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</tr>
<tr>
<td>U5MR</td>
<td>Under 5 Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDM</td>
<td>Voucher Delivery Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Social protection helps tackle the vulnerabilities faced by rural households and plays a fundamental role in improving food and nutrition security while reducing rural poverty. The predictability of social protection instruments enables households to better manage risks and engage in more profitable livelihoods. The impact of social protection systems is greater if they are coordinated with broader food and nutrition security, rural development and poverty reduction strategies.

Social protection incorporates social safety net (SSN) programmes and includes a role for renewed state involvement, emphasises a longer-term developmental approach, includes social assistance and social insurance and is often advocated as a right rather than a reactive form of relief. SSNs are mechanisms that mitigate the effects of poverty and other risks on vulnerable households. SSNs can be private or informal, such as family members in different households supporting each other through hard times with cash, food, labour or housing.

During the past decades, there has been growing attention on issues related to social protection and SSNs as a result of the escalating number of poor people around the world, as well as the necessity to reduce the incidence of poverty. In Sudan, the situation of the poor is critical as it has many dimensions, the most significant of which are the effects of the conflicts in various areas of the country that have resulted in the massive movements of people from their home place to internally displaced persons (IDP) camps or to other safer areas. These conflicts have also resulted in people abandoning their farmlands and their modes of living, hence preventing them from obtaining the necessities of normal life. In addition, the country's economic situation, the absence of virtuous policies and strategies to reduce poverty, environmental calamities, poor agronomic practices, sanctions on the country and other reasons have all caused an increase in poverty in Sudan.

Social protection is now the major pro-poor initiative that targets poor communities around the world. The term includes SSN activities as well as other activities that focus on preventing, promoting or protecting the poor. Social protection consists of policies and programmes designed to reduce poverty and vulnerability by promoting efficient labour markets, diminishing people's exposure to risks and enhancing their capacities to manage economic and social risks.

In Sudan, social protection and SSN activities have been practiced for years on an informal basis. There were no systematic approaches for delivering these services to the poor, although there were deliverables. There have not been any prescribed policies or strategies on how to proceed with social protection activities and reduce poverty. Only recently have these terms taken on
their functional and conceptual meanings, with practical implementation of some related programmes and projects. The global growing focus on poverty reduction and the interventions of the United Nations (UN) and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have added positively to the consideration of social protection and SSN activities in the country.

Nevertheless, the growing poverty conditions in the country indicate that the existing programmes and efforts to reduce poverty are still not enough. This is exacerbated by the economic situation of the country, especially after the cession of South Sudan and the sanctions imposed on the country.

1.2. Poverty in Sudan

The main indicators of poverty, according to the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (IPRSP), show that 46.5% of the population is under the poverty line and living on an income of SDG114 per month per family. There are great variations in poverty levels, however, amongst the states and between the urban and rural populations. The poverty level stands at 26.5% in urban areas and 57.6% in rural areas. While Khartoum registered a lower rate of 26%, West Darfur registered the highest rate of 69.4%. Figures indicate that 61% of all income goes to food items, while the balance of 39% is directed to other household needs. These facts imply that the government should move with great zeal to address not only the poverty level but variations between states, which contributed to the unbalanced development and possibly the conflicts and insecurity. Eight of the 18 states in the country have more than 50% of their population living below the poverty line, a fact that requires tremendous efforts from the government to take appropriate measures to address poverty through comprehensive targeted policies and social protection programmes.

Poverty and human deprivation have worsened over the past decade, due mainly to the implementation of stabilisation policies. Though the government takes credit for a strong successful stabilisation programme up to 2010 that was achieved with limited or no donor support, it has resulted in drastic cuts in public expenditures of over 50%, causing considerable reductions in social services and infrastructure development. The lifting of subsidies on oil in September 2013 has also contributed to the change in the level of the poverty line so that now more than 49% of the people live below that line, according to some estimates (World Bank 2014).

1.3. Objectives of the study

The main objective of this study is to document the social protection and SSN programmes, policies and strategies in Sudan and related government and other efforts to combat poverty. The outcomes of the study should pave the way for WFP and others to streamline their interventions, coordination and collaboration for the best interests of the poor in the country.
The study also has the following purposes:

- to examine social protection from the perspective of food security, livelihood and nutrition outcomes.
- to explore social protection efforts for displaced people, refugees and their host communities.
- to discuss informal SSNs and their importance in combating hunger and food insecurity.

Social protection is defined as a set of policies and programmes designed and implemented by national governments and NGOs to address poverty and vulnerability.

1.4. Methodology

The study’s methodology is as follows:

- Review of relevant documents on social protection and SSN theories, experiences of other countries and available documents on the situation in Sudan.
- Face-to-face interviews with concerned actors in the country, including government ministries and entities, some UN organisations (e.g. WFP) and resource persons.
- Collection of relevant and specific documents during the interviews or by email.
- Checklists sent to Kassala and Darfur to collect information on the refugees and IDPs.

1.5. Report structure

The structure of this report follows the suggested template, with some minor differences. Some issues have been tackled in more than one place, such as Zakat. This indicates their importance in the report and their cross-sectoral status.

Chapters have been set up to go from introductory notes to general settings of social protection in the country and then onto some specific projects and programmes, as examples conducted by the government and international organisations or implemented jointly. The major policies and strategies are briefly discussed with the intention of providing elaboration later as needed.

Some pertinent issues, such as monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and targeting, are added to the document to summarise and pinpoint their importance for enhanced implementation of social protection in the country. A separate chapter has been added to include these issues, as suggested. Another chapter on food security and nutrition has also been added to the report as they relate to important social protection issues. Other sections have been added to the existing chapters to highlight some facts and responses to the comments received.

The conclusion includes some lessons learnt, a summary of the report and the major findings and recommendations for making improvements.
Chapter 2. National context

2.1. Political history and conflicts

Sudan’s recent history starts with the post-colonial era following its independence in January 1956 to the present. The Anglo-Egyptian condominium ruled Sudan from 1899 to 1956.

Sudan is endowed with rich natural resources that include abundant arable land of 170 million acres and diversified production modes; 67% of the Nile basin and the river’s tributaries and seasonal streams providing water resources over 90 billion m³; 130 million head of livestock; oil that is currently at 120,000 b/day and is expected to reach 300,000 b/day in 2015; untapped mineral resources as gold exports reached US$2.1 billion in 2012; 875 kilometres of coastline; a strategic location for regional economic integration and markets; and, finally, an infrastructure that has doubled in recent years (roads, power). ¹

Since independence, Sudan has been plagued by internal conflicts. The first civil war broke on 18 August 1955, ignited by a revolt in the army in the town of Torit in the South and continued up to 1972 when the first peace agreement was reached in Addis Ababa, with the Southern Sudan rebels at that time. This peace accord provided 10 years of peace and stability. But in 1983, the civil war in the south was reignited following the government’s decision to restructure the southern region into three provinces and to apply Sharia Law.

The second civil war broke out in 1983 and continued to 2005, finally culminating in the secession of South Sudan on 9 July 2011, as the newest country in the world. Unfortunately, another conflict that started in Darfur in 2003 has continued until now, despite the Doha peace accord signed in 2011 with some factions of the Darfur rebels. Conflicts have also continued in South Kordofan and Blue Nile States where old factions of the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement-North (SPLM-N) have taken up arms and resorted to war following the nationwide presidential and parliamentary elections held by the government for national unity in 2010.

Sudan has been ruled by many governments and has witnessed several military coups since 1958. The first coup was in November 1958 and that military rule was removed in October 1964 by a popular uprising. In 1969, another military coup took over and ruled from 1969 to 1985. This regime was ended by another popular uprising in April 1985, only to be followed by another coup in 30 June 1989 that has remained in power to this day.

The civil war continued to escalate through the second democratic era in 1986–89, and under the present regime approximately four million people have been internally displaced or have become refugees.

¹ UNDP 2013, Sudan Consultation Paper on MDGs and Post-2015 Development Agenda.
The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the government in the North and the SPLA/M in the South was signed in January 2005. The two sides agreed that Southern Sudan would enjoy autonomy during the next six-year interim period. The referendum on self-determination for South Sudan was conducted and the results were acknowledged as the secession of South Sudan into a new state from the 9 July 2011.

Conflicts broke in South Kordofan and Blue Nile in June and September 2012, respectively, when the SPLA/M North resorted to armed attacks. Since then, the security situation has been affected, leading to the displacement of a large number of people in the two troubled states.

During the negotiations for the CPA with the SPLA/M in early 2003, a new conflict broke out in Darfur. Fighting there displaced hundreds of thousands of people and some of them sought refuge in neighbouring Chad. There are various estimates on the number of human casualties, IDPs and refugees.

The Darfur Regional Authority (DRA) was established in 2012 following the conclusion of the Doha Document for Peace in Darfur (DDPD) in 2011. Darfur has a population of about 8 million people, of whom more than 2.3 million are IDPs and about 350,000 are other refugees.

### 2.2. Effects of conflicts in Sudan

Conflicts within Sudan are a widespread phenomenon and have certainly had negative effects and consequences on the population. First and foremost, a sizeable share of the government’s revenues has been directed to support the armed forces and preserve security. Conflicts have also affected economic development as they have destroyed infrastructure and natural resources, prevented investments and interrupted trade.

Under these circumstances, the government was unable to implement development projects in the areas affected by armed conflicts due to the lack of security and therefore it spared few resources for expenditures on welfare in general and the social sector in particular.

The populations in conflict areas are the most vulnerable to poverty, unemployment, food insecurity and deterioration in all aspects of life. Conflicts cause losses of cohesion and integration of society, affect people’s interrelationships and ignite tribal conflicts. Conflicts have also created hatred, stimulated revenge and caused a lot of misery to these populations.

Poverty prevalence is high in conflict-affected states, bringing the national average of people living below the poverty line to 46.6%.² Conflict-ridden states are considered the poorest in Sudan, where the percentages of people living below the poverty line are 69.5% in North Darfur, 56.6% in Blue Nile, 61.2% in South Darfur, 55.6% in West Darfur and 60% in South Kordofan. The

---

poverty gap was estimated at 16.2% in 2009, and the proportion of the food-insecure population has now reached 24%. Recently, the UNDP Special Coordinator in Sudan stated that 7 million people need humanitarian assistance and 3 million do not have enough to eat and face drastic nutritional deficiencies.

Women and children were the most affected and they represent a sizeable portion of the population. They face many problems, including a lack of education, and many children are excluded from the schools, thus providing an undesired source of child labour and child soldiers in the conflict-ridden areas. Sexual abuse and early marriage for women are normally high in conflict areas, where the percentage of girls getting married before the age of 15 years was 19.2% in 2010.

According to recent surveys and reports, including the IPRSP and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) report in 2013, these conflicts have led to high mortality rates, which are mainly attributable to displacement and the increased severity and persistence of poverty. Conflicts, specifically armed conflicts, in Sudan have resulted in huge losses of life, especially within the age groups involved in fighting, which has resulted in disarray among the population’s natural composition and growth.

As attested by the recent MDG reports, most health indicators are low in conflict-affected areas, where the prevalence rates of malaria and tuberculosis are very high. According to the health indicators in 2010, the percentage of vaccinated children aged 12–23 months was 58.8%, the proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel was 45.1% and the proportion of women aged 15–49 years who received antenatal care at least once during their pregnancy was 51.7%. Lack of access to safe drinking water and sanitation contributed to the spread of diseases such as cholera and diarrhoea in the affected states. High mortality rates have been noted, which reflect the bad health conditions. The mortality rate of children younger than five years was 131 per 1,000 live births. Maternal mortality was 216 per 100,000 in 2010. Continued conflicts would definitely negatively affect these statistics.

Conflicts have also affected the distribution of the population in Sudan where massive migrations took place mainly from affected states to urban centres and neighbouring countries. Khartoum, the capital of Sudan, is housing large numbers of IDPs from the affected states in Darfur, South Kordofan and Blue Nile. The resultant insecurity has forced the rural population to cease their present economic activities of farming and herding and instead work for the informal sector in towns and urban centres. The impact of conflict on population dynamics has also been transparent as it hit hard on social cohesion due to ethnic, religious and language divergences.
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3 SHHS2 Final Report 9, November 2012.
Children are the most vulnerable segment of the population under these conflicts, and their welfare has largely been affected in terms of access to food, education and healthcare. Child soldiers are another threat as many children are likely to drop out of schooling. The psychological impact is another dimension of the conflicts’ effects on children as many lose their parents and hence are subjected to tremendous social and psychological pressures. The MDG reports for Sudan (2010–13) revealed variations among states that reflected the low indicators for school enrolment and retention in conflict-affected states.

**Figure 1:** States affected by conflicts

![Map of Sudan showing states affected by conflicts](source: OCHA 2014)

2.3. The economy

Sudan remains among the least developed, low-income food-deficit countries and ranked 171 out of 197 countries in the 2013 Human Development Index. Sudan’s economy was severely weakened when it lost 75% of its oil revenues following the secession of South Sudan in July 2011. Border issues with South Sudan have resulted in substantial economic instability and insecurity in the Abyei Area, Blue Nile and South Kordofan states. Although previous efforts to reopen the flow of oil floundered, exports of South Sudan oil resumed in April 2013, which should have made some improvements in the two countries’ economies.

In 2011, Sudan’s gross domestic product (GDP) was US$67.3 billion and was estimated to be US$63.2 billion and US$66.5 billion in 2012 and 2013, respectively. International Monetary Fund (IMF) figures revealed that the real GDP growth was -0.3% in 2011, down from 4.0% in
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5 WFP 2013, Emergency Operation Sudan 200597.
2010, and -2.2% in 2012, followed by positive growth of 2.5% in 2014. Per capita income amounted to US$1,550 in 2013.

The estimated contributions of the different economic sectors in GDP are as follows:

1) Agricultural sector (35%)
2) Industrial sector (13%)
3) Services sector (41%)
4) Trade and economic services (11%)

GDP growth declined from as high as 8.3% in 2004 to only 0.9% in 2012, as indicated in the annual reports of the Central Bank of Sudan. Economic growth was high (2004–2009) due to the stable macroeconomic environment during this period and increases in oil production and exports. Following the secession of the South in 2011, GDP growth declined and foreign reserves built through oil revenues were depleted, and consequently, unemployment and inflation rates soared to unprecedented levels.

2.3.1. Economic challenges and constraints

The major economic challenges facing the government will remain managing the fiscal and external adjustments after the loss of substantial financial resources while shielding the poor from the negative impacts of these adjustments and, at the same time, generating surpluses to restructure the economy into one with broad-based growth that alleviates poverty.

In meeting these challenges within an environment without foreign assistance: the inability to access concessional financing, due to debts and sanctions, could undermine these efforts. Sudan has limited access to external financing and has accumulated unsustainable debt. Resorting to non-concessional borrowing and excessive domestic bank financing will further exacerbate the already difficult fiscal situation.

2.3.2. Sudan’s external debt

Sudan has accumulated large unresolved external debts that will have a direct impact on poverty reduction. External debt servicing has diverted considerable national revenue resources that could have been directed towards developmental and social protection needs and hence reduce poverty.

The government has taken concrete steps to meet the requirements of the heavily indebted poor country (HIPC) criteria, such as (i) satisfactory macroeconomic performance within the framework of the present IMF staff-monitored programme, as stipulated under the
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government’s Three-Year Economic Recovery Programme (2012–14), aiming at addressing economic challenges following the separation of the South and (ii) the release and approval of the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy in June 2012.

### 2.3.3. Economic and political sanctions

The economic and political sanctions have hit the population hard, especially agriculture, as the sanctions since 1997 have prevented Sudan from accessing improved seeds and modern agricultural equipment. Gum Arabic, the fourth largest agricultural export item, has been affected, despite exemptions, due to other related sanctions (banking, insurance, etc.).

There have been limited flows of development assistance to Sudan and the operations of the main development financial institutions have been affected by suspensions, including those by the WB and the AfDB, due to accumulated arrears. Following the signing of the CPA, the donors pledged substantial amounts of resources to support the implementation of the Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) 2007–11, but these commitments were not fully met.

### 2.3.4. Government measures to address the economic challenges

Following the secession of South Sudan in July 2011, the Five-Year Development Plan (2012–16), the Three-Year Medium Term Economic Programme (2012–14) and the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy were adopted to address these challenges.

Major government economic policies included measures in the financial sector on taxes and customs exemptions as well as on value-added taxes. In addition, the policies undertook institutional and technological changes for tax collection bodies and the gradual elimination of all subsidies (sugar, wheat, petroleum products), with due consideration for the negative social impacts and the need to put in place an alternative social protection system.

Broad-based growth will be targeted at the Agricultural Revival Programme (ARP), which has the highest political support as agriculture and livestock are the leading sectors. It is strongly believed that maintaining macroeconomic stability will create an environment for growth and inclusive development and stability.

This broad-based development has addressed several social issues, such as balanced development, poverty alleviation and unemployment. Additional policies include maintenance of transfers to the states, investing in social services’ delivery to expedite progress towards the MDGs with the priority on the least performing states, increasing coverage of social security and medical insurance and expediting the programmes of demobilisation and disarmament and reintegration (DDR) to accommodate sustainable livelihoods for ex-combatants and IDPs. Particular attention was given to women in these policies.
2.4. Demography

Sudan has an area of about 1.8 million square kilometres and a population of 30.9 million inhabitants in 2008.\(^8\) However, the estimated number of people is currently 34 million. It is expected that after the fifth census, Sudan’s population will be 58 million people by the end of 2031. The estimated number of people living in the national capital\(^9\) is about 8 million. The latest estimates of the number of foreigners in Sudan is about 4 million, mostly located in the national capital and the eastern states.

Annual population growth rate was 2.4% from 1993 to 2008. Sudan has a young population, as 90% of its citizens are below 50 years of age and 42% are below the age of 15. Middle-aged people between 15 and 49 years represent 47.9% of the population. Those above 60 years represent 5.6%.

Sudan is strategically located in the upper eastern part of Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), bordering the Central African Republic, Chad, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Libya and South Sudan. The country is endowed with 500 miles of coastline on the Red Sea, with a strategic port at Port Sudan serving most of its landlocked neighbours, including South Sudan.

2.5. Poverty and the MDGs

Sudan’s human development indicators have not made notable improvements in recent years, especially following the oil shock in 2011 and continued insecurity in various parts of the country exacerbated by limited access to international financial assistance, sanctions and external debt.

According to the IPRSP (2012), the national poverty rate is 46.5%. Poverty is prevalent all over the country but is higher in rural areas. Most of the poor are rural residents, though urban poverty is also growing. Inequalities are wide between states and regions, between urban and rural areas, between war-affected and more peaceful areas and between men and women.

Wide variations of economic and social development among states exist (poverty incidence is 26% in Khartoum and 69.4% in North Darfur) and the same is true for progress towards the MDGs. The government has taken the necessary measures, including the release of the IPRSP, and has put the objective of poverty reduction in the centre of the Five-Year Strategic Plans and long-term planning horizon. Other MDGs are equally addressed as a prime priority for interventions. Spending for the poor has been increasing since 2007, but was marginally reduced in 2011 due to financial constraints. Unemployment and access to services have been addressed, and social funds and social security have been strengthened.
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\(^8\) National Population Census 2008.

\(^9\) The national capital is composed of three cities: Khartoum, Omdurman and Khartoum North.
Sudan has large numbers of displaced persons due to conflicts and natural conditions, and so economic conditions need to be reintegrated into sustainable livelihoods. The large numbers of ex-combatants pose a challenge amid slow progress in implementing the national DDR programmes. In addition, Sudan is faced with continuing environmental degradation and frequent floods that have worsened displacements and poverty.

There has been a significant decrease in the mortality rate for children under 5 years in Sudan over the years, from 123 in 1990 to 83 per 1,000 live births in 2010. The under-five mortality rate (U5MR) is likely to reach 75 per 1,000 live births against a target of 41 by 2015, if current trends continue.

According to available data, Sudan had a 60% decrease in maternal mortality per 100,000 live births over the past two decades, from 537 in 1990 to 216 in 2010. If current trends continue, the maternal mortality rate (MMR) would reach as low as 154 against a target of 134 by 2015. The rates for under-five and maternal mortalities remain a challenge.

As for environmental goals, the race to achieve the target in 2015 is unlikely to be reached, due to many challenges that are limiting progress. Concerning global partnerships for development, it is unlikely that the poorest countries will achieve goals 1–7 of the MDGs without partner countries’ commitment to achieving goal 8 (‘Develop a global partnership for development’). Policy changes in rich countries for aid, debt, trade and technological transfers are essential to achieving goals, but not much is being done to achieve this goal.

With the MDG framework officially expiring in 2015, unless otherwise renewed, Sudan has made some progress in most of the targets, particularly in the areas of gender, maternal mortality and education, as well as human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS). It is hoped that the current and ongoing government efforts, supported by economic and political stability, will enable Sudan to achieve some progress in attaining some of these objectives fairly soon and concentrate on the central objective of poverty reduction.

The gross enrolment rate in primary education stood at a national average of 72% in 2009, but variations exist at state levels, specifically in conflict-ridden states. There was an 11-percentage-point increase in the gross enrolment rates in primary schools from 2004 to 2008. The primary completion rate (PCR) in Sudan is estimated at 63%, indicating a significant dropout rate of 37%. In 2006–10, the literacy rate for females and males aged 15–24 increased dramatically, from 28.2% to 36.7% and then to 67%. Nevertheless, hitting the MDG targets by 2015 is beyond reach.

The pattern for youth (15–24) literacy rates also indicates variations by sex, with male rates surpassing those of females in 14 out of the 15 states for 2008. Females’ literacy rate surpasses
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10 NPC 2013, Sudan Consultation Paper on MDGs and post 2015 Development Agenda.
that of males in Northern State. The widest gap was recorded in West Darfur, Al-Gadarif, Blue Nile and South Kordofan. There were also overwhelming variations in literacy rates by mode of living. The highest rate was recorded at 87% in urban areas followed by 63% and 17% in rural and nomadic areas, respectively.

Sudan’s MDG report tracked the progress towards goal 3a of the MDGs (‘Eliminate gender disparity in all levels of education’) with more focus on women’s education and employment: Sudan is far from having equal numbers of girls and boys in primary schools. However, there is continuous progress with gender parity indices ranging from 0.83 in 2001 (UNICEF 2001) to 0.87 in 2005 (UNDP-HDR 2007/2008) to 0.93 in 2010. The gender parity index in secondary schools, calculated using the net enrolment ratio, was 0.95 in 2000 and 0.93 in 2010. Hence, the gender parity index and female enrolment in secondary education are by far better compared to the gender parity index in primary schools.

Regarding the percentage of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector, women in Sudan carry out a major portion of agricultural activities and livestock production and bear almost the entire burden of household work, including the collection of water and fuel wood and the processing and preparation of food. They represent 49% of the farmers in the irrigated sector and 57% in the rain-fed traditional sector; however, their control over productive resources is limited.

Progress towards gender equality in the labour market is positive as in 1990–2000, there was significant progress in Sudan. The share of women in paid non-agricultural activities rose from 18% to 30%. However, the last two population censuses in 1993 and 2008 put women’s economic participation rate at 26% and 25%, respectively.

In 2008, the unemployment rate was 13.7% for males and 20.2% for females. Comparing these rates to the unemployment rates in 1996 for males (13%) and females (24%), there was about a 4-percentage-point fall in females’ unemployment. Nevertheless, gender disparity is evident in unemployment and in participation in the formal sector by mode of living. Also, unemployment overall is increasing – current estimates are 18.6% according to a recent labour survey (2013).

Noticeable progress in women’s political participation occurred during 1970–80, and in 1982, women occupied around 9% of the seats in National Assembly. In 2004–10, there was a 15-percentage-point increase in the seats occupied by women in the parliament. Sudan is on its way towards achieving some aspects of MDG 3 (‘Promote gender equality and empower women’) by 2015. However, still more efforts are needed to eliminate disparities between regions and to narrow gender gaps in education and women’s employment.

According to Sudan’s MDG Report 2013, the prevalence of people who are underweight is 32.2% while the prevalence of underweight children younger than five is 12.6%.
2.6. The macro-economic situation

Since 1990, the government has adopted market economy policies in a paradigm shift in the country’s economic policy. The Three-Year Recovery Programme (1991–93) was a turning point in the national economy as it approved the policy of economic liberalisation and the dismantling of the government’s monopoly of the means of production through the privatisation of public sector enterprises in industry, agriculture, communications and services, thereby providing a greater opportunity for the private sector to contribute to economic revival.

Since the 1990s, Sudan has gone through tremendous political and economic changes, including its political process, following the signature of the CPA in 2005. The secession of the South resulted in the withering of 36% of the oil resources (that, in the past, comprised up to 95% of export earnings) and the decreasing of the substantial amount of foreign exchange reserves, and both changes had a major impact on the fiscal situation and the economy. The secession of the South negatively affected the economy. About 75% of the oil was lost as most of the oil fields are located in the South. This means the loss of almost 20% in GDP growth and a loss of 54% of the foreign exchange accumulation base.11

The gap caused by oil loss has been estimated to be US$10 billion in the five years following the secession. This has created domestic and external imbalances and has threatened stability and the economy and emphasises the timely need to adjust to avoid destabilisation of the economy. Indicators show there is an over-reliance on oil and inadequate attention to diversified growth, especially from agriculture on which the livelihoods of the majority of people depend.

Recent IMF reports and the annual report of the Central Bank of Sudan (CBoS) attest that Sudan’s economic conditions continue to deteriorate and this will affect economic growth and macroeconomic stability. The inflation rate increased from single digits in 2004–05 to approximately 48% in 2013. The government is now faced with a huge budget deficit and persistent increased pressure on the pound, resulting in almost a 100% gap between the official and parallel markets in mid-2014.
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Chapter 3. Social protection policies and institutional arrangements

3.1. Development planning framework


The existing planning frameworks and polices aim at improving the business climate and encouraging diversified investment in order to facilitate the private sector’s role in growth and employment creation. Although Sudan is passing through a special situation, these planning efforts highlight the present and future of the economic manifestation and development vision. The MDGs have been fully integrated into Sudan’s development plans and programmes.

The government endorsed and released an IPRSP in June 2012. The release of the IPRSP is expected to support Sudan’s continued efforts to resolve its external debt, as this is a condition to be eligible to access the HIPC debt relief initiative.

3.2. Government measures in support of social benefits

The first and second five-year strategic plans included the following important objectives: eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, achieve sustainable economic stability, expand microfinance, develop Zakat and improve access to target groups, achieve food security, achieve balanced development, increase the economic growth rates, build information and a competent society through the expansion of income-generating opportunities and social security coverage and the enhancement of the participation of the people in the development efforts for poverty alleviation and, finally, strengthen capacity building and human resource development to be responsive to the requirements of sustainable development and the needs for labour and productive markets.
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12 The final full-fledged Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSP) is expected in 2015.
13 A term used in Islamic finance to refer to the obligation that an individual has to donate a certain proportion of wealth (2.5%) each year to charitable causes for the benefit of the poor.
Other objectives of these plans include education expansion and reforms, provision of Education for All (EFA), expansion of knowledge and skills and capacity development through continuous training, achievement of universal access to basic education by 2015, expansion of the electricity services to 45% of the population, an increase in the contribution of the service sectors in GDP, promotion of gender equality and women’s empowerment and enhancement of the level of empowerment of women and their families, socially and economically. The MDGs are therefore fully integrated in all development planning frameworks in Sudan. The adopted development plans aim at enhancing economic growth, promoting employment supporting productive sectors and directing resources to basic services and social security.

Definitely contributing positively to these efforts are the implementation of the new five-year economic reform programme, finalisation of the PRSP, implementation of the provisions of the cooperation agreement with the government of South Sudan, continued support for the Darfur Doha Accord and peace efforts, and the recently launched initiative of a national dialogue.

### 3.3. Social protection policies and strategies

The Government of Sudan is increasingly taking into consideration social protection activities for the poor. Efforts are expected to go along with the global norms in providing the poor with some assistance as needed. Traditionally and religiously, the poor are being considered and are supported in various ways. Their extended families necessitate that the rich ones in the community should assist their poor relatives either directly or through remunerated work. Zakat has been well known for centuries, though it was not organised as well as in the recent 20 last years. Usually, people with a certain level of limited savings must pay 2.5% of it and distribute it to the poor, usually within the extended family. Zakat and other religious payment systems were carried out as voluntary payments, depending on the strength of beliefs rather than being compulsory and regulatory operations with a formal and constitutional set-up, as at the present time. It could therefore be concluded that informal social safety nets were persistent and practiced but without the institutional framework and arrangements as now.

The government’s policy framework with regard to social protection and SSNs are composed of the following actions:

- Increase the resources spent on basic services through mobilisation of state and local resources and by attracting grants and foreign aid for basic services.
- Increase the resources of Zakat for the poor and the needy; in addition, return to an Awqaf\textsuperscript{15}-oriented education for health and water.

\textsuperscript{15} Awqaf is an Islamic religious endowment for an irrevocable dedication of a person’s wealth or a portion of it in cash or kind (such as house, stores, gardens, etc) and their revenues be used for Islamic compliant projects. Awqaf is permanent donation.
• Continue the programmes for productive families and income-generating activities.
• Activate the roles of the funds and social security institutions in the field of poverty alleviation.
• Encourage and facilitate the role of national NGOs in the field of voluntary social work.

The government’s social protection programmes in Sudan are implemented mainly through the following modalities:16

• **Cash Transfer Programme**: This is an unconditional transfer of 150 SDG/month to poor households identified using poverty criteria established by the Ministry of Welfare and Social Security (MoWSS) and the Zakat Chamber. Currently, the programme reaches 260,000 households, but it is expected to cover 750,000 households by the end of 2015 (originally planned for 500,000 households in 2011). The beneficiary selection and case management for this project are done by the MoWSS and the Zakat Chamber, while the Saving and Social Development Bank (SSDB) is entrusted with disbursing the cash to targeted households, along with Zakat points at state level. The programme faces many operational challenges because of lack of transparency, inefficiency, difficulties in outreach, as well as inadequate and irregular resource allocation.

• **National Health Insurance Fund (NHIF)**: This is the second-largest programme of the MoWSS and it supports the access to health services by 380,000 households. It is conditional and contributory, but there is a provision to include poor households that are unable to contribute the premium. The programme covers all the recipients of the unconditional cash transfer. This programme is expected to cover 1,130,000 households by 2018 and has been gradually expanding its coverage in the Darfur area.

• **Student Support Grant**: This is a grant for students from poor households to pursue university education. Each student receives SDG100/month in cash and an additional SDG100/month is paid to the educational institution on behalf of the student, for food and rental expenses. The programme expects to cover 200,000 students by 2015.

• **Rural Women’s Empowerment and Revolving Fund**: Microfinance and training on business development for rural women.

• **Microfinance and Microenterprise Development/Asset Transfer**: Provision of small loans for livelihood promotion.

• **Social projects for specific target groups**: Meets immediate needs like water and health expenses for vulnerable groups such as homeless people and IDPs.

• **Support for the disabled**: Includes distribution of prosthetic limbs and revolving funds.

• **Community media and corporate social responsibility**.

• **Other related projects**, and the larger funds under the MoWSS.
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3.4. Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (IPRSP)

The government’s attempts to formulate a Poverty Reduction Strategy started in 2004. After many years, the IPRSP was issued in June 2011 and approved in 2012. The document is regarded as one of the instruments that could be used by the government as a beginning for elaborating a vision and new direction for its governance, socio-economic development and poverty reduction efforts. It is also considered as a basic document for guiding programmes for social protection and poverty reduction. The MDGs were reflected in the CPA and Sudan’s Interim Constitution as prerequisites for achieving stability in Sudan. Thus, this IPRSP takes the MDGs as medium-term development targets for Sudan. Progress in implementing the IPRSP is monitored against relevant MDGs.

The major objectives of the IPRSP are as follows:

1. to complement planning instruments that are already in place or underway, by strengthening the prioritisation of actions within and across sectors targeting poverty
2. to be used by the government of Sudan to support its national planning for its annual and medium-term budget exercises
3. to provide the framework and road-map for the elaboration and implementation of the full PRSP.

The IPRSP has specified four pillars for its functionalities:

1. strengthen governance and institutional capacity of the public sector
2. reintegrate IDPs and other displaced people
3. develop human resources
4. promote economic growth and employment creation.

The report has the following major headings that specify the issues in question:

1. Poverty Diagnostics
2. The Poverty Reduction Strategy: Core Elements and Pillars
3. Strengthening Governance and Institutional Capacity
4. Reintegration of Internally Displaced Persons and Refugees
5. Developing Human Resources
6. Promotion of Economic Growth and Employment Creation
7. The Road Map for the Preparation of the Full PRSP.

As far as social protection and safety nets are concerned, the IPRSP restated that the primary social protection mechanism in Sudan is Zakat, with its total resources increased from SDG13.5
billion in 2001 to SDG27.1 billion in 2005. Most of these resources are allocated to the poor, the indigent, road farers and insolvent, who received 68% of the Zakat spending in 2005. Out of the total spent on the poor in 2005, an amount equivalent to 19% went to education, health and water services. The IPRSP suggested that the contribution of Zakat spending on poverty reduction and the funds’ benefits on various income groups need to be assessed.

The IPRSP analysed the labour and employment situation and found that total employment increased from 5.9 million in 1993 to 6.7 million in 2008, which is a growth rate of less than 1% (0.9%) during the period. With the labour force growing by 1.3%, from almost 6.6 million to 8 million between 1993 and 2008, the number of unemployed persons increased considerably, from 0.7 million in 1993 to 1.4 million in 2008. Accordingly, the unemployment rate stood at 16.8% in 2008 compared with 11.1% in 1993.

With regards to achievements in terms of MDG indicators, the report found the following facts:

### Table 1: Regional disparities in key MDG and related indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Highest Region</th>
<th>Lowest Region</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1.1 Proportion of population below poverty line</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1.2 Poverty gap ratio</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1.5 Employment ratio to population 15 years old and above</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1.6 Proportion of employed population below poverty line</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1.7 Proportion of own account and contributing family</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers to total employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 2.1 Net enrolment rate in primary education</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 2.3.1 Literacy rate of 15–24 year-olds—Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 2.3.2 Literacy rate of 15–24 year-olds—Men</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 2.3.3 Literacy rate of 15–24 year-olds—Women</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Sudan National Household Budget Survey, 2009.

On microfinance, the IPRSP stated that the major components of the action plan to develop the microfinance industry should include the following:

- Building on the existing system and/or developing a reformed financial system for the poor with a solid infrastructure and efficient financial intermediaries that have the required outreach to meet the financial needs of the poor.
Creating the legislative and regulatory frameworks that enhance the performance of the microfinance industry.

Adopting mechanisms that support transparency among microfinance institutions.

Applying ‘best practices’ and setting distinct performance standards for the sector.

Creating an efficient information network that includes access to reliable, up-to-date, market information on the financial needs of the poor, on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and on gender and geographical imbalances.

Increasing coordination among various stakeholders including microfinance institutions (MFIs), government, NGOs, practitioners, donors, etc.

The major problems of microfinance are their targeting systems and mechanisms, and the roles of the government to enhance the execution of the system have not been specified clearly, although they are the basic elements for successful microfinancing.

On the various other institutions dealing with social protection in the country, the IPRSP analysed the roles of only a few of them, such as pensions and health insurance. Important institutions such as the Social Security Fund, the Ministry of Welfare (MoW) and others are not clearly covered and hence no concrete recommendations could be drawn. The IPRSP indicated the achievements and that projects such as the Community Development Fund (CDF) are good for highlighting the role of such projects in social protection in rural areas. No recommendations were made on how to improve the implementation mechanisms of such projects to directly target the poor, such as the recommendation by the World Bank to use a conditional Cash-for-Work (productive safety net approach) instead of the normal CDF project practice of hiring contractors for the implementation of the sub-projects. In this connection, the CDF used the community contractors as a solid base for introducing Cash for Work and productive safety nets.

**Pensions:** In 2005, total pension liabilities amounted to SD115.6 billion, while revenue was only SD30.4 billion, representing only 26% of expenditures.

**Health Insurance:** The 25-year strategic plan (2003–27) aims at comprehensive health coverage for all sectors of the population. This strategy is divided into five-year plans; the first aims to increase coverage to 33% of the population. There is no evaluation of the service delivery, but anecdotal evidence points to dissatisfaction and discontent with the quality of services provided.

The IPRSP was approved by parliament in 2012 and by the World Bank in 2013. Nevertheless, the final PRSP is yet to be prepared and come out as a binding document.

On the food security and agricultural sector, the IPRSP stated that the ‘key conclusion drawn from the poverty profile is that productivity growth in agriculture remains a fundamental
requirement for poverty reduction in Sudan.\textsuperscript{17} This is mainly because two-thirds of the population lives in rural areas and most of those in the bottom 20\% are engaged in agriculture for their livelihoods. The IPRSP recommended that agriculture should be the vehicle for shared growth and the reduction of poverty and hunger and therefore it deserves a very high priority.

According to the IPRSP, the key areas for action in the short-term should include the following:

- Assist smallholder farming to become more productive, competitive and sustainable.
- Improve productivity of rain-fed and semi-mechanised farming with improved seeds, modern irrigation technologies and the provision of farm inputs.
- Improve access to markets and establish efficient value chains by enhancing local infrastructure, improving commodity trading and risk management.
- Increase access to water and irrigation as a major determinant of land productivity and the stability of yields.
- Enhance agricultural research and extension.
- Improve livestock marketing through the regulation of stocking rates.
- Make agricultural systems more environmentally sustainable.

\textbf{3.5. Social protection strategy}

Sudan has embedded social protection strategies as prescribed in the IPRSP and other documents. The five-year plan (2012–16) and Sudan’s 25-year development plan (2007–31), in addition to the short-term policy documents like an annual budget framework paper, are all in line with addressing the major economic and social issues.

The IPRSP specified: ‘The services that the government provides in many areas, infrastructure, human development, social protection, are crucial for the economic growth and poverty reduction that Sudan is seeking’.\textsuperscript{18}

There is no unified national strategy for the social protection initiatives in Sudan. Though specified in the IPRSP, there are still scattered strategies as each ministry virtually has its own strategy and policies of implementation. The IPRSP started, however, some initiatives to unify those by the Ministry of Finance and National Economy (MoFNE).

\textsuperscript{17} Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, 2011, page 65
\textsuperscript{18} Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, 2011, page 30

The draft document for the Five-Year Economic Reform Programme (FYERP) was just released and it covers the reports from the sectorial technical committees. The compiled report assessed the achievements of the previous Three-Year Reform Programme (2012–14) and found the following:

- The National Pension Fund covered 323,000 persons and the minimum monthly remuneration was raised to SDG425. This is in addition to other services such as health insurance, microfinance and support for children in education.
- The health dimension achieved its objectives with 88%.
- In the education sector, the programme tackled the problems that are related to the low enrolment rates, e.g. quality of teachers, girls’ education and schools’ environment.
- The total achievement in the water sector was about 70% with regard to increasing the per capita consumption and the supporting programmes and projects.
- Health insurance covered 11.8 million subscribers (31.9% of the population) by June 2014, in addition to 1.9 million covered by other health insurance systems (private and regular systems), which increased the total coverage to 37.2% of the population.

The Technical Committee for the Service Sectors, Social Protection and Poverty Reduction for this FYERP denoted the following dimensions with regard to social protection and poverty reduction for 2015–19:

**Social support:**
- Raise the Zakat assistance to SDG3 million (from SDG1.2 million presently).
- Complete the coverage of 2.5 million households for cash transfers in addition to getting 500,000 households out of poverty by the end of the programme.
- Establish a social security database.
- Regular monitoring and auditing.

**Social insurance:**
- Increase the coverage of health insurance from 37% to 70% with the inclusion of children, mothers and school students.
- Periodically increase the minimum level of the retirement pensions to cope with the changing wages.

**Social funding:**
- Raise the ceiling of microcredit from 5% to 12%.
- Expand microfinance and direct it to the productive sectors.
• Continue microfinance that targets the youth and graduates and provides financing for consumable goods.
• Increase the capital of the SSDB from SDG130 million to SDG500 million by the end of the period.

Labour and employment
• Increase work opportunities and reduce the redundancy level from 22% to 18%.
• Improve the vocational training systems.
• Revitalise the role of the cooperatives and the specialised work unions.
• Develop human resources and arrange a free work market.

The above dimensions are all targeting poverty reduction in their built-in programmes.

3.7. National Population Council (NPC)

The NPC\textsuperscript{19} was established in 1994 and is composed of a number of members including the minister of the MoWSS and other related federal and state ministers and partners. It is chaired by the president of the Republic. It is intended that the NPC lays the foundation for institutional structure to coordinate the government and civil society efforts regarding population issues through development, monitoring, evaluation and adjustment of policies, plans and population programmes.

Hence, the NPC’s main mission is to ensure the realisation of population strategy and relevant goals stated in the Comprehensive National Strategy through policies, programmes and action plans that employ both quantitative and qualitative goals.

The NPC is specifically tasked with the following:
• Formulating and achieving the national population policy and associated objectives and goals through projects and programmes and plans of action.
• Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the National Population Policy.
• Raising the level of awareness on population issues among all population sectors through appropriate information media and education curricula.
• Encouraging support and disseminating scientific research in population issues, in coordination with national research centres.
• Soliciting local and foreign aid to assist in the implementation of population policies, programmes and plans.

\textsuperscript{19} The information reported here was gained by in-depth interviewing of the NPC consultant, who also provided a written brief.
3.8. Other related policy endeavours

The Federal Ministry of Health (MoH) is finalising a nutrition policy that encompasses both a National Nutrition Strategy and the creation of a High Level Nutrition Council. These steps are aimed at enabling the government to embrace the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement in 2014.

In July 2013, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) launched the signing of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)\(^\text{20}\) compact, which supports existing national policies, such as the Agricultural Revival Programme (ARP) aimed at increasing smallholder farmers’ productivity.

In June 2013, the Council of Ministers adopted a national school feeding policy to be adopted in collaboration with the WFP and the Ministry of Education (MoE).

3.9. Fuel subsidies

Sudan has been subsidising fuel and gas for many decades. These subsidies were forcing Sudan’s economy to the brink. The costs of these subsidies were met from the large oil revenues before the secession of South Sudan in 2011. In addition, the government devaluated the currency from SDG2.2 to SDG4.4 for one dollar in June 2012\(^\text{21}\) and that exacerbated and increased the suffering in meeting the minimal requirements for the lives of the poor.

One of the key measures adopted in September 2013 was the abolition of fuel subsidies, which was aimed at reducing the fiscal imbalance and boosting the economy. This action resulted in increases in the prices of diesel, gasoline and cooking gas by 65, 68, and 67%, respectively, which then caused massive protests throughout the country in the same month. The abolition of fuel subsidies also increased the prices of goods and services that use fuel in their production and distribution. The loss in real income is estimated to be about 4% overall, but a large part of this burden fell on the poor. The IMF estimates that 1 million more people have been added to the current figure of 13.5 million poor people in Sudan (those with incomes of less than SDG114 per month). The percentage of people below the poverty line is therefore more than the official figure of 46.5%.

It is estimated that the subsidy reform will generate about SDG797 million (about US$140m) in budgetary savings (IMF). These savings should be utilised for expanding the social protection and SSN programmes and to formulate a new strategic framework and policies for social protection in the country. The interventions should include all the programmes and projects related to social protection. This should include the cash transfers, which are consuming most of

---

\(^\text{20}\) CAADP is an African-led initiative to boost agricultural productivity in Africa. It was initiated in 2003 and it works through four pillars, and the third is Food Supply and Hunger. It is one of the initiatives under the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

\(^\text{21}\) The official rate in November 2014 was SDG5.7 for a U.S. dollar.
the savings, and other social protection and safety net projects, such as those using cash-for-work and intensive work methods.

In October 2013, the government doubled the social spending budget and the cash transfer programme was reinstated. Over 350,000 poor families are being targeted to receive SDG150 per month instead of the SDG100 per month for 100,000 households (89% were reached) since 2011.\textsuperscript{22} The salaries of civil servants were raised at the beginning of 2013, but not to the level that will coincide with the increases in prices that followed the abolition of the subsidy.

3.10. Institutional arrangements and functions

3.10.1. Government institutions\textsuperscript{23}

Many government entities have the responsibility of delivering specified social protection activities and formulating their own policies and strategies for their intended operations and outputs. The list below shows the major ministries responsible for delivering social protection and safety net programmes and activities:

1. Ministry of Welfare and Social Security (MoWSS)

   In addition to the larger funds such as the Zakat, the MoWSS is also responsible for effecting the following policies: National Policy for the Welfare of the Elderly, National Policy for Social Service Education (training for social workers), National Policy for Supporting Orphans, National Policy for Resolving the Problems of Homelessness, National Policy for Street Children and the forthcoming Comprehensive Integrated Social Programme.

   The MoWSS has eight directorates including Social Programmes, Women and Family, Poverty Reduction and Planning. It also has 10 semi-autonomous agencies including the Zakat Fund, National Council for Child Welfare, National Council for Persons with Disabilities, and the National Health Insurance Fund, National Population Council, and the microfinance programme under the National Rural Women’s Empowerment Programme.

   The MoWSS has identified the following challenges that need to be addressed urgently in order to develop an effective safety net that is efficient, transparent and reliable for the poorest of the poor:

   1. Targeting and beneficiary selection (errors of exclusion and inclusion).
   2. Timeliness and alternative modalities of payments.
   3. Lack of clarity in operational guidelines related to procedures and processes to guide implementing agencies involved in the Cash Transfer Programme.

\textsuperscript{22} Jamal Alnil, MoWSS, December 2012; \textit{Economic and Social Impact for the Social Support Project}.

\textsuperscript{23} Detailed information is found in the World Bank Sudan Safety Net Assessment 2014.
4. Absence of linkages between the beneficiary databases of Zakat and NHIF (both provide services to the same households).

5. Limited field monitoring and absence of an external evaluation of the cash transfer or other Social Initiative Programmes (SIP) that could provide guidance on impacts of selected sub-programmes of the SIP to determine its impact on the poorest.

6. Weakness in M&E and avoiding the dependency of beneficiaries on the temporary support they receive.

7. The absence of a feedback mechanism for beneficiaries’ grievance redress systems.

8. Reliable information on the results of programmes, e.g. through impact evaluations.

2. Ministry of Finance and National Economy (MoFNE)

The MoFNE sets up the policy formulation of the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, which includes social safety nets and the commitment to a National Social Protection Policy under the human development pillar.

The ministry was overseeing the Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF) for social service projects, including the CDF (closed October 2013), and the AfDB’s projects. The ministry is in charge of the forthcoming Development Aid Strategy for non-humanitarian aid. The ministry is coordinating poverty sections in all related ministries, but has yet to establish coherent units with common objectives, databases and projects. The MoFNE is working with the World Bank to establish a new partnership with donors (Sudan Partnership Fund), which is expected soon.

The MoFNE is presently engaged in the preparation of the Five-Year Economic Reform Programme for 2015–19. The programme evaluates the macro-economic and sectorial performances in addition to the three-year programme (2012–14). Special attention is warranted to the areas of service sectors and poverty reduction. The programme aims at important objectives in the services sectors, poverty reduction and social protection. It includes policies and interventions in education, health, water provisions and social protection. The programme has clearly identified challenges, policy objectives and specific interventions throughout its duration. It is expected that the programme will be endorsed prior to the preparation of the 2015 general and development budget.

The MoFNE is currently executing a project with the Islamic Development Bank (IsDB) in West Darfur, known as the Sustainable Village Programme in Kulbus Locality (total cost US$15 million).

3. Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI)

In July 2013, the MoAI launched the signing of the CAADP compact, which supports existing national polices, such as the Agricultural Revival Programme aimed at increasing smallholder farmers’ productivity. The Connecting Farmers to Markets project was initiated by the government through the creation of this programme.

The ministry is responsible for food security and livelihood programming, including early warning systems and the monitoring of food security in collaboration with the FAO.

A high-level committee chaired by the vice-president was formed recently for food security, with a technical secretariat responsible for the national food security policies and strategies. The members of the high-level committee are ministers and under-secretaries of the Ministries of Agriculture and Irrigation, Animal Resources, and Health, in addition to the Farmers’ and Pastoralists’ Unions.

A poverty unit was recently established in the ministry to work in harmony with the MoFNE and the Food Security Technical Secretariat.

4. Ministry of Health (MoH)

The Federal MoH is finalising a nutrition policy that encompasses both a national nutrition strategy and the creation of a high-level nutrition council. These steps are aimed at enabling the government to embrace the scaling up of the nutritional status.

The ministry is responsible for the draft of the National Nutrition Policy (2012-2016) and for implementing a nutrition programme in close collaboration with WFP and UNICEF.

It is also responsible for implementing the 2009 decree that granted free health insurance to pregnant and lactating mothers and children under five years of age. The MoH is responsible for the extended immunisation and malaria control programmes.

5. Ministry of Education (MoE)

The MoE is responsible for the school feeding programme under the new National School Feeding Policy (2012–16) in close collaboration with WFP. The programme will be gradually transferred to the government’s full control by 2016.

The MoE is also responsible for promoting girls’ education and education for nomads.

It is hosting the new Basic Education Project financed by the Global Funds that will build the capacities and construct schools and other educational needs at the state level.

6. Central Bank of Sudan (CBoS)

The CBoS is responsible for setting the microcredit policies and implementation and for introducing financial mechanisms to promote income-generating activities to complement SSN programming for the poor. Its 2007 policy requested that all banks set aside 12% of their portfolios for microfinance if their profit margins permitted. Of this 12%, 30% is to go to women and 70% to rural families.
7. Ministry of Labour (MoL)

This ministry is responsible for labour market activities and programming, including for youth. The MoL is only responsible for the formal employment sector, not the informal sector. It is beginning to conduct research on the informal sector in coordination with the MoFNE.

8. Ministry of Interior (MoI)

According to Republican Decree No. 29/2012, constituting the mandate and functions of the national presidential and executive organs of the government of Sudan, both the Commission of Refugees (CoR) and the Commission for Humanitarian Aid Commission (HAC) are within the jurisdiction of the MoI. The functions of the COR are to care for refugees in accordance with international conventions and to encourage their voluntary return to their country.

HAC’s tasks are many: to coordinate a set of plans and policies for humanitarian aid in close coordination with the relevant authorities; organise regional and international support and humanitarian coordination with local, regional and international organisations; supervise the work of international bodies and voluntary organisations in the field of relief and reconstruction; design general plans and policies that help to increase and activate voluntary and humanitarian work in the fields of charity and relief; register civil society organisations executing humanitarian or relief programmes including unions, associations, voluntary organisations, non-governmental and semi-governmental foreign or national organisations working in the social, cultural, economic and professional fields, and non-profit research centres; mobilise and revitalise capacity and work in the fields of charity, relief and prevention of natural disasters; monitor the voluntary organisations’ programmes and evaluate their performance and direct them towards meeting the country's needs; and supervise collaboration with the relevant authorities on the reconstruction and rehabilitation and resettlement of returnees in the selected states affected by war.

9. Ministry of Petroleum (MoP)

While MoFNE sets the prices at which oil is sold and determines the extent to which the price is subsidised, the MoP is responsible for executing sales at the specified prices and sending the proceeds to the MoFNE.

The ministry is involved in providing some basic services (water stations, schools, etc.) at its worksites that add to the social protection, although not always by following the right process.

---

24 Was formerly under the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs (MoHA) and before that under MoWSS.
10. Commission for Student Support Fund (SSF) (Office of the President)

The SSF provides in-kind and cash grants supporting 30.8% of all public university students (80,000 supported by the Zakat Chamber and 88,000 by the Student Welfare Fund (SWF)). The benefiting students are determined by means of information provided by each student about their economic status and that of their families as verified by a committee of social workers at each university. Of the benefiting students, 65% are women and 35% are male. Since 2012, soft loans have been offered to students by the SSF through the Savings and Social Development Bank (2,000 students are currently enrolled) with the bank’s administrative fees being paid for by the SWF.

3.10.2. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)

Many UN and other international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) are involved in delivering social protection and safety net interventions based on their working mandates and approvals from the concerned government agencies. Some organisations have done this job for decades and have reached large numbers of poor communities, vulnerable families, IDPs and refugees. In fact, people in the IDP and refugee camps are only targeted by these organisations as there is no government commitment apart from providing some assistance to those who moved as a result of the incessant conflicts and those who were deprived of most of their means of living as a result of seasonal catastrophes such as floods and rains.

Social protection partners in the country can be classified as those working in close collaboration with the government and the states and those working alone after getting permission from the government authorities. In the first case, the government makes some contributions towards the delivery of services whereas there are no contributions to the second type. Nevertheless, the government has control of all international and national NGOs through HAC, in that all are considered aid providers to the communities and to the government.

World Bank (WB)

The World Bank, which has been in the Sudan since 1994, re-established its office in 2005 after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between North and South Sudan. The major role of the WB office was managing and supervising the MDTF portfolio of projects in North Sudan. Thirteen projects25 for various sectors were implemented at a total cost of about US$265 million and all were completed by June 2013. Descriptions of these 13 projects follow with their MDTF contributions and costs.26

---

25 Information was obtained from various WB documents.
26 The total Government of Sudan contribution for all projects was about 57% of the total cost.
1. **The microfinance project provided assistance to the Bank of Sudan**

   The funding for this microfinance project amounted to US$20 million. The project was approved in May 2007 to support the new and existing microfinance institutions and providers by the dissemination of best practices, technical assistance, training, financing and managing donor resources. The objective was to provide affordable financial services to 200,000 households by supporting the emergence of commercially sustainable microfinance service providers, including those in the marginalised parts of western, eastern and northern Sudan, as well as for the urban working poor.

   The project was supposed to create a management information system (MIS) for microfinance institutions in Sudan. This Loan Tracking System was intended to support microfinance institutions in managing data relating to loans disbursed to clients. The project’s cost was US$11.8 million.

2. **The Community Development Fund Project (CDF)** targeted war-affected areas and provided basic services prioritised by the poor communities which were selected based on their deprivation of basic services (schools, health units, water projects, solar energy, etc.). The project reached 616 communities in five states and implemented more than 1,000 basic services. During subsequent phases of the programme, the CDF project used the productive safety net cash for work methods in the implementation of the interventions. The total cost at the end of June 2013 was US$52.8 million.

3. **The Technical Assistance Facility Project** in the MoFNE built up the capacities of civil servants: US$5.7 million.


5. **Capacity Building of the Judiciary Project**: US$10 million.

6. **National Emergency Transport Rehabilitation Project**: US$77.5 million.

7. **Decentralised Health System Development Project**: US$12 million.


9. **Improving Livestock Production & Marketing Project**: US$7.5 million.

10. **Capacity Building for Public Sector Reform & Decentralisation Project**: US$2.6 million.

11. **Basic Education Project**: US$15 million.


13. **Gum Arabic Project**: US$7 million.
A project financed by the World Bank started in 2013: Sustainable Livelihoods for Displaced and Vulnerable Communities in Eastern Sudan. The cost of the project is US$3.08 million from the WB to be implemented over three years (2013–16). The Project Development Objective is, 'To strengthen the capacity of (local) stakeholders, including state authorities, displaced persons and vulnerable host communities, to plan and deliver services and develop sustainable livelihoods'\textsuperscript{27}. Project beneficiaries are IDPs, refugees and host communities, local authorities responsible for the delivery of basic services and promotion of livelihood in vulnerable communities\textsuperscript{28} and local NGOs and other organisations active in delivering public services.

The pilot designed under this project will cover 15 community groups in two areas. The pilot will test an alternative mechanism for delivering public services and managing microcredit at the community level.

The WB is working jointly with the MoFNE to establish a Sudan Partnership Fund (SPF) to involve donors for funding projects and programmes, including those of a social protection nature. An inauguration workshop was held on 30 April 2014 when the basic features of the new fund were presented and discussed.

One recent initiative by the WB is the formation of a Social Protection Sector Working Group (SPSWG). The first meeting was held in June 2014. The group is headed by the WB resident representative and members from the following institutions: MoFNE, MoWSS, UNICEF, WFP, AfDB, Department for International Development (DFID), European Union (EU), and UNDP.

The major aims of the groups are to coordinate common areas of interest in the field of social protection between the Government of Sudan and interested development partners to jointly advance the social protection agenda.

The WB’s possible support in the field of SSN are as follows:

- Assist in developing a Proxy Means Test (PMT) and poverty mapping for the country.
- Carry out an IT assessment and provide advice on, and assist in, the development of a MIS.
- Support the development of a Social Initiative Programme (SIP).
- Conduct capacity building for the staff working in the SSN.

\textsuperscript{27} The Project’s results framework, from the World Bank general project details

\textsuperscript{28} MoFNE and the WB (2013), \textit{Sustainable Livelihood for Displaced and Vulnerable Communities in Eastern Sudan}. 
**World Food Programme (WFP)**

WFP has a long and solid history of working in Sudan. Building on its extensive logistics network, geographical outreach and 200 cooperating partners, WFP is continuing the provision of a timely and appropriate response to evolving humanitarian needs. WFP is performing its work through both in-kind food assistance and voucher transfers, depending on context and seasonality.

WFP’s strategic objectives are as follows:

- Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies.
- Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies.

WFP’s specific objectives are as follows:

- Save the lives of highly vulnerable, food-insecure and acutely malnourished groups affected by conflict and natural disasters, including IDPs, refugees and returnees, and strengthen the government’s capacity to respond to emergencies.
- Support the creation and rebuilding of community assets and livelihoods to enhance access to food security and strengthen the government’s capacity to address national food security and nutrition.
- Support the reduction of maternal and child undernutrition, particularly during the first 1,000 days, and assist the government’s efforts in related policy and strategy.
- Improve access to basic services to alleviate short-term hunger and contribute to learning while strengthening the capacity of the government to manage school feeding programmes and create an enabling environment that promotes gender equality.

WFP is targeting four main groups of beneficiaries:

1. IDPs, refugees and returnees.
2. Severely food-insecure and vulnerable households affected by conflict, natural disasters and high food prices.
3. Malnourished children, pregnant and lactating women and those at risk of malnutrition.
4. Schoolchildren from conflict-affected and food-insecure households.

WFP’s Emergency Programme for 2014 encompassed the provision and distribution of 287,099 metric tonnes of food to almost 4 million beneficiaries, mostly in the IDP and refugee camps. The total cost of the operation was more than US$376 million, as detailed in Table 2.

---

29 WFP, 2013, Emergency Operation Sudan 200597, and outputs from the discussions with the WFP international staff.
30 Refugees in CETA (Kassala) are mostly from Eritrea, while those in Darfur are mostly from Chad.
Table 2: WFP emergency programme costs for 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Related Costs</td>
<td>256,480,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Vouchers and Related costs</td>
<td>40,912,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development and Augmentation</td>
<td>930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Support Costs</td>
<td>53,627,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Support Costs</td>
<td>24,636,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost to WFP</td>
<td>376,586,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WFP Emergency Operation Sudan 200597

WFP is assisting the government in the formulation of the School Feeding Programme to be implemented at the state level, which will be followed by the successful Home-Grown School Feeding pilot projects in North Kordofan and Kassala.

WFP is implementing its interventions through the following mechanisms:

- **Food for Assets**: The basis for this method is the General Food Distribution (GFD) list from where the beneficiaries are transferred. Food will be provided in return for the beneficiaries' labouring in projects that build their assets or capacity. They should generate income by increasing their literacy, providing nurseries, or training them in the production of handicrafts or food production by helping them to access agriculture or livestock extension services. In 2012, the programme assisted 1.4 million beneficiaries.

- **School Feeding**: The programme is implemented in collaboration with the federal and state Ministries of Education. It targets school-aged children in areas with high food insecurity or in communities with a large concentration of IDPs (such as Darfur). WFP is also planning to provide the same service to displaced and vulnerable children in the conflict-affected South Kordofan and Blue Nile states. The programme will help reduce hunger and stabilise the enrolment rates of primary school children throughout the school year. In 2012, the programme covered about one million beneficiaries. Dry take-home rations and home-grown health foods are components of this programme.

Apart from direct implementation support in School Feeding, WFP has been supporting the Ministry of Education in drafting an interim Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2015-17 as part of the overall national planning cycle of the Government of Sudan, which provides for five-year planning cycles. The ESSP is an integral part of Government of Sudan’s longer-term vision for the development of the education sector through 2020. The ESSP builds on various policy documents of the government, including the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (iPRSP) and the National Development Plan for 2012-2016.

Since 2009, the global understanding of school feeding programmes has changed significantly, reflecting WFP’s broader strategic shift from food aid to food assistance.
School feeding is regarded as a safety net that contributes to countries’ social protection and development goals by providing support to children and their families. By supporting education of the most vulnerable children, WFP’s school feeding strategy in Sudan contributes to increasing human capital and ending hunger while making the need for future assistance less likely. Considering school feeding in Sudan as a safety net and as one of the tools contributing to ending hunger is also coherent with the Sudan Country Office’s strategy for 2014-2017 which emphasises WFP’s role in building resilience and help reduce vulnerability.

- **Targeted Seasonal Supplemental Rations**: This programme targets children between six and 59 months old in households receiving GFD in Darfur by providing them with a seasonal nutritious food supplement to address their high nutritional needs. In 2012, the programme assisted 0.24 million beneficiaries.

- **Integrated Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programme (IBSFP)**: This programme targets pregnant and lactating women and children between six and 36 months old throughout the year by providing specialised foods to meet the nutritional needs of the target group. The programme was originally piloted in 2012 to reduce acute malnutrition in the target areas in Kassala and Red Sea states.

- **Targeted Supplementary Feeding Programme**: This programme targets children between six and 59 months old with moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) and malnourished pregnant and lactating women by providing them with supplementary food. In 2012, the programme assisted 0.24 million beneficiaries.

- **General Food Support**: While WFP’s programming is becoming more targeted, a large number of poor and vulnerable people still depend on its general food support.

These general programmes are as follows:

- **General Food Distribution (half and full rations)**: This programme targets IDPs and vulnerable residents of Darfur who have other sources of food (with a half ration) and newly arrived refugees and IDPs or residents recently affected by conflicts who rely entirely on WFP assistance and have no other sources of food (with a full ration). Assistance is provided either in kind (as food) or as vouchers. Registered IDPs and refugees receive assistance throughout the year, while vulnerable and food-insecure residents in Darfur benefit from the WFP’s support for five months during the lean season. WFP provides full GFD rations to recently displaced people and vulnerable people in South Kordofan and Blue Nile until they can access other sources of food or income. In 2012, the programme assisted 2.4 million beneficiaries (with both half and full rations), of whom 1.4 million were IDPs.

31 According to international standards, school meals, take-home rations and food for training are considered as safety net conditional transfers: ‘Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy’ (WFP/EB.A/2012/5-A).
- **Voucher Delivery Mechanism (VDM):** This programme provides IDPs in camps with monthly or bi-monthly voucher transfers. WFP’s partners (NGOs, community-based organisations (CBOs) and line ministries of state governments) provide these vouchers under the supervision of WFP. In 2012, the programme assisted 726,500 beneficiaries.

WFP is planning to make some strategic changes in its delivery methods and mechanisms. Conditional transfers will be utilised, including cash and food for work and productive safety nets. WFP has introduced the following initiatives:

- Safe access to fuel and efficient alternatives (SAFE), which started in 2009 and was extended to Darfur and includes the eastern states in 2015. SAFE will target only women and is providing 20 days of training each year on livelihood and microfinance. It also supplies improved stoves in the IDP camps, which resulted in many benefits such as the restoration of the environmental and eco-systems, improvement of sanitation and hygiene in households and safeguarding women from documented abuse for those looking for firewood. The initiative also trains women in establishing small nurseries so that they can contribute to the household expenses and improve the environment. The initiative is implemented by the national CBO Women Development Association Network (WDAN).

- Farmers to market ingenuity with the CBoS and Practical Action organisations. This initiative provides micro-financing and micro loans, training in financial management, extension advice and markets for sales. It also introduced early warning systems by providing the necessary information on the weather conditions and market prices, and thus connected to better marketing systems and supply chains. The MoAI is involved in the training and the extension activities.

- Since January 2014, the WFP has been working on establishing a corporate resilience strategy through an evidence-based strategy. This is based on the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) in collaboration with the FAO and other partners.

- The WFP is planning to reduce the GFD and expand its interventions in providing conditional transfers and productive safety nets. This endeavour targeted 20 IDP camps in Darfur in 2014 and up that to 28 in 2015 (44% of the camps) with beneficiaries totalling 1.2 million IDPs (53% of the IDPs in Darfur).

Sudan is preparing a Comprehensive Food Security Policy. The country is also party to the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Project (CAADP) compact. The National Nutrition Strategy (2014-2018) – developed with the support of WFP – seeks to improve access and utilisation of health services, to strengthen institutional support for the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) and to advocate for nutrition in development priorities.

---

32 The total number of IDP camps in Darfur is 91 camps distributed among the five states (WFP).
33 MoU between the Government and WFP, UNICEF, WHO, FAO, UNFPA and IFAD.
In 2014-2015, WFP formulated a three-year country strategy with four pillars: i) save lives in emergencies and protracted crises; ii) support early-recovery through safety net activities; iii) build resilience of local communities to withstand shocks and seasonal vulnerability; and iv) address underlying causes of chronic undernutrition.

Based on this country strategy, WFP has moved to a 24-month Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO), since July 2015. The overarching objective of this PRRO is to save lives of highly vulnerable populations through a robust short-term emergency relief component and to transition to vulnerability-based targeting for protracted beneficiaries and to restore livelihoods following shocks through early recovery and safety net activities. The early recovery and safety net activities will improve household food security and promoting self-reliance. Targeting and selection of these activities will be informed through WFP’s three-pronged approach (3PA).³⁴

At field level, jointly with FAO and UNICEF, WFP is applying the 3PA to ensure that project outcomes remain sustainable and community-driven. WFP is taking the lead on the Community Mobilization Output (SLP and CBPP), and has worked to define a Resilience and Safety Net Unit with staff specifically designated to scale up resilience work, aimed at training a wide group of staff and partners in how to conduct Seasonal Livelihoods Programming and Community-based Participatory Planning exercises in the most effective and comprehensive way.

As linking resilience building with social protection and social safety nets (SP/SSN) has become a key priority for humanitarian and development stakeholders in the country, WFP is actively participating in the World Bank-led Social Protection Sector Working Group (SPSWG). This contribution is considered by WFP as an entry point for strengthening its relations with line ministries, especially the Ministry of Welfare and Social Security (MoWSS), and key donors (e.g. DFID, AfDB, WB) towards more development-oriented activities.

**African Development Bank (AfDB)**

The AfDB is becoming one of the major actors in social protection in the country. The bank is continuing its provision of financial support for the country, although there is still a problem with declared arrears. The bank has just completed a project with the MoFNE, Institutional Capacity Building for Poverty Reduction and Good Governance Project (CBPRGG), at a total cost of US$375,000. The project was establishing the basis for the full PRSP and building up the capacities of the poverty-related ministries. A poverty unit was established and equipped in each of the following federal ministries: the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), MoFNE, MoWSS, MoL, Ministry of Animal Resources (MoAR), MoH and MoE, in addition to some states. Workshops were conducted in the states advocating for the IPRSP and for poverty issues. The

³⁴ The 3PA is a comprehensive planning tool that WFP has introduced globally, consisting of an Integrated Context Analysis (ICA), which highlights geographic trends and risks; the Seasonal Livelihood Programming (SLP), which is a participatory consultation process at the sub-national level; and Community-Based Participatory Planning (CBPP), which tailors programmes with communities.
project succeeded in finalising two important surveys: the Household Survey of 2009 with the MoWSS and the Impact Assessment of the Social Security Funds in 2014. Relevant studies were carried out for the project by national consultants; one of these is ‘The Role of Agriculture in Poverty Reduction and Food Security in Sudan’.

The AfDB is implementing some important projects such as the Darfur Conflict Resolution and Peace Building. The AfDB is going to finance the following programmes:

- Drought resilience and sustainable livelihood in the Horn of Africa with US$45 million.
- Improved social service delivery in three states for US$25 million.
- Technical Assistance and Capacity Building to the Preparation of a Full Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (TCB-PRSP) with a grant to the MoFNE of UA1.9 million or the equivalent of about US$3 million. The project started in 2014 and the planned closing date is June 15, 2015. The project is being conducted during the period a comprehensive household survey has been commissioned to the Central Bureau of Statistics.
- Improving the education sector with about US$25 million.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)

The FAO supports food security, agricultural and livestock inputs and services and capacity development. Food security programmes have been implemented in collaboration with the MoAl.

The FAO had undertaken an assessment for the Special Programmes for Food Security (SPFS) funded by Libya through the Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD) in five countries: Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Niger and Sudan. A Beneficiary Assessment approach was utilised in this study. The objective was to assess the results and initial impact of SPFS in Sudan as perceived by the beneficiaries themselves, in terms of positive and/or negative changes induced in their livelihoods and food security, in the level of production and sales, and in their access to infrastructures, technical knowledge and production inputs. The study was completed in 2009. The major impacts of the project have been in increasing household incomes, improving diets and eating habits, and in the settlement of beneficiaries and returning back of some household members. Other important impacts are the involvement of women in production and in their effective contributions to household expenses and decision making.

Other findings are as follows:

- Improvement of the standard of living and quality of life as well as the food security.
- Introduction and raising of livestock resulting in the improvement of food security and nutrition.

---

• Women being given visibility by animal ownership and sharing in production decisions, thus contributing to household income generation and food security.

**Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)**

The FAO with other global partners and national NGOs issued the first version of the document on IPC in 2008 as evidence of the standards for better food security decisions. A second version was produced in 2012. The Global Steering Committee members for the IPC are representatives from CARE, FEWS NET, the FAO, FSC, EC, OXFAM, SCF and WFP.

The IPC is a set of protocols aimed at classifying the severity of food insecurity in the country and providing achievable knowledge to support local decisions on food security policies and practices. The purpose of the IPC is to consolidate the complex analysis of food security situation sites by the various partners. Three functions guide its operational analysis:

1. Building technical consensus.
2. Classifying severity and causes.
3. Quality assurance.

The IPC in Sudan has been active since the formation of the technical secretariat for food security under the MoAI. The IPC is now issuing periodic overview reports on acute food insecurity for all the states and classifying the situation by phases such as none or minimal (phase 1), stressed (phase 2), crisis (phase 3), emergency (phase 4) and catastrophe/famine (phase 5). It also highlights the areas with inadequate evidence and areas not analysed. The overview analyses the situation of Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) and Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) households having extreme food consumption gaps, the nutritional situation for children, access to food, etc. for each state. The attributable reasons are also highlighted in the periodic overview reports.

The IPC report of August-October 2014 classified the situation of the population as 50% under phase 1 (maximum in Khartoum and Northern provinces with 83% and minimum in Central Darfur with 4%), 36% under phase 2, 11% under phase 3 and 3% under phase 4.³⁶

The key findings for this year are as follows:

• Harvests in October 2014 improved food availability and access as well as the income and purchasing power of poor households. Increased supplies of cereals to markets put downward pressure on prices, although sorghum and millet prices remained well above

---
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their averages. Insecurity and displacement limited improvements in food security in Darfur and South Kordofan, where acute food insecurity still persists.

- An estimated 3.5 million people in Sudan face stressed (IPC Phase 2) and crisis (IPC Phase 3) acute food insecurity. This represents a reduction in the size of the food insecure population by roughly one-third since the peak of the lean season in September 2014.
- Above-average 2014–15 harvests are expected across most of Sudan. Favourable rainfall performance, increased access to credit and high prices encouraged farmers to expand their planted areas. Especially in central and eastern surplus producing areas, areas planted for sorghum increased by up to 20%. Above-average production will continue to improve consumption and ease food insecurity through the first quarter of 2015.

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

IFAD is one of the longest-acting organisations in the country, working continuously with various projects over the past 34 years. It has invested more than US$257 million to finance about 20 projects and programmes in various parts of the country. These activities included enhancing natural resource management policy, upgrading traditional finance institutions and liaising with the programmes on microfinance to improve credit availability, capacity building of community-based organisations, establishment of water-users’ associations, and rehabilitation of irrigation schemes, technology implementation enhancement to increase productivity, rural agricultural development initiatives, climate change adaptation, and other interventions.

Currently IFAD is supporting the following projects:

- Western Sudan Resources Management Programme
- Butana Integrated Rural Development Project
- Revitalising the Sudan Gum Arabic Production and Marketing Project (continued from the MDTF project)
- Rural Access Project
- Supporting Small-Scale Traditional Rainfed Producers in Sennar State Project
- Seed Development Project.

In the pipeline:

- Livestock Marketing and Resilience Programme (continued from the MDTF)
- Butana Integrated Rural Development Project (Supplementary Financing)
- Rural Microfinance and Value Chain Development Programme.

The IFAD Results-Based Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (RB-COSOP) for the period 2013–18 is aligning with Sudan’s rural and agricultural development strategies. The overall goal
of this COSOP is to increase food security and incomes for the poor rural people of the country, which will be achieved through two strategic objectives:

1. Enhancing and making the productivity of crops, livestock and forestry more resilient in rain-fed farming systems.
2. Increasing the access of poor rural households to sustainable rural finance services, marketing and profitable value chains.

The targeting of IFAD’s interventions will depend on climate vulnerability maps overlaid with population densities, soil productivity, poverty areas, food-insecure areas, disaster-risk areas and areas with potentialities for increasing agricultural productivity. The proposed geographic areas to be covered would be North Kordofan, South Kordofan, Sennar, White Nile and Gadarif states, and poverty pockets in rural Khartoum and Gezira. The target groups in these areas are the rural households at the bottom layers of the economy pyramid, with a focus on smallholder farming households. The credit delivery will be done mainly through women’s groups. Traders, merchants and other relevant private sector value-chain actors will also be targeted. The COSOP is aiming to reach about 300,000 households over the seven-year period.

Total allocations for COSOP in 2014–18 will be about the same as for the previous COSOP, which was around US$33 million, mainly for the projects in the pipeline above.

The COSOP country strategy alignments are as follows:

- Increasing productivity and efficiency of production and processing stages, achieving food security, reducing poverty, generating job opportunities, increasing per capita income and protecting natural resources.
- Promote economic growth and employment creation.

The strategy’s framework includes sound output indicators, milestone indicators and institutional and policy objectives.

**The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)**

Making social protection more child-sensitive through UNICEF has the potential to benefit not only children but also their families, their communities and national development. Child-sensitive social protection systems mitigate the effects of poverty on families, strengthen families in their childcare role and enhance access to basic services for the poorest and most marginalised. Since many at-risk children live outside family care, child-sensitive social protection systems must be responsive to this vulnerable group.

---

37 It should be noted here that these allocations are 100% grant financing as Sudan is under the Debt Sustainability Framework and so it is qualified for that framework.
UNICEF is working all over Sudan with offices at many state capitals and elsewhere. UNICEF’s overall goal for the 2013–16 programme of cooperation is to support the more equitable development of children while protecting the fundamental rights of all children recovering from the effects of conflicts and natural disasters. As part of this focus, the country programme addresses key bottlenecks and barriers to the needs of disadvantaged children. These children live in low-performing localities in terms of access to decentralised basic services, in rural areas, in urban slums, in nomadic and internally displaced persons’ communities, as well as children living with disabilities and those affected by conflicts.

The country programme will help to achieve the priorities in the Five-Year Strategic Plan of Sudan (2012–16), interim poverty reduction strategies and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which has four pillars:

1. Poverty reduction, inclusive growth and sustainable livelihoods.
2. Basic services.
3. Governance and rule of law.
4. Social cohesion, peace consolidation and peace dividends.

The programme will aim to facilitate improvements in relevant policies and guidelines, as well as the implementation of evidence-based, high-impact nutrition interventions, including infant and young child feeding, maternal nutrition and micronutrient supplementation and fortification. The new programme will help establish functional information systems and knowledge generation to systematise data availability. The programme will support increased coverage and improved quality of education, with a specific effort to reach the unreached.

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

The UNDP is supporting programmes in early recovery as well as strengthening government capacity for engagement in climate change. It is focusing on the following national priorities that aim at leading to the achievement of the MDGs:
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- Support the implementation of important elements of the CPA, such as key national and state-based commissions.
- Support public administration reforms, parliamentary systems and decentralisation and electoral processes.
- Support the development and implementation of pro-poor policies, such as MDG-based poverty reduction strategy and direct monitoring of MDG targets.
- Strengthen government capacity in policy development, strategic planning and programme formulation and management.

---

38 SUD-UNDAF-FINAL (2012).
• Support the implementation of the integrated national DDR.
• Support the national AIDS response.

In 2012, the UNDP prepared a project titled ‘Enhance the Cash Transfers for Poor Families Programme in the Republic of Sudan’, at an estimated cost of US$1 million. The project should have the following outputs:

• Structure for cash transfer fund designed and established.
• A system for co-responsibility assessed and piloted.
• Beneficiaries’ empowerment units designed and established.
• Capacity development programme designed and implemented.

Unfortunately, the project, which was expected to be implemented in 2013–16, has not been signed by the MoWSS. The project is expected to assess the current programme of cash transfers and strengthen this capacity.
Chapter 4. Food security and nutrition

Nutritional and food security situations are being tackled in Sudan mainly by the MoH and the MoA and other concerned organisations. The Metrology Authority and the Consumer Protection Society are also doing monitoring and surveillance activities on the nutritional status and the quality of food items. The MoH is entrusted with the nutritional status of children and women in addition to patients and others. The ministry is supported by the WFP, UNICEF and WHO, and to a lesser extent, the FAO, to improve the nutritional situation of the target population. The MoA is also working with the FAO and other organisations to improve agricultural food productivity, food security and the nutrition situation.

Malnutrition in Sudan has detrimental effects on the country as its economic costs are revealed by the increased burden on the healthcare system and medication and the indirect costs of lost productivity and investments.

4.1. National comprehensive policies for food security

In 2013, the MoAI issued a document titled, Comprehensive Food Security Policies in Sudan (CFSP). The CFSP specified the following on the situation of food security:

- Although local cereal production increased from 3.3 to 6.5 million tonnes from 2001 to 2010, fluctuations in the annual production have had negative effects on food security in the country. In addition, there was great variation between states related to food production as some showed a surplus while others suffered a deficit in 2008–09. This resulted in an overall deficit countrywide of 1.2 to 1.5 million tonnes in this year.
- Food and nutrition situation: The per capita intake of calories per day is only between 2187 and 2282, which is less than the global average of 2749–2798. In addition, the number of people suffering from a scarcity of food is about 13 million in the country.
- Access to food: Household spending on food items is about 62% of their total expenditure (66% in rural areas and 56% in urban areas).

According to the CFSP, the determining factors for improving and ensuring food security in the country could be:

1. The commitment of the government.
2. Peace dividend setup.
3. Complementing food security with higher-level policies.
4. Institutional and organisational arrangements.
5. Community participation.
6. Capable database.
The documents discuss all issues related to food production, distribution, marketing and related matters, such as research and extension roles. Strong linkages were foreseen to connect food security with other sectors such as education, health and water. A matrix has been formulated specifying the policy issues, the targeted sectors, implementing agents, timeframe and the suitability with the existing policies. No costs have been estimated for the different sectors.

The timeframe for the CFSP in Sudan will be implemented from 2013 to 2022. However, some policy items will be continued, some will be completed before the last year and others will be completed during the period. The implementers are most of the federal government ministries and other entities, each with specific responsibility towards adopting the relevant segments of food security policies: the MoAI, the MoFNE, the CBoS and other relevant banks, Ministry of Transport (MoT), MoH, MoE, MoWSS, MoAR, Ministry of Water Resources and Dams (MoWRD), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), Ministry of Trade (MoT), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), and Ministry of Industry (MoI).

4.2. Nutrition policies and strategies

Nutrition is the process of nourishing or being nourished, and the science or study that deals with food and nourishment for the population. From the health dimension, good nutrition can help prevent diseases and promote general health. It consequently has effects on the development of the country as well as the wellbeing of the population.

The situation of children with regard to nutritional status is worse than in many developing countries, below the global standards, and much work is still needed to achieve the MDGs. The figures revealed that almost one in three children under the age of five in Sudan were moderately or severely underweight. There was a slight difference in terms of those who were moderately or severely underweight among boys (33.6%) and girls (30.7%). About one in eight (12.6%) children under the age of five in Sudan could be classified as severely underweight (considered serious according to WHO classification (serious 10–15%). The 2010 Sudan Household Survey (SHHS2) findings indicated that about 35% of children under the age of five in Sudan were moderately or severely stunted (too short for their age), divided into 37.4% for boys and 32.6% for girls. The situation, however, was found to be decreasing with the increasing education of mothers (22.9% for mothers with a secondary or higher education).

Wasting prevalence (moderate and severe): Approximately one out of six children under five years old (16.4%) in Sudan were found to be moderately or severely wasted (too thin for their height). Wasting is usually the result of a recent nutritional deficiency related to, for example, recent illness or inadequate diet intake. The prevalence estimate may indicate significant seasonal shifts associated with changes in the availability of food or the prevalence of diseases.
The 2010 SHHS2 data also indicated that a total of about 8.4% of the households in the country were moderately or severely food insecure. The proportion of moderately and severely food insecure households ranged between 0.4% and 20.1% among the states.

Sudan has recently (2014) applied to join the SUN movement, that is the key allied global initiative detailing the means through which national, regional and international actors will work together to establish and pursue efforts to boost nutrition in countries with a high burden of malnutrition. SUN is a unique movement founded on the principle that all people have a right to food and good nutrition. In this context, a Food Security and Nutrition High Council (coordination body) has been established and is functioning well.

Nevertheless, the country should take the following steps after it has joined SUN:

1. **Bring people together:** Work together effectively through functioning multi-sector, multi-stakeholder platform(s).
2. **Put policies in place:** Establish (and seek legislative endorsement for) a coherent policy and legal framework.
3. **Implement and align programmes:** Identify common objectives and agree on a framework of results around which to align and intensify actions.
4. **Mobilise resources:** Mobilise sufficient domestic resources, supplemented with external assistance, to realise the agreed results as quickly as possible.

The Sudan National Nutrition Strategy (SNNS) with its plans are, therefore, on the right track to join SUN.

The MDG target between 1990 and 2015 is to reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger. One of the indicators for measuring progress towards this target is underweight prevalence (moderate and severe), i.e., the proportion of children under the age of five who fall below minus two standard deviations from the median weight-for-age of the WHO growth standards. A reduction in the prevalence of malnutrition is also expected to contribute to the achievement of the goal of reducing child mortality.

### 4.2.1. Sudan National Nutrition Strategy (SNNS)

Only recently has the government shown authentic concern with regard to nutritional status. Stemming from the fact that malnutrition in Sudan is a major public health problem negatively affecting the growth, development and survival of the population, the Federal MoH formulated the first National Nutrition Strategy 2013–2016 with the help of WFP. The strategy was issued in July 2013 and provides a detailed overview of activities that should guide the prioritisation of interventions and activities in the context of limited resources in the country.
The overall objective of the strategy is ‘To protect and promote healthy child and maternal nutrition, prevent acute, chronic and micronutrient undernutrition, and reduce morbidity and mortality associated with poor nutritional status’.  

The strategic objectives of the SNNS are as follows:

1. Strengthen the policy, legislative and institutional frameworks for improving nutritional outcomes within the population; use advocacy for resource mobilisation and galvanising political commitment.

2. Improve access to and utilisation of quality services for the management of acute malnutrition; strengthen linkages to effectively coordinate, plan and implement programmes to improve nutritional outcomes.

3. Increase the percentage of child caregivers adopting appropriate infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices to prevent malnutrition.

4. Enhance behaviours, customs and traditions of men, women and caregivers, as well as family and community members and those who influence them to positively impact nutrition.

5. Reduce the prevalence of micronutrient deficiency disorders (in particular iron, iodine, Vitamin A and zinc) and enhance consumption of diverse nutritious and fortified foods throughout the country.

6. Strengthen the delivery of clinical nutrition services through capacity building and effective linkages with health services.

7. Ensure that nutritional responses to emergency or crisis situations are timely, appropriate and effectively managed.

8. Strengthen research, M&E to inform development planning and emergency responses.

The SNNS specified the types and categories of malnutrition and their causal pathways as related to immediate, underlying and basic causes. Gender parameters were identified for those pathways that are mostly pro-men and with more drastic effects for women, such as the following:

- Inequalities in food sharing at the household level, particularly if food is scarce, mean that women generally eat last and less.
- Women have early marriages and adolescent pregnancies.
- Undernourished women are more likely to give birth to low birth weight (LBW) infants or die during pregnancy and delivery.
- Women have a limited understanding of increased nutritional needs during pregnancy and lactation.
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• Women have limited decision-making options about healthcare within the household.
• Sudanese women have high illiteracy rates, of approximately 45%.
• Female-headed households are poorer than male-headed households.

The document found that multi-sectoral integration with regard to food security and agriculture, education, social welfare and protection, and water and sanitation remains very limited, with nutrition underrepresented in wider sectorial policies and action plans. Coordinated leadership in ensuring that nutrition is considered a cross-cutting issue is lacking.

**Table 3: Nutrition outcome indicators for the strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline (2010 SHHS)</th>
<th>Target 2016 (NHSSP) 2015 (MDG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Five Mortality Rate</td>
<td>83 per 1,000 live births</td>
<td>53 per 1,000 live births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>60 per 1,000 live births</td>
<td>40 per 1,000 live births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Mortality Ratio</td>
<td>216 per 100,000 live births</td>
<td>152 per 100,000 live births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Under Five Underweight</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sudan National Nutrition Strategy

The M&E for the strategy is not clearly formulated. The document does have a section for the M&E, but it does not specify the means for monitoring the implementation of the strategy’s plans and activities. It is right that three years is short for a comprehensive assessment, but there should be a system for monitoring that at least allows follow up on the implementation and pinpoints any drawbacks, deviations or corrected actions that are needed to achieve the targets. It is good, however, to report progress, but it should include some regular monitoring data and ongoing evaluations.

**4.2.2. WFP’s nutrition strategy**

The nutrition strategy for WFP is for 2014–18. The goal for the strategy is to contribute to the reduction of wasting, stunting and micronutrient deficiencies in Sudan through partnerships and the design and implementation of coordinated, community-based, community-owned, nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes.

According to WFP, the prevalence of GAM is above the critical threshold of 15% suggesting that over one million children are wasted in the country. The strategy for integrated management of acute malnutrition (IMAM) is targeted at reaching some 250,000 and 406,345 people with 13,500 and 8,428 metric tonnes in 2014 and 2016, respectively. The coverage is still only about 50%.
The total number of beneficiaries from the WFP nutrition programme estimated to be served in 2016 is about 1.2 million, with 200,000 for the stunting initiative (CISRI\textsuperscript{40}), 400,000 for IMAM prevention, 500,000 for IMAM treatment and 100,000 for emergency prevention. The estimated quantities of food are about 2,000, 10,000, 10,000 and 3,000 metric tonnes, respectively.

WFP Sudan is planning to operate according to the following themes for the strategic period:

- IMAM Treatment
- IMAM Prevention
- Emergency Prevention
- Stunting Reduction
- Prevention of Micronutrient Deficiencies
- Nutrition Programme Overall Trends

WFP will also build the capacity of women and communities to detect and treat moderate acute malnutrition for their children through the rollout and handover of integrated blanket supplementary feeding (IBSFP) (UNDAF for Sudan 2012).

The total estimated cost for the nutrition programme for 2015–16 is about US$63 million.

4.2.3. \textit{UNICEF’s nutrition strategy}

The UNICEF country office for Sudan has issued a nutrition strategy for 2012–16. The major objective of the strategy has been to improve the nutritional status of children and contribute to the reduction of the under-five mortality rate in Sudan. The target is to reduce the stunting and wasting by 5% in five years.

The purpose of the nutrition strategy is to improve the coverage and quality of curative and preventative nutrition services and the integration of related interventions to prevent malnutrition.

The specific objectives of the document are as follows:

- Improve the prioritisation and planning for nutrition.
- Increase the quality and use of nutrition data.
- Increase the coverage and quality of the CMAM programme.
- Improve infant and young child feeding and care practices.
- Improve the micronutrient status of children and pregnant women.

\textsuperscript{40} Community-led Integrated Stunting Reduction Initiative.
The aims of the strategy are as follows:

- Articulate nutrition programme priorities for Sudan, taking into account the context and capacity.
- Strengthen nutrition programme planning at national and sub-national/state levels.
- Serve as a reference document for appeals and proposals to facilitate resource mobilisation.
- Raise awareness of key stakeholders to the scale and nature of the nutrition problem in Sudan.
- Provide a framework for scaling up nutrition interventions in the country, including the wider issues of prevention of co-morbidities and exposure to underlying risk factors.

As shown in Figure 2, there has been no significant improvement for acute malnutrition since recording began in 1986. According to 2010 data, 11 states in Sudan recorded a prevalence of acute malnutrition above the emergency threshold of 15%.

**Figure 2: Acute malnutrition trends, 1986–2010**
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The current programme to address nutrition involves micronutrient supplementation, improved infant and young child-feeding practices and nutrition-supportive legislation. Another important area is developing the capacities of the health sector staff and partners.

These issues need to be addressed with the government authorities, especially legislation. In addition, a joint UNICEF/WFP assessment of the food manufacturing capacity showed that the industry can begin fortifying food with iron, folic acid and Vitamin A by using flour, sugar and oil.

The nutrition strategy considers Sudan’s geographical variations and coordinates activities with the relevant government entities and with WFP, WHO, FAO and NGOs. As stated in the document, funding for these activities will become more challenging over the next four years.
Funding requirements will increase as the level for the prevention and treatment of malnutrition increases. The document, however, did not estimate the subsequent funding requirements.

4.2.4. **FAO’s nutrition strategy**

The FAO, a leading organisation dealing with food security, is committed to eradicating hunger, eliminating child malnutrition, making food systems and items available and sustainable, and thereby eradicating rural poverty and minimising food losses. Nutrition is an integral part of the FAO’s strategies and policies, especially in Sudan where the diet lacks many nutrients.

FAO is working closely with many organisations on nutrition. They are concerned with the relation between agriculture and food systems in delivering nutritional outcomes in order to make better policies and strategies and improve coordination and collaboration.

FAO’s work in Sudan to improve nutrition includes the following:

- Promote nutrition-sensitive agricultural development and food-based strategies:
  - Increase productivity in crops, livestock, fisheries and forests
  - Increase access to affordable food through equitable and gender-sensitive social protection programmes
  - Improve food utilisation and nutrition through better processing, preservation and storage
- Create a supportive environment and increase investments in agriculture to improve nutrition
- Collaborate and coordinate to improve nutrition.

As briefly stipulated above, many government ministries and organisations are focusing on the nutritional status of the population, especially children (with their focus depending on the mandate of each entity). However, their coordination and collaboration processes are not clear, especially between those ministries with a role in nutrition and the UN and other international organisations, although these processes are stated in the organisations’ different strategic plans.

Some perceptible signs of collaboration, however, are visible among international organisations, such as between the WFP, UNICEF and WHO, as joint efforts are in place, such as that between the FAO and WHO for organising the International Conference on Nutrition in November 2014. WFP and UNICEF, as leading organisations for nutrition, should initiate the means for improving coordination around nutrition with the Ministries of Health and Agriculture.

These above-mentioned organisations are the ones with nutrition as their basic strategic endeavour, along with other important organisations working to improve nutrition in Sudan, such as WHO, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), World Bank, IFAD, IsDB, AfDB and INGOs.
Chapter 5. Social protection programmes and safety nets

Many projects and programmes, especially those financed by international donors, focus on social protection interventions. Some have closed, but their impacts are still in place, and others are ongoing. For instance, most of the WB’s recent cycle of projects were completed in 2013.

As for the government projects, most have some element of donor assistance. The WB has estimated the percentage of the government’s share in social protection and safety net interventions at 26.5% (excluding subsidies). The remaining percentage is provided by donors and NGOs.

Many factors affect social protection programmes, especially those related to food security. In addition to the lack of financing, motivation and supportive policies, the existing climate risks are becoming a major danger to food security. Climate change is causing more severe and chronic droughts, which are threatening rain-fed cultivation, and hence negatively affecting food security. This will result in increasing tensions and conflicts over access to natural resources – already one of the main reasons for the persistent conflicts in Darfur. These climate shocks are strongly correlated with dependency on non-irrigated agriculture and livestock, the lack of coping capacities and mechanisms and household food insecurity. Therefore, increasing climate risks necessitate a new focus on resilience and adaption of the agricultural systems and empowerment of the policy makers and poor communities.

5.1. Objectives of social protection and safety net programmes

The objectives of the social protection programmes depend on their scope and strategies for implementation. While the objectives of the agriculture-related institutions and programmes focus on increasing productivity and food availability, those of the social-related interventions concentrate on delivering cash and services to poor households. In contrast, the objectives of the development projects are mainly on the provision of basic services and other related activities. Overall, however, the general objectives should be to improve the livelihood, food security and nutritional status of the poor households.

The aims of the SSN in Sudan are as follows:

- To provide the poor population with income support and other services to cushion the negative effects of food price increases.
- To enable households to make productive investments in their future (education, health, water, income-generating activities, etc.).
- To ensure coverage of the extremely poor (20%) and scale up or down as needed.
- To contribute to productivity and growth.
5.2. Government projects and programmes

5.2.1. Social Support Project (SSP)

The SSP is under the Ministry of Welfare and is the major channel for managing and delivering the largest cash transfers to the pre-identified beneficiaries. The project, working in harmony with the Zakat Chamber, targets beneficiaries from a common list in all states. The project’s overall objective for cash transfers was to serve 500,000 households, or 22% of the total number of poor families in the country, by 2014. The interim targets were as follows:

- 100,000 households in 2011
- 150,000 households in 2012
- 150,000 households in 2013
- 100,000 households in 2014

The programme started in 2011. By December 2013, the programme had provided 260,000 households with cash transfers of SDG150 per month per family, and efforts are underway by the MoWSS to expand the programme to 350,000 families in 2014 and 450,000 in 2015 to reach 750,000 in 2016.

In addition, each selected family is automatically eligible and included in the National Health Insurance Fund for which the MoFNE also pays a monthly quota. Overall, in 2014, the MoFNE budgeted about US$150 million for the cash transfer programme and US$50 million to cover the health insurance expenses for these poor households.

The project deals with the provision of the following services:

- Education (free, university students, school requirements and school feeding)
- Shelter improvement
- Health (health insurance, potable water, prevention, immunisation, nutritional awareness)
- Income generation (microfinance and social funding)
- Direct support to the poor through unconditional cash transfers and in-kind food support.

The targeting and identification of the households to receive the cash transfer are based on the results of a survey conducted by the Zakat Sciences Institute for the MoWSS and the Zakat Chamber in 2009. The objective was to obtain a wide database to help in formulating a clear strategy to identify the beneficiaries in order to fight poverty.

\[41\] Some projects and programmes in this section have been noted above. It is their importance that puts them in this section as well.
The variables used by the survey to identify the poor households are as follows:

1. Number of persons per room
2. House construction materials
3. Type of ownership
4. Type of toilet
5. Sources of water supply
6. Sources of energy for lighting
7. Sources of energy for cooking
8. Access to healthcare
9. Family size
10. Level of education of the household head
11. Level of household consumption per day.

Weights were assigned to each indicator (5–10) and the poor were categorised as follows:

- First category: 1–33 points
- Second category: 34–66 points
- Third category: 67–100 points

The survey results show there are 2,291,789 poor households (below the poverty level) out of the total of 5,662,600 households, out of which 330,703 are in the first category (extremely poor), 1,729,449 in the second category and 231,637 in the third category.

These survey results are at a 90% confidence level, which is confirmed by the finding that some poor people were not included in this targeting mechanism. This is shown above in the results of the initial assessment of the SSP.

The MoWSS is planning to verify and update the data by using the more scientific system of a PMT, which identifies potential beneficiary households by a single or a set of a few weighted indicators that are highly correlated with expenditures. At the same time, these indicators can be obtained more easily and at a lower cost. While the PMT aims at targeting those most affected by poverty and deprivations, it should ensure that the benefits go to the people who need them most and that the transfers are made in the most efficient and transparent manner.

The MoWSS entrusts the SSDB to distribute the cash transfer allocations to the beneficiaries. In areas where there are no SSDB branches (about 44 branches in the country), the Zakat structure is used to distribute the cash to the beneficiaries. The SSP has reached about 92% of the registered beneficiaries, with the remaining 8% not yet reached, either because of the security situation, difficulty of access or the rainy season.
5.2.2. Community Development Fund (CDF)

The CDF, established in 2005, is an MDTF-funded project administered by the WB after the CPA ended the war between the North and South Sudan. The project was intended to support the CPA.

The CDF project targeted four states: Kassala, Blue Nile, South Kordofan and North Kordofan. The total cost was US$95 million (US$55.6 million from the MDTF). The project came to a close, along with all MDTF/WB projects, at the end of 2013. In view of the successful implementation of the project, and based on requests by targeted states and other states, the MoFNE declared in 2013 that the project would continue for another five years.

The objective of the project was to meet the urgent community-driven recovery and development needs in the war-affected and underdeveloped areas of North Sudan, including the Three Areas, by providing social and economic services and infrastructure.

The core principles of the project were as follows:

- **Ensuring that the sub-projects reflected the priorities of the communities**: All sub-projects were developed by the poor communities through a participatory process in consultation with local authorities and other relevant stakeholders.

- **Accountability and transparency**: Based on a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each partner, information was shared with all levels and stakeholders. Monitoring of the work undertaken was ongoing with periodic reviews to assess progress and discuss the lessons learned.

- **All-inclusive and sustainable programming**: All CDF projects were based on the principle of inclusion (social integration and inclusion), and every effort was made to ensure that the poorer, less vocal and under-represented groups and poor households in the target communities were included in all CDF activities.

- **Involvement and participation**: The communities and the localities were encouraged to participate in the development efforts and to engage in partnerships and collaborations.

The neediest communities were selected from each locality based on pre-defined, accepted and approved criteria. The selection of sub-projects was part of the process for the complete participation of the communities to select and prioritise their needs from among the basic and other services. Community action plans were then formulated for each targeted community that included:

- Definition of community priorities.
- Problem diagnosis to highlight the underlying issue that the proposed activity would address and the necessary conditions for the activity’s positive end results.
- Potential synergies or partners for the proposed activity.
- Estimated cost and resources the community could contribute.
The sub-projects should achieve at least one of the following aims:

- Improve access to basic social and infrastructure services in poor rural areas.
- Enhance incomes or employment opportunities or reduce the costs of basic necessities.
- Conduct social programmes for training, education, life and employment skills.
- Enhance environmental protection initiatives.

In addition to the CDF's implementation through normal contractors (mostly from within the localities), the project introduced the community contracting method (25% of all contracts), whereby the communities implemented their priorities out of their allocation from the CDF, which was US$100,000 per selected community.

The CDF employed the following initiatives that enhanced its implementation and management:

- Community-driven development (CDD) and local community-driven approach.
- Community contracting for sub-projects by channelling money to the communities; improving the capacity of the local labourers; and building the confidence and improvement of the procurement, finance and supervision capacities of communities.
- Community scorecards are a community-based management and monitoring tool and a hybrid for the techniques of social audits. These help in empowering the community and strengthening its accountability and that of the local government.
- Rapid results approach (RRI) is a results-focussed learning process aimed at jump-starting major change efforts and enhancing implementation capacity and building confidence at the local level (i.e., Leadership Development).
- Match grants initiative to enhance the involvement of the states and localities in their local development and improve their learning by teaching these localities' staff about procurement and financial management.
- Partnership with other development collaborators in offering more complete and cost-effective services to the communities.
- Environmentally friendly construction to reduce the destructive effects of cutting trees and polluting the air.

In its new phase, the CDF will be an integral part of the wider social protection programmes. The implementation of these sub-projects will be changed to utilise the cash-for-work mechanism. There will be close collaboration with the MoWSS in targeting the identified cash transfer beneficiaries and get them into the workforce.
5.2.3. FAO projects

An FAO programme, The Sudan Institutional Capacity Programme: Food Security Information for Action (SIFSIA) (2006–10), worked with national institutions to strengthen their capacity for generating, analysing and disseminating food security information. SIFSIA was funded by the European Union and implemented by the FAO in collaboration with key national institutions in Northern and Southern Sudan.

Food security’s multidisciplinary focus requires specific cross-cutting institutions with the mandate of increasing food security. In this light, SIFSIA has:

- Advocated for establishing or re-activating food security councils at the highest levels of government.
- Helped set up food security technical secretariats to support the councils by providing them with the information and analyses they need.
- Strengthened human and physical capacities in ministries at the central and state levels.

The FAO is now implementing a similar programme, Food Security Policy and Capacity Building Project (FSCBP), in four states: Red Sea, Kassala, Gedarif and Blue Nile. The programme is improving the capacity of the government and non-state actors such as women and fishery groups. The programme has established offices in each of these four states. It is also focussing on improving the food security information systems by improving the capacities at the state level. In this context, the programme is collecting data on nutrition, meteorology, market prices, etc. to formulate policies at the state levels. A food security committee has been formed in each state to design a five-year strategic plan.

The FSCBP started in March 2013 with its completion envisioned in 2015, but this date will likely be extended. The funding for the programme is from the European Union at US$8.6 million.

5.2.4. Agricultural Revival Programme (ARP)

The Secretariat General of Agricultural Revival Programme is under the Presidential Office. The High Committee of the ARP is under the chairmanship of the vice president, which shows its importance. A secretariat was formed to coordinate and implement a programme for the revival of the agricultural sector, and it started in 2008 and is ongoing with inconclusive achievements. The ARP’s major objective is to make use of Sudan’s huge and diversified resources and solve the following frustrations about agricultural development:

- Low priority of agriculture development in various plans in terms of allocating resources.
- Lack of political stability.
- The top-down approach to development that reduces rural productivity.
- The weak administration and implementation capacity of the government.
The ARP has suggested many projects and programmes that should lead to increasing and sustaining agricultural productivity. Though all programmes should also lead to reducing poverty and improving the wellbeing of the population, the ARP, however, has suggested some projects with a more direct concern about food security. These projects include special programmes for food security, integrated information system for supporting decision making in food security, risk management and agricultural insurance, drought amelioration and food security, improvement of farmers’ income, etc. The total estimated costs of all the projects under the food security and poverty reduction category were SDG467.23 million, equivalent to about US$230 million at that time. In view of the absence of a M&E system or any tracking system, the actual achievements of the whole programme are not precisely known.

5.2.5. **Proposed social safety net project**

To support the government in addressing these challenges, the bank team worked with counterparts from the MoFNE, the MoWSS and CDF to develop the design of the proposed SSN project to be financed under the new Multi-donor Partnership Trust Fund (MPTF) for Sudan by taking into account the need to do the following:

- Provide the poor population with income support and other services to cushion the negative effects of the price increases.
- Ensure coverage of the extreme poor in Sudan (the bottom quintile) and scale up or down as needed.
- Effectively reach the poorest through efficient, transparent and reliable procedures.
- Support the piloting of a productive cash for works programme for temporary employment that can be scaled up as part of the safety net interventions to help the poor cope with the increases in food prices during the lean season.

Within the above framework, the project would have two components: (1) strengthening the institutional and coordination capacity of MoWSS to implement its mandate, and (2) enhancing CDF’s operational and implementation capacity to pilot a cash for works programme that can be scaled up by the government. However, whether both components can be included under the proposed safety net project will be decided between the Multi-donor Partnership Steering Committee and the banks.

The proposed project development objective is to strengthen Sudan’s SSN system to effectively deliver income support to poor households.

5.3. **Evaluations of social protection and safety nets**

Social protection and the safety net are both new and old concepts. They are new as concepts to be assessed against certain standards and with reference to past experiences. They are old as
they have long been practiced as religious efforts or as government help for the citizens. Therefore, no formal assessments were carried out in the past, although poverty and the MDG indicators were used in many evaluations and surveys.

Two recent evaluations were conducted by the government: The Economic and Social Impacts of the Social Support Project (MoWSS 2012) and the Impact Assessment of the Social Security Funds on Poverty Reduction in Sudan (MoFNE, MoWSS and AfDB).

5.3.1. **Economic and Social Impacts of the Social Support Project**

The project involved 874 interviewees: 715 social support beneficiaries and 159 other project stakeholders. The project was conducted in 8 of the 18 states with the stipulation that at least 1 state be included from each region (Northern, Eastern, Central, Kordofan, Darfur, Khartoum).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Major findings from the survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there regulatory monitoring of the social support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there difficulties in reaching the social support bank?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the food consumption increase after the support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the household purchase non-consumable commodities after the support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there other necessities that the household got after the support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Breakfast for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Writing note books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jamal Alnil, 2012, Economic and Social Impact for the Social Support Project of the MoWSS
Note: The remaining percentages are for those who did not respond

Other questions related to the rating of the programme’s performance, the opinions of the beneficiaries and other stakeholders, opinions on the management and follow-up of the project, targeting appropriateness, timing appropriateness, implementation processes and availability of poorer families.

The survey report provided a quick and general picture of the implementation of the cash transfers. Though simple, and relatively soon after the launch of the programme (less than two
years), it provided some immediate findings and a base for the subsequent and more comprehensive evaluation of the project.

5.3.2. **Assessment of the Impact of Social Security Funds on Poverty Reduction in Sudan**

The assessment was carried out by the Institutional Capacity Building for Poverty Reduction and Good Governance Project (ICBRPRGGP) and was financed and coordinated by the AfDB, MoFNE and MoWSS. The survey was conducted by a foreign consultancy firm (GAH Consulting Group) and the report was produced in May 2014. The assessment focused on the following institutions:

- National Pension Fund (NPF)
- National Social Insurance Fund (NSIF)
- National Health Insurance Fund (NHIF)
- Zakat Chamber
- Saving and Social Development Bank (SSDB)

The key findings of the assessment are presented below.

1. **National Pension Fund (NPF)**

The objectives of the NPF are as follows:

- Extend the umbrella of pensions to cover all employees of the government.
- Develop and modernise the pension services and enhance the prescribed benefits.
- Strive to achieve equilibrium in pension transactions.
- Coordinate the pension policies at the state level.

The NPF is currently covering more than 447,000 employees and serving more than 183,000 pensioners.

Pensions and gratuities are calculated according to the following:

1. Amount of the salary
2. Period of pensionable service
3. Pension coefficient
4. Gratuity coefficient

The payment to the NPF for each employee for the first 25 years of service is 8% from the employee’s salary and 17% of the employee’s salary to be paid by the employer (a total of 25%). After 25 years of service, the amounts are 10.67% from the employee plus 22.67% by the employer.

---

employer (a total of 33.34%). In addition, some additional subsidies are given to the pensioners as emergency loans.

The amount paid to a pensioner or his family (widows, daughters and others) is calculated based on the following formula:

\[ P = \frac{1}{12} \times \frac{1}{600} \times \text{the average of the last three years’ salary} \times \text{the number of pensionable service months}. \]

On average, a pensioner will receive about SDG500 per month. An extra amount was added in 2010–12 to compensate for the rising cost of living.

2. National Social Insurance Fund

The objectives for establishing the NSIF are as follows:

- To provide social protection and an honourable life for the workers and their families by guaranteeing a continuous monthly income in case of disability and inability to work.
- To stabilise labour relations through collection of contributions to pay qualified insured workers in the form of pensions and compensation.
- To contribute to the social and economic development of the country through investment of surplus funds in various sectors.
- To deepen the values of social stability.

The NSIF was established in 1975 and amended in 2004 to include Sudanese expatriates. The calculation of their pensions is according to the following formula:

\[ \frac{1}{50} \times \text{number of contribution months}/12 \times \text{average of at least three months’ salary}. \]

On average, a beneficiary receives SDG347 per month, which is inadequate for a family or more than three persons, given that the poverty line in Sudan is SDG113.8 per person per month.

The Social Security Investment Authority was created in 2004 to invest the reserves of the NSIF and NPF.

3. National Health Insurance Fund

The NHIF has a target of increasing the number of people covered by fee-waiver health insurance by 3% per year. It is responsible for pensions (other than pensions for the police, military and judiciary) and for providing microfinance to poor pensioners. It coordinates the microfinance programmes of institutions affiliated with the MoWSS, such as the Saving and Social Development Bank and the Family Bank.

The strategic plan for 2012–16 has the following objectives:
• Increase the population coverage from 27% to 52% (coverage in 2013 was 29.7% of the total population and 47% of the poor families).
• Increase the coverage with basic insurance service outlets to all states by adding 1,000 new outlets.
• Increase the user satisfaction to not less than 80% of the indicators of satisfaction.
• Computerise 100% of the systems.
• Periodically review the laws, strategies and policies.
• Build the capacity of at least 70% of the staff.
• Develop insurance systems and packages based on sound economic costing and actuarial studies to ensure sustainability.
• Raise the awareness up to 80% through different promotion methods.
• Develop funding resources to ensure sustainability.

Contribution to the NHIF are 10% of salary (6% from the employer and 4% from the employee).

4. Zakat Chamber

Zakat is a religious practice that has existed for hundreds of years with the same target beneficiaries, but it was an individual practice rather than an institutional set-up. The present Zakat Chamber was established in 1990 upon the Act of Zakat regulating the work in the chamber. Since 2001, a new law stated that Zakat is payable from invested public wealth as well. The major objectives of Zakat are to ensure the rights of needy people, especially the poorest of the poor so that they do not fall into destitution, and to increase equity by redistributing incomes from better-off to worse-off people.

The sources of Zakat are as follows:
• Agricultural products
• Livestock
• Trade
• Personal cash income
• Sudanese working abroad
• Income-generating items
• Private jobs

The categories for destitution, according to the Zakat, are as follows:

1. The poor and the neediest, who receive about 60% of the amounts collected from the above sources, of which 40% is paid and distributed in cash and 20% is for production and subsistence schemes.

---

44 Raised to 71% in August 2014.
2. The wayfarers: 0.5% of the sum collected.

3. The indebted.

4. Reconciled: Pays for the weekly faithful Muslims, converts, displaced persons, returnees, and Quranic schools.

5. On the way to Allah: Extended to mean all righteous deeds such as clinical services, digging wells, water canals, settlement of nomads, and placement of refugees.

6. Zakat collection and administration fees.

7. Other social development projects: This is spending on health, water, education, agriculture, guardians and the people during holidays and Ramadan, projects for the custody of orphans, health insurance and owning of the means of production.

5. Saving and Social Development Bank

The SSDB policies are as follows:

- Direct at least 80% of its portfolio for financing microcredit and projects with social dimensions
- Target women so they become 40% of the clients
- Profit margin for Murabaha and Mugawala systems of not more than 15% per year
- Activate non-traditional guarantees
- Assign the following shares for the microfinance allocations:
  - 30% agriculture sector
  - 20% service sector
  - 20% artisanal sector
  - 20% vocational sector
  - 10% small-scale industries

The summary of the major findings of the assessment with regard to the financial transactions are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: NPF expenditures and receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>561,708,503</td>
<td>827,769,698</td>
<td>1,123,333,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>604,919,048</td>
<td>831,363,200</td>
<td>1,152,319,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>43,210,545</td>
<td>3,593,502</td>
<td>28,985,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% savings</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICBRPRGGP, 2014
Table 6: National social insurance expenditures and receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>731,274,618</td>
<td>1,074,782,924</td>
<td>1,236,493,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>882,061,333</td>
<td>1,122,919,629</td>
<td>1,218,786,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>150,786,715</td>
<td>48,136,705</td>
<td>(17,706,193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% savings</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICBRPRGGP, 2014

Table 7: National health insurance fund expenditures and receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>222,736,295</td>
<td>294,798,068</td>
<td>356,946,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>338,511,023</td>
<td>311,031,452</td>
<td>371,038,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>115,774,728</td>
<td>16,233,384</td>
<td>14,091,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% savings</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICBRPRGGP, 2014

The report indicated the perceptions of the beneficiaries of all funds, with details about positive reactions to these systems. Recommendations were also specified for each fund. In general, however, the analysis was patchy and better information, conclusions and recommendations could have been drawn from the collected data based on the questionnaire used.

The major recommendations extracted from the survey are as follows:

- The funds need to devise ways and means to increase their coverage.
- Alternative financing strategies need to be developed to create a more focused approach for safety net programmes.
- There is a need to match the benefits with the cost of living.
- The funds should improve the level of interaction amongst themselves and should have collective strategic plans.
- There should be periodical revisions and amendments to the policies and strategies.

5.3.3. IFAD Projects Impact Evaluations

For project evaluation purposes, baseline and evaluation surveys were conducted by IFAD via a pre-designed questionnaire and analysis package, Results and Impact Management System (RIMS). The package was designed to evaluate the achievements (or underachievement) of the development interventions and the improvement of the accountability for donors’ funds. RIMS
provides a set of common indicators at three levels that correspond to the different levels of the logframe.

- 1st level results (outputs): Measure physical progress.
- 2nd level results (outcomes): Measure improved functionality or behavioural change.
- 3rd level results (impact): Measure the combined effects of 1st and 2nd level results.

RIMS used to be conducted three times during any IFAD project’s life: at start-up, midterm and completion. The sample size was fixed at 900 households (30 randomly selected households in 30 communities). The questionnaire captured data on the demography of the households, household assets and building composition, food security situation, cooking fuel and anthropometric measurements for children under-five (age, length and weight), all with detailed questions. The survey therefore could be added to the efforts related to nutrition.
Chapter 6. Programmes targeting refugees and displaced people

6.1. Refugees

In Sudan, there are 12 official camps, primarily in the Kassala State in the east, where refugees receive assistance from the international community. The rest of the ‘verified’ refugees are in closed camps (15,000) and urban areas in the east. It is assumed that most of the un-verified refugees (estimated at 55,000) are integrated in urban areas of eastern Sudan, with some in rural settlements. Those refugees are, in principle, ‘self-reliant’ because they do not receive any humanitarian support and have to live by their own means. However, they remain a matter of concern, given that their legal status is not yet regularised.

The refugee population in camps is mostly of Eritrean origin (close to 95%), Muslim, and with a social/cultural affinity to the people of Eastern Sudan. Most of them arrived in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It is estimated that 60% of the present refugee population was born in Sudan. There is also a continuous and growing stream of new refugee arrivals in transit to other destinations that started in 2004 and whose present number cannot be verified (approximately 2,000/month in 2010). According to UNHCR, Eastern Sudan has become a transit zone for people arriving from neighbouring countries. There has been a rise in trafficking and smuggling, as people enter Sudan with the aim of travelling on to Khartoum, North Africa, Europe and the Middle East.

The government has made land available for some 90,000 refugees who live in the camps. Moreover, the authorities are committed to finding durable solutions to the predicament of the refugees.

UNHCR is the main organisation dealing with these refugees. Its total financial requirements for operations in 2014 were set at US$97.4 million, a decrease of US$19.3 million compared to the revised 2013 budget of US$116.7 million, mostly due to restriction of access and the ongoing conflicts. Within the 2014 budget, US$65.1 million was allocated to the refugee programme, US$29 million for the protection and assistance of IDPs and US$3.4 million for the prevention of statelessness.

The Eritreans are about 89% of the total refugees in the country, followed by Chadians. However, UNHCR is expecting that the number of refugees will increase in time while the number of IDPs might not.

The programmes targeting refugees and IDPs are mainly concerned with the functional duties of organisations such as WFP and UNHCR. The government has very little input towards them apart from some assistance by national NGOs that are usually working with the international ones.
The people from South Sudan fleeing from the recent conflicts have a special situation. The government does not consider them refugees or even IDPs. Between 300,000 and 350,000 South Sudanese live in Sudan and are at risk of statelessness. The ‘Four Freedoms’ agreement signed between Sudan and South Sudan in September 2012 allows citizens of both states to enjoy freedom of residence, movement and livelihoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Population</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Dec 2013</th>
<th>Dec 2014</th>
<th>Dec 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total in country</td>
<td>Assisted by UNHCR</td>
<td>Total in country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees</strong></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>9,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>118,280</td>
<td>82,940</td>
<td>124,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>5,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People in refugee-like situations</strong></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>23,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asylum-seekers</strong></td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Returnee arrivals (ex-refugees)</strong></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally displaced</strong></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People in IDP-like situations</strong></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Returnee arrivals (ex-IDPs)</strong></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others of concern</strong></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,189,000</td>
<td>1,352,950</td>
<td>2,125,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR Global Appeal

### 6.2. Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), there are about 3.4 million IDPs in Sudan. This number has been reduced from about 5 million in 2010. The reduction was, however, not a result of restrained peace and security but was mainly because of the return of people from South Sudan living in the North who were considered as IDPs. In addition, some IDPs moved from the camps to urban areas where they were not counted as IDPs.

Most of the IDPs are in Darfur states and they total around 2.3 million (up from 1,982,500 in 2013) distributed as 11% in Darfur, and then 15%, 14%, 14% and 9% in North Darfur, South...
Darfur, West Darfur, Central Darfur and East Darfur, respectively. Since January 2014, more than 350,000 people have been displaced in Darfur, which means that their numbers are increasing.

Table 9: Internally displaced people in Darfur, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Darfur</td>
<td>735,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Darfur</td>
<td>352,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Darfur</td>
<td>385,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Darfur</td>
<td>655,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Darfur</td>
<td>205,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Darfur States</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,334,999</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OCHA

In addition, about 354,400 people from Darfur are living in refugee camps in Chad and Central Africa, bringing the total number of Darfurians affected by the conflicts since 2003 to about 2.87 million living in refugee and IDP camps (OCHA). The actual number of affected Darfur people is higher as thousands have left their areas and are living in other areas inside Sudan or they have left the country to seek asylum.

Darfur has 91 IDP camps, according to WFP, and 46 other camps and 68 groupings, according to the Darfur Regional Authority (DRA). The differences might be attributed to the WFP considering some groupings of IDPs as camps that are not considered that way by the government. The DRA indicated that the destroyed villages in the region to date total 3,324, while the number of voluntary returnee villages is 869 and the number of returnees is 299,502. The number of widowed women in the IDPs camps has reached 34,099 (30%, 45%, 12%, 10%, and 2% in North Darfur, South Darfur, West Darfur, Central Darfur and East Darfur, respectively), indicating the high number of casualties during the conflict period.

There are another 510,000 IDPs in other parts of the country, especially in South Kordofan, Blue Nile, North Kordofan and Kassala States.

In Darfur, the shift of the IDP programmes towards more durable solutions will be continued mainly by the UNHCR and the WFP and will focus on promoting the return and reintegration of IDPs while providing basic services and protection.

In the past, some natural disasters and pressing conditions have forced people to leave their homes and areas. There were about 319,700 people internally displaced in 2013 because of heavy rains and flooding in 15 states (238,000 were displaced by floods during 2008–12). Food insecurity and seasonal droughts have also contributed to population movements. As of August 2014, floods had displaced at least 82,400 people (IDMC).
Chapter 7. Informal and semi-formal safety nets

7.1. Zakat

Zakat is the most important source of social protection in Sudan. Zakat takes many forms, ranging from unconditional cash transfers to pre-selected households to arbitrary assistance for sick people in hospitals and requests from acute cases that face unaffordable medical expenses, to seasonal assistance to families during Ramadan and assistance to poor communities during crises.

The Zakat Supreme Council of Trustees (ZSCT) functions like a board of directors. ZSCT members include the minister of MoWSS, the general secretary, and 20 other members from scholarly fields as recommended by the minister. The general secretary is appointed by the president upon the recommendation of the MoWSS and the ZSCT. The federal ZSCT issues directives about expenditure allocations based on needs and priorities. In 2012, it issued 40 decisions, which included an expansion of the allocation to mitigate inflationary pressures on poor households. The guidelines issued in 2013 contained revised technical criteria for revenue collection and expenditures.

Each state has its own Zakat Council of Trustees that is responsible for creating and selecting members of the Zakat community committees at grassroots level. There are currently 19,378 such committees in Sudan. Membership is not decided by elections based on a majority vote. Instead, members are selected based on certain criteria that require the representation of women, youths, and members who pay membership fees. In order to regulate the work of these committees, the ZSCT is computerising information about them and drawing up new membership criteria. Community committee members are not paid a salary but may receive incentive payments.

The beneficiaries are identified by the local Zakat Fund branches by using data from the poverty census of 2011, which was undertaken by the Zakat Fund in collaboration with the Central Bureau of Statistics. The poverty census identified 2.2 million families as qualifying for social support for the poor and the very poor. These data are contained in the Zakat Fund’s database and are disaggregated by gender, state and locality and include information on the age and marital status of the household heads, the educational level of the heads of households, the health of the household head and members, the status of employment or unemployment of the household head and members over 15 years of age, household expenditure, the type of dwelling and the tenure status of the head of the household. The poverty census is reportedly updated continuously without an explanation of the details. However, this database is not readily accessible to the Zakat committees at the grassroots level where the targeting takes place and where there are no computers. More clarification is need on the use of the digitalised list of grassroots beneficiaries.
7.2. Other religious and traditional forms of social protection

There are two main forms of charity in Islam: obligatory as Zakat and voluntary as Sadaqah. The most frequently used charities in Islam are the following:

1. Spending benevolently in the path of God (Infaq)
2. Spending for kindness and consideration (Ihasan)
3. Spending as charitable deeds (Sadaqah)
4. Spending as good deeds (Kharaj)

The giver should not expect any reward from the beneficiary as there awaits for him or her an abundant reward from God. Among all charitable works, the best is to satisfy a hungry person.

There are other religious charities but to a much lesser extent, for example, when a person is not able to fast during Ramadan, then he or she must feed a number of poor people.

Traditionally, people used to help each other, especially the poor people in the community. This assistance could be in the form of food, labour, work or cash.

7.3. Remittances

Remittances (in cash or kind) are transfers to home countries by people working abroad to their families, friends or as one of the sources channelled to the national economy.

- Direct transfers to families: Some expatriates transfer money monthly or less frequently (e.g. annually) to their families. This will be either through the banks (official) or by friends carrying hard currency coming back on visits.
- Taxes to the government (certain amounts taken unequally from the various groups of expat workers (labours, doctors, general classified, etc.).
- Bank exchange transfers (affected by the sanctions): Some people are making their exchanges at official bank rates (about SDG5.8 for a U.S. dollar), while others are using the black market (about SDG9.4 for a U.S. dollar).
- About 50% of the direct transfers could be to poor families.
- It is very difficult to estimate the amounts of remittances, as most of the expatriates’ money is usually transferred and sold on the black market.
- No evidence indicates that the taxes are used in any social protection programme. The collected amounts then go the MoFNE as foreign currency stock.

The IMF’s report in August 2014, which was part of the staff monitored programme, noted that remittances by Sudanese expatriates are increasingly being channelled through informal routes to take advantage of the black market’s premium pricing. A comparison between the average amount of remittances transferred in 2006–10 (a period during which official channels were
used extensively) and those transferred in 2012–13 suggests that about US$1 billion may have been shifted to the black market. This is likely a partial measure of the size of the black market.

Transfers by the Sudanese expatriates are a big source of foreign currencies for the country and constituted about 1.7% of the GDP in 2010. According to World Bank estimates, remittances totalled about US$3.2 billion in 2010 and estimates are that about US$10 billion could be generated during the next five years. These remittances are in addition to the payments they are making for the services they receive and to customs.

The number of Sudanese expatriates, mostly in the Gulf States, totals about 2 million, including those exiting through unofficial gates to Egypt, Libya and Europe.

If we estimate that 50% of the remittances go to poor families, then more than US$1.5 billion is going annually to benefit poor families. Therefore, there must be some overlap with the cash transfer programme as there is no proof that some families are receiving regular remittances and regular cash transfers.

It is recommended that at least 10% of the payments from these expatriates to the government be allocated for the safety net programme. Expatriates transfer these remittances through the following means:

- Through banks
- Through other means outside the normal banking systems (individuals or unofficial offices)
- Imports of consumable and capital goods
- Tax contributions through embassies for the government
- Charges imposed for the private administrative services concerning the expatriates and their families
- Charges imposed by the Expatriates Authority
- Contributions by the expatriates for the development of their areas
- Meeting the educational costs of the expatriates’ children studying in Sudan
- Savings through stocks.
Chapter 8. Social protection challenges and issues

8.1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

The M&E of projects and programmes in Sudan are among the weakest points in terms of implementation because of the unavailability of the needed capacities in the country and lack of motivation to conduct effective systems. No units or departments exist to monitor and evaluate the interventions in most ministries and departments. Even if these units did exist, few, if any, systems or frameworks exist to follow up on the implementation of these M&E activities. The only reasonably working M&E units are in the projects and programmes with support from donors such as the WB, IFAD, WFP, FAO and other UN organisations.

Most government entities do not have functional M&E units or staff to carry out the basic following up and monitoring of the implementation of their activities. Their meagre functions are either done lightly by unprofessional staff or conducted as and when needed. In the latter cases, these M&E activities are assigned to one member of staff. In many projects, the M&E and the procurement activities are also done by only one member of staff.

Nevertheless, periodic reports are issued on a quarterly basis, but they are sub-standard due to the unavailability of proper systems with data-gathering mechanisms. These reports provide only limited financial transactions and the number of beneficiaries, but they do not relate that data to the planned activities or to the monitoring frameworks, the latter of which are lacking. Some supervisory visits, though, are carried out by headquarters staff and the people in charge at the state levels to check on the delivery and to solve some immediate problems.

Donors and other organisations have proper systems that could be used by government entities to improve their implementation mechanisms. For instance, the WB-supported projects used to have strong M&E systems offering technical advice on different levels. IFAD projects have access to one of the best M&E systems with clear guidelines and implementation processes. Other UN and NGOs have the same processes but with different efficiencies and capabilities.

Sudan lacks proper Management Information Systems (MIS). Attempts have been made to formulate such systems, but even though some have been established, they are not working properly (e.g. the Educational Management Information System (EMIS)).

It is important, therefore, to concentrate on building new capacities in this field and to establish MIS at ministries and other institutions.
8.2. Targeting and graduation

Targeting of beneficiaries is the most important part in service delivery, especially for the safety net interventions. Different methods have been used to precisely select the most eligible poor people who definitely deserve to receive the monthly allocations, for instance, by the MoWSS. As mentioned, the MoWSS and the Zakat are using a common list derived from a focused survey by the Zakat Institute that has many gaps and needs to be carefully revised.

This lack of coordination lets other actors adapt their criteria for the selection of their beneficiaries, which only results in the overlapping of the number of beneficiaries so that fewer poor people get assistance from more than one actor, while others get nothing.

WFP has done rapid food security assessments in each state and then in each locality to identify the poorest localities within each state. Then GFD beneficiaries get involved through food management committees, with women being well represented. The members of these communities targeted by the food-for-assets programme then identify the most food-insecure households based on criteria agreed upon between WFP and its partners and then they select the appropriate activities for the recipients to build up their assets.

It is unclear, however, whether these include public works within the camps. WFP and its partners conduct regular information campaigns to ensure that the beneficiaries and the community leaders are aware of the objectives, eligibility criteria and entitlements of WFP’s programmes. There may be issues of conflicts of interest in having the beneficiaries sit on their own selection committee.

As in many other countries, WFP is temporarily using non-electronic ration cards or vouchers. In this way, WFP is attempting to pilot the use of smart cards that stores biometric information for the identification of eligible beneficiaries and their families, as well as their ration entitlements.

Better methods for identifying beneficiaries are imperative, for example, the PMT. That being true, the piloting currently under testing by the WFP should continue and be used by MoWSS and others.

With regards to graduation, most of the organisations working for social protection and safety nets, including WFP, lack a clear road map for this important step. This will require a more concrete monitoring and evaluating system and a robust MIS. The graduation point is essential, especially for beneficiaries from the cash transfers and the productive safety net programmes. Simply put, those who ultimately rise above the poverty line – and then are carefully managed so they do not fall back again – must be supported, and others who are still below this line should be included in these supportive efforts.
8.3. Coordination arrangements

Ministries working on social protection, especially on food security, have too little coordination. According to the MoWSS:

- A common vision does not exist for any coordination in selecting and delivering services by the Zakat Chamber, pension funds or other social security funds.
- Coordination is completely lacking between the social security institutions in delivering the services to the poor.
- Coordination is weak between the High Committee for Social Support and the states and local committees.

Attempts and mandatory coordination between ministries are as follows:

- The financing of cash transfers by the MoWSS comes from the MoFNE. Ties must be built between these two ministries, although their roles with regard to M&E and follow-ups on the outreached programmes are still not clear.
- Most of the funding for social protection programmes, including that for food security, by all ministries, comes from the MoFNE. Their roles are still weak with little monitoring of the outcomes.
- The MoFNE initiated the establishment of poverty units at the above ministries. While the idea is impressive, the actual roles of these units need to be specified along with the complementary works. The overall cumulative outcomes from the streamlined work of these poverty units should contribute to the overall national policies and programmes for poverty reduction. The Poverty Reduction Unit at the MoFNE could play a good role in coordinating the work of these poverty units.
- The national food security policy prepared by the MoAI in 2013 infers that all concerned ministries and departments in the food security platform have issues in both their financing and implementation requirements. A very strong mechanism of coordination and follow-ups is therefore needed. The National Food Security Council and its Technical Secretariat are expected to do this highly needed job and, in doing so, the capacities of the secretariat must be considered. In addition, the states should be more involved and better represented on the council and the Technical Secretariat.

It is good that the government is considering the importance of coordination between the various entities with the same targets and objectives. Lack of coordination has already resulted in some overlapping of activities, even within the ministries. It is envisaged, however, that after the full PRSP, more coordination will take place.
8.4. Gaps

Gaps and weaknesses exist in performing the actions for effective social protection and in the safety net that reaches the intended segments of the poor. The major weakness is in the coordination and synchronisation between the different actors working for social protection among the government entities, between the NGOs and between the government and the NGOs in some cases. Another weakness is the functionality of the M&E in practice and as a management tool for better performance. While few M&E units or systems exist at government institutions, those that do exist lack proper management information systems and electronic systems and devices for the efficient delivery, selection and identification of the beneficiaries. Other challenging gaps facing the safety net payments and others are as follows:

- The SSDB is not reaching all intended beneficiaries. Although the remaining beneficiaries should be served by the Zakat local offices, the coverage is not yet 100%.
- The Zakat services lack reconciliation.
- There is some overlapping and mixing between the payments from the SSP and that from the Zakat.
- The issue of irregular payments is one of the main claims of the beneficiaries.
- The monitoring of progress reports is irregular.
- There is unavailability of experienced staff for M&E.
- There are capacity gaps at the institutions in implementing, monitoring and following up on development plans.
- The selection and identification of beneficiaries need to be improved.
- The graduation or exit criteria in the safety net system is not clear.
- The reporting lacks the specifications of the basic programme data and key indicators.
- The beneficiary databases for the Zakat and the National Health Insurance are not firmly linked to avoid overlaps.
- There is no mechanism for feedback from the beneficiaries.
Chapter 9. Conclusions

Social protection and safety nets are now widely used in projects, programmes and other practices. Social support in the form of cash transfers is becoming an established system for helping the poorest, although some gaps exist in implementation. The concept of food security is now well embodied in the country’s policies and strategies. The roles of the international organisations, including WFP, are commendable in working for the poor in Sudan.

9.1. Summary

Sudan’s economy has been affected since the secession of South Sudan in 2011 and the loss of most of its oil revenues. This was exacerbated by the long-standing conflicts, especially in Darfur, South Kordofan and Blue Nile states.

Sudan suffered from the abolition of subsidies on oil, which increased prices and poverty and affected the economy. As directed by the president, the revenues from this abolition of the subsidy on oil should be utilised for more safety net coverage and hence assisting more of the poor. This direction was actually put in place (at least in the budget) where about SDG900 million was allocated for 500,000 households in 2014. Unless this budget and other control measures are in place, the people under the poverty line will probably increase from 46.5% to about 50% of the population.

Social protection and safety nets as systems for helping the poor have existed in Sudan for centuries as traditional and religious practices. Zakat, for instance, is well known as the best means for distributing wealth and helping the poor. Only in the past 20 years has Zakat been well organised and systematised and is now a major safety net and source of social protection.

This study tried to capture the systems and actors working in social protection in Sudan. The report presented the government’s and NGOs’ roles in active programmes, policies and strategies. The implementation mechanisms, with their shortcomings, have been elaborated for some entities and programmes, with suggestions for improvements. It is evident now that the government is genuinely and legitimately considering poverty and food security in its policies and development strategies. The roles of internal organisations are notable in the implementation of social protection in general and in streamlining the processes in Sudan.

There are scattered policies and strategies focusing on social protection, including food security and safety nets. The upcoming PRSP will be the leading document for specifying and harmonising the work on social protection. The AfDB and the MoFNE are executing a project aiming at finalising the final PRSP.
There are many ministries, projects and programmes working to reduce poverty. With regard to the conditional cash transfers, the most important government ministry is the MoWSS, with its SSP and many specialised funds such as the health insurance fund and the social insurance fund. The UN organisations are offering projects and programmes that tackle other areas of social protection, such as food security and poverty reduction and capacity building in social protection. WFP has started implementing some conditional cash transfer mechanisms through the cash for assets, food-for-work and other methods.

9.2. Lessons learned

From this review, there are lessons to be learned for improvements in the coming times:

- The targeting system adopted is not serving its intended purposes. A better system should be employed to avoid overlaps and gaps in serving the intended beneficiaries.
- The delivery of payments by banks is a good practice that should be encouraged and built on for more transparency and accountability. However, more frequent monitoring and assessments are required in addition to the existing reporting system.
- The schools’ food programme by the WFP has proven to be very effective in reducing dropouts and increasing enrolment rates, in addition to its effects on the feeding and nutritional status of the pupils. The experiment should be continued with more focus on poor communities with low educational achievements.
- Funding was found to be one of the limiting factors for the success of all the social protection and safety net activities. The government should seriously consider funding in its budgets, and more importantly, the commitments that must be met.

9.3. Recommendations

In addition to the recommendations embedded in this report, the following are additional ones that could streamline and improve the work for social protection and safety nets in Sudan:

- Consider the gaps identified above when formulating or modifying social protection and safety net policies and programmes in future.
- Improve the implementation mechanisms for projects and programmes, to directly target the poor population.
- Establish M&E units at all levels and place more emphasis on training the staff. A clear M&E system and logframes or result frameworks should be clearly formulated.
- Develop more scientific systems for the selection and identification of the poorest of the poor who are eligible for cash transfer services. PMT could be a solution as it is widely known and efficiently used.
- Strengthen the poverty centres established in the related ministries and in some states. Their roles and responsibilities should be clearly specified.
• Establish a MIS and a financial management system (FMS) in the MoWSS, as part of the cabinet or as will be agreed upon.

• Introduce new innovations, such as community scorecards, to improve accountability and participation of the beneficiaries.

• Define the processes and responsibilities, and design operational manuals for the cash transfer, cash for work and other social protection and safety nets.

• Introduce more advanced technological innovations to enhance the efficiency and transparency of the operations – the experiences of other counties in this regard, such as Brazil, could be utilised.

• Improve the coordination and collaboration between the various government and non-government institutions, especially in supporting issues like the National Nutrition Programme.

• Establish a social protection website to serve all concerned.

• Continue efforts to resolve Sudan’s external debt, thus freeing resources for development and poverty reduction interventions.

• Embark on a transparent and constructive dialogue with development partners and encourage them to strongly and genuinely support the national poverty reduction strategy.

• Mobilise the necessary resources to finance priority sectors for the poor and improve access to microfinance resources.

• Seek to create a targeted social protection system that would be considerably less costly and more effective in protecting the poor.

• Undertake concrete measures to address the persistent increase in prices and costs of living and consider the youth unemployment rate – the level of inflation should be considered in designing all safety net programmes.

• The recently initiated Social Protection Working Group should be acknowledged and continued while including all relevant government and non-government parties. The group should focus on strengthening the coordination and collaboration between the various implementers. Exchanges and reviews of information should also be considered.

• The PRSP should identify how the needs of Darfur will be explicitly addressed within the overarching vision of the government for poverty reduction and the inclusive economic development of Sudan.

• The comments of international partners on the IPRSP should be considered.

In addition to the above general comments, WFP should:

  o Move more towards a productive safety net through cash for assets or cash for work methods in future programmes.
o Gradually make the WFP delivery systems more technologically advanced to use electronic cards and other delivery and payment systems.

o Coordinate with other projects, such as the CDF, and with other organisations to enhance the performance and enrich the experiences in serving more poor people; establish contacts with all concerned parties to affect the coordination and collaboration.

o Assess the various delivery methods by WFP such as food-for-work, food-for-assets and cash-for-work, to tailor them to the most appropriate method which would serve the poorest people.

o Focus on SAFE and other new initiatives.
### Annex 1. People interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position/Job title</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Clindon</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Policy Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samuel.clindon@wfp.org">samuel.clindon@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanan Ishaq</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Gender Office</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hanan.elabbas@wfp.org">hanan.elabbas@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc-Andre Prost</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Head of Nutrition Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcandre.prost@wfp.org">marcandre.prost@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Apotheke</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:charles.apotheke@wfp.org">charles.apotheke@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Berardo</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Head of M&amp;E Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrea.berardo@wfp.org">andrea.berardo@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo Minozzi</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:filippo.minozzi@wfp.org">filippo.minozzi@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Osman, Mohammed</td>
<td>World Bank: Sustainable Livelihoods for Displaced and Vulnerable Communities Project (SLDP)</td>
<td>Project Manager: Kassala</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.osmanm@yahoo.com">m.osmanm@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omer Ishag</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Omer.elhaj@undp.org">Omer.elhaj@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Sharif</td>
<td>Poverty Unit, MoFNE</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ahmedsharif54@yahoo.com">Ahmedsharif54@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal Elnil</td>
<td>Planning Directorate, MOWSS</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf M.A Bashir Eltahir</td>
<td>African Development Bank (AfDB)</td>
<td>Senior Country Economist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:y.eltahir@afdb.org">y.eltahir@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badreldin Ahmed Osman</td>
<td>Institutional Capacity Building for Poverty Reduction and Good Governance</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Badry1900@hotmail.com">Badry1900@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabeel Ahmed Saad</td>
<td>Food Security Technical Secretariat</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nabeelahmedsaad@yahoo.com">nabeelahmedsaad@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babikir Hag Hassan</td>
<td>General Administration of Planning and Agricultural Economics (MoAI)</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Babikribrahim55@gmail.com">Babikribrahim55@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omer Hajjam</td>
<td>International Financial Cooperation Department (MoFNE)</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ohajam@gmail.com">ohajam@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salah Mudathir</td>
<td>FAO Sudan</td>
<td>Deputy Res. Rep.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Salah.ahmed@fao.org">Salah.ahmed@fao.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yergalem Beraki</td>
<td>Food Security Information System: Food Security Policy and Strategy Capacity Building Programme</td>
<td>Technical Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yergalem.beraki@fao.org">Yergalem.beraki@fao.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Elhaj Sirelkhatim</td>
<td>IFAD Sudan</td>
<td>IFAD Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mara Nyawo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Nutrition Specialist (Surveillance)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnyawo@univef.org">mnyawo@univef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makki Mirghani</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freelance Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dindrawi@hotmail.com">dindrawi@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Matrix of social protection and safety nets in Sudan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of programme</th>
<th>Implementing institution</th>
<th>Agencies providing funding support</th>
<th>Target groups and eligibility criteria</th>
<th>Number of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Benefit amount</th>
<th>Frequency of payment</th>
<th>Year started (and year ended or due to end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Support Programme</td>
<td>MOWSS</td>
<td>MoFNE, Zakat Chamber</td>
<td>The poorest 20%</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>150/HH</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Started 2011 End 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>MoAI</td>
<td>MoAI, MoFNE, FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Fund Project</td>
<td>MoFNE</td>
<td>MDTF/MoFNE</td>
<td>War affected</td>
<td>2 million</td>
<td>US$95 million</td>
<td>According plan</td>
<td>2006–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCB-PRSP</td>
<td>MoFNE</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>UA1.9 million</td>
<td>According plan</td>
<td>2014–2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCBP</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Four States</td>
<td>US$8.6 million</td>
<td>According plan</td>
<td>2013–2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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