

# A review of selected sector policies of the Government of Southern Sudan to identify gaps in food security policy

Report submitted to:

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action, Southern Sudan subprogramme

June 2010

Diress Mengistu

**Independent Consultant**

[Diress.mengistu@gmail.com](mailto:Diress.mengistu@gmail.com)

# Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	3
1. BACKGROUND: FOOD SECURITY IN SECTOR POLICIES.....	4
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE SECTOR POLICY REVIEW .....	4
3. INTRODUCTION .....	5
4. METHODOLOGY .....	10
5. SECTOR POLICY REVIEW AND ANALYSIS .....	10
6. THE TWIN-TRACK APPROACH .....	65
7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS: LESSONS LEARNED AND THE WAY FORWARD .....	65
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A FOOD SECURITY POLICY CONSULTANT .....	69
ANNEX 2: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR IDENTIFYING POLICY GAPS .....	71
ANNEX 3: SYNTHESIS OF POLICY GAPS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS .....	86
ANNEX 4: TABLES ON RELATIONSHIPS .....	91
ANNEX 5: LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND PEOPLE MET DURING CONSULTATIONS ON FOOD SECURITY POLICY ...	95

## **Abbreviations and acronyms**

ABSS:	Agricultural Bank of Southern Sudan
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CSO	Civil society organization
DF:	Directorate of Forestry
DOF:	Directorate of Fisheries
ICSS:	Interim Constitution of Southern Sudan
FAPF	Food and Agriculture Policy Framework of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FPP:	Final Project Proposal
FSTS	Food Security Technical Secretariat
GMO	Genetically-modified organism
MAF:	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MARF:	Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries
MCI:	Ministry of Commerce and Industry
MCRD:	Ministry of Cooperatives and Rural Development
MFEP:	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MTR:	Ministry of Transport and Roads
MWRI	Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation
NGO:	Non -governmental organization
NHOP	Nutrition and Health Operational Plan
NHP:	Nutrition Health Policy
PIM:	Project Implementation Manual
PSU:	Project Support Unit
SSARO	Southern Sudan Agricultural Research Organisation
SIFSIA:	Southern Sudan Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action
SSLA:	Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly
ToR:	Terms of Reference

## **1. Background: Food security in sector policies**

Most of the food security-related sector policy frameworks and strategic plans in Southern Sudan were developed between 2006 and 2007. Three to four years after the formulation and implementation of these policies, it is recognized that:

- food security-related coordination, policy making and institutional setups, such as the Food Security Council, as well as budget allocation mechanisms, are still being defined;
- the role of stakeholders in existing and future policy process is still being discussed, particularly in the context of the ongoing decentralization process;
- policy areas relevant to food security and nutrition are still being identified and developed through various sector policies;
- further advocacy and work is required to highlight the importance of integrating food security and nutrition as cross-cutting policy issues within the overall policy framework and within sector policies;
- policy monitoring mechanisms have not yet been established to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of policy implementation and related accountability, and ensure the focus of investment is on food security;
- the need for a comprehensive food security policy that could provide coherence and complementarities among the various sector policies is being assessed; and
- the overall food security situation has not improved to the degree expected and, in some cases (such as the 2009 harvest), there has been a decline of about 38 percent in domestic cereal production, which has serious implications for food imports and budget allocations up to tens of millions of dollars.

In order to address these policy challenges and given the need to mainstream food security across all relevant sector policies, ministries and commissions, four objectives were identified for the policy review.

## **2. Objectives of the sector policy review**

The main objectives of the review were to:

- identify major policy gaps in each of the sector policies or strategies of the Government of Southern Sudan in addressing food insecurity;
- make recommendations for improving the measures to be included in the Government's future policies, strategies and programmes;
- pave the way for the next step regarding identifying indicators and related benchmarks that are required for adequately and effectively monitoring food security-related policies and programmes; and
- assist the adoption of an agreed roadmap for establishing a policy framework that is conducive to achieving sustainable food security.

## 3. Introduction

### 3.1 Context

This policy review was undertaken four to five years after most of the policies under review were prepared and approved.

Before starting a policy review and analysis to identify major gaps, it is important to take into account the context in which the sector policies and strategic plans were developed. Otherwise, this could lead to assumptions that policy development in Southern Sudan was conducted through normal policy development processes.

Under the terms of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), signed in January 2005 between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army, the Government of Southern Sudan was formed and relevant line ministries were established as per the provisions of the Interim Constitution of Southern Sudan (ICSS)<sup>1</sup>. Most line ministries with a food security focus then developed their sector policies and strategic plans between 2006 and 2007.

During the planning and development of sector policies and strategic plans in 2006 and 2007, the internal technical capacities of the line ministries were constrained by a lack of senior staff members. Most senior staff already had heavy workloads in terms of participating in meetings and carrying out the day-to-day work of the ministries, in addition to the policy development activities. They also faced overlapping commitments and deadlines in response to donor requirements. Working conditions were also difficult, particularly regarding the availability of working space or buildings, and secretarial or clerical services. Organizational structures were not always appropriately assigned to the ministries and, as greater experience was gained, had to be realigned. This process of realignment is continuing.

The administrative context was also difficult, with confusion and varying interpretations of decentralization and subsidiary principles affecting the development of sector policies and strategies. The lack of sufficient stakeholder consultation and inputs from the people who were to be served by the strategies or policies also hindered the process. The main difficulties faced included time constraints, a lack of communication facilities for effective coordination, and logistical challenges. In addition, a number of laws and regulations enforcing the establishment of key subsector institutions are still pending. These complex circumstances during the development of policies and strategies may have led to the use of different formats and styles, even within the same ministry, for subsector policies and strategic plans.

At the time that most policies and strategies were developed, Southern Sudan was experiencing diverse problems. The health and malnutrition situation was among the worst in the world<sup>2</sup>, roads infrastructure and facilities were extremely limited and in a poor condition<sup>3</sup>, water supply and sanitation were approximately 27 percent and 15 percent respectively, and the per capita income of 90 percent of the population was below USD 1 per day.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Article 115 and Schedule B of the ICSS for the mandates of Government of Southern Sudan ministries.

<sup>2</sup> See page 20, Chapter 3 of the Government of Southern Sudan Health Policy 2007-2011.

<sup>3</sup> See page 5 of the Transport Sector Policy for the Ministry of Transport and Roads (MTR), Government of Southern Sudan, May 2007.

Given such unfavourable circumstances across almost every sector, it is clear that ensuring food security through appropriate sector policies would be a huge and complex task for post-war Southern Sudan to achieve in the immediate future. Under such conditions, policy makers and advisors faced difficulties in prioritizing key policy issues as everything appeared to be a priority and of equal importance.

The main aspects of the context within which sector policies have been developed were as follows:

- the policy formulation mandates of the line ministries are derived from the CPA and ICSS;
- sector policies are approved by the Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly (SSLA);
- the development of policies and strategies was constrained by significant challenges, including insufficient stakeholder consultations owing to logistical and time constraints, differing interpretations of decentralization, a shortage of qualified and professional staff, and a lack of appropriate work stations; and
- during the policy development period, Southern Sudan faced considerable challenges in addressing malnutrition, food insecurity, poor roads infrastructure, and insecurity in some areas.

The implications of these circumstances may be that policy development and strategic planning was rushed, policy objectives and corresponding policy measures could have been overlooked, and institutional arrangements may have been blurred or inappropriately aligned.

### **3.2 Interpretation of the scope of work**

The consultancy for this policy review was undertaken according to the Terms of Reference (ToRs) presented in **Annex 1**, which were developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)/Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA). The ToRs required the following outputs:

- a review of policies, strategies and programmes, and production of a document that clearly indicates policy gaps and recommendations;
- a presentation to selected FAO and partner audiences on the main policies reviewed and ways forward; and
- the production of a brief report describing the policy review process, challenges faced and the way forward regarding future policy analysis and formulation.

Owing to the perception that the twin-track simplified tables might not be sufficient for identifying policy gaps and the reasons for these gaps, the SIFSIA Project Support Unit (PSU) and the consultant agreed that as much information as possible would be gathered without the consultant limiting his work to these tables, while still ensuring that the tables (for identifying and synthesizing policy gaps and implications) would be used as much as possible.

### **3.3 Limitations of the policy review task**

The main task was to review and analyse policies, strategic plans and other programme documents of the food security-related line ministries of the Government of Southern Sudan in order to identify major policy gaps in each policy or strategy and make recommendations for future efforts to update these policies or strategies.

It was initially envisaged that the selected policies and strategies would be from four to five Government of Southern Sudan line ministries and about six to seven policy frameworks. A review of policies was to be carried out first, followed by an analysis of policy/strategy documents and

identification of gaps. Once gaps were identified, consultations would be organized with groups of relevant staff from each ministry whose policies/strategies had been reviewed. Finally, the information obtained and analysed would be entered into policy gap identification and synthesis tables.

However, in practice, the consultant felt that it was necessary to expand the number of food security-related line ministries and policy frameworks and strategies in order to assess the real contribution of these ministries to addressing food security. The consultant also felt that the twin-track framework tables might not fully capture the policy gaps as there is no room for understanding why and how these policy frameworks and strategies were developed in a particular way. This led to: (i) an increase in the number of policy and related documents to be reviewed from six to 13; and (ii) the inclusion of an additional narrative report to complement the twin-track framework. The considerable amount of work to be completed was constrained by the 32-day time frame for the consultancy period.

Consultations with relevant staff from the Government of Southern Sudan ministries were extended over three weeks, rather than the anticipated one week, owing to the unavailability of some staff. This further added to the time constraints. An unanticipated trend was the development of newer versions of policy frameworks by some ministries. After a review of the most important sector policies, it was learned that some had been updated or modified to reflect the latest institutional changes and mandates. This meant that the newer versions of documents had to be reviewed again, including the draft Nutrition Health Policy (NHP) of the Ministry of Health (2010), the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (MCI) Policy Framework (2009), and the Ministry of Cooperatives and Rural Development (MCRD) Policy Framework and Work Plan (2007/2008).

The consultant discovered that some ministries have a sector policy, others have a sector policy and strategic plan in one document that is divided into two parts, and others have a sector policy framework and sector strategic plan in two separate documents. In addition to reviewing these documents, the consultant had to review project proposals and other programme documents to gather all relevant information for identifying gaps, particularly regarding institutional arrangements and budget allocations for specific project objectives. This was particularly the case regarding the Water Sector Policy and final project proposal of the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI).

Not all policy documents and strategic plans from the ministries and sectors covered in this report have been fully reviewed, as there may be other documents that were not obtained by the consultant. It is important, therefore, to remember that the review is no exhaustive and that there could be omissions of key information owing to an oversight.

Overall, it appears that the enormity of the task was underestimated by both FAO and the consultant. However, every effort has been made to complete the task within the agreed time frame without compromising the quality of the output. Lessons for the future have been drawn and are included in **Section 7**.

### 3.4 Key definitions

#### Food security

The definition for food security used in this report is a comprehensive definition that was adopted at the World Food Summit in 1996: *“Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”*.

This definition has some direct implications. Conventional wisdom recognizes four dimensions of food security: food availability, accessibility, stability and utilization, which can be understood as meeting nutritional requirements. The general approach to food security combines longer-term action to enhance productive potential and incomes with programmes and policies that respond to the immediate needs of the poor and hungry. To achieve food security, it is necessary to pay attention to both supply- and demand-side variables (production and consumption). These concepts underline the temporal dimension of food security, a feature shared with sustainable livelihoods, which are essential for ensuring household food security and reducing vulnerability to food insecurity.

This has been incorporated in FAO’s twin-track approach, which was used as an analytical tool for this review.

#### Policy

The definition of policy that is used in this report is a commonly accepted and extremely inclusive definition in terms of characteristics and content.

*Policy is defined as a set of inter-related actions concerning the setting “of goals and the means of achieving them within a specified situation”<sup>4</sup>, based on a set of preferences and choices. Policy is thus not just a decision, but a process of action. Ideally policies are made in the framework of a strategy, which “constitutes both a vision of what the sector should look like in the future and a roadmap how to fulfil this vision”<sup>5</sup>, including public investment, used to produce related desired outcomes.*

A comprehensive policy document should, therefore, include the following elements: vision, goals, objectives, measures and instruments, time frame, institutional arrangements, and budget allocations related to either the objective or the measure levels.

However, it is recognized that existing policy documents in Southern Sudan do not always correspond to this definition. Therefore, this policy review included all types of existing policy document, from overall strategy to policy statements and implementation programmes. The aim of this exercise is to contribute to improving and aligning the quality of existing policy documents.

#### Policy objectives

A policy objective involves the mission, purpose or standard that can be reasonably achieved by the policy once it has been implemented within the expected time frame and with the available resources. In general, an objective is broader in scope than a goal and may comprise several different goals. Policy objectives are the most basic planning tools underlying all planning and strategic activities. They serve as a basis for policy and performance appraisals.

---

<sup>4</sup> W. Jenkins, *“Political analysis: A political and organizational perspective”* (2007).

<sup>5</sup> R.D. Norton, *“Agricultural development policy”* (2004).



## **Policy measures**

Policy measures refer to the options selected by policy makers in order to achieve the objectives. In practice, policy measures include the set of policy instruments envisaged in the policy. For example, in the case of a trade policy that seeks to limit imports as a policy objective, the following measures or instruments can be selected: tariff, quota, tariff rate quota, prohibition, etc. In the context of an agricultural policy that seeks to increase production as a policy objective, the government may choose one or more of the following measures: input subsidies, seed distribution, guaranteed price, public purchase of food, etc.

## **Institutional arrangements**

Institutional arrangements refer to governance and, more particularly, to the decisions to be made regarding allocation of roles, responsibilities and accountability of the various institutions (state, ministries, decentralized administration, civil society organizations, development partners, farmers' organizations, etc.) involved in the implementation of policy. A description of the process through which the various actors will interact and collaborate is often an essential part of the institutional arrangements.

## **Budget allocations**

A policy often needs resources to implement both policy measures and institutional arrangements. Budget allocations are therefore the real engine of the policy, especially when specific interventions are foreseen (building roads, dams, providing subsidies, building capacities, etc.).

## **Livelihoods**

A good definition of livelihoods is provided by Frank Ellis (2000:10): "*the assets (natural, physical, human, financial and social capital), the activities, and the access to these (mediated by institutions and social relations) that together determine the living gained by individual or household*".

Later work indicates that it might be useful to add political capital as this can be a key asset defining livelihood activities, access to resources and opportunities. Livelihoods approaches reflect the diverse and complex realities faced by poor people in specific contexts. Unlike many conventional approaches to poverty assessment and project design, a focus on livelihoods requires incorporating an understanding of the ways in which various *contextual* factors – political, institutional, environmental and macroeconomic – either constrain or support the efforts of poor and vulnerable people to pursue a viable living.

In conclusion, this policy review sought to identify key policy gaps that could exist because of, among other things, (i) a lack of understanding of food security dimensions and associations; (ii) poor mainstreaming of food security into national policy documents; (iii) a lack of integration of food security considerations within existing policy processes, including coordination and institutional mechanisms at the national and subnational levels; and (iv) a lack of empowerment and capacity of stakeholders to address food security issues.

## 4. Methodology

One method used to gather information to identify policy gaps was a review of policy and strategic plan documents. Information obtained was analysed and summarized before being entered into FAO's twin-track table, where individual policy gaps are entered with reference to the four dimensions of food security. Information from this table is then summarized into a synthesis table.

After these documents were reviewed, consultations were held with relevant senior Government officials to ensure information obtained from the policy documents was up to date and whether new documents were available. In addition, consultations aimed to clarify some issues not clearly elaborated in policy or strategic plan documents.

## 5. Sector policy review and analysis

In this section, sector policies and strategies are reviewed according to: (i) the four dimensions of food security (availability, access to food, food utilization and stability of access and food supply; (ii) the four parameters of food security analysis (policy objectives, policy measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation); and (iii) emergency preparedness and responses. Finally, gaps are identified according to these and recommendations are made.

### 5.1 Food and Agriculture Policy of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)

Documents reviewed: MAF's Food and Agricultural Policy Framework (FAPR - November 2006); MAF's Strategic Plan 2007-2011 (June 2007).

#### a) Review of vision, mission, goals and objectives

**MAF's vision:** *"Food security for all the people of Southern Sudan, enjoying improved quality of life, environment and economic prosperity."*

**MAF's mission:** *"To transform agriculture from traditional/subsistence system to achieve food security through a science-based, market-oriented, competitive and profitable agricultural system without compromising the sustainability of the natural resources for generations to come."*

#### **Goals:**

- food self-sufficiency/self-reliance by 2011;
- contribution to reduction of poverty by 30 percent by 2011; and
- contribute to increasing GDP by 25 percent by 2011.

#### **Strategic objectives:**

In order to achieve these goals, the Ministry identified the following key strategic objectives (pillars):

- priority policies that quickly boost agricultural production;
- make available agricultural inputs, including a credit facility, at affordable cost;
- rehabilitate and expand rural infrastructure including feeder roads, and markets;
- develop and provide research and extension services and market linkages;
- develop and strengthen institutional and human resource capacity; and
- protect, regenerate and conserve natural resources, formulate policy incentives for rational and sustainable management and utilization.

These indicate that there is a strong desire within the Ministry to address food security for the people of Southern Sudan.

**Specific gaps:**

The vision, mission, goals and objectives are clear; and no gap is observed at these levels.

**Specific recommendations:**

No specific recommendations are required

**b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

Policy framework: MAF's FAPF describes the main agro-ecological settings of Southern Sudan, identifies strengths opportunities, weaknesses, and constraints to the extent that they hamper or promote the policy. It outlines the Ministry's intervention programme, focusing on the following:

- agricultural intensification;
- irrigation agriculture for commercial production;
- revitalizing the traditional cash/export crops;
- conservation and rationale use of the natural resources; and
- mobilization and allocation of resources including human, financial and material both to MAF headquarters and local Agriculture and Forestry Bureaus.

The Framework also makes key recommendations on sector specific interventions as follows:

- improve rural/village infrastructure;
- provide the necessary agricultural inputs for increasing agricultural productivity using private sector intermediaries and regional agricultural institutions;
- efficient provisions of agricultural services;
- sustainable natural resource management and protection of the environment; and
- data collection and analysis for effective planning, monitoring and evaluation and reporting

It summarizes the specific policy recommendations to resolve the weaknesses identified in the earlier sections, detailing them by directorate.

Strategic plan: The MAF Strategic Plan 2007-2011 is a separate document, which is proposed as the operational manual for the implementation of the planned interventions by the five Directorates:

- Agriculture and Extension
- Forestry
- Research and Training
- Planning and Programming
- Administration and Finance

Programme interventions under the Strategic Plan are arranged according to the following for each Department:

- goal;
- major objectives;
- programmes, activities under each programme and in some cases outputs of each activity/programme (note that the depth and coverage of these objectives/programmes/activities vary according to the Department); and
- the final section of the Strategic Plan covers the proposed budget for each Directorate for five years from 2007 to 2011.

The main sections of the FAPF adequately describe how the MAF could contribute to addressing food security. However, given the enormous challenges, threats and constraints identified within the Framework, it is unlikely that the three main goals will be achieved within the 2006-2011 planning period. The gap between the desire to improve food security and the magnitude of limitations (constraints and weaknesses) is too wide to realize these goals in such a short time. This target, therefore, seems unrealistic and we suggest it be revised accordingly.

The MAF needs to critically analyse the extent to which its institutional capacity, opportunities, and strengths would enable it to realize its proposed goals in the face of existing challenges, threats and weaknesses. It appears that the magnitude of limitations is unlikely to lead to the realization of these goals and, hence, it is strongly recommended that realistic goals which take into account the level of threats and weaknesses be proposed so that the vision of the MAF is vigorously pursued.

MAF's Strategic Plan proposes various activities under each of the programmes in order to achieve the major objectives of each Department and Directorate. However, the depth, breadth, and quality of intervention descriptions vary greatly within and between Directorates. The Department of Agricultural Production, for example, lacks outputs and does not have a timeline for achieving its objectives. Budgets are allocated at the level of Directorates for the proposed period of the Strategic Plan (note that one may have to seek additional documents to determine if budgets are allocated at the level of objectives or programmes).

**Specific gaps:**

- The Strategic Plan document lacks a clear implementation matrix for all the objectives/programmes/activities of all the Directorates and Departments, which should have indicated the time frame, quantifiable outputs, locations of implementation of activities, and budget allocations, where appropriate.
- The lack of a systematic flow or arrangement of interventions and policy recommendations in line with proposed strategic objectives and activities under the Policy Framework.

**Specific recommendations:**

- The MAF should develop a clear and detailed Strategic Plan that directly refers to and is proportional to the proposed strategic objectives and goals. The development and use of a simple matrix or table is recommended, which would bring together objectives, programmes, activities, locations, time frames and budget (if possible).
- The FAPF contains all necessary details about how food security will be addressed. However, it is recommended that the Ministry consider the need to systematically arrange the "strategic objectives" with the "outline of Ministry's intervention programme" and

“specific recommendations” section to facilitate the measurement of the extent to which weaknesses and constraints are addressed, and strengths and opportunities contribute to the achievement of proposed objectives.

**c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** is partially addressed with a notable lack of production targets. There are a number of programme interventions, both in the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan, to address food availability. It is reasonably safe to suggest that the sector policy’s interventions have adequately noted how food availability would be addressed. However, what is lacking is a quantitative and qualitative production target (projection of domestic food production target both in quantitative and qualitative terms) at any given period of time during the lifetime of the framework. Proposed goals and progress towards them cannot be measured when there are no target production levels that can be measured against the proposed goals and objectives. Annual aggregated food production levels have been documented by the MAF since 2002. MAF could have used these levels to propose target production levels for subsequent years in order to ensure food availability. The FAPF does not mention how the Ministry would address food availability in times of emergencies.

**Accessibility:** the main ways through which food becomes accessible include increased income, diversification of income generation through other or innovative rural activities, employment opportunities, access to microfinance or grants, accessible road and transport networks, easy access to local markets where food is sold or exchanged, fair prices of food items, remuneration or compensation for environmental good practices, etc.

Both the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan have sufficiently noted the importance of most of these factors in addressing access to food<sup>6</sup>. However, timelines, institutional arrangements and financial support are either very weak, don’t exist or are not time bound. For example, the coordination between the MCRD and the MAF in assisting rural farmers to form self-help groups and producers’ cooperatives is not highlighted. There are no specific policy measures associated with financial or fiscal incentives or administrative support to farmers in setting up producers’ cooperatives. Institutional arrangements between the MAF and MCI (which is responsible for Southern Sudan Trade Policy) with regard to price stabilization and removing multiple taxes are not indicated<sup>7</sup>. Coordination mechanisms for rural or feeder roads construction with MTR to facilitate food grain movement to market centres is not described<sup>8</sup>. In this respect the attribution of institutional responsibility to the MAF must be clearly spelt out in the FAPF or Strategic Plan. Therefore, an overall lack of institutional arrangements for improving access to food is a clear gap in these two policy documents as they only partially address access.

**Utilization:** the Crop Production and Horticulture Departments have a significant role to play in promoting the nutritional quality of staple cereals, pulses, tubers, vegetables and fruits. To this effect, the stated goal of the Department of Horticulture, which is “to meet the demand of Southern Sudan for vegetables, fruits and ornamental plants”, is commendable. The establishment of demonstration plots, training of staff, and establishment of nurseries, and vegetable gardens is a good starting point. However, the ultimate target of improved nutrition for consumers cannot be met without developing clear policy objectives and policy measures supported by funding mechanisms.

---

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, section 4 subsection d; Table 2 section 3; Table 4 section 4; Table 5 section 8, and Table 6 of the MAF’s FAPF for the status of rural infrastructure, credit/loan facilities and trade-related access issues.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, subsection g of the “Weaknesses and constraints section of the FAPF for not coordinating with MCI.

<sup>8</sup> See Table 6, section 3 for the lack of timelines and concrete policy measures for institutional collaboration.

The MAF's 2007-2011 Strategic Plan aims to provide agricultural inputs (improved seeds and seedlings, hand tools, etc.) for small-scale vegetable and fruit production, as well as to build and develop the capacity of smallholder vegetable and fruit producers. This implicit statement needs to be emphasized and targeted to contribute to reducing malnutrition levels. However, institutional arrangements and timelines for coordinating with MWRI for dry season gardening, coordination with the Directorate of Nutrition of the Ministry of Health and with credit-offering institutions for promoting vegetable and fruit production are missing.

**Stability:** the stability of food supply and access is relatively addressed in both the FAPF and Strategic Plan through continuous training, natural resource conservation, research and other technical areas. However, the effect of civil conflict and natural disasters on the stability of food supply and access to food is not addressed. The need to develop early warning systems or monitoring food security and vulnerability are not mentioned. Furthermore, the standards and capacities of the Government of Southern Sudan/state governments' emergency grain reserve storage should be explored to determine how they can contribute to the stability dimension.

**Specific gaps:**

- a lack of quantitative and qualitative production targets for addressing food availability;
- a lack of institutional arrangements for improving access to food;
- the utilization dimension is not adequately addressed owing to a lack of clear policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements, time frame, and budgetary considerations; and
- food availability in times of emergencies is not addressed. The stability of food supply and access to food can easily be affected in times of emergencies caused by civil conflict or natural disasters (in general, track two is not addressed). This is a gap that the Ministry should address.

**Specific recommendations:**

- Develop annual target cereal production levels based on past data (including estimated cultivation land area for cereals) in order to determine annual production requirements.
- Coordinate with relevant ministries to address the access dimension of food security.
- Develop clear policy objectives accompanied by appropriate policy measures, institutional arrangements, and time frames for addressing the utilization dimension of food security.
- The Policy Framework should have a section on emergency response to address all food security dimensions (track two should be addressed).

**d) Analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation.**

**Policy objectives:** the MAF Policy Framework has identified six strategic objectives. The specific policy recommendation section should facilitate the implementation of these objectives. Should this happen, it is likely that the proposed objectives will contribute to food security. However, these strategic objectives do not appear to be linked to the "outline of the Ministry's intervention programme". It is unclear how the objectives will help in implementing the Ministry's proposed interventions or vice versa.

**Policy measures:** it is difficult to extract a clear policy measure for each proposed strategic objective and strategy. It may be that "strategies and approaches" or "specific policy recommendations" are considered as policy measures by the Ministry. Otherwise, the lack of clear

policy measures for each objective and programme will not facilitate the implementation and achievement of the proposed interventions.

**Institutional arrangements:** there are a number of intra- and inter-ministerial institutional arrangements for proposed activities that aim to contribute to food security dimensions. However, the establishment of these institutions is not time bound. For example, the formation of the Agricultural Inputs Directorate within MAF; establishment of the Agricultural Bank of Southern Sudan; establishment of the Southern Sudan Agricultural Research Organization<sup>9</sup>; and the establishment of Agricultural Mechanization Units are not time bound<sup>10</sup>. In other cases, coordination mechanisms with other institutions that promote a specific activity supporting food security dimensions is not mentioned or not well developed. This is particularly the case regarding rural/feeder road construction (there is no mention of MTR), removing multiple taxes and tax rebates for land conversion (coordination with MCI/Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning [MFEP]/Ministry of Legal Affairs and Constitutional Development); fiscal incentives for farmer's cooperatives (with MCRD), etc.

**Budget allocation:** budgetary issues are covered under section seven of the Strategic Plan. Proposed budgets are allocated for each Directorate and for each of the five years of the Strategic Plan 2007-2011. Budget allocation for each Directorate appears to be the norm within the Ministry. Each Directorate may then allocate budgets for the various departments and activities. It is, therefore, difficult to establish budgetary requirements at the level of objectives.

**Specific gaps:**

- the lack of a systematic relationship between a strategic objective and a programme intervention may not be a gap, but a strong relationship would improve the extent to which a given strategic objective has been guided by appropriate strategies for its achievement;
- the lack of clear policy measures that should support the implementation of proposed policy objectives;
- the lack of time frames for the establishment of new intra-ministerial institutions that support the implementation of a policy objective and policy measure;
- the lack of a clear coordination mechanism with existing institutions that promote food security activities; and
- the lack of a proposed budget or allocated budget for a project objective or activity.

**Specific recommendations:**

- MAF needs to develop clear and measurable policy objectives that would be monitored and evaluated at any time to assess progress towards achieving the proposed goals for addressing food security. Such policy objectives should be accompanied by relevant policy measures.
- Institutional arrangements for implementing most of the programme objectives and activities are the least developed part of both the FAPF and the Strategic Plan. Therefore, it is important that MAF critically identify intra- and inter-ministerial, as well as non-

---

<sup>9</sup> See Table 5 for the Agricultural Inputs Marketing Directorate; Section 5 (B) "recommendations on sector specific interventions", subsection c "efficient provisions of agricultural services for the Agricultural Bank of Southern Sudan".

<sup>10</sup> See strategy on agricultural machinery and equipment under the Agricultural Engineering Department; MAF Strategic Plan 2007-2011.

governmental, institutions and the private sector for the implementation of its policy objectives and policy measures.

- The current budget allocation is at the level of Directorates. MAF should explore ways of attaching budgetary requirements to major objectives and programmes in order to ensure that planned activities are implemented, to measure cost effectiveness, and plan for future interventions.

#### **e) Conclusion and recommendations.**

The vision, mission, strategic objectives, conducive agro-ecological conditions, major programme interventions and recommendations on sector-specific interventions are consistent with the mandate of the MAF to make Southern Sudan fully food secure. However, given the threats and constraints listed, it would be too difficult to achieve the proposed goals within the Strategic Plan period of 2007-2011. This target seems unrealistic and we suggest it be revised accordingly.

The FAPF and the Strategic plan 2007-2011 indicated a number of programmes and activities directly related to food security. The availability, access and stability dimensions are better addressed than the utilization dimension.

The absence of clear and bold policy objectives, policy measures and institutional arrangements in both the Framework and the Strategic Plan for implementing the various interventions means that there is a higher probability of not achieving the aim of the policy framework: food security.

The structure and content of the “Overall goals”, “Major objectives”, “Major programmes”, “Activities”, and “Output by activity” of the various Departments of the Directorate of Agriculture and Extension are so superficial that the Directorate must make major improvements in order to ensure that they are in proportion to the role, mandate and budget of the Directorate. This will ensure that each activity and programme contributes to achieving the proposed goals of the Ministry, which has the mandate and responsibility to making Southern Sudan food secure<sup>11</sup>. The Department of Crop Production is the least developed in the Strategic Plan and efforts should be made to ensure the Department prepares its strategic plan in the same manner as other departments. The MAF should consider using similar formats and styles for each Directorate and Department in the preparation of the policy framework and the strategic plan.

With reference to FAO’s twin-track framework, the interventions or programmes prepared through the FAPF and Strategic Plan are developmental in nature (track one). However, cumulative livelihood and food security information and data indicate that Southern Sudan faces chronic food insecurity resulting from drought, civil conflict and other natural and human-induced factors. Given such trends, MAF must include its policies to assist affected resident populations, displaced households and returnees in terms of supplying them with agricultural inputs, or social protection measures such as cash transfers and other safety net instruments. MAF should prepare disaster management and emergency response plans to address food security during emergencies (track two).

The Ministry should consider developing its internal early warning system, and food security and vulnerability assessment and monitoring mechanisms (or should indicate other sources of information if it has established or intends to establish cooperation with other specialized agencies in early warning and food security monitoring).

---

<sup>11</sup> See the Policy Statement delivered by the President of the Government of Southern Sudan to the SSLA in the introduction section of the FAPF, 2006.



MAF should review its FAPF and Strategic Plan in order to prioritize policy objectives and align them with well-articulated and corresponding policy measures, institutional arrangements, and budget/resource allocations to ensure the achievement of its main goals. Measurable outcomes of policy objectives should be considered during the policy/strategy review process. The review process should include updates on the extent to which weaknesses and constraints have been addressed or reduced.

## 5.2 Forestry Sector Policy of the MAF

Documents reviewed: MAF Forest Policy Framework (2007) and Strategic Plan 2007-2011.

### a) Review of vision, mission, goals and objectives

#### **Vision:**

- 1) *“Greener Southern Sudan with fully recovered natural forests and plantations effectively managed for sustainable food security and socio-economic development of the People of Southern Sudan”*<sup>12</sup>.
- 2) *“The vision of the MAF on Forestry is ‘a green Southern Sudan, with fully recovered natural and plantation forests, effectively managed for sustainable socio-economic development.’”*<sup>13</sup>

**Mission:** MAF’s forestry sector mission has seven mission statements, of which the most appropriate for food security are to:

- develop and implement appropriate policies, legislation, institutional reforms, and strategies for a vibrant forestry sector;
- combat desertification and desert encroachment, and protect agricultural land;
- protect and conserve biodiversity;
- reverse the trend of decline in forest cover and ensure that a set minimum percentage (20 percent) of the Southern Sudan land area remains under forest cover; and
- strengthen forest institutions and services to increase productivity, achieve household food security, alleviate poverty and contribute to the macro-economy of Southern Sudan.

**Goals:** there are no goals indicated within the Forestry Policy Framework. However, the Strategic Plan indicates that *“The goal of the Directorate of Forestry (DF), in MAF, is to mobilize and coordinate forest sector activities so as to make maximum contribution to socio-economic advancement of the People of Southern Sudan through actions which ensure that both planted and natural forests are sustainably managed to satisfy the needs of present and future generations”*<sup>14</sup>.

It appears that there are two versions of the vision within the same sector; one directly mentions food security while the other does not. The DF must remove the inconsistencies and develop a clear vision.

In general terms, the vision, mission statement and goals of the DF are, in the broader sense, consistent and can contribute to food security in the long term. However, there are no clear indications that the forest sector policy reinforces the FAPF through direct references to achieving the MAF goal of food security.

The forestry sector is administered under MAF. However, the sector does not propose goals for the sector, nor is there an indication that the goal for the DF is the same as the goal for the sector.

---

<sup>12</sup> Forest Policy Framework submitted to SSLA, October 2007. MAF, Government of Southern Sudan; page 4.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*, page 17.

<sup>14</sup> MAF Strategic Plan 2007-2011; June 2007, page 45.

Despite being administered in the same Ministry and sharing similar responsibilities for addressing food security, the forestry sector has not directly mentioned food security or the sector's contribution to addressing food security at the level of vision, mission and goal.

**Specific gaps:**

Inconsistency in the vision statement and the lack of a clear goal for the forestry sector.

**Specific recommendations:**

At the level of vision, mission and goals, it is strongly recommended that the forestry sector re-examine and remove inconsistencies and develop a clear vision and goals for the sector in general, and ensure that these contribute to the overall vision and goals of MAF.

**b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

The Forest Policy Framework: The Framework introduces the important roles of the forestry sector in the sustainable development of Southern Sudan given that the sector and agroforestry contribute significantly to food security and poverty alleviation. It highlights the diverse ecological zones that support huge biodiversity and takes inventory of forest types and areas by region. Chapters within the Framework describe the current status of forestry in Southern Sudan's ten states. The Framework then describes the historical background of forest policy development and, after a brief introduction and analysis of the forestry sector, provides the vision and mission of the sector with MAF.

Section five of the Framework describes the principles for development of the forestry sector and lists 14 guiding principles to develop a modern and vibrant sector. Various subsections in the "Policies and strategies" section propose the enactment of a new Forest Act and subsidiary legislations, the need for land tenure reform and the repeal of some laws preceding the CPA, and responsibilities for managing and protecting forests. This section contains some measures for implementing the sector's proposed programmes through policy statements, but not systematically linked to a policy objective.

Chapter 6 presents the Strategic Forestry Development Plans for Southern Sudan and is divided into seven subsections according to the organizational structure. Overall goals for the Director-General's Office and the six departments are described. Each includes a table describing objectives and activities, as well as inputs and outputs.

Although all departments may have direct and indirect roles and functions related to food security, the Department of Agroforestry and Forest Extension; Department of Forest Industries; Department of Afforestation and Natural Forest Conservation; and Department of Forest Survey and Inventory have direct contributions to food security,

The Department of Agroforestry has an overall goal of promoting the adoption of agroforestry technologies and trees on farms in order to enhance agricultural productivity, environmental sustainability, and food security. The objectives are to: (i) enhance farm production through integrated land use practices; (ii) diversify farm production systems and increase farm income; (iii) supply household fuel wood and fodder requirements and enhance soil fertility; and (iv) promote tree growing by communities and public institutions for environmental sustainability.

The Department of Forest Industries has an overall goal of enhancing and adding value in the processing of wood and non-wood forest products for socio-economic development in Southern Sudan. Under this goal, one of the objectives is to promote and support producers' associations involved in valuable non-wood forest products (gum, tannin, honey, silk, etc.).

The Department of Afforestation and Natural Forest Conservation has an overall goal of rehabilitating degraded forests and woodlands and improving the landscape tree cover. Under this goal, the major objectives are to: (i) establish tree nurseries; (ii) develop plantations for priority species; (iii) encourage urban and peri-urban tree growing and community woodlots; (iv) promote the conservation and management of natural forest and woodlands; and (v) control wild fires.

The goal of the Department of Forest Survey and Inventory is to provide accurate and timely information/data for sustainable forest management. It has the following major objectives: to (i) establish forest and woodland databases; (ii) assess plantation and woodland growth and yield trends; and (iii) conduct surveys (spatial and temporal) by mapping the resource base.

Chapter 7 focuses on institutional roles and responsibilities in the forest sector. Intra-ministerial roles and responsibilities with regard to their functions are well defined. The roles of other government ministries and agencies are well highlighted with respect to their specific roles. It also assigns roles for state governments, communities and the private sector.

In general, in the Policy Framework, for each department, there is one overall goal, two to five objectives depending on the size and function of the department, and one to three activities for each objective. For each activity, technical inputs and outputs are also proposed. However, policy objectives are not accompanied by appropriate policy measures, institutional arrangements and budgets; proposed objectives, activities, inputs and outputs are not time bound. Outputs are not measurable (see for example the output from activity 2 “good quality honey, gum, etc.” under activity 2 (support value addition in non-wood processing plants) of objective 2 of the Department of Forest Industries. The same is true for most of the objectives, activities and outputs.

Section 7 describes the role of MAF, the functional nature of the Government of Southern Sudan DF, the role of other central agencies/institutions, the role of state governments, the role of communities, and the role of the private sector. This section is relatively well developed and assigns tasks and responsibilities for the various implementing partners.

#### **Specific gaps:**

- It was not possible to find a sector-wide policy objective (s), other than the specific objectives that were found for each department.
- A lack of time frame and measureable outcomes, as well as clear policy measures to implement proposed objectives, must be addressed.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

- develop sector-wide policy objectives which contribute to food security; and
- improve the implementation plan matrix by developing time frames and measurable outputs.

#### **c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** is partially addressed through agroforestry. However, more should have been proposed given the immense contribution that the forestry sector can make to food availability.

**Accessibility:** is partially addressed through Policy Statement 20, which aims to preserve communities’ rights and ownership and reap benefits accruing from forest resources. This is

particularly important as access to indigenous food plants (wild foods) is vital for many rural people, especially during the hunger gap periods. Income-generating activities under the Department of Agroforestry (objective 2) and Forest Industries do contribute to increased income and diversification. Section 7.8 of the sector policy (the role of communities) also identifies a collaborative forest management strategy and community-based cottage industries for processing forest products, which will provide incomes for rural people involved in forest management.

**Utilization:** is not addressed at all. It would have been appropriate to indicate the roles of medicinal plants and wild foods' nutritional contribution to improved diet, especially as these foods are consumed with little or no financial cost for the consumers and at the time of the main hunger gap periods when many rural poor are in need of food.

**Stability:** is addressed whether mentioned explicitly or not; there are a number of policy/programme areas (for example, the Department of Afforestation and Natural Forest Conservation) where the forestry sector makes substantial contributions to the stability of the resource base for long-term food availability and access.

#### **Specific gaps:**

The utilization dimension should be addressed. Efforts should be made to make the sector's contribution to availability and access more direct and visible by proposing more policy objectives and coordination with other institutions.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

There is a need to explore ways of addressing the utilization dimension, and the possibility of identifying appropriate interventions that can add to the proposed objectives and contribute more to the availability and access dimensions of food security. Once identified, relevant policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements could be proposed.

#### **d) Analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation.**

**Policy objectives:** it appears that the sector policy does not have sector-wide policy objectives. There are proposed objectives for each department and these are clear in what they aim to achieve in general and for food security in particular. However, there is a need to propose more objectives proportional to the vastness of the sector and its contributions especially to availability and access.

**Policy measures:** it seems that there are no specific policy measures for proposed objectives even where the objectives are at the level of department. However, there are some general measures mentioned under chapter 5 that may facilitate the implementation of several programme activities.

**Institutional arrangements:** Sections 7.1 to 7.9 of the Policy Framework describing the institutional roles and responsibilities of the various Government of Southern Sudan institutions, state governments, communities and the private sector. Section 7.6 describes in detail several Government institutions that play supporting roles in agriculture and forestry developments. For example, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry will play important regulatory and control roles with respect to forest products. The Ministry of Education will play important roles in training and creation of public awareness. The Ministry of Energy and Mining will have policy development and implementation roles in the area of wood energy utilization and substitution. MAF will need to

work closely with the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism in forest conservation. The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning has the overriding responsibility for revenue and budget allocation. MWRI will have a role to play in water catchment areas and in protection of riparian forest vegetation cover. Livestock production is a major land user in much of Southern Sudan and MAF will work with the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (MARF) to ensure sustainable silvo-pastoral systems. MCRD has a central role in mobilizing community-based activities.

However, these institutional arrangements are not described with respect to the implementation of specific objectives or there are no direct and clear ways of ensuring their contributions to the achievement of the objectives. The roles of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other international actors are not well described.

**Budget allocation:** the forest sector shares the same budgetary allocation systems within MAF. Hence, budgetary issues are covered under section seven of the Strategic Plan. Proposed budgets are allocated for each directorate and for each of the five years of the Strategic Plan 2007-2011. Budget allocation for each directorate appears to be the norm within the Ministry. Each directorate may then allocate budgets for the various departments and activities. It is therefore difficult to establish budgetary requirements at the level of objectives.

Under the Strategic Plan, proposed objectives are not supported by budgets. As budgets are proposed at the level of directorates, one may have to examine all other available documents to see if there are budgetary breakdowns at lower levels.

**Specific gaps:**

- the lack of a sector-wide policy objective;
- the lack of policy measures and institutional arrangements for all proposed activities;
- the lack of description on the role of NGOs and international actors in the forestry sector; and
- budget allocation for specific objectives/programme activities would be appropriate. However, as the norm is to allocate budgets at the level of directorates, it may not be considered as a gap but something that MAF and the DF may have to consider in the next planning periods.

**Specific recommendations:**

- develop sector-wide policy objectives in addition to specific department-wide objectives;
- develop appropriate policy measures and institutional arrangements for each objective for effective follow up;
- discuss the possibility of allocating budgets for policy objectives internally with the relevant directorates within MAF; and
- describe the important roles that NGOs and international actors could play in support of the forestry sector in general and with regard to food security in particular.

**e) Conclusion and recommendations.**

The forestry sector policy should harmonize its vision statements, described in the Policy Framework on pages 4 and 17. The vision on page 4 reflects food security, while that on page 17

reflects only sustainable socio-economic development. The sector policy must develop its sector-wide goal (s), preferably in line with MAF's vision and goals, as well as based on the Government of Southern Sudan's priorities for the sector.

The lack of sector-wide objectives may undermine the development of sector-wide goals and their contribution to the overall vision of the sector. It is, therefore, recommended that the sector develop sector-wide policy objectives.

The Policy Framework should make some of its programme activities more visible and direct in relation to their contribution to food security. For example, the significance of indigenous food plants during the hunger gap and the sector's efforts or commitments to secure and ensure fair access to such vital resources that are under government management must be made clear and direct, while the sector's potential for income generation should be well pronounced

The lack of policy measures for all proposed activities is an area of concern that the sector policy/Strategic Plan should address. Institutional arrangements with non-governmental entities should be attached to proposed objectives. The Strategic Plan should be revised to ensure proposed objectives and activities are time bound, and outputs are measurable.

### **5.3 Animal Resources Sector Policy of MARF**

Documents reviewed: Animal Resources Sector Policy and Strategic Plan (2006-2011).

The Sector Policy document is divided in to two main parts: the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan Implementation Matrix.

#### **a) Review of vision, mission, goals and objectives**

##### **Mandate of the Animal Resources Directorate:**

The mandate of the MARF animal resources sector is to *"promote, regulate and facilitate animal production, value-addition and access to credit and regional and international markets for food security, poverty alleviation and socio-economic development"*<sup>15</sup>.

##### **Vision of the Animal Resources Directorate of MARF:**

*"Our vision is to be the regional leaders in facilitation of sustainable wealth creation from animal resources for the benefit of all Southern Sudanese and investors"*<sup>16</sup>.

##### **Mission of the Animal Resources Directorates of MARF:**

*"Our mission is to enhance livelihoods and food and economic security of Southern Sudanese, especially livestock producers, by promoting, supporting and facilitating improved animal resources production and productivity, providing investor incentives to stimulate value addition and facilitating access to affordable credit and markets while promoting rational utilization and conservation of the rangelands and resources therein"*<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> MARF, Animal Resources Sector Policy and Strategic Plan 2006-2011, Page 28.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 30.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

### **Goal of MARF Animal Resources Directorate:**

*“The overall goal of MARF is to sustainably contribute towards food and economic security and employment creation by facilitating and supporting public and private sector investment in the animal resources sector to achieve a sustained annual growth rate of 4 percent within the next ten years”.*<sup>18</sup>

MARF does not appear to have a unified, Ministry-wide vision and mission. The mandate, vision, mission and goal have been developed for the animal resources sector (within MARF, the Directorate of Fisheries has its own vision, mission and goals). While it is important to develop sector-specific visions, missions, goals and objectives, it is also important that the Ministry have an overarching vision and mission that contributes to the national vision, priorities and goals.

The vision of the Directorate of Animal Resources focuses on sustainable wealth creation with no explicit view on food security. This may prevent an outright focus on directly addressing food security. There is confusion about the goal. Section 5.6 of the Policy Framework reads **“Goal of animal resources directorates of MARF”** while the text under it reads *“The overall goal of MARF is to...”*. This creates confusion about whether the goal is for the Directorate or the Ministry.

### **Specific gaps:**

- It appears that MARF does not have one shared vision at the level of the Ministry and this is a gap which should be addressed.
- The lack of any direct reference to contributing to food security at the level of vision by a major directorate/Ministry is perhaps a gap that should be considered by MARF.
- It is not clear whether the goal mentioned by the Policy Framework is for the Directorate of Animal Resources or for MARF as a whole; and this is gap which should be clarified

### **Specific recommendations:**

- MARF should consider developing a shared Ministry-wide vision, mission and goals from which the two main Directorates of Animal Resources and of Fisheries could develop their sector-specific visions, missions, and goals.
- The vision of the Directorate of Animal Resources should be revised to include or reflect food security in addition to focusing on wealth creation so that addressing food security is not ignored at the level of the vision of the Directorate, as well as the Ministry.
- The Directorate of Animal Resources should clarify the goal, whether it serves the whole Ministry or it is limited to the Directorate of Animal Resources.

### **b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

Policy Framework: The more substantive sections of the policy framework begin with the “constraints to optimal animal resources development” section, which identifies eight major constraints, including: limited organizational capacity; inadequate animal health and production service delivery structures; subsistence (breeding and nutrition) mode of production; inadequate livestock marketing and value addition infrastructure, technologies, and facilities; unplanned and unregulated rangeland and flood plains use and conservation; neglect of training, research and extension; outdated and restrictive legal framework inherited from the previous regime; and a number of cross-cutting and non-sectoral issues.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 31.





The “Policy strategic objectives” section, which is central to our policy review and analysis work, identifies nine policy objectives which directly correspond with the “constraints” described above. Because of the importance of this section to the review and analysis, the section is summarized as follows:

- establish directorates and associated institutions and regulatory bodies of MARF, animal resources sector;
- animal health service delivery including quality assurance and provision of animal health and production inputs;
- animal production (breeding and nutrition);
- range and food plains use and conservation;
- training, research, and extension;
- policy and legal framework, special projects and programmes; and
- cross-cutting and non-sectoral issues.

A section on “Strategies for achieving the policy objectives” also includes corresponding strategies (and measures) to enable or ensure the implementation and achievement of policy objectives mentioned above (see **Annex 4**, Table 1).

Section 10 of the Policy Framework describes the benefits of the sector for the people of Southern Sudan. “*Food and economic security for pastoralists and agropastoralists, traders, processors and the general public due to the good returns on investment*” is mentioned as one of the benefits of the sector. The last section of the Policy Framework “Stakeholder analysis” describes 12 large groups of stakeholders, each with a number of institutions that will be involved in implementing its core functions/policy. The stakeholders’ group includes government institutions, civil society/NGOs, the private sector, religious organizations, and many other groups. Their respective roles are not, however, mentioned.

Strategic Plan: The most relevant section of the Strategic Plan regarding food security is the Implementation and Tracking Matrix. This identifies nine strategic objectives and for each strategic objective there are a number of interventions. Performance indicators and means of verification, actors, and expected start and completion date are also indicated for each intervention. The Matrix also indicates time frames for implementation.

Policy Framework versus Strategic Plan: A close examination of the sector policy reveals that the section on “Constraints”, “Policy strategic objectives” and “Strategies for achieving policy objectives” correspond quite well and address availability, accessibility, utilization and stability dimensions of food security in varying degrees (see Annex 4, Table 1). However, the “Strategic objective” section of Implementation and Tracking Matrix describes very different strategic objectives to those proposed under the Policy Framework. Consequently, one would wonder how the proposed policy strategic objectives, which are designed to address constraints in the Policy Framework, are going to be achieved. This is a major flaw in a policy document and should clearly be presented to the relevant Director-General or other senior official in the Ministry. For quick and convenient comprehension, an extract of the “Constraints” and “Policy strategic objectives” from the Policy Framework and “Strategic objective” from the Strategic Plan Implementation and Tracking Matrix is presented in Annex 4, Tables 1 and 2.

The resource mobilization section of the Strategic Plan indicates budgetary requirements according to three categories: salaries, recurrent costs and development costs. However, there are no budgets

assigned for specific project objectives or even a directorate. This leads to the question of how proposed objectives are to be implemented. One would need to look for additional internal documents to determine whether proposed activities have been allocated an appropriate budget. The absence of a budget allocation from the Strategic Plan for proposed objectives leaves another gap in implementing the proposed objectives. In addition, it is not clear how much a proposed intervention or policy objective under the short-, medium- or long-term programme will cost.

The section on stakeholder analysis does not mention how those stakeholders will be involved in achieving the stated policy strategic objectives. It is also not clear how the strategies to achieve policy objectives (or policy measures) of the Policy Framework will be enforced without clear institutional arrangements and time frames.

All policy strategic objectives and interventions of the sector are developmental in nature (track one), except the provision of free services in cases of disease emergencies especially the outbreak of economically- and socially-important diseases. There is no reference or policy objective to address food security, for example, by way of restocking, in case of natural disasters (such as drought or floods) and human-induced insecurity (such as ethnic conflict or cattle raiding leading to displacement or temporary closure or livestock routes and markets).

#### **Specific gaps:**

- The policy strategic objectives of the Policy Framework and the strategic objectives of the Strategic Plan Implementation and Tracking Matrix do not correspond and is impossible to track the implementation of policy strategic objectives identified in the Policy Framework. This is a serious gap.
- The stakeholder analysis section (Section 11 of the Policy Framework) does not assign any role to those stakeholders or it does not describe how and when those stakeholders would be involved.
- The Strategic Plan Implementation and Tracking Matrix lacks a budget allocation for the interventions described.
- The lack of a policy objective on emergency response such as restocking (track two) is a gap that the directorates should address.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

Policy review with the aim of:

- synchronizing the Strategic Plan with the Policy Framework so that the proposed policy objectives are implemented through a well prepared implementation and tracking matrix;
- determining the scope of stakeholders' participation in the Policy Framework;
- indicating budget allocation for proposed objectives; and
- addressing emergency responses (track two) in the face of natural disasters or insecurity by way of introducing safety net programmes and other emergency responses such as food aid.

#### **c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** this is addressed in very general terms in many aspects, ranging from strengthening the relevant departments and institutions that support animal production to providing adequate animal health services and production inputs, and by improving animal production (breeding and nutrition). In several policy objectives and interventions, it is proposed that there will be increased

production with improved quality of animal products for domestic consumption and for export, while small-scale producers will increase their income from poultry, dairy, honey, milk, meat, etc.

**Accessibility:** access to food (animal products such as meat, milk, honey, eggs, etc.) is partially addressed through various policy objectives and policy measures. Access is also addressed by way of diversification of animal husbandry activities, through increased income, and improved market infrastructure. Credit facilities for smallholders and cooperatives or groups of farmers are well identified as one area to improve access to food directly and through increased income. However, time frames for institutions that facilitate access to inputs and services are lacking. In addition, the absence of reliable rural feeder roads is not mentioned. It would be difficult to realize the objectives without investing in rural infrastructure, particularly roads, and the lack of a policy objective, measure and institutional arrangement for such vital issues is a great concern.

**Utilization:** this is partially addressed in relation to establishing regulatory measures for animal products' safety and hygiene standards and regulations, especially for value-added products and processing facilities. Milk, eggs, honey, etc. are known to provide quality and diverse nutritive value and these are highlighted under breeding and nutrition, as well as production and marketing.

**Stability:** is partially addressed with a long-term perspective through the range and flood plains management for long-term productivity and the establishment of training and research institutions, which should ensure sustainable production and continuity of supply of animal products. However, in a post-conflict situation it is expected that insecurity and temporary closure of roads and market structures, and price fluctuations may hinder the stability dimension of food security.

**Specific gaps:**

- The lack of a policy objective on emergency response caused by factors other than disease emergencies is a gap that the directorates should address.
- It appears that the Directorate has not considered the effect of the stability dimension (of supply and access to animal products) of food security as it may be affected by human-induced or natural hazards.

**Specific recommendations:**

- develop a policy objective on emergency response, which may include restocking and other social protection measures to assist livestock owners; and
- address the stability dimension in a consultative and comprehensive manner

**d) Sector policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements, and budget allocation.**

**Policy objectives:** the animal resources sector Policy Framework has developed nine relevant policy objectives for the eight constraints it identified. The policy objectives are well structured and are in line with the constraints identified. The policy objectives can contribute to food security in general.

**Policy measures:** there are nine well elaborated and corresponding policy measures (“Strategies to achieve policy objectives”) for implementing the nine strategic objectives. The constraints, policy strategic objectives and policy measures are well structured.

**Institutional arrangements:** inter-ministerial institutional arrangements for implementing strategic objectives proposed in the Strategic Plan are indicated, as are time frames. However, it is not clear how the policy strategic objectives proposed in the Policy Framework will be implemented as the Implementation Matrix describes a different set of strategic objectives.

**Budget allocation:** budgetary issues are described under Chapter 4 of the Strategic Plan. Budgets are allocated in three main categories of salaries, recurrent cost and development costs. It is indicated that the Strategic Plan will be funded by contributions from the Government of Southern Sudan and Appropriation in Aid. In-kind contributions from communities are also expected to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan. However, policy strategic objectives or activities have no earmarked budgets. This may be due to the manner in which directorates and ministries are advised to develop their sectoral budgets. However, such funding mechanisms may not allow the tracking of implementing proposed objectives or activities.

**Specific gaps:**

The main gaps include the lack of time frame for the implementation of most policy objectives, and the lack of budgetary allocation and funding arrangements for the various policy objectives and interventions.

**Specific recommendations:**

The Ministry should review the Policy Framework with the aim of understanding the relationship between policy objective, policy measure, institutional arrangement and budget allocation for successful implementation of a given project.

**e) Conclusion and recommendations**

MARF must develop a Ministry-wide vision and mission statements, which should serve the two main Directorates of Animal Resources and of Fisheries. The Ministry's vision should then reflect its contribution to food security.

In general, the animal resources sector policy contributes to addressing food security through its vision, mission, goals, objectives and various programme interventions. However, measuring the extent to which the sector has contributed to addressing food security will be too complex as measureable objectives and goals were not developed at the outset. Furthermore, the lack of earmarked budget for a specific objective/programme or activity at the level of the Strategic Plan would make the tracking of implementation and achievement of planned activities too difficult because budgets are not assigned to a given policy objective, programme or activity.

The "Strategic objective" section of the Strategic Plan Implementation and Tracking Matrix describes very different strategic objectives to those proposed under the Policy Framework. Consequently, one could wonder how the proposed policy strategic objectives, which are designed to address constraints, are to be achieved. This is a major flaw in a policy document and should clearly be presented to the relevant Director-General or other senior official in the Ministry.

MARF has indicated its readiness to test an internationally-accepted early warning system for forecasting disease outbreaks and respond with free services for diseases that are socially and economically important. This must be encouraged and the finalization of the early warning system should be launched officially so that it shares its lessons with other Government of Southern Sudan line ministries and non-governmental institutions, as well as the private sector. In the same way, the directorates should develop a clear policy objective for emergency response to assist especially the pastoralist communities of Southern Sudan as they may be worst affected by food insecurity.

A policy review is necessary towards or before the end of the current Strategic Plan period. The review should be based on lessons learned from MARF itself and should aim to develop a Ministry-wide vision and mission, with the clear intention of clarifying its goals, rectifying the major flaws in the Strategic Plan and addressing track two.

#### **5.4 Fisheries Sector Policy of MARF**

Documents reviewed: Fisheries Sector Policy and Strategic Plan (2006-2011) of MARF.

The Fisheries Sector Policy document is divided into two main parts: the Sector Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan.

##### **a) Review of mandate, vision, mission, goals and objectives**

**Mandate:** *“The Directorate of Fisheries (DOF) shall be responsible for overall coordination and provision of policy and regulatory framework aimed at creating conducive environment for fisheries sector growth and investment in the country. In carrying out this mandate the DOF must form a strong and direct linkage with the State Governments to ensure that fisheries resources which transverse states are managed and developed in a harmonized manner. In order to effectively play the above role, the DOF has adopted the following vision, mission and goal”<sup>19</sup>.*

**Vision:** The vision of the DOF is *“to be a regional leader in facilitating and delivering of efficient and effective services for a sustainable and prosperous fisheries industry”<sup>20</sup>.*

**Mission:** The DOF mission is *“to ensure food security, generation of income, creation of employment and conservation of fisheries resources for sustainable development”<sup>21</sup>.*

**Goal:** *“To increase and sustain fisheries production and utilization through management of capture fisheries, while promoting aquaculture and reducing post-harvest losses”.*

**Objectives of Southern Sudan Fisheries Sector Policy:** *“The national fisheries policy is a guide, which gives direction for the development and management of the fishery sector in an effective and coordinated manner, so as to hasten and enhance the sector’s contribution to the country’s development objectives of poverty alleviation and wealth creation”<sup>22</sup>.*

**Overall objective:** *“The overall objective of the fisheries sector policy is to create an enabling environment for a vibrant fishery industry based on sustainable resource exploitation providing optimal and sustainable benefits, strengthening food security, alleviating poverty, and creating wealth for the people of Southern Sudan”<sup>23</sup>.*

**Specific objectives:** there are 13 specific objectives; however, none directly mention “food security” or the four dimensions of food security. Despite this, more than eight of these specific objectives have some relevance to and/or elements of the four dimensions of food security.

A closer examination of the mandate, vision, mission, goal and overall objective suggests that the sector has reflected or mentioned its intentions of contributing to food security and this appears to

---

<sup>19</sup> MARF Fisheries Policy Framework and Strategic Plan (2006-2011), page 14.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

be consistent with the specific objectives of the sector, although the term food security and its dimensions are not directly mentioned.

### **Specific gaps:**

No specific gaps at the level of mandate, vision, mission and goals.

### **Specific recommendations:**

No specific recommendations at the level of mandate, vision, mission and goals.

### **b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

The Policy Framework: before setting the mandates, vision, mission, goal and objectives, the Policy Framework includes an introduction, overview of fisheries resources in Southern Sudan, a review of sector-wide policies and strategies and of current fisheries policies and strategies, and an overview of constraints to the development of the sector<sup>24</sup>.

A number of important food security issues are highlighted within the Framework. For example, subsection 6.1 states that *“In order to meet the fish protein requirement for the people of Southern Sudan, fish production has to increase to 150 000 tonnes per year”*<sup>25</sup>. Another important issue is the recognition that lack of a disaster preparedness policy affects development in general. This is reflected under section 7.3 (4) of “cross-cutting policy constraints”: *“Lack of policy on disaster preparedness to deal with natural calamities of drought and flood as well as manmade problems which impact negatively on development”*<sup>26</sup>; while Section 12.1 emphasizes the need to maintain peace and stability especially with reference to the rehabilitation and integration of ex-combatants, displaced peoples, and disadvantaged groups (widows, orphans, children) into fisheries activities to ensure that conflicts that may arise from returnees relating to access to fishing grounds are avoided or settled amicably.

Section 11.2 (specific objectives of the fisheries sector policy) and Section 12 (the fisheries policy area) are the most important sections for our review and analysis of food.

Specific objectives under Section 11.2 are to:

1. promote responsible and sustainable utilization of fisheries resources, taking into account environmental concerns;
2. promote development of responsible and sustainable aquaculture;
3. ensure that the people of Southern Sudan have fair access to, and benefit from the country’s shared fisheries resources;
4. promote responsible fish handling and preservation measures and technologies to minimize post-harvest losses;
5. encourage value addition, marketing and fair trade in the country’s fisheries products worldwide;
6. encourage efficient and sustainable investment in the fisheries sector;
7. build human resource capacities for the fisheries sector;
8. promote active involvement of fisher communities in fisheries management;
9. integrate gender issues in fisheries development;
10. promote fish consumption in the country;
11. promote local entrepreneurship;
12. promote peace and stability; and
13. develop fisheries research stations and programmes.

---

<sup>24</sup> See MARF Fisheries sector Policy Framework page 11.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* page 8.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* page 11.



Section 12, Fisheries Policy Area, identifies 14 policy areas:

1. policy on promotion and maintenance of peace and stability in Southern Sudan;
2. policy on institutional framework and strengthening of support;
3. policy on sustainable utilization of the fisheries resources;
4. policy on efficient and effective fisheries management;
5. policy on aquaculture development;
6. policy on fish quality production and safety standards;
7. policy on human resource development;
8. policy on fisheries infrastructure development;
9. policy on promotion and coordination of fisheries research;
10. policy on enhancement of extension services and fisheries information exchange;
11. policy on environmental conservation;
12. policy on promotion of local entrepreneurship in fisheries development;
13. policy on promotion of regional and international cooperation; and
14. policy on gender equity, HIV/AIDS, social responsibility and good governance.

The Strategic Plan: appears under Section 20 of the Policy document and is divided into three main subsections:

Sub-section 20.1 identifies the following broad objectives:

- enhanced institutional framework;
- ensure a productive, profitable and competitive sector;
- ensure sustainable growth and development;
- ensure sustainable local, regional, and global market access; and
- ensure transformed lives of communities.

Sub-section 20.2 describes the following ten strategic objectives, which are sometimes different from the specific objectives and policy areas of the Sector Policy Framework:

1. develop the institutional framework and strengthen support structures for DOF;
2. preparation of the Fisheries Act of Southern Sudan;
3. harmonize sectoral policies that involve other ministries such as Environmental, Civil Defence, Roads and Transport, etc.;
4. develop strong effective and efficient fisheries management through education extension services and development of co-management (community based management);
5. increase aquaculture production in wetland areas of Southern Sudan to bridge the gap of protein demand, especially that of white meat;
6. promotion of fish production; fish products; safety assurance; value addition; trade; consumption and investment;
7. institutional capacity building through training of the required staff at DOF to state levels; and procurement of the required office equipment;
8. strengthen and coordinate research in the fisheries sector by developing strong fisheries research institutions, recruiting highly qualified researchers and establishing linkages with research institutions in the region and internationally;
9. continuously update a national fisheries master plan; and
10. mainstream gender equity and HIV/AIDS awareness in the fisheries sector.

Sub-section 20.3 is entitled “Summary of fisheries sector strategies” and lists 35 areas<sup>27</sup>.

The last section of the Strategic Plan is the strategic plan matrix, which includes strategic objective, strategy, activities, indicators and time frame. The ten strategic objectives indicated in Section 20.2 of the Strategic Plan are well aligned with the matrix. However, this leaves the question of how the proposed 13 specific objectives and 14 policy areas under the Policy Framework are to be implemented.

The Policy Framework has a lot of useful information and data which can be used for planning purposes, such as the need to increase protein requirement through fish production to a level of 150 000 tonnes per year. Such quantitative information could be used to set annual production and consumption targets. However, there are no specific policy objectives that indicate annual targets of production.

The DOF’s recognition of the lack of a disaster preparedness policy should help in developing disaster management and emergency response mechanisms in a timely manner. A policy on promotion and maintenance of peace and stability is perhaps one very good area the DOF has rightly highlighted as conflict over fishing grounds is a likely event at any time.

There are four related sub-sections on objectives within the Policy Framework:

- Objectives of Southern Sudan Fisheries Sector Policy
- Overall objectives of the Fisheries Sector Policy
- Specific objectives of the Fisheries Sector Policy
- Fisheries policy areas

This creates difficulties in identifying the main policy objectives of the sector, which are supported by a policy objective to meet the proposed goals and vision. In addition, there is inconsistency between the specific objectives and policy areas. While it could appear that the policy areas are extended or descriptive versions of the specific objectives, a thorough review indicates that the two are not mutually supportive or systematically linked, except in some cases, such as:

- specific objective 2 and policy area 5;
- specific objective 7 and policy area 7; and
- specific objective 1/6/ 9 are related to policy area .

In most cases, the strategic objectives and summary of fisheries sector strategies in the Strategic Plan do not correspond.

---

<sup>27</sup> See pages 31-32 of the Fisheries Sector Policy Framework and Strategic Plan of MARF 2006-2011 for the complete list of 35 summary of fisheries sector strategies.

### **Specific gaps:**

- The lack of a systematic relationship between the various titles mentioning “objectives” is a gap that needs to be addressed.
- It appears that there is loose relationship between the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan. The two parts do not have identical objectives. The Strategic Plan describes different strategies to the objectives identified by the Policy Framework. This is a very serious gap and should be addressed in a comprehensive manner before the next strategic plan is prepared.
- The lack of a disaster management policy and emergency response mechanisms, as well as early warning systems, in the face of inevitable natural disasters, drought and floods is a gap that the DOF should address. Natural disasters can significantly affect the contribution of the sector to food security.
- While there are plans to help specific societal groups, such as demobilized soldiers, orphans, displaced groups, widows and children<sup>28</sup>, with assistance to enable them to integrate into society; there are no comprehensive plans for the future should displacements or natural disasters occur. The focus is on existing special vulnerable groups and it appears that there are no future plans or proposals in the Policy Framework. Perhaps this is a gap which the DOF should address.

### **Specific recommendations:**

- Ensure that there is strong relationship between the Sector Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan. Efforts should be made to synchronize specific objectives with policy areas so that appropriate policy measures are identified to achieve proposed policy objectives. It is recommended that the specific policy objectives address the constraints identified in the Policy Framework
- Develop a Ministry-wide disaster management and emergency response and early warning system.
- The policy framework should make clear policy objectives and develop policy measures to address a number of important policy issues which are mentioned under the constraints section.

### **c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** the Fisheries Policy Framework has identified a few specific objectives to increase fish production by promoting: (i) the active involvement of fisher communities, (ii) the development of responsible and sustainable aquaculture, and (iii) local entrepreneurship in fisheries development. Availability therefore is partially addressed.

**Accessibility:** access to food or fish is identified in one of the specific objectives: “*Ensure that the people of Southern Sudan have fair access to, and benefit from the country’s shared fishery resources*”. Furthermore, some policy measures are identified to ensure access to fishing inputs that potentially increase the income of organized fishermen in order to meet their food needs. Infrastructure development is also considered a policy measure to facilitate fish transportation and marketing. The costs of fishing inputs and processing facilities have been identified as constraints hindering

---

<sup>28</sup> See Section 12.1 of the Fisheries Policy Framework for proposed assistance.

access to fishing and marketing. However, there is need to explore clear and independent policy objectives and policy measures proportional to the level of constraints to improve access to resources and to fish. In general access is partially addressed.

**Utilization:** the sector policy recognizes that there is need to address protein deficiency in Southern Sudan owing to the shortage of meat, which in turn is caused by the prevalence of tsetse fly. Aquaculture has, therefore, been identified as a policy objective to address the nutrition aspect of utilization. Other specific objectives, such as the promotion of responsible fish handling and preservation measures and technologies, contribute to the utilization dimension. On the other hand, there is a clear policy measure to address the hygiene and safety standards of fish: *“The MARF, in collaboration with other stakeholders, shall establish a strong and efficient national fish safety control system through the development and enforcement of fish sanitary and quality control standards. All peoples of Southern Sudan have a right to eat fish that is safe and have good quality”*<sup>29</sup>. Overall, it appears that the utilization dimension is partially addressed given the constraints of improving the sector as a whole.

**Stability:** stability is partially addressed through two policy objectives: *“promoting peace and stability”* and *“sustainable investment in the fisheries sector”*. There are also a number of policy measures to address stability: *“policy on sustainable utilization of the fisheries resources”*, *“conflict management”*, and the development of a long-term master plan to facilitate efficient fisheries management.

#### **Specific gaps:**

There are no notable or major policy gaps with reference to the four food security dimensions but efforts may be required to address all the dimensions in a comprehensive manner as the institutional capacity and the rural infrastructure are developing.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

There are no major specific recommendations with reference to the four dimensions of food security.

#### **d) Sector policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation**

**Policy objectives:** what we consider policy objectives are written as “specific objectives” or “strategic objectives”. There are about 13 specific objectives that the DOF aims to promote or implement. These specific objectives can contribute to addressing food security.

**Policy measures:** there are a number of policy measures proposed to support the implementation of the proposed specific objectives. The 14 policy areas under the Policy Framework and the ten strategies under the implementation matrix can more or less serve the purpose of a policy objective. There are a far greater number of policy measures with some degree of depth than policy objectives. What is clearly missing is the time frame for the realization of the proposed policy measures. In general, there are adequate policy measures proportional to the specific objectives.

**Institutional arrangements:** in many of the policy measures, institutional arrangements may either be loosely defined or institutions may not even be identified by name. There are also

---

<sup>29</sup> See policy on fish quality production and safety standards section 12.6 of the Fisheries Policy Framework, p 18.

problems of not indicating the time frame for institutional arrangements. The greatest gap is seen in the Strategic Plan where actors or institutional arrangement columns are missing.

**Budget allocation:** the DOF has proposed 11 strategic objectives, each with a number of activities to be implemented in a specified period of time. However, there are no budgets attached to either the strategic objective, activity or department. In the absence of budgets, it is not known how the Directorate receives its share from the MARF. This is a clear and significant gap.

**Specific gaps:**

- The main gaps are defining institutional arrangements, time frames and the lack of budgetary allocations.
- Inconsistency between the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan with reference to policy objectives or policy issues that the sector proposes to address

**Specific recommendations:**

- The institutions involved in the implementation of proposed objectives and measures should be clarified with a reasonable time frame for their involvement.
- Efforts should be made to allocate budgets for proposed objectives/programmes/activities.
- It is important to improve the relationship between the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan so that the implementation of proposed objectives/activities is ensured.

**e) Conclusion and recommendations**

The Policy Framework has documented the sector's potential for food security and poverty alleviation, identified key constraints, and proposed relevant objectives, programmes and activities to realize its vision, goals and objectives.

In general, the technical programme areas covered under the Policy Framework should contribute to food security in many ways, including through increased fish production, income generation from fish marketing, infrastructure development, research and training, and aquaculture development, among others.

The DOF in collaboration with the Directorate of Animal Resources should develop a Ministry-wide disaster management policy and emergency response mechanisms to respond to potential natural disasters and conflict.

The DOF should identify appropriate conflict management strategies as precautionary and pre-emptive measures to the displacement of fishing communities. It should also identify and assist customary conflict management institutions for fishing communities.

The Policy Framework and Strategic Plan should be reviewed to: (i) make both documents consistent to facilitate their clear implementation; and (ii) develop clear or explicit and consistent policy objectives, measures and institutional arrangements related to availability, access, utilization and stability.

## 5.5 Transport Sector Policy of the MTR

Documents reviewed: Transport Sector Policy (2007-2011) and Strategic Plan for the Road Sector (2006-2011).

### a) **Review of vision, mission, goals and objectives**

**The vision** is to develop a safe, secure and efficient transportation system for a prosperous Southern Sudan<sup>30</sup>.

**The mission** is to serve the Southern Sudan by ensuring a fast, safe, efficient, accessible, convenient and affordable inter-modal transportation system that meets the vital national interests and enhances the quality of life of people today and in the future. The sector will provide a level of service that reflects the importance of transport infrastructure and transport services for the future of Southern Sudan.

**Goal:** the Ministry does not describe its goal (s), instead it has chosen to set and describe its overall objectives as stated below<sup>31</sup>.

#### **Overall policy objectives:**

The Policy Framework identifies 12 overall policy objectives of MTR and the transport sector, of which the following four contribute to addressing the access and stability dimensions of food security:

- improve mobility in rural areas through promoting the use of appropriate means and modes of transport;
- contribute to job creation and income generation; and in doing so provide equal opportunities for men and women in transport;
- introduce sound management through appropriate policies and institutions in the transport sector that will lead to rapid sustainable development and poverty reduction; and
- provide links with the states and neighbouring countries<sup>32</sup>.

The vision and mission of the transport sector is geared towards developing a safe, reliable and efficient transportation system and rehabilitating the roads infrastructure. Although not mentioned directly at the level of vision and mission, food security is likely to be addressed as proposed road infrastructure and transportation projects are implemented. The sector's clear specific objective on "*upgrading and constructing roads to open agricultural areas*" is an important consideration for addressing food security dimensions of availability, access and stability.

#### **Specific gaps:**

No specific gaps at the level of vision and mission.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

No specific recommendations for addressing food security at the level of vision and mission.

---

<sup>30</sup> Transport Sector Policy for the MTR, May 2007, page XVII.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* page XVIII.

## **b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

The transport sector policy is a detailed document with technical descriptions about the various transport subsectors, and how the Ministry should set up systems and standards to deliver safe, reliable and efficient services to Southern Sudan. It also focuses on organizing the Ministry and its institutions for the delivery of services, and therefore does not mention addressing food security.

The Road Sector Strategic Plan: unlike the Transport Sector Policy Framework, which deals with the four major modes of transport (roads, railways, inland water transport and air transport) in greater detail, the Strategic Plan presents only an overview of the transport sector, but describes in greater detail the road infrastructure and transport modes. This is because the road subsector carries the bulk of passenger and freight traffic. Roads are important in international trade with East and Central African countries<sup>33</sup>. The Strategic Plan is divided into two phases as identified by the Transport Policy Framework: recovery phase (2006-2007) and development phase (2008-2010).

The Strategic Plan describes the condition of the roads network, constraints to road development and improved maintenance, and proposes 12 detailed steps to enable and implement the Strategic Plan. Among the 12 steps, a detailed description of establishment of institutions, management of roads, and funding mechanisms is of particular interest for this analysis of the sector's contribution to food security. The steps could refer to policy measures as the description is similar to that of a policy measure.

The subsection on establishing institutions justifies the need to set up a number of governmental and semi-governmental institutions for the management of the road sector's key activities, for managing finances allocated to the road sector and for generating and managing revenues from road users. It also defines the functions of each of the institutions at various levels within the Government of Southern Sudan.

Under the subsection on managing the roads, criteria is provided for prioritizing the construction of roads. It indicates that *"The prioritization of road investments should be based on both the level of **economic benefits and social benefits** associated with the road improvements expected from those investments. The social criteria will however take precedence in the prioritization of the road projects in the recovery period"*<sup>34</sup>. It is proposed that *"during the immediate recovery period, project prioritization should be based on the social criteria whose objectives are geared to: increased mobility; peacebuilding, security and facilitating administration; facilitating the return of internally displaced persons, resettlement and distribution of relief goods; maximization of access to social services; **creation of employment and poverty reduction; and increased food security through increased production**"*.

The funding subsection identifies potential sources of funding for the road sector, while the subsection on the planned implementation schedule deals with budgets allocated for each road construction project under the two phases of recovery and development.

The Transport Sector Policy Framework and Road Sector Strategic Plan are two independent documents, with the former addressing the core policy issues or policy objectives while the latter is a core tool for implementing the policy objectives of the road component of transport policy; this distinction is clearly described: *"The Transport Sector Policy will assist to develop a Strategic Plan*

---

<sup>33</sup> See Strategic Plan for the Road Sector, page 2.

<sup>34</sup> See Strategic Plan for the Road Sector, pages 38-39.

*that will define the business of the Ministry and its key targets for achievement over a plan period. With the Strategic Plan, the Ministry will achieve its objectives more efficiently and effectively. A Strategic Plan will be prepared with the conviction that it is a critical tool in planning and management of operations, and will be implemented and monitored through annual work plans*<sup>35</sup>.

There is consistency between the Transport Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan for the Road Sector. Tracking progress towards achieving stated policy objectives can easily be done due to a clearly established Strategic Plan that attaches responsibility to specific institutions, allocates budgets to each project and assigns time frames for each project/activity.

**Specific gaps:**

There are no notable gaps that the Transport Sector Policy should address with regard to food security. The transport and road sector's role in contributing to food security for the people of Southern Sudan is not explicitly mentioned.

**Specific recommendations:**

It would be appropriate to state that the road component of the transport sector is an important contributor to improving the food security of the people of Southern Sudan and such statements should be supported by clear policy objectives and policy measures.

**c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** by its nature, the transport sector and the road component are not expected to make food available (produced or purchased or donated).

**Accessibility:** access to food by facilitating the movement of food stuff from one location to the other is adequately addressed, although it is not explicitly mentioned that the objective is to ensure access to food. A specific objective of the road transport to upgrade and construct roads to open up agricultural areas as well as the social criteria used for road construction (increased food security through increased production) are some examples of the sector's contribution to addressing food security.

**Utilization:** the transport and road sectors may not be expected to address utilization dimension.

**Stability:** when there is adequate road infrastructure and transport facilities, the stability of food supply is greatly enhanced. Although not directly mentioned that the sector policy has prioritized the stability dimension of food security, it is understood that most of the proposed interventions (including the proposed road networks connecting Southern Sudan with neighbouring countries) are likely to contribute to stability dimension of food security.

**Specific gaps:**

No major gaps are observed with regard to addressing food security dimensions.

**Specific recommendations:**

No specific recommendations with regard to addressing the food security dimensions.

---

<sup>35</sup> See Transport Sector Policy, page X



#### **d) Sector policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures institutional arrangements and budget allocation**

**Policy objectives:** there are 12 overall objectives of the transport sector; nine specific objectives for road infrastructure and eight specific objectives for road transport. Various specific objectives deal with the construction of roads, establishing institutions and standards for the management of these roads, etc. Important references to food security within the specific objectives of road infrastructure include “*improve accessibility in the rural areas with emphasis on feeder roads leading to productive areas*”, and “*upgrade and construct roads to open up agricultural areas and promote national and regional transportation exploiting the strategic geographical positioning of Southern Sudan in the region*”<sup>36</sup>.

**Policy measures:** the social criteria of “*increased food security through increased production*” and “*creation of employment for poverty reduction*” in prioritizing road construction during the first phase of 2006-2007 are good examples of a policy measure to contribute to food security through road construction and income generation.

**Institutional arrangements:** although not addressing or contributing to food security directly, institutional arrangements, especially within the Ministry and sector for the successful implementation of proposed objectives, projects and activities are well developed. This is a good lesson that this sector can provide to other sectors in that it has assigned specific institutions for managing a specific task.

**Budget allocation:** although not specifically designed to address food security, budgets are allocated for each specific road project and activity. This is another good example for other sectors.

#### **Specific gaps:**

The Ministry does not have clear and independent policy objectives and policy measures related to access and stability dimensions of food security. It should also earmark budgets and institutional responsibilities for road construction linking agricultural areas or grain market access centres.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

Explore the possibility of proposing independent policy objectives that can contribute to food security.

#### **e) Conclusion and recommendations**

The Ministry has developed its vision and mission statements but does not indicate its goal (s); instead it has chosen to describe its overall objectives.

The Transport Sector Policy consists of four modes of transport: road transport, inland water transport, rail transport and air transport. However, the focus is on road transport due to its major role.

The Policy Framework proposes a number of overall objectives and specific objectives which can potentially address access and stability dimensions of food security.

Road construction is based on a mix of social and economic criteria, with social criteria taking precedence during the recovery phase of 2006-2007; and by the same criteria but based on merit

---

<sup>36</sup> See Transport Sector Policy consolidated, 2007, page XiX.

(social versus economic) during the development phase (2008-2010). It is therefore commendable that the MTR has given priority to social criteria. The application of these criteria for prioritizing and selecting road infrastructure construction/rehabilitation could be considered as favourable policy measures for contributing to food security as many rural areas will be have access to markets and agricultural surplus areas.

The Transport Sector Policy has not yet mainstreamed food security although food security is one of the priorities of the Government of Southern Sudan and by extension all relevant sector ministries are supposed to contribute to attaining food security for the people of Southern Sudan. It is therefore recommended that the MTR is made aware of the critical importance of the sector.

MAF and MARF have reported that one of the major constraints affecting the performance of the two sectors and food security is the inadequate rural road and transport facilities. Therefore, it is very important that coordination with MAF and MARF and with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry are considered during the transport/road sector policy and Strategic Plan review, perhaps before the end of 2010. MAF and MARF should be able to provide indicative data on the amount of food/livestock which may be transported from one area to the other.

## 5.6 Water Sector Policy of the MWRI

Documents Reviewed: Draft Water Sector Policy 2007; Phase 1 Final Project Proposal (FPP) 2007-2009; and Phase 1 Project Implementation Manual (PIM) 2007-2009.

### a) Review of vision, mission and goals

**Vision:** it was not possible to find the Ministry's vision within the Sector Policy document and other project documents reviewed for the policy analysis.

**Mission:** it was also not possible to find the Ministry's mission within the Sector Policy document and other project documents reviewed for the sector policy analysis.

**Goal:** the overall goal of the Government of Southern Sudan's water policy is to support social development and economic growth by promoting efficient, equitable and sustainable development and use of available water resources, and effective delivery of water and sanitation services in Southern Sudan<sup>37</sup>.

**Purpose and scope of the policy:** the purpose of developing water policy is to outline the Government's vision for the water sector, and to establish basic principles and objectives to guide future water sector development. It aims to provide greater clarity to the sector entities, reduce institutional fragmentation, attract external investment, support the emergence of effective government structures, and support interventions in other sectors. In short, it provides a framework for optimal allocation of available water resources in Southern Sudan on an equitable and sustainable basis<sup>38</sup>.

It appears that the Ministry is yet to develop its vision and mission statement. Interviews with the senior staff from the Ministry revealed that it may be an oversight on the part of the organizers of the various sections of the policy document.

---

<sup>37</sup> Government of Southern Sudan Draft Water Sector Policy, 2007, page 8.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

### **Specific gaps:**

It can be argued that the lack of vision and mission statement is a gap that the Ministry should address.

### **Specific recommendations:**

The Ministry should develop its vision and mission as soon as possible

#### **b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

Water Sector Policy: The foreword section of the Sector Policy indicates that the document addresses specific issues in relation to three main components of water policy: water resources management (WRM), rural water supply and sanitation (RWSS), and urban water supply and sanitation (UWSS); and establishes guiding principles and objectives in relation to each component

The Sector Policy document starts with a brief introduction of the establishment of MWRI based on the CPA and the ICSS. It highlights the need to develop sector policy through participatory and inclusive processes and outlines water availability under subsections on “surface water” and “ground water”.

The policy document details the main uses of water under the “social and economic uses of water” section and describes the use of water for daily domestic use, and water for agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries, industries, hydropower, navigation, environment, wildlife, and tourism. An important statement referring to the future policy and strategy development is “...civil war has constrained the development of irrigated agriculture to-date but irrigation will form an important component of future strategies for achieving food security and agriculture-based economic growth in Southern Sudan”<sup>39</sup>. Furthermore, it indicates that agriculture is expected to be the single biggest user of water in Southern Sudan in future and as demand for irrigation water grows there is need to establish policies and strategies to promote efficient and responsible water use and mitigate potential conflicts between competing water users<sup>40</sup>.

It indicates that by the time the sector policy was developed (2007) only 27 percent of Southern Sudan’s 8 million people had access to improved water supplies, while just 15 percent had access to basic sanitation<sup>41</sup>.

The document recognizes that the provision of safe drinking water, basic sanitation and a clean environment at household level can have a major impact on health. There are also significant additional livelihood benefits associated with time and energy savings (especially for women) and small-scale productive water uses that can lead to increased income and food security.

It recognizes the role of forestry as an important sector in ecological stability. It also underlines the role of livestock both as a means of livelihood and as a contributor to the GDP and notes the need to develop new water points in order to reduce pressure on existing grazing areas and open up new pastures as a high priority. It also highlights the need to develop a clear strategy for providing water for livestock, including construction of water harvesting structures (such as *haffirs* and dams) to trap seasonal waters for off-season watering of animals in areas where the natural terrain

---

<sup>39</sup> Government of Southern Sudan Draft water Policy page 3

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, page 4

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, page 2

does not trap water. It underscores the need for effective management of water resources and conservation of the environment for the sustainable development of the fisheries sub-sector.

Twelve key challenges are identified and the document notes *“management and mitigation of water-related disasters is required since frequent flood and drought events impact negatively on food security, agricultural productivity and economic growth”*.

The Water Sector Policy then sets out the three main components or subsector policies: WRM policy; RWSS policy, and UWSS policy. Each has its own goals, guiding principles, specific objectives, and key issues and priorities.

The overall goal for the WRM policy is: to promote effective management of quantity, quality and reliability of available water resources in order to maximize social and economic benefits while ensuring long-term environmental sustainability.

The overall goal for RWSS policy is: to improve access to safe water supply and sanitation facilities and to promote hygiene education for all people living in rural areas of Southern Sudan.

The overall goal for UWSS policy is: the Government of Southern Sudan is committed to ensuring rapidly growing urban populations benefit from access to safe, affordable and reliable water supply and sanitation services. The overall objective of UWSS policy is to ensure efficient development and management of UWSS services on a sustainable and equitable basis.

The guiding principles in all cases aim to lay out the basic principles for how water resources will be used and how to improve sanitation and hygiene, taking into account access, safe utilization, conservation, institutional arrangements, and legal framework for the overall management of water resources.

Specific objectives aim to ensure access, safety, utilization, sustainability, institutional responsibility, funding mechanisms for water resource management and rural and urban water supply and sanitation.

The WRM policy does not have specific policy objectives with regard to any food security dimensions. It only highlights the need to develop guidelines and institutional arrangements including cross-sectoral issues for sustainable management of water resources. However, it highlights the need to manage water-related disasters.

The RWSS has a number of clear policy objectives including to:

- provide adequate, affordable and sustainable safe water supply services to the rural population on an equitable basis and contribute to the survival and development of children;
- actively promote sanitation and hygiene education alongside water supply;
- establish effective structures to manage delivery of rural water supply and sanitation services at the lowest appropriate level; and
- clearly define institutional arrangements within the RWSS sub-sector including clear separation of institutional functions and roles and responsibilities of the Government and NGOs.

The FPP and PIM can be considered strategic plans for the implementation of the Water Sector Policy. These two documents contain five components of the water sector: water supply, sanitation and hygiene promotion, water resource technical support, capacity building, and project management support. The first three components of the FPP and PIM are in line with the three subsector policies of the Water Sector Policy. The FPP and PIM are, therefore, the mechanisms through which the detailed activities such as location, institutional arrangements, time frame, procurement and budget allocation are developed.

The relationship between the Water Sector Policy document, the FPP and the PIM is consistent, strong and direct. Institutional arrangements, time frames and budgetary allocations are well organized.

It appears that the Water Sector Policy has not prepared policy objectives/programmes contributing to food security, especially regarding the availability and access dimensions. This is perhaps due to the recognition that the Ministry is a newly-established institution and priorities are related to setting up the institution, developing systems, strengthening internal capacity and working on urgent programmes such as rural and urban water supply and sanitation components. The statements on social and economic uses of water suggest that irrigation for agricultural production is a long-term strategy and may not have been given a priority in the current planning period of 2006-2011.

**Specific gaps:**

Having no general or specific policy objective contributing to food security is perhaps a gap which should be discussed with the Ministry.

**Specific recommendations:**

Develop clear and specific objectives for contributing to food security through promoting irrigation agriculture and the construction of water reservoirs (*haffirs*) for livestock and fisheries in the next phase of the sector policy.

**c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** availability is not adequately addressed at this stage. It is indicated in several instances that the main guiding principles for water use/allocation are on the basis of social equity, economic efficiency, system reliability and environmental sustainability<sup>42</sup>. It is understandable from the water resource management component that the aim within 2007-2011 is to identify water resource potential for irrigation.

**Accessibility:** access to irrigable land and water reservoirs (*haffirs*) would help diversify incomes from dry-season horticultural production as well as from keeping small domestic animals, but it appears that this is not a priority policy area given the level of investment and the technical capacity involved at this early stage of the Ministry's capacity. The Sector Policy does not contribute to the access dimension of food security.

**Utilization:** provision of clean and safe water as well as better hygiene and sanitation is well addressed.

---

<sup>42</sup> See Government of Southern Sudan Draft Water Sector Policy, page 10.

**Stability:** The provision of safe and clean water and hygiene promotion and sanitation efforts are well designed to ensure stability of safe water supply, hygiene promotion and sanitation.

**Specific gaps:**

Generally, the Sector Policy lacks food a security focus in its Policy and Implementation Plan. This is perhaps largely due to the Ministry's intention to address more critical and emergency programmes under rural water and sanitation components.

**Specific recommendations:**

There is need to ensure that the sector contributes to food security by allocating water for irrigation or building irrigation infrastructure for agricultural production, assisting in the construction of water reservoirs for livestock, pond establishment for fisheries, etc. in the next phase of sector policy review and development.

**d) Sector policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation**

**Policy objectives:** there are sufficient clear policy objectives, especially for addressing sanitation, hygiene and clean water supply. For reasons of prioritization, policy objectives are lacking for food availability and accessibility.

**Policy measures:** there are no clear policy measures for contributing to the food availability and access dimensions of food security.

**Institutional arrangements:** although not designed for addressing food security, internal institutional arrangements for all components of the water sector are clearly spelt out, especially in the FPP and PIM.

**Budget allocation:** there are no specific projects aimed at addressing food security and hence budgets are not allocated. However, each specific component and activity under the FPP and PIM have been allocated funds.

**Specific gaps:**

The lack of policy objectives and policy measures for contributing to the availability and access dimensions of food security is perhaps the result of the prioritization at the beginning of the development of the Sector Policy and as such this should not be considered a gap but rather an issue that needs to be addressed during the review of the current policy framework by the Ministry itself.

**Specific recommendations:**

Ensure the development of specific policy objectives accompanied by appropriate policy measures, institutional arrangements and adequate budget with time frames for irrigation agriculture, water reservoirs for livestock use, and for other food security-oriented projects and activities.

**e) Conclusion and recommendations**

The lack of vision and mission statements is a serious policy gap and the Ministry should develop these according to the Government's priorities and development plans for the sector.

The Water Sector Policy document has clearly identified and elaborated its three main components: WRM, RWSS and UWSS. It has established the basic principles, specific objectives and key issues and priorities for each subsector. The importance of water for agriculture, livestock and fishing is highlighted; the importance of clean, safe water and sanitation for better health is also well recognized; the magnitude of inadequate water supply especially for the majority of the rural poor is well articulated; and the current poor sanitation conditions and need to improve hygiene are also well addressed.

The focus of the WRM component is to lay the foundation for future water resource development activities by identifying key water resources and developing information and early warning systems. The need to address water-related disaster preparedness and water use conflicts are well described. Given the Ministry's internal capacity and the urgent need to provide clean and safe water to the population; the Ministry seems to have preferred to delay any policy objective or programmes on food security and allocating water for such uses as agriculture, forestry, fisheries and livestock. A lack of contribution especially to availability and access dimensions of food security should not be overlooked.

It is strongly recommended that the next policy development process include policy objectives, policy measures, institutional arrangements and funding mechanisms in order to contribute to food security through the construction of irrigation and water reservoirs with the explicit purpose of crop diversification, and increasing production of crops, livestock and fishing. It is therefore important that concerned ministries such as MAF, MARF and others are aware of such prioritization and coordinate their future plans with MWRI before the next planning cycle, which may begin by 2011.

The Sector Policy has identified the need to develop an early warning system and disaster management strategies given the devastating natural disasters in the country's recent past. Institutional arrangements and funding mechanisms for such important issues as early warning system and disaster response are highly recommended.

The Ministry should identify an appropriate time to review its current Policy Framework and develop an updated Policy Framework. This should include the development of a Strategic Plan. The Ministry should request external assistance, if required, to help develop the next policy objectives, and measures, and identify the relevant institutions involved in the implementation of the proposed objectives. Funding mechanisms and allocations should well be integrated into policy objectives during the planning stages.

## 5.7 Trade and Industry Policy Framework of the MCI

Documents reviewed: MCI Policy Framework 2009.

### a) **Review of vision, mission, goals and objectives**

**Vision:** *“An industrialized Southern Sudan fully integrated into the world trade and global business sector”*<sup>43</sup>.

**Mission:** *“to foster internal and external trade and to systematically build an industrial sector that is dynamic, competitive, and fully integrated into the domestic, regional and global economies”*<sup>44</sup>.

**Goals:** the Policy Framework identifies five strategic goals, of which three are directly relevant for the policy review:

- *“access to markets in which businesses and farmers sell at a fair price”;*
- *a diversified economy with a range of exports leading to sustainable jobs, incomes, and dignity for Southern Sudanese; and*
- *“efficient, capable firms gradually increasing their skills, productivity and ability to employ South Sudanese”*<sup>45</sup>.

**General policy objectives:** *“The Ministry of Commerce and Industry shall pursue a policy that is consistent with the aspiration of the people of Southern Sudan as elaborated in the CPA, which lays the basis, and among others sets forth very clear guidelines. This includes the governing instruments and institutions within the Government of Southern Sudan, including utilization and management of land and the natural resources therein, the power sharing and wealth sharing frameworks, and the rights and obligations of the Southern Sudanese people, including legal processes which ensure that these rights obligations are not violated. The Government of Southern Sudan Trade and Industry Policy seeks to address salient issues on Government of Southern Sudan plans towards the stride for poverty eradication as part of its strategy for attainment of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This bold attempt is being undertaken consciously but cautiously given the understanding that the CPA is an overarching platform to guide the legal and institutional framework for trade and industrial development, investment among others in the Sudan post-conflict scenario”*<sup>46</sup>

It is apparent that food security is not mentioned at the level of the vision and mission because these reflect the broader aspects of the Ministry’s portfolio. However, the strategic goal has included some important aspects of food security such as access to markets, a diversified economy that creates jobs and raises incomes, and skills development; all of which contribute to food security.

### **Specific gaps:**

No specific gaps are observed at the level of vision and mission of the Ministry.

---

<sup>43</sup> MCI Policy Framework (2009), page 2.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> MCI Policy Framework (2009), page 2.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, page 5.



## **Specific recommendations:**

There are no specific recommendations at the level of vision, and mission.

At the level of goals and general objectives, the policy framework should at least make clear statements on the role of domestic trade in improving access to food given the traditional role that domestic trade has played in bridging the food gaps in deficit areas of Southern Sudan.

### **b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

The MCI Trade and Industry Policy Framework has just been revised to reflect the new institutional arrangements that brought the industrial sector to the Ministry and shifted the mining sector to another ministry. It was not possible to obtain the strategic plan or other documents that describe the implementation of programme activities.

The Ministry's Policy Framework is divided into three sections. The first contains the introduction and describes the background of the Ministry, its vision, mission, goals, values, guiding principles, and general policy objectives (one for trade and one for industry). The second presents a detailed trade policy framework, while the third provides the detailed industrial policy framework.

The last section of the introduction describes the general policy objective of the Ministry, which is divided into trade and industry. The general policy objective for trade identifies 11 key considerations<sup>47</sup>, but none indicates the role of trade in contributing to food security through grain marketing and facilitating agricultural inputs trade for improved production. The key considerations are general considerations that the trade policy considers for discharging its duties.

The policy objective for industry identifies seven items, of which two are relatively important for addressing food security: *"respect the domestic interests of Southern Sudanese farmers and business community and preserve their rights to enable them design and operate market systems, including orderly marketing, and preserve those measures necessary for the stability and profitability of Southern Sudanese cash crops"* and *"ensure that farmers' marketing structures are not subject to restrictive rules"*.

Trade policy framework: under the specific objectives section, it is indicated that *"the overarching objective is to create a conducive atmosphere for trade and investment in the Southern Sudan that would contribute the economic prosperity of the people of Southern Sudan"*. The principal focus of this policy will be:

- efficient market systems and infrastructure;
- institutional development (the development of indigenous entrepreneurs);
- sustainable exploitation of natural resources;
- enabling policies and legislation (with emphasis on promoting agricultural and industrial development and investment); and
- balanced, integrated and equitable development.

It is indicated that this focus will be complemented by measures to discourage and reverse practices and policies that have been responsible for the neglect of the development of rural communities<sup>48</sup>.

---

<sup>47</sup> MCI Policy Framework (2009), page 5.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, page 11.

It is not clear whether the above are specific objectives, but they are mentioned as the principal focus of the policy. However, most would contribute to food security directly and indirectly.

The trade policy describes the traditional pattern of domestic trade with North Sudan, which supplied food grains to urban centres of the South; all export subsidies shall be eliminated and that Southern Sudanese producers are not forced to compete in an international market that is distorted by export subsidies provided by others; export-oriented market access for agricultural products; prohibition of genetically-modified organisms (GMO) crops and other harmful biotechnology agricultural products<sup>49</sup> in the domains of import or market access; and the establishment of agricultural marketing boards and agencies under the proposed Southern Sudanese Agricultural Crops and Livestock Marketing Legislative framework (to enable farmers to deal effectively with their buyers and give farmers the leverage to successfully meet the challenges of a competitive market place, while they shall be able to provide fair prices to consumers)<sup>50</sup>. The policy also aims to develop and implement, through a public-private partnership approach, a market information system at the national and regional levels. It is indicated that the system will focus on providing trade/market information in time so as to help the producers and traders make correct investment decisions<sup>51</sup>. The policy also indicates that the MCI shall collaborate with other ministries and state governments to harmonize local taxation and eliminate multiple taxes as such practices artificially raise the costs of commodities in the market<sup>52</sup>.

Subsection 2.5 of the trade policy focuses on food security. Here it is indicated that the “*MCI shall enact appropriate laws and develop guidelines to ensure that growth in trade leads to and ensures food security in Southern Sudan*”. It indicates that “*the Ministry will work hand in hand with the Southern Sudan Food Security Council and other stakeholders to facilitate and encourage mechanized agriculture for large-scale farming to cater for export needs of Southern Sudan as well as satisfy local demand. Mechanized agriculture will inevitably lead to surplus production for export in the long run*”<sup>53</sup>.

Through a paragraph on trade facilitation and cross-border trade, it is indicated that the import-export process shall ensure the efficient movement of goods and reduced costs by reducing delays at the borders for commodities in and out of Southern Sudan. To this effect, MCI will seek to develop this capacity as soon as it is feasible. Under Subsection 2.10, it is proposed that inter- and intra-state trade be strengthened to ensure surplus food crops are sold to deficit areas while food deficit areas may sell other surplus resources such as (cattle) to other areas<sup>54</sup>.

Under Subsection 2.13 on trade policy on agricultural products, the policy proposes the promotion of marketing agricultural products through land conversion tax on the issue of the use of agricultural land for other purposes, and tax rebates for cultivation of crops other than strategic crops for export<sup>55</sup>. It further states that “*MCI will encourage the production of subsistence crops for domestic consumption and, working with the Food Security Council and other stakeholders introduce and accelerate mechanized agriculture in an effort to boost agricultural productivity for export crops*”<sup>56</sup>.

---

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid*, page13.

<sup>50</sup> MCI Policy Framework (2009), page 13.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid*, page 15.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid*, page 17.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid*, page18.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid*, page 21.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid*, page 22.

Sub-section 2.15 on the role of women in trade makes recommendations on the formation of cooperative societies for women and other vulnerable groups in order to access loans for running businesses and to acquire business skills for these groups living in rural areas.

Industrial policy framework: this identifies four focus areas, of three are relatively and directly relevant for the policy review: (i) exploring and developing natural domestic resource-based industries such as timber, petroleum, cement, and fertilizer industries; and promoting competitive industries that use local raw materials; (ii) agroprocessing: focusing on food processing, leather and leather products, textiles and garments, sugar, dairy products, gum Arabic, groundnuts and sesame; and (iv) engineering for capital goods, agricultural implements, construction materials and fabrication<sup>57</sup>.

In order to realize the vision and objectives of the industrial sector, the policy proposes a number of sector strategies. One is labour-intensive sectors. Given the current (and immediate future) level of development of the economy of Southern Sudan, it is feasible to suggest that the economy shall significantly benefit from labour-intensive industrial processes including agriculture and agroprocessing<sup>58</sup>. Industrial processing for agricultural, forestry fisheries, beekeeping products, and leather are all labour intensive and employ a substantial portion of the rural population of Southern Sudan. With better rural infrastructure and an appropriate strategy that promotes industrial growth for the processing of these products would mean increased and diversified incomes for large population.

The detailed trade and industrial policies have both sufficiently mentioned how these sectors can effectively contribute to food security in a number of ways ranging from creating market access, protecting farmers both from domestic multiple taxes and export subsidies, facilitating agricultural inputs supply, by promoting light agroindustries for agroprocessing, manufacturing of agricultural implements, and so on. In general, it is safe to state that these have made substantial provisions for contributing to food security. However, the policy does not mention its role in facilitating the importation of relief food in times of emergency response.

#### **Specific gaps:**

The lack of role in food imports for emergency is a gap that the Ministry should include in its next policy/review development efforts.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

The Ministry should indicate its role in facilitating food imports during domestic food deficit periods and in times of emergency response based on its mandates.

#### **c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** Availability is not addressed. If the Ministry has indicated a policy statement on prohibiting GMO crops, it should also indicate its position in connection with GMO food imports (especially donations) during emergencies. Land conversion taxes, tax rebates could potentially increase food crop production.

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, page28.

<sup>58</sup> MCI Policy Framework (2009), page 30.

**Accessibility:** access to food is well addressed in relation to facilitating the movement of food grains from one location to the other, removing multiple taxes, through rural job creation in light agroindustries, etc.

**Utilization:** the Ministry may not be expected to contribute to utilization directly but all other statements may help contribute to utilization indirectly.

**Stability:** is fairly addressed. Price stabilization, elimination of multiple taxes, harmonization of local taxes, removing unnecessary road blocks, etc. all contribute to stability of supply.

In general the trade and industry policy framework has adequately described how it is able to contribute to food security in many ways. What is perhaps required from the Ministry is to make these more concrete and frame them such as in the existing food security section, and propose specific policy issues promoting various activities which contribute to food security.

**Specific gaps:**

The role of the Ministry in relation to food importation during domestic food deficit and emergencies should be indicated.

**Specific recommendations:**

- In light of tax rebates and land conversion tax exemptions, care should be taken to balance food production for export versus for domestic consumption; and care should be taken to ensure crop production for bio fuels is not practiced at the expense of food crop production.
- The policy should also mention alternative sources of food for emergency grain reserve if GMO grains are not going to be imported.
- Expand on the existing food security section and bring other relevant descriptions and statements together for greater clarity and focus.

**d) Sector policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation**

**Policy objectives:** there is considerable mention of supporting agricultural production or increasing income, but there are no concrete and clear policy objectives on food security in general. The trade sector is perhaps one of the most important sectors in facilitating access to food, yet there is no single policy objective to this effect. In general, policy objectives are not well addressed.

**Policy measures:** elimination of multiple taxes, harmonization of local taxes, removal of subsidies on imports, removing trade barriers, facilitation of cross-border trade, inter- and intra-state trade, etc. are all good policy measures that can potentially contribute to food security. However, these and other policy measures are fragmented and do not systematically enforce a particular policy objective. Some policy measures may require the involvement and decisions of other ministries such as the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, the Ministry of Legal Affairs and Constitutional Development and state governments especially in relation to tax rebates and elimination of local taxation since the local government act and the ICSS and the states allow collection of local taxes. In general, policy measures are better addressed.

**Institutional arrangements:** institutional arrangements have been highlighted to some extent, for example, with the Southern Sudan Food Security Council in connection with mechanized

agriculture for large-scale farming. This is a good step; however, similar institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms are required, for example with MAF, MARF, MFEP, Ministry of Legal Affairs and Constitutional Development, MCRD to ensure the plans proposed to help farmers and other rural poor are materialized with the full participation of other institutions. In general institutional arrangement, is not addressed.

**Budget allocation:** it was not possible to obtain the Ministry's strategic plan, which would have described budget allocation for proposed objectives/activities; it is therefore not possible to see how much financial resources would have been required for the proposed objectives. Budget allocation is not addressed at all.

**Specific gaps:**

- Lack of concrete and independent policy objectives as well as strong and clear policy measures for contributing to food security is a gap which needs to be addressed.
- Lack of well developed institutional arrangements, time frames and budget allocations for the various proposed interventions is a gap that should be addressed.

**Specific recommendations:**

- Make access to food one of the policy objectives of the trade sector.
- Expand and develop the policy instruments mentioned in the food security section<sup>59</sup> and in several other sections of the trade and industry policy framework in order to implement the policy measures which contribute to food security in several ways.
- The trade and industry policy should identify mechanisms which facilitate bilateral discussions at the Government level with, for example, MAF, MARF and MFEP to enforce tax exemption, removal of multiple taxes at different levels of government.

**e) Conclusion and recommendations**

The trade and industry policy framework describes its vision, mission, goals and general and specific objectives in line with Government priorities. The mission may contribute to addressing food security better than the vision, which may have no direct link to food security.

With respect to the description of goals, general objectives, specific objectives, focus areas, key considerations, guiding principles, etc., it is important that the Ministry identifies appropriate terms and reduce the titles to reflect and harmonize what it wants to describe, propose and implement.

A number of good and innovative ideas, statements, and interventions which can potentially contribute to food security are described. It only needs systematic realignment of those descriptions into making appropriate policy objectives capable of contributing to food security. Once policy objectives are made clear, appropriate policy measures, institutional arrangements, time frames and budget allocations can be worked out during a strategic plan development period.

The Ministry's intention of eliminating multiple taxes, provision of land conversion rebates, etc. if enforced through legislation could greatly help in improving access to food and stabilizing prices. However, a policy statement on the position of the Ministry in relation to food aid imports should be included in the next policy review/development process.

---

<sup>59</sup> See section 2.5, page 17 of the trade and industry policy framework for details.

The policy framework may seem ambitious given that Southern Sudan is still in the recovery phase and the internal capacity of institutions is still being developed, which means it may take longer than the proposed period to see implement activities, especially in the development of legal instruments and institutional coordination mechanisms.

It is strongly recommended that a policy review be carried out at the end of the current planning period with the following issues to be addressed:

- clear policy objectives accompanied by measures institutional arrangements; and
- a strategic plan with clear time frames and budgetary allocations for proposed objectives.

## 5.8 NHP of the Ministry of Health

Documents reviewed: Draft NHP for Southern Sudan 2010.

### a) Review of vision, mission, mandate, goals and objectives

**Vision:** *“The vision of the NHP is for a healthy and productive population, fully exercising its human potential of optimum growth, active healthy life, optimal mental development, physical productivity and survival”<sup>60</sup>.*

**Mission:** *“The mission of the NHP is to improve the nutrition status and ensure an environment appropriate for all the people of Southern Sudan to access quality nutrition care and support, and especially among the most vulnerable, women and infant and young children”<sup>61</sup>.*

#### **Policy goals and objectives:**

*“The NHP focuses on improving the nutritional status for the people of Southern Sudan, providing the needed health nutrition care and services, and ensuring structures supporting these nutrition services are coordinated and managed effectively and efficiently”<sup>62</sup>.*

The objectives of the NHP are to:

- promote a core set of nutrition areas that support adequate nutrition through community-based initiatives for wide coverage, creating awareness of evidence-based nutrition actions and screening of malnutrition at community and facility levels;
- lay out quality interventions to promote nutrition among vulnerable groups to reduce morbidity, increase micronutrient intake and improve appropriate maternal and infant feeding behaviours for optimal growth;
- propose strategies to improve nutrition wellbeing as part of the management of infections and obesity, and diet-related diseases, and in treating illnesses associated with nutrition deficiencies;
- lay out the framework to establish organizational support structures needed to implement quality nutrition care and support through the health sector; and
- lay out the institutional framework and systems to maximize efficient use of resources for nutrition care through development of key guidelines, tools and legislation, establishment of a nutrition information system and research agenda, leadership and coordination and creation of strategic partnerships.

---

<sup>60</sup> Draft NHP for Southern Sudan, Ministry of Health, January 2010, page 13.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

There appears to be consistency among the vision, mission, goal and objectives regarding the proposed achievements of the nutrition policy framework: improved nutritional status for all, which is in line with the utilization dimension of food security.

**Specific gaps:**

There are no notable gaps at the level of vision, mission, goals and objectives.

**Specific recommendations:**

No recommendation. The NHP has aligned its vision, mission goals and objectives according to the priorities set by the Government of Southern Sudan.

**b) Overview of the technical/programme areas of the policy framework**

The policy framework: the technical/programme areas are scattered across the policy framework, while a Nutrition Health Operational Plan (NHOP) is yet to be developed<sup>63</sup>.

The NHP contains seven chapters and an annex. The first introduces the NHP and describes its rationale and purpose, the process of development and assumptions made in its development. Chapter two analyses the situation in Southern Sudan situation, describing morbidity and mortality, nutrition, causes of malnutrition, policy and infrastructure, and nutrition health actors. Chapter three focuses on priority nutrition areas and institutional framework and describes the core nutrition areas, support structural areas and institutional framework. Chapter four presents the conceptual foundation of the policy and sets out its vision, mission, goals, objectives and guiding principles. Chapter five describes policy strategies in detail and identifies a number of strategies under nutrition support, promotion and monitoring for adequate nutrition; prevention of malnutrition; management of malnutrition and its effects, nutritional technical support, organizational and management structures; institutional framework and systems. Chapter six describes policy implementation arrangements, where the Directorate of Nutrition shall develop and disseminate a costed NHOP, in line with other sector plans within the Ministry of Health, which should be followed by state plans. Chapter seven proposes policy monitoring, review and reporting. The annex describes linkages with the Directorate of Nutrition.

The NHP has identified key nutrition policy objectives, strategies, and implementation arrangements including a clearly developed organizational structure and institutional arrangements. The improvement in nutritional status is consistently referred to, as well as the need to launch awareness raising and nutrition programmes. The NHP recognizes the multiple factors affecting nutrition and offers proposals for technical assistance to other ministries such as the Ministry of Gender, MAF, MARF, Office of the President, etc. to integrate nutrition in appropriate areas/services to reduce vulnerability, cyclic food insecurity and/or acute malnutrition<sup>64</sup>.

**Specific gaps:**

There are no notable specific gaps in the technical/programme area.

**Specific recommendations:**

There are no specific recommendations on technical/programme areas.

---

<sup>63</sup> See, Draft NHP for Southern Sudan, Ministry of Health, January 2010, page 2.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, page 11.

### **c) Sector policy analysis with respect to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** the sector may not have a major and direct role to address the availability dimension of food security.

**Accessibility:** the sector may not have a major direct role to address the access dimension of food security.

**Utilization:** the nutrition aspect of the utilization dimension is sufficiently addressed through various policy objectives and measures. Clear descriptions of measures, for example, include “*supporting the establishment of demonstration sites (e.g. for food diversity and quality, preparation, preservation and safety) and shows, or open days to promote good nutrition at the individual and household levels*”; and measures such as “*the Ministry of Health is committed to ensuring all food donated, procured or produced locally, and distributed for the purpose of meeting the health and nutrition needs of vulnerable groups meet minimum international quality and safety standards*” are good measures if implemented correctly.

**Stability:** the sector does not have a major direct role to address the stability dimension of food security. However, promoting food and water safety and preservation are partly addressed.

#### **Specific gaps:**

No specific gaps of policy importance are observed.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

No specific recommendations are required.

### **d) Policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation**

**Policy objective:** the five specific objectives of the NHP are sufficient to address the nutrition component of the utilization dimension, while contributing to some extent to the stability dimension of food security.

**Policy measures:** there are a number of policy measures which are proposed to ensure safety and quality standards of food through establishing monitoring safety and quality standards, and specification for all supplementary and therapeutic foods and nutritional supplements distributed in or through health facilities and/or nutrition support interventions<sup>65</sup>. There are adequate policy measures which will allow the Directorate of Nutrition to contribute to food security.

**Institutional arrangements:** there is also a section dedicated to addressing institutional arrangements for the implementation of policy objectives. Institutional arrangements outside the Ministry of Health such as civil society organizations (CSOs), NGOs and the private sector are also proposed. More specifically, the nutritional technical support Subsection of Chapter 5 indicates the role of the Directorate of Nutrition in assisting other directorates within the Ministry of Health and other Government of Southern Sudan line ministries. The annex attaches clear roles and responsibilities for other ministries. For example, for MAF, it identifies “*build skills and provide subsidized inputs for production of nutrient dense foods e.g. fruits and vegetables and extension services*”; “*extension on backyard gardens*”; “*perm-culture, and working with women/community-*

---

<sup>65</sup> Draft Nutrition Health Policy for Southern Sudan, GoSS/ Ministry of Health, January 2010, page 17



groups”; “nutrition/home-economics education, food hygiene and preparation”; “extension services on food storage, preservation and processing”; and “promotion of cottage industries (agribusiness) as an income-generating activity”. While it proposes such specific activities for other ministries with mandates of food production, it also indicates its role, for example with reference to the agriculture sector, as follows “the role of the Directorate of Nutrition is to promote information, education and communication in the development of backyard gardens (kitchen gardens)”. Major actors in promoting nutrition health are assigned specific roles and this is generally very commendable. However, Annex 1 of the NHP did not specify its role in connection with disaster management as the column for disaster management of Annex 1 is not completed.

**Budgetary allocation:** as it stands, the reviewed documents do not indicate budget allocation. However, the Directorate of Nutrition makes a number of proposals for financing the NHP and activities. For example, the policy indicates that “Nutrition services will continue to be free of charge at the point of delivery. The Ministry of Health will aim to raise enough resources to provide quality nutritional services, particularly to pay for salaries, materials and supplies, training, for monitoring and evaluation, and for mobilization and advocacy”<sup>66</sup>. The policy also makes proportional policy measures for ensuring funding for the nutrition health programs and activities. Under chapter six, it is indicated that the Directorate of Nutrition shall “develop and disseminate a costed NHOP, in line with other sector plans formulated by the Ministry of Health. This should be followed by state plans. The states will be responsible for developing and implementing their plans”<sup>67</sup>.

#### **Specific gaps:**

- The operational plan or strategic plan is yet to be prepared and the financing mechanism is not yet available during this policy review task.
- The NHP does not indicate its role in emergency response planning and operations.

#### **Specific recommendations:**

- Develop the operational or strategic plan with time frame and budgetary allocation as soon as feasible.
- The NHP needs to indicate its role in emergency response or disaster management.

#### **e) Conclusion and recommendations**

There is good consistency among the vision, mission, the overall goal and objectives regarding what the policy framework wants to achieve: improved nutritional status for the all people, which is in line with the utilization dimension of food security.

The utilization dimension of food security is well addressed. Proposed policy objectives measures, and institutional arrangements are able to effectively address the utilization component of food security.

The proposed NHOP with costs attached and funding mechanisms identified should be pursued vigorously.

The role of the Directorate of Nutrition should be clarified in relation to emergency response planning and operations.

---

<sup>66</sup> Draft NHP for Southern Sudan, Ministry of Health, January 2010, page 22.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, page 24,

There may be a need to discuss with policy-makers to ensure that the sector policy on nutrition is a vital component of food security and as such institutional arrangements can be strengthened with relevant sector ministries by creating appropriate platforms to implement policy proposals.

## **5.9 Cooperatives and Rural Development Policy of the MCRD**

Documents reviewed: MCRD Policy Framework and Work Plan (2007-2008).

The policy framework has been reviewed while it is in a draft stage after the Rural Water and Sanitation Directorate was moved to MWRI in June 2008.

### **a) Overview of vision, mission and overall objectives**

**Vision:** *“empowered vibrant Southern Sudan society, co-existing in harmony with improved socio-economic, cultural, traditional, and political development”*<sup>68</sup>.

**Mission:** *“to facilitate and encourage equitable and sustainable development of the rural populations of Southern Sudan towards improved livelihoods through sensitization, mobilization, capacity building and direct involvement of the rural communities”*<sup>69</sup>.

**Overall objectives and strategies of the Ministry:** the policy framework identifies seven overall objectives, each with its own strategies. Three of these overall objectives have direct relevance for our policy review with respect to food security while the rest may have indirect or support roles for contributing to food security.

The vision, mission and overall objectives of the Ministry are clear, consistent and can contribute to food security in several ways.

#### **Specific gaps:**

No major specific gaps of concern are observed at the level of vision, mission and overall objectives.

#### **Specific Recommendations:**

No recommendation is required.

### **b) Review of technical/programme areas and strategic plan**

The Policy document does not have a separate strategic plan document or a work plan section. It only has an action plan for 2007/2008 for each activity. Hence, the review covers the various technical/programme areas of the policy framework.

The policy framework contains seven chapters. The first begins with a brief introduction, highlighting the effects of 22 years of civil conflict, and emphasizing the large scale displacement. The chapter describes the destruction of infrastructure, institutions and local capacity, and the diversity of natural resources in Southern Sudan, as well as the inability to effectively use these resources owing to the conflict.

The second chapter focuses on the rationale for the Ministry’s establishment. The fact that over 90 percent of the people of Southern Sudan live in rural areas is described as one of the rationales

---

<sup>68</sup> MCRD, Policy Framework and Work Plan 2007-2008, page 5.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

for the establishment of this Ministry, while other justifications include the need to address the negative impacts of the conflict which heavily affected the rural population and because the rural population is the basis for the Southern Sudan's emerging economies.

Chapter three presents an overview of the Ministry, including its vision and mission. Seven overall objectives and three to four strategies for each objective are proposed:

- mobilize and facilitate communities to initiate community-based development projects;
- enact, promote and put into practice ethics of good governance, democratic principles, and accountability within the organs of the ministry;
- facilitate the empowerment of the people of rural Southern Sudan in all facets of social, economic, cultural and political spheres;
- build capacities of local communities, community-based organizations and CSOs to enable them to realize their aspirations and potentials;
- provide favourable policy and legal environment to nurture and catalyze people-driven poverty alleviation interventions;
- coordinate and regulate activities of various projects within the ministry in liaison with other line ministries and partners; and
- promote basic electrification schemes for the rural population.

The fourth chapter is about the policy framework and emphasizes the need for legislation to implement the above objectives, while the fifth chapter proposes an organizational structure for the Ministry, which has four directorates, of which the Directorate of Cooperatives and the Directorate of Community Development are technically responsible for cooperatives and rural development activities while the Directorate of Administration and Finance and Directorate of Planning and Training are support structures.

Each directorate has clear responsibilities, objectives, strategies and plan of action for the proposed objectives. The plan of action component of the Work Plan contains eight to ten activities, all for 2007/2008. The most relevant objectives, strategies and activities of the two directorates are summarized below.

**Directorate of Cooperative Development:** describes the important role that cooperatives play in rural communities and outline its responsibilities including to:

- administer the Cooperatives Act;
- educate and train cooperative management committees, cooperative society members about cooperatives; and
- register, liquidate and settle disputes involving cooperative societies.

The objectives of the Directorate of Cooperative Development are to:

- mobilize and facilitate the formation of cooperative societies;
- provide subsidies to cooperatives; and
- rehabilitate, renovate and institute cooperative assets.

The most relevant strategies for achieving the objectives are:

- forming production cooperative societies, rural urban savings and credit cooperative societies;
- developing effective loan and credit policy of cooperative movement;
- undertaking advocacy for provision of loan and credit facilities for the supply of agricultural inputs/consumer articles and marketing of agricultural produce; and
- supporting the maintenance of existing cooperatives storage facilities, offices and other structures.

The 2007/2008 Plan of Action indicates that the following activities will be implemented:

- disbursement of loans and credit;
- support to rehabilitation and renovation of cooperative storage facilities and offices in five states and construction of a cooperative college in one of the state capitals; and
- reorganization and registration of 200 cooperative societies.

**The Directorate of Community Development:** is responsible for facilitating rural community empowerment by providing support to communities to organize themselves to initiate implement community development activities on self-help basis.

Some relevant objectives include to:

- promote the policy of self-help and self-reliance; and
- empower rural communities to improve their livelihoods.

Some strategies are the:

- creation of awareness through workshops, seminars and meetings;
- organization and formation of development committees; and
- provision of technical skills and financial support to self-help projects.

The 2007/2008 proposed Plan of Action includes:

- financial, material and technical support to community groups and development committees;
- financial, material, and technical support to income-generating activities; and
- organizing and conducting a leadership workshop for 30 community leaders from all the states of Southern Sudan.

The two directorates have proposed a number of objectives, strategies and activities to be implemented over a specific time period. If implemented, these have the potential to organize and assist rural farmers to better access inputs, credit and loans, not just for agricultural production, but for other income-generating activities that will contribute to the availability, access and stability dimensions of food security. Skills training will also improve diversification and specialization in selected income-generating activities.

The sector policy does not mention key partners, such as MAF, MARF, MCI, the Ministry of Energy and Mining, MTR, state ministries, etc. in implementing the proposed objectives. Nor does it indicate the relationship with state governments. The Directorate of Planning, Training and

Research is responsible for preparing budgets in collaboration with other directorates, while the Directorate of Administration and Finance will administer the budget to improve administrative and financial management. However, no budget descriptions or allocations are in the policy framework and Work Plan.

**Specific gaps:**

- major implementing partners are not mentioned in the policy framework;
- no budgetary allocation or any general statement describing how the proposed objectives would be implemented is in the policy framework; and
- there is no systematic implementation plan.

**Specific recommendations:**

- describe the major partners and their roles in the implementation of the proposed objectives;
- indicate budget sources and allocate budgets to proposed objectives; and
- develop the implementation plan.

**c) Sector policy analysis with reference to food security dimensions**

**Availability:** given the role of the Ministry in organizing farmers and assisting them in accessing inputs, loans, grants, skills training in leadership and production activities, there should have been an indication of the number and type of cooperatives involved in production activities and what level of production would be expected from them. In general, availability is not adequately addressed even if a number of policy objectives and strategies are already in place to organize and support producers' cooperatives in general terms. A lot more should be done as the Ministry is becoming much more organized, strengthening its internal capacity and allocating budgets.

**Accessibility:** access to inputs, loans, credit and skills training contributes to the access dimension of food security by raising the income levels of people involved in various activities. In general, access is partially addressed, although more specific and concrete plans would have made the sector's contribution more visible, for example, by specifying the type of cooperatives and the amount of credit or loans that a given cooperative may be able to access.

**Utilization:** is not mentioned directly and it may be that the sector has little role in contributing to utilization dimension directly.

**Stability:** stability of food supply is obviously enhanced through a strong private sector or cooperatives specialized in producing and marketing agricultural products, farm implements and storage facilities. To this effect, organizing new cooperatives, leadership and skills training, and renovation of rural grain stores and storage facilities all contribute to the stability dimension. In general, stability is partially addressed although more objectives and activities would be expected to improve the stability dimension and include both animal and fish products.

**Specific gaps:**

- quantifiable information or data on cooperatives which aim to contribute to food security dimensions may improve the performance of the sector in contributing directly to food security; and

- the sector focuses more on farmers' cooperatives producing and marketing crops and does not mention in clear terms its support to other rural producers' cooperatives in livestock, beekeeping, fisheries and related production and marketing activities

### **Specific recommendations:**

- Develop a very clear and specific role that cooperatives would play in contributing to the food security dimensions. Given the current technical capacity limitations of the Ministry, it would be advisable to seek external technical assistance to help develop clear objectives for the next planning period.
- The sector needs to indicate its support to rural people involved in animal production, animal products' marketing, fisheries production and marketing, beekeeping, rural blacksmithing, etc.

### **d) Sector policy analysis with reference to policy objectives, measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocation**

**Policy objectives:** most of the proposed overall objectives are too general and do not specifically aim at contributing to food security, but the objectives under the Directorate of Cooperative and Development and Directorate of Community Development have the potential to contribute to food security if properly implemented. Policy objectives are relatively well addressed at the level of directorates.

**Policy measures:** a number of policy measures are proposed to facilitate the improved performance of cooperatives. Measures such as the Cooperatives Act, subsidies, access to inputs, loans and grants, skills training, etc. all contribute to improving the performance of cooperatives. However, some of these may require legally recognized and binding measures such as level of tax exemption, fiscal incentives, level of subsidies, etc. for their implementation or enforcement. Policy measures are relatively well addressed.

**Institutional arrangements:** the policy framework has not addressed the need to describe institutional arrangements, especially beyond the Ministry. A number of objectives and measures require the participation and involvement of other ministries. The absence of this calls into question how the Ministry will fully implement its plans, especially those activities that may require external coordination, assistance and support.

**Budget allocation:** the policy framework and Work Plan do not mention how the proposed activities will be funded. It may be that the budget allocation is described in another document that was not available for this review.

### **Specific gaps:**

- There are no clear policy objectives at the level of the Ministry's overall objectives to contribute to food security directly.
- The sector policy assumes rural people are homogenous and does not disaggregate them into occupational or sectoral cooperatives related to animal production and marketing, fisheries production and marketing, beekeeping, rural blacksmithing, etc.
- The lack of institutional arrangements for the implementation of proposed objectives and enforcement of measures is a serious gap which must be addressed.
- The lack of budgetary allocation for the proposed objectives is another gap which needs to be addressed.

### **Specific recommendations:**

Revise the policy framework with the aim of:

- making policy objectives directly contribute to food security;
- facilitating all rural sectors which contribute to food security (including animal production and marketing, fisheries production and marketing, beekeeping, blacksmithing, agroprocessing, etc.); and
- identifying institutions and clarifying their roles in the implementation of proposed objectives and measures; and allocating budgets for proposed objectives.

### **e) Conclusion and recommendations**

The vision, mission and overall objectives of the Ministry are clear, consistent and can contribute to food security in several ways. If implemented as planned, the various objectives and strategies have great potential to organize and assist rural farmers for better access to inputs, credits, and loans, not just for agricultural production but also for other income-generating activities which will contribute to the availability, access and stability dimensions of food security.

However, these three dimensions of food security are not adequately addressed. Policy measures are relatively better addressed than policy objectives and institutional arrangements.

The sector policy should identify partner institutions and assign specific tasks for the implementation of proposed objectives and measures. Roles and responsibilities of the Ministry and its main partners should be clear in implementing objectives. It should also clearly indicate the relationship with state governments.

The Ministry should review the policy framework and Work Plan to better organize its contribution, to food security but also to realizing its vision, mission and goals. In doing so, it may require external assistance and support for policy development processes and policy formulation. Such assistance would integrate internal knowledge and experience with externally-available skills on formatting and aligning policy objectives with policy measures, institutional arrangements and budgetary allocations in order to make the sector's contribution to food security more concrete.



## 6. The twin-track approach

The twin-track approach advanced by FAO combines the promotion of quick-response agricultural growth, led by small farmers, with targeted programmes to ensure that hungry people who have neither the capacity to produce their own food nor the means to purchase it can access adequate food. The two tracks are mutually reinforcing as programmes to enhance direct and immediate access to food offer new outlets for expanded production.

A prerequisite for the success of investments in the twin-track approach is the creation of a national and international policy environment that is conducive to broad economic growth. This is the responsibility of national governments in developing countries, as well as the international community. It implies putting in place measures to promote peace, political and economic stability, and a trading environment, especially for agricultural commodities, that protects and promotes the development and food security of developing countries. It also implies the adoption of macroeconomic policies that provide the necessary stability to encourage savings and investment. In most cases, this requires increased budgets for agricultural and rural development.

Owing to a number of advantages over other methods, the twin-track approach has been recommended as an effective tool for identifying major policy gaps in each of the sector policies and strategies of the ministries of the Government of Southern Sudan to address food security, and for making recommendations to improve the measures to be included in future policies, strategies and programmes. The use of the twin-track approach generally involves two tables: an analytical framework for identifying policy gaps regarding food security and a summary table to synthesize policy gaps and implications. The information gathered and analysed from the selected ministries has been entered into these two tables, which are attached in **Annexes 2** and **3**.

## 7. Conclusion and recommendations: lessons learned and the way forward

### a) Issues of general concern

Conceptual foundations are the cornerstones of any organization:

In general it has been noted that some sector policies either lack a vision, mission statement, goals or objectives. Ideally, all sector policies should include: a vision, mission statements, objectives, goals, strategies, measures (several measures could be proposed for one objective), time frame, institutional arrangement and budget allocation. In order to identify and address policy gaps at the level of conceptual foundations such as the vision and mission in particular, policy-makers should explore the methods by which they can address such gaps. One such method would be conducting a mid-term review with the explicit purpose of identifying policy gaps, which are shared across all departments and staff. It must be understood by policy-makers that a vision is pursued, while a mission is accomplished.

Weak and vague institutional arrangements:

Institutional arrangements and time frames are the least developed aspects of most sector policies. Sufficient attention should be paid to identifying appropriate institutions, and if these are not identified by the time the sector policies are developed, they should be identified – and their roles and responsibilities defined with reference to specific policy objectives and measures – preferably during a mid-term review or as soon as the gap is identified.

No sector policy has mainstreamed food security:

Even when the FAPF notes food security as its mandate and proposes goals to attain it, the subsequent policy objectives and measures are too technical and do not even set a national target for annual cereal requirements. There is a need to mainstream food security across all relevant ministries and at all levels of government to ensure national targets are clearly known and monitored, and institutional roles and responsibilities are well defined.

Lack of policy objectives on emergency response:

Southern Sudan still faces chronic food insecurity in most areas and transitory food insecurity in a number of areas. However, almost all sector policies reviewed do not propose emergency preparedness and response at best; and, at worst, they do not mention the role of the ministries in emergency response (track two), even when the situation is clearly known to all policy-makers and advisors.

Inconsistencies in sector policy planning:

There is a great deal of inconsistency in the use of the terms specific objective, policy objective, strategic objective, strategic area, policy area, focus area, etc. within the same sector policy and across all sector policies. Furthermore, there are a number of inconsistencies between the policy framework and the strategic plan. This was more evident in proposed objectives under a policy framework of a given sector against the strategic plan of the same sector, which was meant to guide and serve the implementation of the policy objectives proposed in the framework. Unfortunately, this was the case in almost every sector policy document. Because these inconsistencies prevent a clear monitoring of the implementation of proposed objectives and measures, there is a strong need to resolve them as a matter of priority.

System of budget allocation:

The allocations of budgets for all sector policies are indicated at the directorate level and sometimes broadly divided into categories such as salaries, recurrent costs and development costs. This appears to be the norm or perhaps a directive from the Government of Southern Sudan's MFEP. Efforts should be made to discuss with the relevant Director-Generals and Under-Secretaries of the ministries the possibility of allocating budgets according to proposed objectives and ensuring these budgets are in strategic plans or other policy-level documents to facilitate the tracking of progress and monitoring of achievements.

**b) Lessons learned**

Policy formulation formats:

Almost all the sector policy documents reviewed identified many essential policy issues and elements that can contribute to addressing food security to varying degrees. The importance of institutional arrangements or the involvement and participation of stakeholders has also been highlighted and in some cases better described in some policy documents. What remains is to format and align these essential technical elements into policy and strategic objectives and measures for effective implementation of proposed objectives and measures.

Policy review task:

It has been learned that a policy review task of this nature requires the identification of a number of relevant policy documents in addition to a sector's policy framework or strategic plan or both. Other policy-level documents such as project proposals, implementation or operational manuals, progress reports, mid-term review reports, monitoring and evaluation reports, Presidential

Decrees, and press releases often contain useful and updated information and data. A systematic archiving of such documents would greatly facilitate such review tasks and make the reference base as wide as possible so that important information and data are reflected in review reports for the benefit of all concerned parties and not just for the commissioning agency (in this particular case FAO/SIFSIA). The review of such extensive documents would also ensure credibility of the report and the organization that commissioned the review task.

#### Stakeholder consultations:

The consultative meetings that were held with senior and middle-level staff from several ministries (at the level of Director-Generals and Directors) were very useful and informative. There was tremendous cooperation and open discussions highlighting limitations, progress since the formulation of sector policies, progressive capacity improvements, and so on. However, there have been some fundamental issues of concern raised by almost all staff on vital issues such as the lack of inter-ministerial information exchange and coordination mechanisms for specific interventions. A case in point was the construction of a dry season water reservoir (*haffir*) in Nakuromai area of Kapoita East county, Eastern Equatoria state by MWRI for livestock consumption without the knowledge and involvement of MARF. This was revealed during consultative meetings with the staff of MARF at their offices. Thus, mechanisms to ensure information exchange, coordination and collaboration on specific interventions within the Government of Southern Sudan ministries should be explored. According to suggestions by some Director-Generals, such uncoordinated work normally arises due to a lack of reference to the mandates by some ministries.

### **c) The way forward**

#### A workshop on policy review:

FAO/SIFSIA could assist relevant Government ministries on policy review by designing and facilitating a workshop involving relevant officials and staff from ministries whose policy documents were reviewed before the next policy frameworks are prepared. A three to four day workshop should have the aim of addressing specific policy gaps and recommendations, as well as the general comments and recommendations of this report. Specific attention should be paid to elaborating the importance of developing clear policy objectives, policy measures, institutional arrangements and budget allocations as a means to fill some of the identified critical policy gaps.

It is widely expected that Southern Sudan will have a referendum on self-determination in January 2011. Whatever the outcome, the current policy frameworks are likely to be revised to meet the new realities of institutional and mandate changes for various ministries. Given this, it is important that FAO/SIFSIA present the key findings and policy gaps and recommendations of this review to food security stakeholders. This should be followed by support for capacity building to design and develop sector policies in a time to be agreed upon by the main stakeholders, including MAF and MARF.

### **Need for an overarching food security strategy for Southern Sudan**

At present, a large proportion of Southern Sudanese population are facing serious chronic and transitory food insecurity due to the impacts of drought, conflict and persistent rise in price of food commodities. Under these conditions, ensuring food security at all levels will be a challenging and complex task which requires collective action and multi-sectoral effort. The current policy review work has demonstrated that the various dimensions of food security have not been adequately and systematically captured in most of the GOSS sector policy documents reviewed. It is apparent that

the absence of an overarching national food security policy and strategy was one of the major constraints for these shortcomings and inconsistencies.

Therefore, it is crucial that GOSS develops a comprehensive food Security strategy which will provide direction and clear guidance for developing and updating relevant sector policies and strategies in the future. A conducive policy and strategic framework will contribute to providing an environment in which food security issues will be discussed and acted upon by all stakeholders. The proposed strategy will inform action plans, which in turn will set time-bound targets to implement sector strategies that will ensure the realisation of the vision of the Government regarding food security. The food security strategy will help in defining the strategic direction for resource allocation for implementation of the national food security action plan which was developed by GOSS in 2007.

In addition, the proposed food security strategy will also assist in providing a management tool for GOSS to oversee, monitor and coordinate the implementation of food security programmes in Southern Sudan. The strategy will also demonstrate GOSS's commitment to food security and serve as a spring board for mobilizing resources from donors and the international community for the implementation of the sector strategic plans and programmes.

In conclusion, given the limitations of the existing sector strategies in comprehensively addressing food security and in the context of the upcoming referendum, this review recommends the following two urgent actions regarding food security policy in Southern Sudan. Firstly, it is important to initiate and support the development of an overarching *food security strategy* which will consider the multidimensional nature of food security with clearly defined roles and coordination mechanisms for all relevant sectors. Secondly it is also important to *revise the existing sectoral policy documents* in the framework of the proposed food security strategy paper to ensure a comprehensive streamlining of food security into the relevant sector policy documents.

## **ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference for a food security policy consultant**

### **1. Background**

SIFSIA is programme aimed at strengthening capacity of the Government of Southern Sudan in food security information collection, analysis and dissemination for improved policy and programme development. The programme is funded by the European Commission and executed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in collaboration with ministries and commissions having food security related mandate at the Government and Southern Sudan and state levels.

The objective of the programme as stated in the project document is “human, physical and organisational capacities strengthened in the generation and utilisation of information for the analysis, design, monitoring and evaluation of food security related policies and programmes.

One of the major outputs expected to be delivered by SIFSIA is “Strengthened Government of Southern Sudan capacity for food security policy analysis and programming”. In line with this output, SIFSIA is looking for a competent consultant to undertake a participatory review and benchmarking of selected food security related policies/strategies/programmes of the Government of Southern Sudan.

Since the formation of the Government of Southern Sudan, some of the ministries/commissions have tried to develop policies/strategies and programmes relevant to their specific sectors. A number of these policies and strategies require a through review and updating due to changing circumstances after their development. Many of them were also developed based on scanty information and limited qualified human resource available during the formation of the Government of Southern Sudan. Therefore, a comprehensive review of these policies is essential in order to update them based on the available evidence and current situation in Southern Sudan.

### **2. Objective of the consultancy**

The specific objective of the assignment is to review selected<sup>70</sup> food security related policies/strategies/programmes developed by relevant ministries and commissions in the Government of Southern Sudan. The review exercise will identify the gaps in each policy/strategy and develop benchmarks for monitoring the implementation of the policies. The exercise will also contribute to future efforts in updating the policies/ strategies.

---

<sup>70</sup> Often time policies and strategies are used interchangeably in Southern Sudan. Therefore, some of the documents will be strategies / programme documents.

### **3. Scope of work**

The consultant will undertake the following, but not limited to, activities:

1. Acquaint him/herself with the food security related policies of the government, donors and United Nations in Southern Sudan,
2. Hold consultation with stakeholder from government, NGO/community-based organization, private sector and community representatives on relevance and usefulness of the policies and gaps in the policies,
3. Revise the selected policy documents including those previously reviewed by SIFSIA/Food Security Technical Secretariat and partners. The selected policies include:
  - a. Food and Agriculture Policy Framework
  - b. Forest Policy Framework
  - c. Animal Resource Sector Policy and Strategic Plan
  - d. Fisheries Sector Policy and Strategic Plan
  - e. Health Policy
  - f. Trade Policy
  - g. Land Bill
4. Review the policies of United Nations and other major development partners for consistency with the policies and programmes of the government of Southern Sudan,
5. Assess and identify the gaps and benchmarks in the selected policies based on the FAO twin-track-approach, and propose recommendations for improvements,
6. Briefly assess and analyse how traditional/informal policies affect the policies/strategies under review.

### **4. Deliverables**

The following outputs/ deliverables are expected from this consultancy work:

- a. Policies, strategies and programmes reviewed and document which clearly spells out the policy gaps and proposes recommendations produced
- b. Food security policy indicators and related benchmarks identified,
- c. Presentation made to selected audience from FAO and partners on the major policies reviewed and ways forward,
- d. A brief report describing the policy review process, challenges and way forward regarding future food security policy analysis and formulation produced,

### **5. Requirements**

A consultant should be a holder of a postgraduate degree in relevant disciplines. At least 5 years of relevant previous experiences in the area of policy design, review and analysis is a necessary prerequisite. It is also important that the consultant has an understanding of food security situation in Southern Sudan. Thus, experience in Southern Sudan or countries with similar setup will be necessary. SIFSIA PSU will provide the selected policy documents and other necessary references. SIFSIA will also facilitate meetings with the relevant government stakeholders.

### **6. Duration**

The consultancy process will take 32 days including two days for transportation. The consultancy expected to start as soon as possible.

## ANNEX 2: Analytical framework for identifying policy gaps

**TABLE 1: Identification of policy gaps based on the twin-track framework**

**Policy:** FAPF of MAF, November 2006.

**Vision:** Food security for all the people of Southern Sudan, enjoying improved quality of life, environment and economic prosperity.

**Mission:** to transform agriculture from the traditional/subsistence system to achieve food security through a science-based, market-oriented, competitive and profitable agricultural system without compromising the sustainability of the natural resources for generations to come.

**Goals:**

Food self-sufficiency/self-reliance by 2011; contribution to reduction of poverty by 30 percent by 2011; contribute to increasing GDP by 25 percent by 2011.

Twin-track framework	Availability	Access	Stability	Utilization
<b>Track one:</b>  Rural development/  productivity  enhancement	<b>Policy objectives:</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• boosting agricultural production;</li> <li>• making agricultural inputs available, including credit facilities, at an affordable cost;</li> <li>• providing the necessary agricultural inputs for increasing agricultural productivity; and</li> <li>• developing and providing extension services and market linkages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improving/rehabilitating and expanding feeder road networks; and</li> <li>• rehabilitating and expanding rural markets (market centres, stores, post-harvest facilities, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Develop and provide research and extension services and market linkages.</li> <li>– Protect, regenerate and conserve natural resources.</li> <li>– Formulate policy incentives for rational and sustainable management and utilization.</li> <li>– Efficient provision of agricultural services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– There are no clear policy objectives to address the utilization dimension.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability is partially addressed, with a notable lack of production targets.</li> <li>• A variety of descriptions and subheadings in several sections of the Policy Framework, such as <i>strategies and approaches</i>, and sector-specific interventions contribute to availability.</li> <li>• It is implicitly assumed that availability can also be addressed by way of reducing or addressing constraints, weaknesses, or threats and by seizing and maximizing opportunities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b> The lack of an annual production target.</p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access is partially addressed in different policy/strategy statements, if not directly mentioned as policy objects.</li> <li>• MAF should at least mention its institutional responsibility to ensure access to food by proposing direct policy objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b> The lack of a clear and independent policy objective on access to food.</p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stability is partially addressed.</li> <li>• Stability of supply and access can be severely constrained or interrupted at critical periods if there is civil conflict and/or natural disasters in a given area. Policy objective should indicate the role of MAF in such situations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b> No policy objective on resource-based conflict.</p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilization is not addressed.</li> <li>• MAF could propose policy objectives, which can promote nutritional quality of foods especially of fruits and vegetables with the dual purpose of improving quality of food for consumers while raising incomes of producers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b> The lack of a policy objective on utilization is a major gap.</p>
<b>Policy measures:</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish programme for incentives to farmers and agricultural entrepreneurs in the form of loans, loan guarantees, credit facility,</li> <li>• Agricultural Bank of Southern Sudan (ABSS), support funds from other agencies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the policy measures are described as policy recommendations under various directorates.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of a systematic relationship between a proposed strategic objective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no clear policy measures or directives with timelines for the implementation of the policy objectives on access.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general it appears that no concrete and satisfactory policy measure to implement the proposed objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of clear policy measures for the implementation of proposed objectives on access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive assessment of land resources, land use study and mapping, remote sensing and GIS all contribute to stability. But these and other statements are not strong policy measures and may not support the implementation of policy objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No measures indicated in relation to conflict management.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of clear and strong policy measures for stability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no policy measures which support the utilization dimension.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MAF should develop measures once it identifies objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of policy measure on utilization.</li> </ul>



	<p>and the policy measure which will support or facilitate the implementation of the proposed objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of time frame for the implementation of proposed measures.</li> </ul>			
<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and strengthen institutional and human resource capacity.</li> <li>MAF will have a Directorate of Inputs; it will have planning, procurement, and distribution units.</li> <li>There are a number of additional institutional arrangements for almost all proposed objectives and recommendations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intra- and inter-ministerial institutions are identified with some description of their roles. However, coordination and collaborative mechanisms (with intra- and inter-ministerial and non-governmental and private sector institutions) are not clearly described.</li> <li>There are no timelines regarding when some of the institutions mentioned are to be established (eg, ABSS).</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of coordination mechanisms for institutional collaboration.</li> <li>Lack of time frames for establishment of proposed institutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ABSS and microcredit institution will be established.</li> <li>There are a number of proposed intra- and inter-ministerial institutional arrangements in relation to various objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear timelines for the establishment of these institutions.</li> <li>No clear institutional arrangement, for example, to implement feeder road construction and other rural infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of time lines for institutional set up.</li> <li>Lack of coordination mechanisms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting up a planning and statistics department with adequate staff.</li> <li>SSARO shall develop a ten-year agricultural research strategy for long-term food self sufficiency.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear timelines for the establishment of these and other intra- and inter-ministerial institutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of time lines for institutional set up.</li> <li>Lack of coordination mechanisms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No institutional arrangements are proposed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAF could have proposed institutional collaboration or coordination with relevant institution such the Directorate of Nutrition in the Ministry of Health, the DOF, the Animal Resources and Fisheries Directorates of MARF and other relevant institutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of institutional arrangements with relevant ministries.</li> </ul>

	<b>Budget:</b>			
	Budgets are prepared at the level of directorates, so it was not possible to find budgetary allocations in the Strategic Plan.  <b>Comments:</b> It would be appropriate to explore whether other documents within the Ministry have some budgetary allocations for proposed objectives.	See similar statement and comments on the second left column.	See similar statement and comments on the second left column.	See similar statement and comments on the second left column.
<b>Track two:</b>	<b>Policy objectives:</b>			
Social protection mechanisms	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.
Direct and immediate access to food	<b>Policy measures:</b>			
	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.
	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>
	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.	Not mentioned in the Policy Framework, so it is a gap.
	<b>Budget</b>			
	Not mentioned in the Strategic Plan, so it is a gap.			

**Policy:** Forest Sector Policy

**Vision:** A green Southern Sudan, with fully recovered natural and plantation forests, effectively managed for sustainable socio economic development.

**Mission:** To strengthen forest institutions and services to increase productivity, achieve household food security, alleviate poverty and contribute to the macroeconomy of Southern Sudan.

**Goals:** The policy aims to ensure a sufficient and sustained forest resource base and flow of forest goods and services to support livelihoods and socioeconomic development for present and future generations.

Twin-track framework	Availability	Access	Stability	Utilization
<p><b>Track one:</b></p> <p>Rural development/ productivity enhancement.</p>	<p><b>Policy objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to enhance farm production through integrated land use practices; and</li> <li>promote and support producers' associations involved in valuable non-wood forest products (gum, tannin, honey silk, etc.).</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability is partially addressed.</li> <li>There are diverse types of indigenous food plants that contribute to the household food basket (availability) but their roles in availability are not captured by a policy objective.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no clear policy objectives on the contribution of these indigenous food plants to food availability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to diversify farm production system and increase farm income; and</li> <li>to introduce fast-growing multipurpose trees/shrubs for fuel wood.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access is partially addressed.</li> <li>A lot more policy objectives could be proposed to ensure a good contribution of the sector for income generation of many rural poor households while conserving the forest base.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of additional policy objectives on income-generating activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to promote tree growing by communities and public institutions for environmental sustenance; and</li> <li>to conserve and manage natural forest and woodlands.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stability is addressed.</li> <li>The forestry sector contributes to the stability dimension through various long-term interventions such as conservation, protection, afforestation, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <p>No major gaps on stability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no clear policy objectives on utilization.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilization is not addressed at all.</li> <li>Indigenous food plants are to have significant nutritional values and medicinal values. A policy objective is needed to make full use of these resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of a policy objective on utilization dimension.</li> </ul>

	<b>Policy measures:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide market-oriented production by communities; provide support for well-functioning community associations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot more, and concrete policy measures proportional to policy objectives on availability are required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no gaps as such; however, the measures are a bit scattered and do not correspond well with objectives and activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of on-farm tree-based enterprises (production of honey, mushrooms, silk, tannin, latex, etc.).</li> <li>• Identification of community groups with expressed interest in Lulu and gum production, processing and trade.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot more, and concrete policy measures proportional to policy objectives on access are required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to indigenous food plants needs to be guaranteed by legislation before such areas are awarded to private developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of indigenous tree species; and identification and demarcation of potential reserves for conservation of tree diversity.</li> <li>• There are a number of measures for ensuring sustainability of the forestry sector, which, in the long run, contribute to environmental sustainability and production/supply stability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed measures are satisfactory.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No major gaps are observed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No policy measure on utilization.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop policy measures for ensuring the sector's contribution to food security.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy measures on utilization are lacking.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The forestry sector identifies government institutions and describes their roles in relation to some of the interventions and not necessarily according to proposed objectives.</li> <li>• Institutional arrangements with NGOs and the private sector are indicated in general terms and not necessarily related to the proposed objectives and measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The same as the second left column.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No major gaps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The same as the second left column.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No major gaps.</li> </ul>	<p>No institutional arrangements for the utilization dimension in particular.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of institutional arrangement.</li> </ul>	

	<b>Gaps:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major gaps.</li> </ul>			
	<b>Budget</b>			
	No budgets are allocated for proposed objectives; budgets are allocated at the level of directorates. <b>Gaps:</b> This may not be a gap as such but there is need to ensure that proposed objectives are allocated a budget for their implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The same as the second left column.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The same as the second left column.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>he same as the second left column.</li> </ul>
<b>Track two:</b> Social protection mechanisms.  Direct and immediate access to food.	<b>Policy objectives:</b>			
	No policy objective	No policy objective.	No policy objective.	No policy objective.
	<b>Policy measures:</b>	<b>Policy measures:</b>	<b>Policy measures:</b>	<b>Policy measures:</b>
	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Budget</b>
	<b>The lack of policy objectives, policy measures and institutional arrangements for emergency response is a gap which should be addressed.</b>			

**Policy:** Animal Resources Sector/MARF.

**Vision:** the vision of the Animal Resources Sector of MARF is to be the regional leaders in facilitation of sustainable wealth creation from animal resources for the benefit of all Southern Sudanese and investors.

**Mission:** the vision of the Animal Resources Sector of MARF is to enhance livelihoods and food and economic security of Southern Sudanese, especially livestock producers, by promoting, supporting and facilitating improved animal resources production and productivity, providing investor incentives to stimulate value addition and facilitating access to affordable credit and markets while promoting rational utilization and conservation of the rangelands and resources therein.

**Goals:** the overall goal of MARF is to sustainably contribute to food and economic security and employment creation by facilitating and supporting public and private sector investment in the animal resources sector to achieve a sustained annual growth rate of 4 percent within the next 10 years.

Twin-track framework	Availability	Access	Stability	Utilization
<p><b>Track one:</b></p> <p>Rural development/ productivity enhancement</p>	<p><b>Policy objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to provide, facilitate and support the delivery of quality animal health and production services including diagnostic, clinical and inspection services and inputs, including drugs, ethnoveterinary products, vaccines, chemicals, and feed additives;</li> <li>to promote and facilitate increased cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, poultry, bees and emerging livestock production through improved husbandry and production of quality feeds; and</li> <li>to facilitate the establishment of a vibrant diary industry.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability is addressed in very general terms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve marketing of animals and animal products through the establishment of Information Management System (IMS) units to collect, analyse and disseminate of up-to-date market information while encouraging and facilitating the private sector and states to establish value addition facilities in areas of production whenever appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access is partially addressed.</li> <li>Lack of a policy objective on rural infrastructure such as feeder roads and other infrastructure, such as water points, etc., are highlighted as constraints, but do not appear as policy objectives. It is not possible to realize the full benefit of livestock without investing in rural infrastructure for marketing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To facilitate, encourage and support rational range and flood plains development, utilization and conservation through community dialogue and technology transfer.</li> <li>To rehabilitate, expand, and construct, equip/ establish research institutions/training institutions to enable them to engage in continuous research and train human resources for public and private sector.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stability is partially addressed considering long-term perspectives.</li> <li>Without reliable rural infrastructure, stability of supply and access could easily be undermined. This implies strong emphasis by the Ministry on rural infrastructure development in coordination with relevant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To introduce international standards for sanitation, hides, and skin, meat, milk and honey hygiene to be enforced in all value addition facilities and plants where animal-derived products are processed in order to ensure the safety of the public and enable Southern Sudan animal products access regional and international markets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilization is partially addressed.</li> <li>Animal products' hygiene and safety looks geared towards export, safety and hygiene should also be made clear for local consumption, e.g. in abattoirs and other food processing subsectors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparatively, there is little focus on domestic animal products' utilization; emphasis should equally be placed on</li> </ul>

<p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost all policy objectives are too general and do not reveal specific targets, this is a major gap.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of a policy objective on rural infrastructure to facilitate livestock marketing and less focus on rural infrastructure for increased income is therefore a gap which should be addressed.</li> </ul>	<p>ministries.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A relatively much less focus on rural feeder roads and other rural infrastructure which facilitate the stable supply of animal products is a gap.</li> </ul>	<p>the domestic products.</p>
<p><b>Policy measures:</b></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen delivery of veterinary services initially through mobile clinic and diagnostic laboratories and outsourcing services from private sector and competent NGOs.</li> <li>• Develop strategies to transform the current subsistence production to semi-commercial and commercial production (strategies for achieving policy objectives).</li> <li>• Establish central breeding and multiplication station for animal species, these stations may also be used for beekeeping programmes.</li> <li>• Promote production of all types of fodder, especially the indigenous types to facilitate higher productivity; encourage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the status and cost of rehabilitating the existing markets, marketing infrastructure, and stock routes. Subsequently, undertake improvement of marketing infrastructure including livestock market structures/ facilities at the main markets in state capitals and along boarders with the North and neighbouring countries; develop or facilitate the development of abattoirs and hides and skins drying and tanneries and leather development facilities in areas of production and high population centres; development of rural access roads, stock routes, and watering points, boreholes and dams.</li> <li>• Establish a functional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research institutions in collaboration with stakeholders to develop suitable research strategies; promote on-farm and adoptive research into issues that relate directly to and contribute towards higher production and marketing in collaboration with national, regional, and international research institutions.</li> <li>• Commission an assessment of the livestock training institutes; upgrade to offer certificates and diplomas.</li> <li>• Undertake a comprehensive survey of the animal resources sector including livestock census and an assessment of range and flood plains resources to establish the basis for making informed decisions.</li> <li>• To develop and test an early</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish minimum standard designs for slaughter facilities, milk processing plants, honey refineries and tanneries to be adopted by the states and private developers. Provide live animals, hides and skins, meat, milk, honey and animal health inspection and certification services.</li> <li>• Establish quality assurance laboratories for animal health and production inputs including equipment and tools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed measures are relevant, but more is required to ensure the utilization dimension's contribution to food security.</p>

	<p>the making of hay and silage and use of farm by-products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the adoption of modern bee farming and processing technologies while encouraging the participation of all stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b> Well addressed.</p>	<p>national livestock market information network that will provide up-to-date market information through print and electronic media, extension services and any other means available to a majority of stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage the formation of marketing cooperatives, associations or groups to mobilize resources for investment in value addition activities.</li> <li>Support the establishment of cottage industries including honey refineries, hatcheries, tanneries and dairies using inputs from locally-produced animals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b> The policy measures are relevant and address a critical gap which is missing from the policy objective.</p>	<p>warning system for animal disease and drought preparedness and response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen drought preparedness and recovery programmes and extend the services to all areas that are vulnerable or at risk. Local communities will be empowered through training and active participation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b> Well addressed.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stakeholders' analysis section of the Policy Framework is too general and does not assign specific institutions for a specific dimension, in this particular case, availability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Implementation and Tracking Matrix of the Strategic Plan lists institutional arrangements but the strategic objectives indicated in the Matrix are very different to those proposed in the Policy Framework of section 8 and 9.</li> <li>Institutional arrangements for availability are relatively addressed</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b> No major gaps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional arrangements for access are indicated in the Implementation and Tracking Matrix and coordination with some of the relevant ministries is described.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The role of MTR is not indicated at all.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of coordination and collaboration with MTR is a serious gap.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborate and network with relevant agencies in early warning systems such as the Famine Early Warning Systems Network, the Intergovernmental Authority's Drought Monitoring Centre and national and regional meteorology departments will be encouraged.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional arrangements are relatively well addressed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major gaps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional arrangements for utilization are not well developed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b> N/A.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> The lack of institutional arrangements is a major gap.</p>
	<b>Budget</b>			
	Budgetary issues are covered under the resource mobilization section of the Strategic Plan. Budgets are divided according to three categories: salaries, Recurrent cost and Development costs. It is therefore not possible to find budgets allocated for policy objectives from the Strategic Plan document.	See the second left comment.	See the second left comment.	See the second left comment.

<b>Track two:</b>  Social protection mechanisms.  Direct and immediate access to food.	<b>Policy objectives:</b>			
	<i>"MAF/states and their agents will offer free services in cases of disease emergencies especially the outbreak of economically and socially important diseases"</i> . No other policy on safety-nets/restocking; no policy or role on food aid or how emergency assistance may be provided for pastoralists. Generally not enough policy objectives and this should be addressed.	No policy objective on access. The lack of a policy objective on access should be addressed.	No policy objective on stability. The lack of a policy objective on stability should be addressed.	No policy objective on utilization. The lack of a policy objective should be addressed.
	<b>Policy measures:</b>			
	No clear policy measures on availability.	No clear policy measures on access.	No clear policy measures on stability.	No clear policy measures on utilization.
	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>			
		No clear institutional arrangements on access.	No clear institutional arrangements on stability.	No clear policy measures on utilization.
<b>Budget:</b>				
No budgets are allocated.	No budgets are allocated.	No budgets are allocated.	No budgets are allocated.	

## Policy: Fisheries Sector Policy and Strategic Plan

**Vision:** to be a regional leader in facilitating & delivering efficient and effective services for a sustainable and prosperous fisheries industry.

**Mission:** to ensure food security, generation of income, creation of employment and conservation of fisheries resources for sustainable development.

**Goals:** to create an enabling environment for a vibrant fishery industry based on sustainable resource exploitation providing optimal and sustainable benefits, strengthening food security, alleviating poverty, and creating wealth for the people of Southern Sudan.

Twin-track framework	Availability	Access	Stability	Utilization
<p><b>Track one:</b></p> <p>Rural development/ productivity enhancement.</p>	<p><b>Policy objectives:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote responsible and sustainable utilization of fishery resources taking into account environmental concerns.</li> <li>Promote development of responsible sustainable aquaculture.</li> </ol> <p><b>Comments:</b> Availability is partially addressed although there are no concrete policy objectives on current/future fish production levels. Hence, it would be difficult to estimate the sector's contribution to food availability.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> Lack of a quantifiable target on estimated fish production levels.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that the people of Southern Sudan have fair access to, and benefit from the country's shared fisheries resources.</li> <li>Promote local entrepreneurship; improve access to fishing inputs and infrastructure, etc.</li> </ol> <p><b>Comments</b> Access is partially addressed; what is lacking is a strong and precise policy objective designed to increasing the income of fishermen.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> No major gaps as such, but developing concrete objectives for increasing incomes and creating favourable access to fishing resources may improve the access dimension.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage efficient and sustainable investment in the fishery sector.</li> <li>Promote the active involvement of fisher communities in fisheries management.</li> <li>Promote peace and stability.</li> </ol> <p><b>Comments:</b> Stability is partially addressed from a variety of perspectives but stability may be affected in the face of poor infrastructure and insecurity.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> No major gaps as such, but a policy objective on fishing and other rural infrastructure may improve stability dimension.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote responsible fish handling and preservation measures and technologies to minimize post-harvest losses.</li> <li>Promote fish consumption in the country.</li> </ol> <p><b>Comments:</b> Utilization is partially addressed. A much stronger objective is required to ensure the sanitation, safety, and preservation of fish is required.</p> <p><b>Gaps:</b> No major gaps. But stronger objectives would improve utilization dimension better.</p>

	<p><b>Policy Measures:</b></p> <p>1. Development of a master plan for efficient and effective fisheries management.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Because there are no clear policy objectives on production levels, concomitant or corresponding policy measures or instruments for achieving policy objectives are lacking.</p>	<p>1. Initiation of income-generating projects to ensure self-dependency among the fisher communities, including identification of affordable credit facilities for community investment.</p> <p>2. Allocating fisheries access rights.</p> <p>3. Small-scale commercial fish farmers shall be encouraged to form groups in order to better access micro-credit and marketing facilities.</p> <p>4. MARF in collaboration with fisheries stakeholders' organizations and civil society shall lobby for fisheries infrastructure to receive a fair share of the government budgetary allocation both at Government of Southern Sudan and state levels.</p> <p><b>Comment</b> Policy measures on access are relatively better addressed.</p>	<p>1. Fisheries-related licensing and taxation measures shall be harmonized and rationalized in order to encourage investment in the fisheries sector.</p> <p>2. MARF shall enhance training of fisheries personnel through collaboration with sector players and local and international training institutions.</p> <p>3. Ensure that conflicts that may arise from returnees relating to access to fishing grounds are avoided or settled amicably.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Long-term stability is partially addressed from an investment, training and research point of view. However, a lack of rural infrastructure and associated facilities mean that supply and access may be constrained at any one time. There is a gap regarding the lack of measures to support and enforce rural infrastructure efforts which contribute to stability.</p>	<p>1. MARF in collaboration with other stakeholders shall establish a strong and efficient national fish safety control system through the development and enforcement of fish sanitary and quality control standards.</p> <p>2. The Directorate of Fisheries shall produce safety and fish quality production hand manuals with the help of external technical assistance.</p> <p><b>Comments</b> Utilization measures are relatively better addressed.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

	<b>Institutional arrangements:</b>			
	Fisheries extension services will be coordinated by a special unit under the Directorate of Extension, Research and Training.	No clear institutional arrangements with regard to access. Arrangements are mentioned in general terms as “relevant stakeholders”. <b>Gaps:</b> Relevant stakeholders or institutions should be identified; and their roles and responsibilities defined.	The transformation of the current Fisheries Research and Training Unit to the Southern Sudan Fisheries Research Institute in the long run. <b>Gaps:</b> There is no time line for the establishment of the proposed research institute.	It is indicated that MARF in collaboration with other stakeholders shall establish a strong and efficient national fish safety control system. However, there are no identifiable stakeholders who would be involved in the development of the safety control system.
	<b>Budget:</b>			
	There are no budgetary allocations in the Policy framework and Strategic Plan document. It is not, therefore, possible to see how proposed objectives would be funded unless the Directorate of Fisheries has a separate document detailing its budgetary allocation.	There are no budgetary allocations in the Policy Framework and Strategic Plan document.	There are no budgetary allocations in the Policy Framework and Strategic Plan document.	There are no budgetary allocations in the Policy Framework and Strategic Plan document.
<b>Track two:</b> Social protection mechanisms.  Direct and immediate access to food.	<b>Policy objectives:</b>			
	Not clear what the role of the Directorate of Fisheries will be in cases of emergencies, for example, the distribution of fishing gear, nets, etc.	Support infrastructure development for the affected communities to ensure faster integration and return to normal life. Not clear what role the Directorate shall play in creating/improving access to fisher communities in need to assistance.	Rehabilitation and integration of ex-combatants, displaced persons vulnerable groups (widows, orphans, children) into fisheries activities.	No policy objective on utilization.
	<b>Policy measures</b>			
	<b>Institutional arrangements</b>			
<b>Budget</b>				

### ANNEX 3: Synthesis of policy gaps and policy implications

Policy analyzed	Main policy gaps identified with respect to the <u>dimensions of food security &amp; track</u>	Main gaps identified with respect to clear <u>policy targets and timeline</u>	Main gaps identified with <u>institutional arrangements and budgeting</u> ensuring effective implementation and monitoring	Main policy implications of the gaps identified
FAPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of programme interventions are proposed to address availability. However, there are no independent and clear policy objectives proportional to the sectors' responsibility to address availability. Therefore, availability is partially addressed.</li> <li>Access is partially addressed, but again without a clear and systematic link between the objectives and measures. There is a risk that the access dimension may not be addressed if the proposed measures are not properly coordinated and implemented at the right time.</li> <li>Stability is partially addressed but MAF needs to develop a policy objective to intervene in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy goals have clear targets and timelines, but objectives and policy measures on availability, access and stability have no clear targets and timelines.</li> <li>The Policy Framework does not set annual cereal production targets, which is a pre-requisite for determining annual cereal demand and supply.</li> <li>Rural farmers are not differentiated according to their subsectoral occupations or mode of production methods such as mechanized versus traditional, or subsistence versus commercial, or irrigated farming versus rainfed farmers, cash crop farmers versus staple farmers, etc., and hence the lack of targets for specific groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of intra-ministerial and agriculture-oriented Government of Southern Sudan institutions are proposed (Agricultural Inputs Marketing Department, Agricultural Mechanization Unit, ABSS, SSARO, etc.), but in most cases, coordination and collaborative mechanisms are not elaborated and the time they will be established is not well developed.</li> <li>Budgetary allocations are at the level of directorates and are indicated under Section 7.2 of MAF's Strategic Plan. Therefore, budgetary allocations for proposed interventions are not indicated in MAF's Strategic Plan document. There is a need to look for other documents to ensure proposed activities are funded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current Policy Framework and Strategic Plan need major revision with the aim of making policy objectives clear, consistent and time bound.</li> <li>The policy formulation format could be designed in such a way as to make linear and corresponding arrangements with regard to policy objectives, the measures that enable objectives to be implemented, monitored and evaluated; and a corresponding institutional arrangement for implementation with budgetary indications including government and non-government potential sources of funding.</li> <li>It is not clear what role MAF will play in early warning related to drought and outbreaks as well as in cases of food insecurity emergency responses. For example, how would MAF intervene in seed aid?</li> <li>The health and nutrition situation in Southern Sudan is among the worst in the world<sup>71</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>71</sup> See Government of Southern Sudan Health Policy document 2007-2011, Chapter 3 page 20.

	<p>resource-based conflicts which may affect stability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The utilization dimension is not addressed</li> <li>• Track two is not addressed at all.</li> </ul>			<p>Under such alarming situations, it would be too costly to ignore food utilization dimension from a FAPF.</p>
<b>Forestry sector policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability is partially addressed through agroforestry.</li> <li>• Access is partially addressed with respect to wild foods; but the sector could contribute a lot more to access through various income-generating activities.</li> <li>• Stability is addressed in a number of forest conservation, afforestation, protection and land use interventions.</li> <li>• Utilization is not addressed at all.</li> <li>• Track two is not addressed.</li> <li>• Overall, the sector policy should develop clear policy objectives and measures and institutional arrangements to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets and time frames for the implementation of proposed interventions are not adequately developed both in the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 of the Forestry Sector Policy has clearly identified government line ministries and their roles. However, the roles of NGOs, the private sector, and other groups is not indicated.</li> <li>• Budgetary allocations are at the level of directorates and are indicated under Section 7.2 of MAF's Strategic Plan. Therefore, budgetary allocations for proposed interventions are not indicated in MAF's Strategic Plan document. There is a need to look for other documents to ensure proposed activities are funded or not.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sector Policy should clearly identify and develop policy objectives which contribute to the four dimensions of food security. These policy measures should be supported by relevant measures and institutional arrangements and budgets. Attention should be given to the neglected dimension of utilization.</li> <li>• The Sector Policy should design a better structured Strategic Plan, whereby targets, time frames and measurable outputs are indicated so that the sector's contribution is measured against its plans and objectives.</li> </ul>

	adequately contribute to the four dimensions of food security.			
<b>Fisheries Sector Policy and Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability is partially addressed.</li> <li>• Access is partially addressed.</li> <li>• Stability is partially addressed.</li> <li>• Utilization is partially addressed.</li> <li>• Track two is not addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The absence of clear target production levels, time lines for many of the objectives/activities and institutional arrangements are lacking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intra-ministerial institutional arrangements are described but inter-ministerial and external institutional arrangements are not well addressed.</li> <li>• Coordination mechanisms with other vital Government of Southern Sudan line ministries are lacking; this may either delay or prevent the implementation of proposed objectives and measures.</li> <li>• Budgets are not indicated for proposed objectives or programmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear policy objectives on production levels accompanied by clear policy measures and institutional arrangements for addressing availability and access and for monitoring implementation are lacking.</li> <li>• The lack of clear institutional arrangements both in terms of identifying the right institute and the timeliness of establishment of mentioned institutes may give rise to under-performance of the sector.</li> <li>• The Sector Policy should have considered emergency response mechanisms (such as fishing gear and nets provision either through donation or cost recovery); food aid, etc.</li> <li>• It appears that there is loose relationship between the Policy Framework and the Strategic Plan. The two parts do not have identical objectives. The Strategic Plan describes different strategies other than objectives identified by the Policy Framework. This is a very serious gap and as such should be addressed in a comprehensive manner before the next Strategic Plan is prepared.</li> </ul>
<b>Animal Resource Policy and Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability is addressed in general terms. In several policy objectives and interventions, it is proposed that there will be increased production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part II (Strategic Plan); Chapter 2.1 sets three time frames for the implementation of priority programmes: short-term priority programmes (2006-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional arrangements are confusing. Section 11 of Part 1 of the Policy Framework makes a list of stakeholders in very general terms and cannot be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is consistency among constraints, policy objectives and strategies for achieving policy objectives. This a good lesson for other sectors. However, there is a major flaw in</li> </ul>



	<p>with improved quality of animal products for domestic consumption and for export.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access is partially addressed due to the lack of bold objectives and measures as well as institutional arrangements in the construction of rural roads and other infrastructure.</li> <li>• Stability is partially addressed through the range and flood plains management for long-term productivity and the establishment of training and research institutions which shall ensure sustainable production and continuity of supply of animal products. But the lack of focus on rural infrastructure (particularly on rural roads), as well as a lack of conflict management strategies, may negatively impact on stability.</li> <li>• Utilization is partially addressed; the focus is more on export products and little is indicated on domestic utilization.</li> <li>• Track two is not addressed. There are no policy objectives as to what the Ministry could do other than provide</li> </ul>	<p>2008); medium-term priority programmes (2008-2011) and long-term priority programmes (2011 onwards). These priority programmes, however, are more or less instruments or measures which support strategic objectives and not necessarily the implementation of the objectives. In general it is a good intention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific subsectoral targets and no targets on policy objectives; no time line for establishment of institutions, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>considered as institutional arrangements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Implementation and Tracking Matrix of the Strategic Plan has a column for “Actors” and describes the institutions involved in implementation of 9 proposed strategic objectives. However, these strategic objectives are not the same as the strategic objectives (except 2 objectives) proposed in section 8 of the Policy Framework of the same document.</li> <li>• This leaves the tough question of how the proposed strategic objectives in the Policy Framework would be implemented. This is a serious policy gap.</li> </ul>	<p>the Strategic Plan Implementation Matrix, whereby out of the proposed 9 strategic objectives only 2 are similar to the strategic objectives proposed in the Policy Framework. This leaves a considerable gap in how the 7 proposed objectives in the Strategic Plan would be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less focus on rural infrastructure and conflict management can seriously affect access and stability.</li> <li>• Lack of clear coordination mechanisms with implementing partners/ministries mean that activities outside the Ministry which are vital for the implementation of policy objectives may not be achieved.</li> <li>• The lack of a clear policy objective on the contribution of the sector to food security is one area the Ministry should critically examine. Quantifiable contributions and concrete measures should be explored.</li> <li>• The lack of emergency response in times of disasters is a critical gap that the Ministry needs to address. Social safety nets and social protection measures such as restocking, food aid, food for work, etc. are lacking. In general the Ministry should define its role with respect to track two.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

	free services in cases of disease emergencies. The gap includes policy objectives on restocking, prevention of distress livestock sales, safety nets.			
--	---	--	--	--

## ANNEX 4: Tables on relationships

**Table 1: A linear relationship between “constraints”, “strategic policy objectives” and “strategies to achieve policy objectives” within the Policy Framework of the Animal Resources Sector**

**Note** that this table contains extracts from narrative sections of the Policy Framework and this table is created for quick and convenient comprehension and appreciation of the consistency within some of the relevant sections in the Policy Framework.

Constraints	Policy strategic objectives	Strategies for achieving policy objectives
7.1 Operation of MARF and its associated institutions and regulatory authorities.	8.1 Establish directorates and associated institutions and regulatory bodies of MARF, animal resources sector.	9.1 To establish directorates of MARF, animal resources sector and associated institutions and regulatory bodies.
7.2 Animal health services delivery including quality assurance and provision of animal health and production inputs.	8.2 Animal health services delivery including quality assurance and provision of animal health and production inputs.	9.2 Animal health services delivery including quality assurance and provision of animal health and production inputs.
7.3 Animal production – breeding and nutrition.	8.3 Animal production – breeding and nutrition.	9.3 Animal production – breeding and nutrition.
7.4 Livestock marketing and value addition.	8.4 Animal resources marketing and value addition.	9.4 Animal resources marketing and value addition.
7.5 Range and flood plains utilization and conservation.	8.5 Range and flood plains utilization and conservation.	9.5 Range and flood plains utilization and conservation.
7.6 Training, research and extension in animal resources.	8.6 Training, research and extension.	9.6 Training, research and extension in animal resources.
7.7 Policy and legal framework	8.7 Policy and legal framework.	9.7 Policy and legal framework.
Cross cutting and non-sectoral issues	8.8 Special projects and programmes.	9.8 Special projects and programmes.
7.9	8.9 Cross-cutting and non-sectoral issues.	9.9 Cross-cutting and non-sectoral issues.



**Table 2: Inconsistency between “policy strategic objectives” of the Policy Framework versus “strategic objective” of the Strategic Plan part of animal resources sector Policy Document**

Extract from Policy Framework	Extract from Strategic Plan Implementation and Tracking Matrix
Policy strategic objectives	Strategic objective
8.1 Establish directorates and associated institutions and regulatory bodies of MARF, animal resources sector.	1. Establish MARF and revitalize/establish associated institutions.
8.2 Animal health services delivery including quality assurance and provision of animal health and production inputs.	2. Creating favourable environment for the development of the animal resources sector.
8.3 Animal production – breeding and nutrition.	3. Facilitating and supporting access to markets for animal resources.
8.4 Animal resources marketing and value addition.	4. Increasing productivity of animal resources.
8.5 Range and flood plains utilization and conservation.	5. Improving range utilization and conservation of the environment.
8.6 Training, research and extension.	6. Mainstreaming gender, the disadvantaged groups and individuals and HIV-AIDS.
8.7 Policy and legal framework.	7. Establish appropriate information management system.
8.8 Special projects and programmes.	8. Mobilization and utilization of resources.
8.9 Cross cutting and non-sectoral issues.	9. Establish and strengthen monitoring and evaluation system.

Note that item no 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, and 8.9 are not included in the implementation plan; and this is a major flaw.



**ANNEX 5: List of organizations and people met during consultations on food security policy gaps identification: 23 January to 23 February 2010, Juba**

Ministry/Agency	Date and venue	Persons participated	Issues raised
MAF	08/02/2010 Office of DG for Planning  12/02/2009	Michael Roberto, DG, Planning and Programming Beda, Director, Policy development Timothy Thwol Onak Yor, DG, Forestry Dr. Fredrick Owino, advisor, forestry	Policy gaps and future actions to address current gaps (track 2 not being addressed; nutrition/utilization not addressed, lack of time lines and policy targets for policy objectives, and measures, lack of internal and external institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms.  Proposed action: a checklist for policy objectives, measures and institutional arrangements to be developed to ensure inclusion of all relevant issues.
Centre for Statistics and census	08/02/2010	Alfred Tako: Food Security Technical Secretariat (FSTS), Transitory food insecurity unit Suzan Taban, FSTS, nutrition unit Emmanuel Dajo, FSTS Leone daniel, FSTS Manase yanga, FSTS Philip Dan Thong, M&E David Chan Thiang, ES Mark Otwari SDS	Whether policy document or strategy document are available; how nutrition and transitory food insecurity are being addressed; what coordination mechanisms exist between Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission, World Food Programme and MAF.
MARF	04/02/2010	Francis Luaala, Director for Planning Director for Fisheries Director for veterinary Director for special projects	Institutional arrangements, for example with MWRI, which is constructing water ponds for livestock; budgetary allocation per project, capacity to formulate sector policy.
MRDC	05/02/2010	Bortel Mori, Under Secretary MCRD	The role of the Ministry in supporting farmers'

		<p>Eliakima Ezikia, Director of Planning  Victor Mabruk, Principal, Amadi Rural Development Institute  Joseph Emmanuel Nyiboyii, D/Director, Admin &amp; Fianace  Rev Oneil Yosia, DG Planning  Alfred Dimido Andrea, Senior Inspector  Peter Anyieth Mayen, A/Inspector  Abdon Ayuen Kuol DG, Coop Development  Alfonse Okot Mathew ??</p>	<p>cooperatives, other non-agricultural sectors in rural areas; institutional arrangements with other ministries such as the MAF, MTC, etc.</p>
The World Bank, Southern Sudan	12/02/2010	Jaramogi Oloya Charles	<p>World Bank's support to food security: through 3 programmes of 2-5 years each aiming at 1) addressing availability and access through direct production support and through social protection (cash transfers/cash for work), b) through providing access to grants for agricultural production and c) through supporting livestock production and marketing.</p>
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	15/02/2010	Bertha, in charge of Nutrition	<p>UNICEF's role in supporting the Government of Southern Sudan Nutrition Policy.</p>
Southern Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission	22/02/2010	James Kueth Chuol, Director of Relief and Food Security Department	<p>Discussion on annual work plans, budgets and food relief appeal strategies.</p>