a revised tool developed during the session. While the revised IAA4R tool was better understood by participants, it still requires further adjustments to make it consistent.

## Recommendations

### Technical

1. It is critical to design and offer a concise brief on the principles of partnership prior to constituting a PfRR in the CPAs where it is yet to take off.
2. The sequencing of activities prior to and after the IAA4R is critical for it determines the participants understanding of the concepts and processes. The ideal sequence should be such that Resilience Profiles Study validation precedes IAA4R.
3. Review the IAA4R tool to better suit the CPAs that are yet to establish a functional PfRR. This is especially in view of Pillar four on nurturing partnerships as was observed in Aweil.
4. Preliminary results of the administration of the tool can be obtained through group consensus as done in Aweil. This can serve as a basis for developing the IAA4R improvement plan.

### Process

1. In situations where the PfRR is yet to take effect, it is critical that participants are adequately sensitized and socialized on the IAA4R process.
2. The participants should be afforded and opportunity to validate the findings of the IAA4R.

### Revised IAA4R Tool

1. The tool is still too long and needs to be summarized in all the pillars.
2. Participants were not clear on the three colors (Red, Green, Blue) and they suggested that the colors be replaced with numbers (1,2,3) as was the case in Aweil.
3. Many of the questions in the tool are very technical – therefore, the participants suggested that the tool should be administered to technical staff who understand the different levels of partnership their organization have with other organization in Aweil.

# Annex I: Strengths and Weaknesses of Aweil Institutions

### Pillar 1: Building Trust in People and Institutions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses (Gaps)** |
| 1. Presence of Police/Army/Judiciary | * Inadequacy in correctly interpreting laws (All) * Weak communication skills (both in Arabic and English languages) * Inadequate Human Resources * Poor infrastructure (Police, Army and Judiciary) * Poor gender representation * Mobility problem (transportation) |
| 1. Existence of Local Government | * Poor management system * Poor infrastructure * Inadequate knowledge of Local Government Act (LGA) |
| 1. Existence of State/County Legislative Council | * Inadequate knowledge of roles * Inadequate HRs |
| 1. Presence of Peace Committees and Peace Commission | * Poor gender representation (few women) * Low capacity |

### Pillar 2: Access to Basic Services

| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses (Gaps)** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Existence of institutions | * Limited logistics |
| 1. Peaceful environment | * Duplication of interventions at some point |
| 1. Willingness and commitment of the institutions to work | * Limited resources to address the needs (high need but resources limited) |
| 1. Availability of natural resources | * Poor infrastructure |
| 1. Some institutions have very good HRs | * Donor fatigue |
| 1. Policy framework | * Inadequate HRs in some institutions |
| 1. Established technical working groups (different clusters, humanitarian forum) | * Poor or inadequate incentive in some institutions – leading to brain-drain – esp: Government |
| 1. Adaptive capacity | * Inadequate number of personnel – (health and Education department) |
| 1. Basic infrastructure in place | * Poor community perception towards development projects |

### Pillar 3: Production Capacities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses (Gaps)** |
| 1. Government: (SMAARF)  * Coordination cluster – FSL * Guiding policy framework in place * Existence of structures – state – County and Payam * Availability of system – cool chain facilities in Aweil | * Weak capacity of HRs * Poor coordination ability * Inadequate financial support within institutions |
| 1. Private Sector:  * Presence of agro-input dealers * Good level of capacity to produce * Availability of market | * Donor dependence * Inadequate capacity |
| 1. Research and Training Centres  * Skills and knowledge | * Inadequate capacity of trainers * Lack of laboratories in Aweil (State, county, Payam and Boma) |
| 1. Development partners (NGO, CBOs, NNGO, CSO)  * Very strong coordination in Aweil * Ability to conduct assessment * Capacity of the HR * Availability of policy framework * Access to information | * Over Dependence on donor funding * Poor consultation with beneficiaries – or communities regarding projects |

# Annex II: Institutional Capacity Gaps and Proposed Interventions Per Pillar

### Pillar 1: Build Trust in People and Institutions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institutional Capacity Gaps** | **Proposed Interventions** |
| Ineffective community mobilization | * Training of community mobilizers |
| Inadequate training on and in interpretation of laws | * Revision of customary laws and training of customary court members/leaders |
| Inadequate skills among the staff (government) | * Training of the cooperative staff |
| Inadequate WASH technical skill | * Training of pump mechanics and hygiene promoters |
| Inadequate number of qualified teachers | * Provision of attractive incentives |
| Lack of management skills | * Provision of training on management skill to all state technical personnel |

### Pillar 2: Accesses to Basic Services

| **Institutions** | **Gaps** | **Intervention** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Schools | * Lack of learning materials (scholastic materials) * Few qualified teachers * High number of drop-out pupils * Poor infrastructure * Poor/low payment / poor incentive * Low involvement of parents in school affairs | * Provision of learning materials (scholastic materials) * Teachers training * Develop stronger policy and implement to promote school retention and completion * Formation of Parents teachers associations for Increased involvement of parents in school affairs * Improve incentive to attract teachers * Ensure child friendly environment |
| 1. Health Facilities | * Lack of basic drugs and supplies * Inadequate qualified health personnel * Poor referral system * Poor infrastructure (especially at community level – Boma, Payam and County) | * Provision of drugs and essential supplies * Train and attract qualified health workers * Improved and equip health facilities * Strengthen referral system * Train community health workers |
| 1. State Ministry of Education/Health/ SDGCW/WIRD | * Poor institutional capacity for smooth operation (HRs), Financial, Logistics and equipment) * High turn-over of personnel (qualified go searching for better pay) | * Institutional capacity building to ensure accountability, sustainability and effectiveness in delivering basic educational services * Improve staff retention and better benefit (payment) |

### Pillar 3: Restoring Productive Capacities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| INSTITUTIONS | IDENTIFIED GAPS | PROPOSED INTERVENTIONS |
| 1. Ministry of Physical Infrastructure | * Low capacity in term of skills * Financial challenges * No clear policies on land ownership | NB: no intervention provided in this section by the group |
| 1. MAARF | * Lack of policies * Limited capacities of Agricultural Extension Workers (AEWs) * Limited budget | * Develop good policies to guide the ministry and popularize them * Political will to finance agriculture * Clear definition of roles * Capacity building of CAHWs and AEWs |
| 1. Private sector | * Lack of strong umbrella association * Inadequate business skills * Livelihood stress | * Form strong umbrella association * Capacity building for agro-input dealers and business skills * Livelihood alternative * Develop infrastructure (road network) |
| 1. Development partners | * Heavily relying on donors - funding * Mostly responding to emergency * Long procedures (Bureaucracy) * Assessment not informative | * Multi-years projects * Simple procedures and realistic implementation schedules * Effective coverage of areas * Shift toward resilience building |

### Pillar 4: Nurturing Partnerships

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identified Gaps** | **Proposed Interventions** |
| 1. Host government capacity [weak skill manpower and inadequate resources] | * Investing in improving on host government capacity (especially technical staff) |
| 1. Lack of structural coordination platform mechanisms | * Strengthening a mechanism to nurture partnership (defining roles, training) |
| 1. Lack of enough information (New partner, and projects) | * Establishing partnership and projects registration and tracking system |
| 1. Lack of coordination mechanisms to guide and engage private sector | * Invite Private Sector in all meeting and planning |
| 1. Lack of joined project planning and monitoring | * Strengthening joined project planning and monitoring |
| 1. Lack of joined funding | * Provision of joined funding opportunities |

# Annex III : Aweil IAA4R Action Plan

### Pillar 1: Build Trust in People and Institutions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concrete Action | Why it is Important for IAA4R | Sub-Activities | Time Line | Lead Implementer/Other to Involve |
| Enhance law enforcement (Police, Army, Judiciary, Customary Law Courts and Council of Traditional Authorities) | Due to inadequate interpretation of the laws | * Training of law enforcement agencies * Provide copies of laws in local languages * Capacity build Traditional Authorities * Improve office infrastructure * Recruitment of more specialized staff | Continuous  > 6 months  < 6 months | UNDP and partners |
| Promote good governance (Local Government and Peace Committees) | Poor governance system in Local government | * Training local government staff on management and LGA (Local Government Act) * Build capacity of Peace committee members | Continuous  < 6 months | UNDP and partners |
| Promote Effective State/County Legislative Councils | Due to inadequate knowledge on their roles | * Training in roles and responsibilities * Form Councils * Provide office infrastructure | Continuous  1 year | UNDP and partners |
| Enhance representation of women in various institutions such as peace committees, School Committees and others | To achieve sustainable peace | * Gender sensitivity training * Capacity development for women and advocacy campaign | Continuous | UNMISS and Partners |

### Pillar 2: Access to Basic Services

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concrete Action | Why it is Important for IAA4R | Sub-Activities | Time Line | Lead Implementer/Other to Involve |
| Strengthen management system in schools (PTA, SMC, teachers) | For improved:   * efficiency * accountability * productivity * compliance | * Capacity assessment * Orientation on role and scope of partnership * Mobilization of parents to form PTAs * Training * Monitoring and supervision | Yearly  Quarterly  [ongoing, quarterly and monthly] | * UNICEF and Partners * SMoE (State Ministry of Education) * YTTC |
| Back to school campaign/initiative to promote education for all | support completion of school by both girls and boys | * Awareness campaign * Radio talk show * Community forum * School meal program * Girl education initiative (provision of scholastic materials) | Ongoing | * SMoE * UNICEF * HACT * RLC * NRC * WFP * WV * JAM |
| Make schools learner friendly (ECD, primary facilities) | Enhance quality of learning (enrollment, retention and completion) | * Improve schools infrastructure * Integrate ECD into primary education * Life skill activities | Annual | * SMoE * UNICEF * WFP * NRC * WV * RLC |
| Strengthen primary health care | Lay foundation for improved health care | * Capacity building of primary health care and community development workers | Continuous | * SMoH * UNICEF * UNDP |

### PILLAR 3: RESTORING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITIES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concrete Action | Why it is Important for IAA4R | Sub-Activities | Time Line | Lead Implementer |
| Enhance skills level of extension workers | To improve the delivery of extension services | * Training * Community involvement | < 6 months  (2020) | MAARF |
| Strengthen Agro-input dealer’s business skill and capacity to participate in development initiatives | * To assist Agro-input dealers in accessing financial services * Improve involvement of private sector in development initiatives | * Training in financial management * Formation of Agri-input dealers association | < 6 months  (2020) | * Financial institutions (banks) * Agri-input dealers |
| Public awareness on food security and Capacity building for farmers | * Improve production capacity * Help in understanding farming best practices | * Capacity building on agriculture production skills * Provision of agro-input e.g. tools and seeds | <6months  (2020) | Development partners |

### PILLAR 4 NURTURING PARTNERSHIPS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action/Activities Needed | Important to IAA4R | How to do it step by step | When to Make It? | Who can do it |
| Develop structure for the PfRR coordination platform | Nurture partnership in the PfRR institutions and organizations | * Strengthening the strategy by – defining roles to guide * Provide trainings to build capacity | Every 3 months for 2-4 weeks to (12) weeks | All partners [NGOs, government, and private sector] |
| Lack of coordinated and joined project planning and monitoring mechanism | Create links for identifying projects in the community | Consolidation by: assessing needs – coordinate for resources for a common problem | 1 – 2 weeks | NGOs, Government and Community |
| Strengthen PfRR networking mechanism | Knowledge of available experts in various fields | Registration and record keeping of HR (technical skills) in the partnership | Continuous | Government,, Private and NGOs |
| Develop joint funding mechanism | Easy accessibility of funds in time of needs | Create bodies assigned to assess shocks and stresses | Every two months – six months | NGOs, Community and Government |
| Improve Host government technical capacity | Build a pool of Trained and skilled manpower | -Training of personnel  -maintaining top managers | 1-3 months or yearly | Government and NGOs |

# Annex IV: Program for Aweil IAA4R Workshop

### Institutional Architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R)

**19th – 20th June 2019 Aweil, South Sudan**

**Agenda**

**Workshop Objectives**

1. Build a shared understanding of institutional architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R).
2. Participate together in self-assessment and deliberations within the Aweil IAA4R areas of inquiry.
3. Prioritize Aweil IAA4R actions for improvement.
4. Reach consensus on a detailed prioritized Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan.

### DAY 1: Wednesday 19th June, 2019

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Activity** | **Responsible** |
| **8.00am – 8.30am** | **REGISTRATION** |  |
| 8.30am – 9.30am | * Recap * Workshop Objectives and Agenda | ALL  Africa Lead |
| 9.30am – 10.30am | Introduction to Institutional Architecture for Recovery and Resilience (IAA4R) | Africa Lead |
| **10.30am – 11.00am** | **HEALTH BREAK** |  |
| 11.00am - 12.00pm | Group Exercise ( Four Groups)  Identify the Strengths and Weaknesses of Aweil IAA4R Per Pillar   * Pillar 1: Trust in People and Institutions * Pillar 2: Access to Basic Services * Pillar 3: Productive Capacities * Pillar 4: Nurturing Partnerships | Africa Lead |
| 12.00 – 13.00 | Group Presentations | ALL |
| **13.00 – 14.00** | **LUNCH BREAK** |  |
| 14.00 – 15.00 | Introduction to the IAA4R Tool and Individual completion of Tool | Africa Lead |
| 15.00 – 16.30 | Group Exercise on Developing Appropriate IAA4R for Aweil  (Identify Institutional Capacity Gaps and propose interventions per Pillar) |  |
| **16.30 – 17.00** | **HEALTH BREAK** |  |
| 17.00 – 18.00 | Group Presentations |  |

### DAY 2: Thursday 20th June, 2019

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Activity** | **Responsible** |
| 9.00 – 9.30am | Introduction to Day 2   * Recap of Day 1 * Day 2 agenda | ALL  Africa Lead |
| 9.30 – 10.30am | Moving toward Consensus on the Aweil IAA4R Improvement Plan   * Review IAA4R questions that got the lowest scores * Identify which are the easiest to fix ie “the low hanging fruit” * Agree on the top priorities for action planning | Africa Lead |
| **10.30 – 11.00am** | **HEALTH BREAK** |  |
| 11.00 - 13.00 | Group Exercise Developing IAA4R Improvement Plan   * Each Pillar develops and proposes an action plan (who, what, where, when, how) for the top prioritized areas for improvement | ALL |
| **13.00 – 14.00** | **LUNCH BREAK** |  |
| 14.00 – 15.00 | Group Presentations on Action Plans | ALL |
| 15.00 – 16.00 | Way Forward and IAA4R Roadmap of Prioritized Actions  (who will do what by when of the priority areas) | ALL |
| 4.30pm – 5.00pm | Health Break and Departure |  |

# Annex V: Aweil IAA4R Workshop Participants List

### Recovery and Resilience Profiles Validation Workshop

**Participant Email Contact List**

**Aweil – Grand Hotel**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Participant | Gender | Email Address |
| Benjamin Anyuon | M | [cawdcafrica@gmail.com](mailto:cawdcafrica@gmail.com) |
| Francis Aakot | M | [francisakot@gmail.com](mailto:francisakot@gmail.com) |
| Shahida Paul | F | [Shahida.Paul@fao.org](mailto:Shahida.Paul@fao.org) |
| Mayuol Diing | M | [Mayuoldiing@gmail.com](mailto:Mayuoldiing@gmail.com) |
| Tako Seme | M | [Seme.Tako@fao.org](mailto:Seme.Tako@fao.org) |
| Wono Luke | M | [Wono.luke@usf-suisse.org](mailto:Wono.luke@usf-suisse.org) |
| Joseph Lual Deng | M | [Joslual2015@gmail.com](mailto:Joslual2015@gmail.com) |
| Frank Kessy | M | [fkessy@nonviolentpeaceforce.org](mailto:fkessy@nonviolentpeaceforce.org) |
| Lita Jackson | M | [Jackson.Lita@fao.org](mailto:Jackson.Lita@fao.org) |
| Emmanuel Ramba | M | [eramba@unicef.org](mailto:eramba@unicef.org) |
| Elizabeth H | F | [nyanut.care46@gmail.com](mailto:nyanut.care46@gmail.com) |
| Dominic Anyanga | M | [dominic.anyanga@undp.org](mailto:dominic.anyanga@undp.org) |
| Ajang Santino | M | [ajongsantino631@gmail.com](mailto:ajongsantino631@gmail.com) |
| Upieu Jongkor | M | [upieu1979@gmail.com](mailto:upieu1979@gmail.com) |
| Philip Thon | M | [Philip.garagg@gmail.com](mailto:Philip.garagg@gmail.com) |
| Santino Garang | M | [akotsantinoskot@gmail.com](mailto:akotsantinoskot@gmail.com)  [cipadsouthsudan@gmail.com](mailto:cipadsouthsudan@gmail.com) |
| Aguak Kuach | F |  |
| Akun Amet Amet | F |  |
| Archangelo Diing | M | [diingarchangelo@gmail.com](mailto:diingarchangelo@gmail.com) |
| Angelo Lual | M |  |
| Efange Sophie | F | [effange@unfpa.org](mailto:effange@unfpa.org) |
| Khalif Fareh | M | [Fareh2@un.org](mailto:Fareh2@un.org) |
| Yusuf Mohammed | M | [mohammed89@un.org](mailto:mohammed89@un.org) |
| Rogers Otuta | M | [rogers.otuta@concern.net](mailto:rogers.otuta@concern.net) |
| Emmett Watson | M | [emmett.watson@undp.org](mailto:emmett.watson@undp.org) |
| Sampson VK Dolo | M | [fieldco-nbeg@ssd-actionagainsthunger.org](mailto:fieldco-nbeg@ssd-actionagainsthunger.org) |
| Solomon Telan | M | [Solomon.Tilahan@wfp.org](mailto:Solomon.Tilahan@wfp.org) |
| James Amet | M | [jamesamet1983@gmail.com](mailto:jamesamet1983@gmail.com)  [James\_Dhu@wvi.org](mailto:James_Dhu@wvi.org) |
| Moses Jiel | M | [Jielmoses@gmail.com](mailto:Jielmoses@gmail.com) |
| Aron Afuer | M | [arunjok@gmail.com](mailto:arunjok@gmail.com) |
| Dee Santos | M | [deesantos10@gmail.com](mailto:deesantos10@gmail.com) |
| Nicholas Kerandi | M | [NICHOLAS.KERANDI@FAO.ORG](mailto:NICHOLAS.KERANDI@FAO.ORG) |
| Dan Dunlop | M | [Dunlop2@un.org](mailto:Dunlop2@un.org) |
| Bona Yak | F |  |
| Deborah Amor | F |  |
| Wawien Ayom | M |  |
| James Chol | M | [Choljames37@gmail.com](mailto:Choljames37@gmail.com) |

# Annex VI: Aweil IAA4R Participants by Gender

**Aweil IA4R Participant Analysis by Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Male | 30 | 81.1 | 81.1 | 81.1 |
| Female | 7 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 37 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The table above represents the participants in the IAA4R workshop in Aweil by gender. Eighty one (81) per cent of the participants were male representing different organizations in Aweil, government officials, NGOs, NNGOs, Cultural leader (s) and CBOs. One school was also represented. Only 19 per cent of the participants were female. As seen above males, were over represented in the workshop.

# Annex VII: Institutional Capacity for Resilience Assessment Framework Revised (IA4R) Tool

### Institutional Capacity for Resilience Assessment Framework (IA4R) Tool

| **PILLAR 1: TRUST IN PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS**  **Relevant institutions**   1. Local government 2. State Ministry of Local Government 3. County Department of Local Government 4. State and County Legislative Councils 5. Police/Army/Judiciary 6. Church 7. Peace committees 8. Traditional leaders 9. NGO, CBO, FBOs addressing security, peace building, reconciliation, social cohesion, conflict resolution and rule of law 10. Civil society | **Status Ranking**   1. Institutions require significant attention to ensure the Pillar Objective is achieved. 2. Progress is mixed. The conditions required to achieve Pillar Objective are partially achieved, but additional attention is required. 3. The Pillar objective, from an institutional perspective, is realized to a sufficient degree, and additional attention to this area is not required now. | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Provide Status ranking of 1, 2 or 3 where applicable** | | | | | | | | | |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** | **H** | **I** | **J** |
| **INSTITUTIONS EXIST AND HAVE ABSORPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions are Present:**  With the assessed community, institutions and/or their representatives exist and provide **security, peace building, reconciliation, social cohesion, conflict resolution and rule of law** on a regular basis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutional Roles are Clearly Defined:** Institutions have defined roles that are known within the community and respected by other institutions and people, regardless of how they are carried out. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Predictable:** Institutions consistently follow formal or informal processes (*i.e.* *play by the rules*). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Human Resources:** Institutions have capable staff and/or volunteers with assigned responsibility to respond to shocks/stresses in the community, and they have known how to carry out their role. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Access to Resources:** Institutions have the capacity and/or relationships to access basic resources in response to shocks and stresses from relevant sources (government, donors, private sector, and community members). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions are Shock-Aware:** Institutions have identified the primary shocks and stresses that impact the local community, and can easily name them and describe their impact. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions know Early Warning Signs and Stages of Shocks:** Institutions have clear criteria to detect early warning signs of shock and identify the stages of shocks (warning, eminent, early, full, recovery) including knowing whose role it is to apply the criteria and who to report the assessment to. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Emergency Response Plans:** Institutions have, or participate in, emergency response plans for all identified primary shocks and stresses. They can describe their response plans in sufficient detail or provide response plan documents. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions can Access Resources to carry out Emergency Plans:** Institutions have identified resources to implement emergency response plans and have relationships and regular communication with these sources. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Social Bonding and Linking Capital:** Families and localized groups cooperate internally with each other, and with their Local Government and Humanitarian/Development Partners to provide social safety nets and organize collective actions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE TRANSFORMATIONAL CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions’ Stakeholders participate in Preparedness and Response Planning:** Institutions have built consensus around solutions to overcoming shocks and stresses with stakeholder buy-in, and conduct periodic updates. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions employ Evidence-Based Approaches:** Institutions use evidence to evaluate and improve their services. They can easily identify a recent improvement they made and the evidence that led to the decision. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Action-Ready:** Institutions proactively seek resources to implement preparedness and response solutions. A green rating is justified if an institution currently has two or more identified sources covering their key shocks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions employ a Cooperative Approach**: Institutions in the community work cooperatively to undertake collective actions and produce development coalitions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have and use Resilience feedback loops:** Institutions have and regularly use methods to measure community satisfaction on their performance. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Inclusive:** Institutions are inclusive of vulnerable groups (women, widows, orphans, youth, religious/ethnic minorities, etc.) as demonstrated by their service records and/or feedback from vulnerable groups. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Social Bonding, Bridging and Linking Capital**: Families and other localized groups cooperate internally, with each other, with other communities, Local Government and Development Partners in creating institutional arrangements to mitigate against future shocks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **PILLAR 2: RESTORING BASIC SERVICES**  **Relevant institutions**   1. State Ministry of Social Services 2. County Department of Social Services 3. Schools 4. Health facilities 5. Water committees 6. NGO/CBOs/FBOs providing education, health services, WASH, and basic infrastructure 7. Local government | **Status Ranking**   1. Institutions require significant attention to ensure the Pillar Objective is achieved. 2. Progress is mixed. The conditions required to achieve Pillar Objective are partially achieved, but additional attention is required. 3. The Pillar objective, from an institutional perspective, is realized to a sufficient degree, and additional attention to this area is not required now. | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Provide Status ranking of 1, 2 or 3 where applicable** | | | | | | |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** |
| **INSTITUTIONS EXIST AND HAVE ABSORPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions are Present:**  Within the assessed community, institutions and/or their representatives exist and provide **education, health services, WASH, and basic infrastructure** (roads, etc.) services on a regular basis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institution’s Services meet Minimum Standards:** Institution’s services meet the most basic quality and reliability standards during non-shock periods. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Human Resources:** Institutions have capable staff and/or volunteers with assigned responsibility to respond to shocks/stresses in the community, and they have known how to carry out their role. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institution Services are Accessible to Households During Shocks/Stresses:** Not only do institutions provide services during shocks/stresses, but their clients/households have savings, assets or social capital to access basic services and social safety nets to survive/endure shocks and stresses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions are Shock-Aware:** Institutions have identified the primary shocks and stresses that impact the local community, and can easily name them and describe their impact. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions know Early Warning Signs and Stages of Shocks:** Institutions have clear criteria to detect early warning signs of shock and identify the stages of shocks (warning, eminent, early, full, recovery) including knowing whose role it is to apply the criteria and who to report the assessment to. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Emergency Response Plans:** Institutions have, or participate in, emergency response plans for all identified primary shocks and stresses. They can describe their response plans in sufficient detail or provide response plan documents. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions can Access Resources to carry out Emergency Plans:** Institutions have identified resources to implement emergency response plans and have relationships and regular communication with these sources. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Resourced Human Resources:** Institutions have capable staff or volunteers with assigned responsibility to respond to shocks/stresses in the community and the ability to pay them competitive wages or retain them with other incentives. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE TRANSFORMATIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions’ Stakeholders participate in Preparedness and Response Planning:** Institutions have built consensus around solutions to overcoming shocks and stresses with stakeholder buy-in, and conduct periodic updates. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions employ Evidence-Based Approaches:** Institutions use evidence to evaluate and improve their services. They can easily identify a recent improvement they made and the evidence that led to the decision. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Action-Ready:** Institutions proactively seek resources to implement preparedness and response solutions. A green rating is justified if an institution currently has two or more identified sources covering their key shocks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have and use Resilience feedback loops:** Institutions have and regularly use methods to measure community satisfaction on their performance. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Inclusive:** Institutions are inclusive of vulnerable groups (women, widows, orphans, youth, religious/ethnic minorities, etc.) as demonstrated by their service records and/or feedback from vulnerable groups. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **PILLAR 3: STRENGTHENING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITIES**  **Relevant institutions**   1. Extension Service 2. Private sector input suppliers, off-takers, and supporting businesses 3. Markets actors 4. Financial Services 5. Government – relevant regulatory, production and commerce departments 6. NGOs, CBOs, FBOs providing productive inputs, market access, extension services, financial services and business support 7. Production Cooperatives 8. Land Commissions 9. State and County Ministries/Departments of Agriculture 10. State and County Ministries/Departments of Infrastructure | **Status Ranking**   1. Institutions require significant attention to ensure the Pillar Objective is achieved. 2. Progress is mixed. The conditions required to achieve Pillar Objective are partially achieved, but additional attention is required. 3. The Pillar objective, from an institutional perspective, is realized to a sufficient degree, and additional attention to this area is not required now. | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Provide Status ranking of 1, 2 or 3 where applicable** | | | | | | | | | |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** | **H** | **I** | **J** |
| **INSTITUTIONS EXIST AND HAVE ABSORPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions are Present:**  Within the assessed community, institutions and/or their representatives exist and provide **productive inputs, market access, extension services, financial services and business support** services on a regular basis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institution’s Services meet Minimum Standards:** Institution’s services meet the most basic quality and reliability standards during non-shock periods. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Human Resources:** Institutions have capable staff and/or volunteers with assigned responsibility to respond to shocks/stresses in the community, and they have known how to carry out their role. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institution Services are Accessible to Households During Shocks/Stresses:** Not only do institutions provide services during shocks/stresses, but their clients/households have savings, assets or social capital to access basic services and social safety nets to survive/endure shocks and stresses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions are Shock-Aware:** Institutions have identified the primary shocks and stresses that impact the local community, and can easily name them and describe their impact. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions know Early Warning Signs and Stages of Shocks:** Institutions have clear criteria to detect early warning signs of shock and identify the stages of shocks (warning, eminent, early, full, recovery) including knowing whose role it is to apply the criteria and who to report the assessment to. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Emergency Response Plans:** Institutions have, or participate in, emergency response plans for all identified primary shocks and stresses. They can describe their response plans in sufficient detail or provide response plan documents. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions can Access Resources to carry out Emergency Plans:** Institutions have identified resources to implement emergency response plans and have relationships and regular communication with these sources. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE TRANSFORMATIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions’ Stakeholders participate in Preparedness and Response Planning:** Institutions have built consensus around solutions to overcoming shocks and stresses with stakeholder buy-in, and conduct periodic updates. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions employ Evidence-Based Approaches:** Institutions use evidence to evaluate and improve their services. They can easily identify a recent improvement they made and the evidence that led to the decision. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Action-Ready:** Institutions proactively seek resources to implement preparedness and response solutions. A green rating is justified if an institution currently has two or more identified sources covering their key shocks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have and use Resilience feedback loops:** Institutions have and regularly use methods to measure community satisfaction on their performance. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions are Inclusive:** Institutions are inclusive of vulnerable groups (women, widows, orphans, youth, religious/ethnic minorities, etc.) as demonstrated by their service records and/or feedback from vulnerable groups. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **PILLAR 4: NURTURING PARTNERSHIPS**  **Relevant institutions**   1. Local government 2. State Ministry of Local Government 3. State Ministry of Social Services 4. County Department of Local Government 5. County Department of Social Services 6. State and County Legislative Councils 7. Police/Army/Judiciary 8. Schools 9. Health facilities 10. Water committees 11. Church 12. Peace committees 13. Traditional leaders 14. NGO, CBO, FBOs addressing security, peace building, reconciliation, social cohesion, conflict resolution and rule of law 15. NGO/CBOs/FBOs providing education, health services, WASH, and basic infrastructure 16. Civil society | **Status Ranking**   1. Institutions require significant attention to ensure the Pillar Objective is achieved. 2. Progress is mixed. The conditions required to achieve Pillar Objective are partially achieved, but additional attention is required. 3. The Pillar objective, from an institutional perspective, is realized to a sufficient degree, and additional attention to this area is not required now. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Provide Status ranking of 1, 2 or 3 where applicable** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** | **H** | **I** | **J** | **K** | **L** | **M** | **N** | **O** | **P** |
| **INSTITUTIONS EXIST AND HAVE ABSORPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Information is Available to Identify New Partners:** Information on institutional activity/services exists and is generally available to institutions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have the Capacity to Partner:** Institutions know how to contact potential partners and have designated staff/volunteers to lead partnership activities. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Development Partners are Present:** Several organizations implementing donor-funded programs and/or government-funded programs are operational in the area and capable of providing humanitarian assistance when needed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Private sector activity exists, but is largely subsistence:** Actors are mainly smallholder farmers with only minimal market orientation. Trade and service sector exists but is nascent. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS HAVE ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions have Partnership Strategies:** Shock preparedness and response plans are analyzed to identify key partnership areas (ex. land tenure policy reform, etc.) and partnership strategies to address them. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Development Partners are Present:** Several organizations implementing donor-funded programs and/or government-funded programs are operational in the area and capable of providing humanitarian ***and development*** assistance when needed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions have Structured Partnerships**: Structures/Forums are operational for coordination based on geographic or sector criteria, and incorporate most the relevant stakeholders (traditional, formal, private, public, etc.). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Diversity and inclusion in institutional partnerships:** Institutional partnerships span sectoral boundaries and include often neglected sectors such as local institutions, civil society, private sector and traditional administration. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **INSTITUTIONS HAVE TRANSFORMATIVE CAPACITIES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Institutions’ Stakeholders participate in Regular Coordination Meetings:** Coordinating bodies/forums have active representation and participation from various sectors/geographies to build consensus around solutions to overcoming shocks and stresses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutional Coordinating Bodies employ Evidence-Based Approaches:** Coordinating bodies/forums use evidence to improve services and inform decisions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutional Coordinating Bodies provide Joint Accountability to Constituents:** Partners/members provide constructive feedback to each other and are proactive against bad actors. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coordinating Bodies are Action-Ready:** Coordinating bodies/forums proactively seek resources and plan collective action to implement joint solutions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coordinating bodies have and use Resilience Feedback Loops:** Coordinating bodies/forums have and regularly use methods to measure member and/or community satisfaction on their performance. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coordinating Bodies are Inclusive:** Coordinating bodies/forums are inclusive of vulnerable groups (women, widows, orphans, youth, religious/ethnic minorities, etc.) as demonstrated by their service records and/or feedback from vulnerable groups. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |