

SECTION A: PRIORITISED NEEDS

In light of the drivers and other prioritisation parameters highlighted in the allocation scoping paper, please briefly describe the most important, time critical needs that you intend to address through this allocation. Please make reference to assessments or other supporting information that justifies your choice.

With funding received from SSHF, the Food Security & Livelihoods Cluster proposes a **strategy** in line with the existing HRP to scale up existing interventions with **support to frontline actors** with a presence on the ground extending capacity and effectiveness to respond in a timely manner to especially displaced populations on the move from conflict. The response will prioritize the **immediate and short term lifesaving activities** in a **multiple crisis scenario**: supporting the populations in crisis, emergency and catastrophe phases according to the **IPC classification phase** (severe food insecurity & need to prevent famine) and that correspond to the OCHA allocation strategy criteria of **high levels of displacement (protection crisis)**, the collapse of the health system and the high levels of **acute malnutrition (public health crisis)** across the targeted locations identified in this cluster strategy:

- **HRP FSL cluster objective 1:** life-saving support from WFP and FSL partners, FAO (survival kits) and the CRS pipeline involving scaled up General Food Distributions (GFDs), Blanket and Targeted Supplementary Feeding Programs (B/TSFP) and provision for Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM); this will form the 1st wave of immediate support which will be complemented by
- **HRP FSL cluster objective 2:** livelihood protection support from FAO and FSL partners, with additional funding from SSHF, to scale up further the provision of dry season livelihood kits (fishing and vegetable kits) to 55,000 of the most severely affected households and to protect their existing, often meagre, livelihood assets;

The **immediate causes** of the increase in severely food insecure persons are due to a combination of: (1) an escalation in conflict as we enter the dry season; (2) below average harvests (part due to location specific environmental factors: flooding & drought and increasingly due to large scale displacement) resulting in limited food stocks and an early start to the lean season in 2018; (3) lower purchasing power in the current protracted economic crisis; (4) reduced trade flows or supply of goods and commodities from neighboring countries and within the country itself (likely to improve in non-conflict affected areas as the dry season progresses); (5) livestock raiding and disease morbidity and mortality that undermine stock survival, productivity and off take with many displaced families having already lost all their animals through the need to sell or looted in the mayhem of conflict; and (6) seasonality: the peak lean season when household food stocks are at their lowest and in most cases none existent after repetitive conflict and shocks to their normal livelihood.

The **broader scenario and context** from the January IPC projections into 2018 by May-July, with humanitarian assistance planned, funded and likely there are 40 counties expected to be in Crisis (IPC Phase 3), 31 counties in Emergency (IPC Phase 4) and none in Famine (IPC Phase 5). However, in the continued absence of all forms of humanitarian assistance, in May–July 2018, an estimated 7.1 million people (63% of the population) would face Crisis (IPC Phase 3) or worse acute food insecurity, of which 155,000 are estimated to be in Catastrophe (IPC Phase 5) and 2.3 million are estimated to be in Emergency (IPC Phase 4) – at this time, rising excess mortality and acute malnutrition would be expected.

Targeting & prioritization by the FSL cluster: FSLC strategy will target 55,000 households across 10 counties in **Greater Upper Nile** and **Greater Bahr el Ghazal**: (1) Northern Bahr El Ghazal: Aweil South and Aweil West; (2) Upper Nile: Luakpiny/ Nasir, Maiwut, Manyo and Panyikang; (3) Jonglei: Pibor, Urur and Duk; and (4) Unity: Koch

The **rationale for priority locations** being: (1) they are currently IPC 4 & 3 priority locations based on the January IPC projections and are deteriorating as the lean season deepens; (2) the SSHF funding is being used to support the FAO/ ELRP national dry season response campaign by filling essential gaps in their existing coverage across Greater Bahr el Ghazal and Greater Upper Nile; (3) the Greater Equatorias (GE) region has earlier been prioritized with emergency crop kits for both the 1st (completed) and 2nd main

season response (about to commence¹); there are currently no partner gaps in the FAO ELP emergency crop response and so no requirement for SSHF 'gap' filling support; core pipeline purchases with SSHF funding from SA2 will be available to target locations in GE and other crisis responses in late 2018/ 2019; and (4) the SSHF will be used to fill an essential funding shortage for frontline support and for core pipeline; it is anticipated that the required inputs will not be available until October/ November implementation at the earliest.

Seasonality and location specific actions: two instruments in the dry season response will be used to strengthen household food security and resilient livelihoods of the affected populations: (a) **fishing activities** (delivering almost immediate benefits) in areas where populations have access to fishing sites (a fishing kit of hooks & net equipment² and valued at \$70 each, can generate up to 400 kg of fresh fish, equivalent to \$800); and (b) **vegetable activities** (delivering returns in 3 – 4 weeks) where beneficiaries remain static for a few weeks and have access to small plots of land to cultivate (a vegetable kit consisting of 7 types of seed & tools and valued at \$65 each, can produce as much as 1,000 kg of fresh food, equivalent to \$1,200). These two types of kit, used during the dry season response (October – January) are therefore dependent upon households having access to natural water bodies.

SECTION B-1: - FRONTLINE RESPONSE PRIORITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

Priority response activities <i>List the top THREE activities, in order of priority</i>	Standard Output Indicators <i>For each activity list 2 most important SOIs that will measure success</i>	Estimated number of beneficiaries <i>Indicate the number of beneficiaries to be targeted by the activity</i>	Beneficiary type <i>For example, IDPs, host community, other – please specify</i>	Priority locations <i>Indicate priority locations where the activities will be implemented</i>		\$ requirements <i>Indicate the amount required, based on cluster endorsed unit costs for a given activity</i>
				Former state (10 states)	County	
1 Fishing & vegetable kits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to frontline partners to deliver kits to target beneficiaries Budget based on 10 partners but not limited to ten partners as may make sense to have multiple partners in one county especially if case load dictates such; 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people receiving vegetable kits Number of people receiving fishing kits 	<p>Each household near the water bodies will receive a combined kit of vegetable kit and fishing kit. 55 000 HH will be targeted with a combined kit or at least a vegetable kit.</p> <p><u>55,000 HH x 6</u> <u>= approx... 336,000 persons</u></p>	IDPs and host community	NBeG NBeG Unity Upper Nile Upper Nile Upper Nile Upper Nile Jonglei Jonglei Jonglei	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Aweil South (6000 HHs) Aweil West(6167 HHs) Koch (8500 HHs) Luakpiny/Nasir(8000) Maiwut(3500 HHs) Manyo (1200 HHS) Panyikang(2300 HHs) Pibor(5333 HHs) Uror(8667 HHs) Duk (5333 HHS) 	<p><u>@\$25 per Household inclusive of transport for 55 000 HHS</u></p> <p><u>\$1.375 million</u></p>

¹ Note that SSHF funding is too late to support this timely response so FAO/ LOA will be utilized;

² This is a light weight intervention that can be easily carried by beneficiaries experiencing multiple displacements;

<p>2 Transport support to access locations in Jonglei, Upper Nile, Unity and Jonglei – 2 Locations in NBeG will be by road and the balance of 8 will be transported by the logs cluster from Rumbek. LC despatch hub – Rumbek And partners' need to budget for cargo from FAO (Juba) to Rumbek + last mile; or direct to sites in Aweil by road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of kts transported 			<p>Transport by helicopter across 8 counties in Unity, Upper Nile & 3 in Jonglei</p>	<p>Based on estimated kit weight for: fish 1.2 kg (55,000 kits) & Veg 1.2 kg (35,000 kits)</p>	<p>55,000 kits @ \$5 \$275,000</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION B-2: CORE PIPELINE PRIORITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

Pipeline name (A)	Lead agency (B)	General description of pipeline content (C)	2018 HRP requirement (\$) (D)	2018 HRP cost per beneficiary (\$) (E)	2018 secured funding (\$) (paid + committed) (F)	2018 unmet requirement (\$) (G) = (D)-(F)	Estimated time of stock-out if no further funding received (month) (H)	Prioritised requirement in order to ensure viability of frontline activities set out in SECTION B1 above (I)	Beneficiaries to be reached (should correlate with unit cost stated at (E)) (J)
FSL	FAO	VEGETABLE, TOOLS, FISHING KITS	US \$75,000,000	\$20/ HH \$3.34/ Beneficiary *for Lean Season	US \$45,000,000	US \$30,000,000	SEPTEMBER *Pipeline replenishment of Lean Season and Rapid Response items (vegetable seeds, tools, fishing kits)	\$1,450,000	72500 HHs (435,000 beneficiaries)

Notes:

- In line with the parameters set out in the scoping paper, proposed core pipeline requirements should be minimised to only those that are essential in order to ensure the viability of proposed frontline activities. The intent is to maximise funds available for frontline response.

- Requirements should take into account available and committed funding, actual supplies inventories, and potential stock outs. Where actual or projected inventories are sufficient to ensure the viability of the frontline activities set out in section B1 above, no additional requirement should be proposed. Where actual or projected inventories are insufficient to ensure the viability of the frontline activities set out in section B1 above, additional requirements should be calculated based on the intended coverage of those frontline activities.

DRAFT

SECTION C – INFORMATION REGARDING OTHER PRIORITISATION PARAMETERS

Local response

Please describe how you will interpret and implement the requirement to make the response 'as local as possible, as international as necessary'

- Given the severity of needs and the urgency of the interventions, partners with demonstrated experience, **presence on the ground and proven capacity** to deliver will be prioritized to mount interventions leveraging also on their local knowledge, understanding of seasonal and location specific contexts, existing resources and networks.
- In 2017 14 out of 17 recipients of SSHF were NNGOs (82%) and in SA1 2018 9 out of 12 recipients were NNGOs (75%). The FSL cluster aims to maintain this trend in SA2 given that (1) FSL has a large number of partners in most counties providing greater choice; (2) many of these NNGO partners are experienced and well established with significant capacity; 50% of all HRP partners in 2018 (68 in total) are NNGOs; and (3) NNGOs can often submit more cost effective budgets than their peer INGO agencies (we recognize also the trade off, sometimes though not always, between lower costs and quality programming).

Quality programming

Please describe how you will incorporate gender, AAP and protection mainstreaming into the response

- The strategy incorporates the core principles and components of the **Accountability to Affected Populations** as part of our humanitarian obligations under the Common Humanitarian Standards (CHS). The core themes are expected to be part of the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of all FSL partners to ensure that: Communication with Communities/ good community entry/ participatory approaches etc. are employed through the PCMS and that inclusive ways of working consider the needs of the young and old (age); of people with varying degrees of disability and of women and girls, men and boys (gender).
- This is a highly insecure operating environment where protection from **GBV** (rape), murder and looting of property is a daily fact of life. The provision of humanitarian assistance needs to ensure that it does not increase these risks further for the target beneficiaries (Do No Harm principle) and that effective systems of community complaint and feedback mechanisms are established. Selection of FSL partners for SSHF funding will therefore prioritize projects that can demonstrate how AAP and protection principles and GBV best practice will be incorporated in their design, planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting.

Inter-cluster synergies

Please describe how you will ensure integrated programming / inter-cluster synergies to optimise overall impact of the limited resources available

- **Multi sector synergies:** can be obtained by combining WASH, Health, Nutrition (with other cluster actors) and FSL interventions across the same community, boma and payam where feasible; in this SA2 the FSL cluster will also coordinate closely with the **NFI/ Shelter cluster so that cooking equipment** can be provided to enhance food utilization and preparation in relation to fresh fish, vegetables and their GFD rations from WFP & partners;
- Initial **joint planning** indicates that FSL/ SSHF locations overlap with 2 Health/ SSHF; and 4 Nutrition/ SSHF counties; in all the other proposed Health & Nutrition/ SSHF counties interventions will be implemented by FSL partners who have a direct LOA with FAO for the dry season response; since the January 2018 minimum package workshop the four famine prevention clusters have each begun to roll out simple tools for improved sub national coordination and integration;

Feasibility within the operating environment

Please outline your feasibility analysis in the priority locations, given volatility on the ground and other potential operational impediments. What are the proposed modes of delivery to ensure feasibility of the proposed activities? Are there innovations that will enhance feasibility and outcomes?

- Key risks around feasibility are: (1) **conflict**: all potential actors operate under this context; operate conflict sensitivity programming and risk/ insecurity mitigation measures; (2) **bureaucratic impediments**: are a daily hazard that have been addressed so far by maintaining strong working collaboration with authorities on the ground and where legally acceptable adjusting and complying with the new regulatory environment; (3) **resource capture**: from internal and external sources by ensuring strong stock management controls and having open transparent targeting criteria such that the community themselves can hold the service provider (NGO) and local authorities to account IF they do not receive the requisite number of kits agreed after the operational needs assessment;
- Agreed modes of delivery are: (1) SSHF partners budget for and transport items from the FAO warehouse in Juba directly to either Rumbek, or Aweil; (2) Logs cluster delivers agreed cargo & tonnage to specified locations on the ground in GUN; by October/ November roads should be passable for road transport to the two locations in GBEG; and (3) SSHF partners transports the 'last mile' from landing sites in GUN to the targeted beneficiary households; and all 'last mile' sites in GBEG.

Cost effectiveness, value for money

Please outline how your approach promotes cost effectiveness and represents good value for money. Are there innovations that will enhance cost effectiveness?

- In 2017 a resolution was found to the unit cost of budgeting for the delivery of kits to each household; this reduced the unit cost per household down more in line with the FAO Letter Of Agreement unit price of \$22 per household; in previous CHF/ SSHF rounds this figure had been 3 to 4 times higher;
- However it was found that in SA1 2018 additional budget was required for transport and to fund SSHF value addition (especially training and community engagement/ complaint response and feedback mechanisms) which is still half the unit price per household that was being used in 2016 and early 2017;
- Support from the Logistics Cluster and use of these common resources for air support from Rumbek to locations in Greater Upper Nile will also provide significant savings through economies of scale and use of specialist services;

Integrated Programming

Please describe how your proposition promotes integrated programming to enhance coordination, efficiencies and convergence of cluster response, in terms of common target populations / geographical locations, as well as complementary activities.

- Given the nature of food insecurity and malnutrition existing in South Sudan an **integrated multi sector approach** is required to address the immediate causes which will require close collaboration with the WASH, Health and Nutrition Clusters. In terms of general strategy and coordination the FSL cluster partners will work closely with the ICWG so that on the ground operational planning and coordination can ensure that each sector is operating (dependent upon resource constraint) in each Payam and where feasible in each Boma. Synergies are generated when each sector builds human, household and even community capital assets to break the immediate causal effect³ of food insecurity; poor care giving practices; poor environmental factors and a lack of access to health care that results in increased morbidity and mortality over time.
- Selection of FSL partners for SSHF funding will prioritize projects that can **demonstrate innovations** in collaborating and establishing links with other cluster partners especially the GBV sub cluster in line with the prioritized roll out of a cluster GBV action in 2018/ 2019 e.g. use of fuel efficient stoves and briquettes that have been shown demonstrate: reduced time spent by women collecting firewood; reduced incidence of GBV as women do not need to trek to the bush so frequently where rape and other violations are perpetrated; reduced smoke in the kitchen with positive health benefits; and reduced levels of deforestation especially around densely populated locations e.g. refugee, POC, collective centres etc.

³ Reference the UNICEF causal framework analysis for malnutrition; and the DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework;

DRAFT