

# REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN

*"2011 has been a momentous year for South Sudan. However, the attainment of independence brings with it significant challenges and we must plan now to ensure a prosperous future. It is our sincere hope that the 2011 Survey for Monitoring Implementation of the Fragile States Principles will provide further insight into how we can better address the need for greater ownership and accountability for aid."*

Aggrey Tisa Sabuni  
Undersecretary of Economic Planning Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

## PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide co-ordinated support to relevant national institutions to develop the country's capacity to generate socio-economic statistics and strengthen the country's result-based M&E system (FSP 1).
- Support a holistic and long-term approach to capacity building, especially in support to the development of basic services provision (FSP 2).
- Current financing mechanisms may need a strategic reorganisation and realignment to better support implementation of the South Sudan Development Plan (FSP 7).
- Development partners need to provide clarity on future aid flows and volumes for at least three years and should ensure aid flows are reliably and transparently communicated to enable better government planning and budgeting (FSP 9).

## HOW DOES SOUTH SUDAN COMPARE TO THE 2011 AVERAGE?



## KEY FINDINGS OF THE 2011 SURVEY

### Principal 1: Take context as the starting point

In a situation exacerbated by the complicated and changing dynamics of conflict, development partners have tried to take context into account but their work is significantly hampered by the lack of statistics and other basic planning data and their own limited capacity and experience.

### Principal 2: Do no harm

Continuing to bypass the government in the delivery of basic services will cause harm in the medium to longer term. Both South Sudanese and international actors are increasingly concerned about the pervasive and destructive impact of corruption, but there is little will to address it. Aid dependency is perceived as a growing problem and there is increasing competition for staff between development partners and the government, which is expected to increase after independence.

### Principal 3: Focus on statebuilding as the central objective

Since 2005, development partners have been hampered by having to simultaneously support unity, as a requirement of the CPA, and prepare for an independent state of South Sudan. The strong initial focus on the central executive has been at the expense of working with state and county governments. Although development partners claim to focus on the key requirements of statebuilding, they have overlooked some key dimensions including economic diversification, domestic resource mobilisation, and the specific need in the South Sudan situation to address nation-building. The lack of capacity in South Sudan has led development partners to establish a large number of parallel project implementation units (PPIUs) which the government feels will ultimately undermine state systems.

#### ■ Principal 4: Prioritise prevention

The threat of renewed conflict remains high both from the North and from internal threats caused by ethnic divides and perceived discrimination. These latter threats are perceived to be growing. In response, many agencies are involved in conflict prevention on a number of levels and there is wide support for establishing early warning systems, but co-ordination and the lack of a single national peacebuilding strategy are regarded as problematic. Such a strategy, though ambitious, would not just focus on the cessation of violence and implementation of government-led disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) but also include improved service delivery and development of the security and justice sectors.

#### ■ Principal 5: Recognise the links between political, security and development objectives

Development partners (DPs) can no longer rely on the CPA framework to integrate political, security and development concerns and to drive the necessary prioritisation. The government and DPs will be faced with increasingly difficult choices and trade-offs between political, security and development objectives in the post-independence era. Whilst preventing conflict and building consensus is naturally high up on the agendas of international partners, the government's focus on maintaining and strengthening the armed forces cannot be supported at any cost.

#### ■ Principal 6: Promote non-discrimination as a basis for inclusive and stable societies

Most DPs claim to have mechanisms in place to ensure the views of vulnerable and marginalised groups inform their programming. Many survey participants admit to feeling some unease over their levels of understanding the complicated nature of discrimination in South Sudanese society, for instance the issues around supporting the reintegration of returnees. The government is committed to addressing the issue of gender discrimination but it remains deeply embedded in South Sudanese society.

#### ■ Principal 7: Align with local priorities in different ways in different contexts

Both government and development partners experience problems prioritising and sequencing work. A number of line ministries have embarked on "sector strategic planning" processes whilst also participating in the South Sudan Development Plan process, with timelines of the various processes overlapping but not clearly feeding into one

another. There is currently neither any general nor any sector budget support provided to the government. Only one DP has a strategy for gradually moving aid on-budget and through country systems. Most participants recognised that current financing mechanisms may need a strategic reorganisation and realignment to better support implementation of the SSDP.

#### ■ Principal 8: Agree on practical co-ordination mechanisms between international actors

Despite the existence of a formal donor co-ordination forum and Budget Sector Working Groups (BSWGs) to support budget planning, there is no effective formal donor co-ordination agreement in South Sudan. There are a wide range of informal, broad donor forums – including groups focused around specific sectors with ad-hoc participation by the government. Some donor and aid co-ordination is effective but generally it is weak. Paris Declaration (PD) indicators for joint analysis, technical co-operation and joint mission planning are all very low. The government's revised Aid Strategy sets out the need to develop more formal co-operation mechanisms and represents a new opportunity to address some of the failings of the 2006 Strategy. NGOs need more clarity on their legal, management and co-ordination frameworks, as they are some of the government's key implementation partners.

#### ■ Principal 9: Act fast... but stay engaged long enough to give success a chance

International actors have the flexibility to respond quickly to humanitarian needs, though procedures can sometimes appear complicated. Although most international actors appear to be committed to long-term engagement in South Sudan, this is not always well-reflected in forward budget planning and contractual commitments. This is due in part to the cyclical nature of programming, the current emphasis on short-term funding, the highly volatile political situation and poor predictability of bilateral aid in an uncertain global financial climate.

#### ■ Principal 10: Avoid pockets of exclusion

Political exclusion continues to jeopardise the conclusion of a political agreement necessary to promote stability. Both the government and DPs recognise that there are states, sectors, and/or population groups in South Sudan that receive insufficient development assistance. Unemployed, disaffected youth – particularly young men – have emerged as a significant threat to maintaining peace. Rapid urbanisation will lead to a complicated picture of increasingly marginalised and excluded urban poor.

## About the 2011 Survey on the Fragile States Principles

Four years after ministers of the OECD Development Assistance Committee endorsed the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations, 13 countries\* have decided to take stock of the quality and impact of international engagement across the areas of diplomacy, development and security. The 2011 Monitoring Report (*International Engagement in Fragile States: Can't we do better?*) synthesises main findings and recommendations from across these 13 countries, providing evidence from the ground of what works and what doesn't. **Read the full reports online at [www.fsprinciples.org](http://www.fsprinciples.org)**

\* Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste and Togo

