



Food and Nutrition Security

Organisation		Date			Reporting period			
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Juba, South Sudan		June 2016			2015			
Activity Number	Name	2015 Actual expenditure	Implemented by Name organisation	Channel	Result area Result area	Rio marker Mitigation/Adaptation	Significant/principal	Gender marker Significant/principal
23857	Livelihood Development Program (LDP)	1.056.597	IFAD	Multilateral organisation	Promote agricultural growth (included livestock and fish)	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24064	South Sudan Agribusiness Development Program (SSADP)	1.257.897	Mott Mac Donald BV	Research institute and companies	Promote agricultural growth (included livestock and fish)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Significant
24723	Feeder Roads	609.452	WFP	Multilateral organisation	Promote agricultural growth (included livestock and fish)	Adaptation	Significant	Not applicable
25367	South Sudan - Seeds Sector Development Program (SS-SSDP)	11.110.000	AGRA	Research institute and companies	Promote agricultural growth (included livestock and fish)	Adaptation	Significant	Significant

Result Area 1				Reduce malnutrition				
Result question 1a: To what extent have hunger and malnutrition been reduced?				Hunger and malnutrition have increased. Civil strife and unfavourable rains have further reduced crop production in South Sudan, contributing to a cereal deficit of 381,000 tonnes --53 percent greater than in 2015 --and aggravating the already severe food shortages. An estimated 3.9 million people (3.1 million in Crisis and 800,000 in Emergency) Or 34% of the population are classified as severely food and nutrition insecure and are unable to meet their food needs in September. This is an 80% increase compared to the same period last year. (Food gap widens in conflict-stricken South Sudan - UN assessment). The prevailing insecurity interfered with most of the agricultural activities instead aggravating both hunger and malnutrition more in greater Upper Nile, Bahr el Ghazal and Equatoria, in that order				
Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 standard deviation from the median of the World Health Organization (WHO) Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age						No recent data available		

Result question 1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?				Sustainable agricultural growth, one of the objectives of our programmes contributes to reducing hunger and malnutrition. However due to the circumstances mentioned above our programmes were delayed and the possibility of data collection was limited.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Total number of undernourished people reached (m/f/child)						No recent data available		
(direct)								
(indirect)								
Indicator 1a: Reached number of people with improved access to appropriate food (direct)						No recent data available		
(indirect)								
Indicator 1b: Reached number of people whose nutritional situation became more resilient to possible stresses and/or shocks (direct)						No recent data available		
(indirect)								
Indicator 1c: Reached number of people (m/f/child) with improved food intake (direct)						No recent data available		
(indirect)								

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 1		Reduce malnutrition
Assess achieved results compared to planning:		C. Results achieved poorer than planned
Reasons for result achieved:		Above all there was restriction of movement to areas of operations, due to prevailing insecurity
Implications for planning:		Planning is difficult and adjustments are often called for. Flexibility is needed, due to the changing context (deteriorating security situation). It leads to shorter workplans and budgets (maximum 6 months).

Result Area 2		Promote agricultural growth (Included livestock and fish)						
Result question 2a: To what extent has inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector been realised?		In 2014 and 2015, secure access to land throughout the season has again been the defining characteristic of areas-farmed in Greater Upper Nile Region and its bordering states, where large numbers of IDPs sought refuge. Apparently (based only on secondary information) some IDPs have returned home in 2015, and percentages of households farming in counties in Unity and Jonglei states have increased above the very low 2014 levels. However, areas harvested are still smaller than normal due to insecurity, with labour shortages exacerbating reluctance to invest in such uncertain times. In the seven states not directly affected by the conflict, pre-crisis (2013) planting assessments noted an expansion in both numbers of farming households and cultivated areas to all crops. However, in 2015, the continuous breakdowns in law and order in parts of Warrap, Lakes and, lately, in Greater Equatoria Region (even state-wide in the case of Western Equatoria State) precluded any further expansion or even caused some reduction in planted areas. Inclusive and sustainable growth has also not been realised as there was general shift from development to humanitarian activities with lots relief item hand outs.						
Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size						1,080,733 Households		FAO Crops and Food Security Assessment in South Sudan - 2015

Result question 2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?		One of the objectives of our programmes is to enhance the capacity of farmers and farming organisations. Compared to others the embassy made substantial contribution by being able to pursue some of its agricultural development strategies. However due to the circumstances mentioned above our programmes were delayed and the possibility of data collection was limited.						
Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Total number of farmers reached (m/f/young) (direct)								
(indirect)								
Indicator 1a: Reached number of farmers (male/female/young) with increased productivity and income (direct)								
(indirect)						SSLDP reached 4,541 farming households		SSLDP Annual progress report 1st July 2014 - 30th June 20th
Indicator 1b: Reached number of farmers with improved access to input/output markets (direct)						SSADP 29 Trained Business Development Advisors giving technical assistance to 200 businesses in the agrisector.		
(indirect)						AGRA reached 5,000 farmers with 924.66 tons of seeds		AGRA Inception report 2014
Indicator 1c: Reached number of farmers whose farming enterprise became more resilient to possible stresses and/or shocks (direct)						SSADP trained 425 agribusiness persons in the areas of poultry and crops while SSLDP reached 4,541 farmers		
(indirect)								SSADP Progress Report 6, February 2016
Indicator 2: KM's of feeder roads with effects on agricultural production and trade						130 KM		

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 2		Promote agricultural growth (Included livestock and fish)	
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	C. Results achieved poorer than planned		
Reasons for result achieved:	The prevailing circumstances could not allow for more effective operations. This has been beyond capacity of the implementing team.		
Implications for planning:	Agro-input suppliers have the potential to deliver at least part of badly needed extension services, hampering growth of agricultural production and employment. An approach for upgrading the reach and quality of agro-input suppliers, possibly using a franchising approach, is developed and will start up in 2016, mainly in the Green Belt. This activity will link up with ongoing embassy funded activities, like the AGRA seed project and SSADP, and activities of NGOs.		

Result Area 3 **Create ecologically sustainable food systems**

Result question 3a: To what extent have ecologically sustainable food systems been created?

There has been no concerted effort nor operational working policy to that effect. Slash and burn cultivation system is most widely practiced coupled with over grazing in main cattle keeping areas

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture						Less than 5%		Estimate
Indicator 2: Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium or long term conservation facilities						NA		
Indicator 3: Proportion of local breeds, classified as being at risk, not-at-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction						NA		

Result question 3b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?

The program made substantial contribution by maintaining its focus on sustainable agricultural development, promoting farming as a business, promoting use of improved agriculture production inputs and technologies in all its intervention networks. However due to the circumstances mentioned above the results were limited.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Total number of hectares of farmland (including pastures and fish ponds) reached (direct)						NA		

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 3 **Create ecologically sustainable food systems**

Assess achieved results compared to planning: C. Results achieved poorer than planned

Reasons for result achieved: Focus on professionalism, enhancement of improved agriculture technology uptakes, competence sensitivity in staff recruitment and deployments, conflict sensitivity.

Implications for planning: Keep updating based on lessons learned and maintain flexibility in planning

The broader picture

To what extent have general enabling conditions for food and nutrition security (incl. private sector development conditions) been strengthened? (please report here only the type of results that cannot fit under the three food and nutrition security objectives)

The business climate deteriorated further in 2015 due to insecurity, and crowding out of the private sector –including banks- in the area of access to hard currency. This affected the access to finance (A2F) component of the South Sudan Agribusiness Development Program (SSADP). Banks did not want to risk providing loans to finance business plans of SSADP-supported (agri-) businesses. • South Sudan is at the very bottom of the World Bank’s Doing Business ranking. Insecurity, corruption, bad macroeconomic management, lack of sectoral policies (and funding thereof) and of capacity (in the public-, private- and NGO-sector) contribute to this. These circumstances hamper local business. International, including Dutch, business is very reluctant to start operations in South Sudan. The IFDC-executed 2SCALE project has stopped its efforts in South Sudan in 2015, due to the scarcity of local businesses that can be linked with –international- value chains.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Number of persons (m/f/young) reached/trained with improved technology/skills (direct)								
(indirect)						469		AGRA and SSADP Progress reports
Indicator 2: Number of collaborations established or strengthened (in dedicated programmes)						NA		
Indicator 3: Number of institutions strengthened (in dedicated programmes)						4		Embassy Finance Department
Indicator 4: Number of land titles secured (persons (m/f/young) and hectares)						Not applicable		
Indicator 5: Number of farmers/value chain actors strengthened organisationally						Not applicable		
Indicator 6: Number of substantial policy changes/reforms contributed to (plus effects)						Not applicable		