

ANNEX VI: SECOND INTERIM NARRATIVE REPORT

Project title:

SORUDEV Smallholder Food Security and Livelihoods Project 2014 - 2017

Contract number: FED/2013/333-492

The Project is Managed and Implemented by Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD) in Western Bahr el Ghazal state, South Sudan



The project is co-funded by:



Table of Contents

List of abbreviations and acronyms.	3
1. Description	4
1.1 Name of the coordinator of grant contract	4
1.2 Name and title of the Contact person	4
1.3 Name of beneficiary(ies) and other affiliated entity(ies) in the Action:	4
1.4 Title of the Action:	4
1.5 Contract number:	4
1.6 Start date and end date of the reporting period:	4
1.7 Target country(ies) or region(s):	4
1.8 Final beneficiaries &/or target groups (if different) (including numbers of women and men):	4
1.9 Country(ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7):	4
2. Assessment of implementation of Action activities	5
1.1. Executive summary of the Action	5
1.2. Results and Activities	6
A. Results	6
B. Activities	23
2.3 Up dated logframe	36
2.4 Work plan	48
3. Beneficiaries/affiliated entities and other Cooperation	52
3.1 Relationship with beneficiaries and affiliated entities	52
3.2 Relationship with State authorities	52
3.3 Relationship with other organisations	52
3.4 Synergies with other actions	53
3.4 Previous grants	54
4. Visibility	54
Photo gallery covering the four result areas.	57

<i>List of abbreviations and acronyms.</i>

AFIS	Agriculture and Food Information System for Decision Making.
CA	Christian Aid.
CACs	County Agriculture Committee
CAD	County Agriculture Department.
CAWHS	Community Animal Health Workers.
CMD	Cassava Mosaic Disease
CORPS	Community Own Resource Persons
CTC	Crops Training Centre
DG	Director General.
EU	European Union.
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
FFS	Farmer Field School
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
FSTP	Food Security Thematic Programme.
IPC	International Food Security Phase Classification.
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PHM&H	Post Harvest Management and Handling
SMOARF	State Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources and Forestry.
SMOACAR	State Ministry of Agriculture, Cooperatives and Animal Resources.
SORUDEV	South Sudan Rural Development.
SSP	South Sudanese Pounds
TOTs	Trainer of Trainers (TOTs)
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
ZEAT-BEAD	Zonal Effort for Agricultural Transformation - Bahr el Ghazal Agriculture Development

1. Description**1.1 Name of the coordinator of grant contract.**

Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD)

1.2 Name and title of the Contact person.

Cleto Ireneo Kunda, Executive Director.

1.3 Name of beneficiary(ies) and other affiliated entity(ies) in the Action:

Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD)

1.4 Title of the Action:

Smallholder Food Security and Livelihoods Project 2014 - 2017

1.5 Contract number:

FED/2013/333-492

1.6 Start date and end date of the reporting period:

February 15, 2015 –February 14, 2016

1.7 Target country(ies) or region(s):

Republic of South Sudan, Wau State and Raja County in Lol State (formerly Western Bahr el Ghazal state, Jur River, Wau and Raja Counties).

1.8 Final beneficiaries &/or target groups¹ (if different) (including numbers of women and men):

The project targets to reach and provide material and technical support to 3,000 Households in 24 bomas and covering 11 Payams; approximately 35,000 persons (average of seven persons per household). Specifically, the project will support the following categories of beneficiaries:

- Smallholder farmers with capacity to acquire inputs from the market and cultivate at least 3 feddans of land.
- Voluntary Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) and farmers groups/associations/cooperatives.
- Community Own Resource Persons (CORPs) and Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs)
- County Agriculture Department officials.

The final (indirect) beneficiaries include the whole population of Western Bahr el Ghazal state estimated at over 433 129 persons (FAO/WFP crop and food security assessment mission to South Sudan, 2013). The final beneficiaries will benefit through; increased food availability, incomes and improved use of agricultural technologies

1.9 Country(ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Same as 1.7

¹ "Target groups" are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and "final beneficiaries" are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

2. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

1.1. Executive summary of the Action

Please give a global overview of the Action's implementation for the reporting period (no more than ½ page).

Referring to the [updated logical framework matrix](#)² (see point 2.3. below), please describe and comment the level of achievement of the outcome(s), if it is relevant at this stage and the likeliness of reaching the final target(s) related to the outcome(s) at the end of the Action.

Please explain if the intervention logic is still valid and justify any possible change.

Please indicate any modification that should be brought to the logframe matrix and explain briefly why (complete explanation should be placed in the following section under the relevant level considered (outcomes, outputs, activities)).

The project formally started on February 15, 2014, however actual implementation began on July 1, 2014. It is being implemented in 2 Counties, 9 Payams and 20 bomas in Wau State, 2 Payams and 4 bomas in Raja County in Lol state (formerly all the Counties were in the defunct Western Bahr el Ghazal state). The project targets to support **3,000 smallholder farmers** with different interventions to increase agricultural production and incomes. The project rationale of supporting progressive farmers to increase agricultural production is still valid though the amount of money available to farmers as loans has been increased. As at the end of the interim period, a total of **2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104)** out of the targeted **3,000 farmers** had so far been reached with different interventions. Most of the planned activities in the interim period to support farmers in the 2015 agricultural season were carried out and some results had already been realised. However, the following activities were planned but not implemented; establishing 10 Junior Farmer Field Schools (JFFS) and supporting seed producers to produce seeds. These activities will be implemented in the next interim period.

² The relevant terminology (i.e. outputs, outcome, indicators etc.) is defined in the logical framework matrix template attached to the guidelines for applicants (annex e3d).

There four thematic result areas that the project seeks to deliver are; increased adoption of animal traction, increased adoption of appropriate agricultural practices, increased diversified cropping and incomes and reduced post harvest losses through better post harvest management and handling practices. As at the end of the interim period under review, some of the results achieved by the project included; 130% jump in land area cultivated for farmers using animal traction, 23% increase in yields of sorghum which is the main staple crop and 104% increase in incomes of smallholder vegetable producers compared to the last interim period, promising agro-dealership system, savings of 148,043 SSP for Voluntary Savings and Loaning Associations (VSLAs) and adoption of improved post harvest management practices. Though it is still early in the project implementation stage, these changes will positively impact on the livelihoods (which include; longer period that the food stocks lasted, reduction in hunger gap period, reduction on expenditure on food, reduction in the distress sale of assets to buy food) of the target beneficiaries. Therefore, there is high likelihood of achieving most of the results by the project end date and with possible a possible 3 – 6 months no-cost extension to take advantage of 2017 agricultural season. The request for a no-cost extension will be submitted to EUD by the end of July 2016.

The main challenges experienced were; fixed foreign exchange rates, delayed and erratic rains in 2015 agricultural season which impacted on the yields of the crops, insecurity in Wau County especially in the last quarter of the interim period, high rates of inflation as a result of devaluation of South Sudanese Pound and shortage of some essential goods in the market.

Due to the harsh economic condition which has affected farmers' purchasing power, the project plans to allocate more funds for loans for investment in farming. The indicators denominated in SSP are also being revised so that they can reflect the current economic situation. Additionally, the creation of new states in South Sudan may also call for changes to the project in line with new administrative units. Finally, the project plans to relocate from Wau County due to insecurity and move activities to safer areas in Jur River County. This implies that the activities that were started in Wau County will not be continued. However, the project plans to increase the number of beneficiaries in Jur River and Wau County with the aim of ensuring that the target number of beneficiaries is reached.

1.2. Results and Activities

A. Results

What is your assessment of the results of the Action so far? Include observations on the performance and the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts and whether the Action has had any unforeseen positive or negative results.

At the end of the 2015 agricultural season, the project sought to assess the degree of the achievement of different results. To carry out comprehensive and objective assessment of the project progress, data was collected on different enterprises in order to track progress in of the indicators. Some types of data are usually collected routinely as part of on-going monitoring work and are kept in the data base while some data are collected based on the seasonal timing. One of the key challenges faced in data collection is the paucity of quantitative data at the household level such as yield data, harvest quantities and size of land cultivated. In addition, there were cases where the heads of households deliberately give incorrect data on the false belief that the information will be used to make decisions on the level of support to farmers. To overcome these problems, the project designed simple data collection templates which the staff administer routinely to build credible time series data and which can also be used to identify inconsistencies in the data. Further, the project staff also use qualitative data collection methods such as; focus group discussions with different groups, observations and key informant interviews to collect the data. Therefore the information presented below largely reflects the contribution of the project in meeting different results.

Table 1: Tabular report format for basic narrative reporting on physical progress - based on the Logframe structure

Result code	Result description and indicators	Planned target/achievements for the reporting period	Progress/issues	Action required
Overall objective (OO)	<i>To contribute to increased food security, reduced vulnerability and enhanced livelihoods of rural households in Western Bahr el Ghazal (WBG) State.</i>			
OO Indicator 1	Average length of food stock (months) per household increased from 3.2 to 4.8 months by 2017	Average period of time food stocks last is 4.16 months	In the interim period, the average period of time food stocks lasted was 4.5 months . The period could have been longer but it was affected by poor harvests in 2015 agricultural season due to unreliable rains.	Training of farmers to improve agricultural productivity and also diversify crop production. Promotion of short term varieties of crops will also be promoted.
OO Indicator 2	Distress sale of livestock and other household assets among supported households to meet food needs during "hunger gap" period is reduced from 32% to 16% by 2017.	Distressed sale of assets is to be reduced from 32% to 22.4%	Supported households on average managed to reduce distress sale of assets from 32% to 28%. Asset stripping is still common among the supported households. The major constraint was the poor harvests in 2015 agricultural season forcing many households to dispose of assets to buy food.	Training of farmers to improve agricultural productivity and also diversify livelihood sources. Promotion of short term varieties of crops will also be promoted.
OO Indicator 3	Monthly average cash expenditure on food per household among supported smallholder beneficiaries reduced from 328 SSP to 164 SSP by 2017	Average monthly expenditure on food to be reduced from 328 SSP to 230 SSP	In US dollar terms, the average monthly expenditure on food during the reporting period slightly reduced from 328 SSP (85 USD) to 1,800 SSP (72 USD). The amounts have also been denominated in USD due to rapid loss depreciation of South Sudanese Pounds (SSP). During the reporting period, South Sudanese Pounds continued to depreciate against the USD.	Encouraging households to diversify sources of incomes. The VSLAs should also be trained to diversify their activities by venturing into other income generating activities.

OO Indicator 4		Average number of meals per day in adults increased by 50% by 2017.	Households were expected to have 2.47 Meals per day	Households supported had 2 meals per day which was less than the planned target for the period. The main contributing factor was the low production in 2015 agricultural season and high prices of food in the local markets.	Diversification of production at the household level is needed. Income generating activities should be encouraged so that households can increase their purchasing power to buy food from the markets.
<i>Result 1 (R1)</i>		<i>Increased area of land cultivated using animal traction without corresponding decrease in crop yields.</i>			
R1.1 Indicator		3000 farmers have increased their knowledge and skills in use of draught animal power for cultivation by 2017	2200 HHs were to increase their knowledge and skills in animal traction	415 (M=354; F=61) HHs increased their knowledge and skills in animal traction. The main constraint remains the few farmers who had ox-ploughs to be trained and hence the target of 2,200 HHs could not be met.	More sensitisation and awareness on the availability of ox-ploughs at the agro-dealer. In addition, encouraging farmers to get loans from VSLAs to purchase ox-ploughs.
R1.2 Indicator		Average land area cultivated per household increased by 50%, (from 2 feddans to 3.5 feddans in at least 2720 households using animal traction in cultivation by 2017	30% (2.8 feddans) in 2000 HHs	387 (M= 341; F=46) HHs using animal traction cultivated an average of 4.9 feddans which was higher than the target of 2.8 feddans. The main constraint was the low number of farmers who had ox-ploughs in the target areas.	More sensitisation and awareness on the availability of ox-ploughs at the agro-dealer. In addition, encouraging farmers to loans from VSLAs to purchase ox-ploughs.
<i>Result 2 (R2)</i>		<i>R2 - Increased promotion and adoption of appropriate agricultural practices for 1500 smallholder farmers.</i>			
R2.1 Indicator		County-based extension delivery system established & functional to support at least 3000 farmers by 2017	2200 HHs to be supported by County based extension system.	2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104) HHs were supported by the County-based extension system. There were two main constraints during the report; i) few government extension who are mainly based in Wau town; and ii) the wide	The project will make use of CORPs more in extension delivery. In addition, more farmers will be encouraged to join groups where they can be easily reached.

			geographical area that the project covers.	
R2.2 Indicator	2.2 Indicator 2: Adoption of farm fertility improvement measures increased by 50% in at least 3000 farmers by 2017	30% in 2200 HHs	30% adoption of farm fertility improvement measures was recorded in 920 (M= 507; F=393) HHs. High illiteracy levels, lack of resources and insufficient labour were the main constraints in realizing the target.	Promote practical learning of farmers through; Farmer Field Schools (FFS), Junior Farmer Field Schools (JFFS) and demonstration farms.
R2.3 Indicator	2.3 Indicator 3: Adoption of agro-forestry practices such as tree planting increased by 50% in at least 800 supported households by 2017	30% in 450 HHs	Adoption of agro-forestry practices such as tree planting increased by 50% in 62 (M=51; F=11). The main challenge was that, the tree nurseries were established late in the season and the seedlings were not ready for transplanting as at the end of the interim period.	Ensure that more farmers plant fruit tree seedlings during the 2016 agricultural season.
R2.4 Indicator	2.4 Indicator 4: Access to extension services increased by 30% for at least 3000 supported households by 2017	17.5% in 2200 HHs	2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104) HHs accessed extension services at least two times per month. The main constraint is that, farmers are spread out over a wide geographical area and therefore it was difficult for project staff, CORPs and County Extension staff to reach some of them.	Group formation, farmer to farmer learning and participation of CORPs in delivery of extension services at the boma level are remedial actions required.
Result 3 (R3)	<i>R3 - Increased diversification of crops grown through integrated fruit trees, vegetables and cassava farming.</i>			

R3.1 Indicator	Adoption of diversified crop types (fruit trees, vegetables & cassava) increased by 50% in at least 1000 households by 2017	30% in 600 HHs	246 HHs (M=146; F=100) adopted at least one of the crops being promoted by the project. The number of farmers was low due to late establishment of fruit trees while cassava was still bulked for future distribution.	Recruit more farmers to adopt improved cassava cuttings from the 5 bulking farms that were established. More farmers will also be recruited to plant fruit tree seedlings.
R3.2 Indicator	3.2 Indicator 2: Income per household from sale of vegetables increased by 50% (from 77 SSP to 138 SSP) in at least 120 supported households by 2017	30% (115 SSP) in 40 HHs	132 (M=60; F=72) HHs earned an average of 1,390 SSP per month from sale of vegetable. Vegetable production performed well with all the vegetable producers reporting sale of vegetables. The key constraint was the low water levels in shallow wells that were sunk as source of water.	Train vegetable producers in conserving water so as to reduce consumption of water. Encourage the vegetable producers to sink more shallow wells as source of water.
R3.3 Indicator	3.3 Indicator 3: Each of the 200 households supported under fruit tree cultivation are earning at least 200 SSP per season from selling fruit tree seedlings by 2017	150 HHs are earning at least 200 SSP from sale of seedlings.	No results were reported under this indicator since tree nurseries were in the course of the period under review.	There were not sales of seedlings during the period under review. Seedlings will be ready for transplanting in the next season.
<i>Result 4(R4)</i>	<i>R4 - Improved post harvest handling and management & increased adoption of post harvest storage facilities and marketing of surplus farm produce.</i>			
R4.1 Indicator	Adoption of effective post harvest practices increased by 80% in at least 2,100 farmers by 2017	50% in 800 HHs	522 (M=333; F189) HHs adopted at least one post harvest management practice mainly; drying of grain to the right moisture content and improvement of local granaries. The main constraint was the high cost of materials for grain construction.	Promote and recruit more farmers to adopt improved post harvest management practices. Provide subsidies for construction of granaries.

R4.2 Indicator	Post harvest losses reduced by 50% in at least 400 farmers by 2017	30% in 280 HHs	The activity was started in November 2015 and therefore it was too early to assess its impact by the end of interim period in February 2016 to assess the achievement.	Monitoring to assess whether farmers have actually experienced reduced post harvest losses.
R4.3 Indicator	Incomes from sale of surplus farm produce increased by 50% (from 479 SSP to 718 SSP) in at least 2500 supported households by 2017	20% (574SSP) in 1800 HHs	125 (M= 87; F=38) HHs sold produce for income; average income per household from the sale of produce was 1,825 SSP. Agricultural production is still very low due to small land area cultivated, poor agricultural practices and low and erratic rainfall.	Promotion of commercial oriented farming and linking producers to value chain actors being supported by other SORUDEV partners such as GIZ and UNIDO.
R4.4 Indicator	Marketing of farm produce increased by 30% in at least 2500 farmers by 2017	17.5% in 1800 HHs	125 (M= 87; F=38) HHs sold 15% of the total produce. The main challenge that the production in 2015 agricultural was depressed and thus there was little surplus to off-load in the market.	The project will promote marketing of agricultural produce by linking farmers to value chain actors and also encouraging VSLAs to purchase the produce and sell when prices improve.

Title of the income: *Increased agricultural production and income of smallholder farmers in Western Bahr el Ghazal state*

Oc 1. Indicator 1: *Yields for the three main crops (sorghum, groundnuts and maize) per feddan increased by 50% in at least 3000 supported households by 2017.*

Data to evaluate the achievement of this result was collected from 1,645 (M= 913; F=623) farmers in 17 out of 24 bomas. Seven bomas in Wau County were not accessible due to insecurity. The 2015 yield data was analysed and the results presented in Table 1 below:

Table 2: Yields of the main crops in 2015 agricultural season.

	Year 1 (2015) in 900 households.		
	Sorghum	Groundnuts	Maize
Baseline values	164 Kg	302 Kg	169 Kg
Target average yields per feddan per HH	264 Kg	413 Kg	254 Kg
Actual average yields per feddan per HH	278 Kg	590 Kg	315 Kg
% increase in yields	23.26%	41.16%	19.77%

As can be seen in the table 2 above, the average yields per household for the three main crops increased during the period under review. The yields of sorghum, groundnuts and maize increased by 23.26%, 41.16% and 19.77% respectively. Maize recorded the least increase in yields due to erratic rains that were received during the early part of the 2015 agricultural season as maize is a short term crop that is planted at the start of the wet season. Generally, farmers mentioned erratic rains during the season as one of the key challenges that affected production.

O c 1 Indicator 2: Monthly household incomes increased from 571 SSP to 800 SSP in at least 900 supported households by 2017.

Table 3: Monthly incomes of farmers

	Years	
	2014/2015	2015/2016
Baseline income value	571 SSP	571 SSP
Target average income per hh per month	629 SSP	714 SSP
Actual income per hh	680 SSP	1180 SSP
% increase in incomes compared to baseline income value	11.86%	106.65%

Target number of farmers	100	400
Actual number of farmers	143	367 (M=192; F=175)

Data was collected from farmers 367 (M=192; F=175) farmers to assess the total household incomes. Most of the households earned incomes from sale of agricultural production and sale of grass, firewood and charcoal. At the time of data collection, the average monthly average income was 1,180 SSP. However, if the devaluation of SSP is taken into account, it is likely that there was no increase in real value terms as the official South Sudanese Pound (SSP) exchange rate against the US dollar was 3.1 when the indicators were set in 2013 and early 2014. For instance, a 50 kg bag of sorghum was retailing at 250 SSP in 2013 but at the time of data collection, the same was retailing at 850 SSP.

SO Indicator 3: Proportion of food consumed derived from own production increased from 40 -90% in at least 3000 households by 2017.

To assess the proportion of food consumed at household level, data was collected from 1,645 (M= 913; F=623) households through data collection templates, in addition to focus group discussions (FGDs) that were held in 4 bomas. The data was collected in the months January and February 2016 which fall in the dry season. Table 4 below shows that 82% of food consumed at the household was derived from own production while 18% was derived from other sources. However, it is important to note that the period in which data was collected was just after the harvest and households still had most of the produce they harvested. Assessment of household food availability at the household level is better assessed during the lean (hunger gap) which runs from May to August each year. Household level data will be collected by the project during the hunger gap period and will be analysed to measure food availability. Specifically, the project will strive to measure the amount of food derived from own-production at the household and the duration the food is supposed to last.

Table 4: Proportion of own production consumed at household level.

	Years	
	2015	2016
Baseline percentage of own production consumed at the household level (August 2014)	64%	64%
Target percentage of own production consumed at the household level	70%	80%
Actual percentage of own production consumed at the household level (Jan/Feb 2016)	Data not collected.	82%
Target number of farmers	900	1300
Actual number of farmers	1043	870

Output 1: Increased area of land cultivated using animal traction without corresponding decrease in crop yields.

Indicator 1.1: 3000 farmers have increased their knowledge and skills in use of draught animal power for cultivation by 2017

Table 5: Training of farmers in animal traction.

	Y1(2015)	Y2(2016)	Y3(2017)	Total
Baseline number of farmers (August 2014)	0	0	0	0
Target number of farmers	900	1300	800	3000
Actual number of farmers (August 2015)	415 (M=354; F=61)	N/A	N/A	415 (M=354; F=61)

Table 5 above gives the number of farmers who were trained and acquired knowledge and skills in animal traction. Training of farmers took place both at the animal traction centres & and at the individual household-level. A total of 415 (M=354; F=61) farmers increased their knowledge in animal traction out of whom, 90 (M=75; F=15) were Animal Traction Trainers (TOTs). The target was set based on the assumption that in year 1; at least 1,700 ox-ploughs will be purchased by farmers. However, by the end of the interim period, slightly over 200 ox-ploughs had been purchased by farmers from the agro-dealer.

Indicator 1.2: Average land area cultivated per household increased by 50%, (from 2 feddans to 3.5 feddans in at least 2720 households using animal traction in cultivation by 2017.

Table 6: Land area cultivated using animal traction.

	Y1 (2015)
Baseline land area cultivated per households (August 2014)	3.2 feddans
Target land area cultivated per household.	3.52 feddans
Actual average land area cultivated per household (August 2015)	4.9 feddans.
% increase in land area cultivated compared to baseline	40%

Target number of farmers	800
Actual number of farmers	387 (M= 341; F=46)

Table 6 above shows that, a total of 415 (M=354; F=61) out of the target of 800 farmers were trained in the use of animal traction for cultivation. Out of these, the project managed to track 387 (M= 341; F=46) farmers who used animal traction mainly ox-drawn ploughs. As shown in the table above, 387 (M= 341; F=46) farmers cultivated an average of 4.9 feddans each in the 2015 agricultural season. In addition, FGDs also revealed that in one season, one ox-plough cultivated for an average of 5 households in one season with an about 21 feddans per ox-plough. Therefore, benefits of ox-plough use are spread far beyond the household that owns the plough. It is important to note that when the project was designed in 2013, it was supposed to provide ox-ploughs through cost recovery system and hence the target number of farmers that were supposed to increase and area cultivated in year 1 was set at 800. However, with the market driven approach that was adopted after the 'Wau resolutions' of July 2014, the number of farmers who have achieved an average of 40% increase in land area cultivated was 387 (M=341;F=46). The ox-ploughs were available through the agro-dealers at a negotiated market price and by the time training was taking place, only 35 ox-ploughs had been purchased by farmers. Therefore, lack of ownership of ox-ploughs meant that few farmers turned up for training.

Output 2: Increased promotion and adoption of appropriate agricultural practices for 1500 smallholder farmers.

Indicator 2.1: County-based extension delivery system established & functional to support at least 3000 farmers by 2017.

Table 7: Total number of farmers who received extension services during the season.

	Y1 (2015)	Y2 (2016)	Y3 (2017)
Target number of households reached	900	1300	800
Actual number of farmers	2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104)		

The county based extension system is composed of; project staff, County Agriculture Department (CAD) extension officials and Community Own Resource Persons (CORPs). There are 10 CAD extension officers in the three Counties and 11 project staff providing extension services to farmers. The table 6 above shows that, during the period under review, a total of 2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104) farmers were provided with extension support services using different extension methods.

Table 8: Details of CAD staff who were trained by the project in 2015.

S/no.	NAMES	SEX	Position	County
1	Martin Damazo	M	County Director of Agriculture	Wau
2	Charles Uchalla Muong	M	Extension Officer	Wau
3	Joseph Martin Khamis	M	Extension Officer	Wau
4	Khedir Tamim Bosh	M	Extension Officer	Raja
5	Elizabeth Victor Hassan	F	Extension Officer	Jur River
6	David John Koryom	M	Extension Officer	Jur River
7	Geaton Guido	M	County Director of Agriculture	Jur River
8	Mohamed Abakar Musa	M	Extension Officer	Raja
9	Mahammed Mahboub	M	County Director of Agriculture	Raja
10	Bilal Abia	M	Extension Officer	Raja

Indicator 2.2 Adoption of farm fertility improvement measures increased by 50% in at least 3000 farmers by 2017

Table 9: number of farmers adopting farm fertility improvement practices.

	Y1 (2015)	Y2 (2016)	Y3 (2017)
Baseline percentage number of farmers (August 2014)	216 farmers (27%)		
Target number of farmers	900	2200	3000
Actual number of farmers	920 (M= 507; F=393)		

The project sought to assess the level of adoption of farm fertility improvement practices at the farm level. This was a follow up to the extension services which has been provided to farmers over the season. As table 9 above shows, it was established that **920 (M= 507; F=393)** farmers adopted at least one practice as shown in the table above. The most common practices adopted were; 1) legume cropping; 2) correct mixed cropping and; 3) better decomposition of farm yard manure and 4) line planting of groundnuts. The FGD sessions with farmers also found out that, Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and demonstrations remain the most effective ways of learning new practices.

Indicator 2.3: Adoption of agro-forestry practices such as tree planting increased by 50% in at least 800 supported households by 2017.

Table 10: Number of farmers adopting agro-forestry practices.

	Y1 (2015)	Y2 (2016)	Y3 (2017)
Baseline percentage number of farmers	41 farmers (27%)		
Target number of farmers	150	300	350
Actual number of farmers	62 (M=51;F=11)		

Table 10 above shows that, in the second interim period, a total of 28 (M=19; F=9) nursery attendants were trained in tree nursery management and three tree nurseries were established in three locations. By the end of the interim period, the nursery attendants had trained another 34 (M=21; F=13) farmers. The farmers acquired knowledge and skills in different aspects of tree nursery establishment and management. The target of 150 farmers could not be reached since it was important to start few nurseries and learn lessons which would be used to establish more nurseries in the next interim period.

Indicator 2.4: Access to extension services increased by 30% for at least 3000 supported households by 2017

Table 11: Number of farmers who accessed extension services in 2015 agricultural season.

	Y1 (2015)
Baseline percentage number of farmers targeted in year 1	306 farmers
Target number of farmers	900

Actual number of farmers	2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104)
--------------------------	--------------------------

During the baseline data collection in August 2014, it was established that only 306 farmers had access to some form of extension services. That is, access to extension services is measured in terms of the number of farmers who had contact with an extension worker (LEWs, CAD staff, project staff) at least 2 times per month. The target of 900 farmers was only for year 1 of project implementation. The project therefore set a target to ensure that at least 900 farmers get access to extension services. As shown in the table 11 above, 2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104) farmers were reached with extension services through different extension methods such as; FFS, demonstration farms, field days, individual farm visits, vegetable production, tree nursery management, improved post harvest management and VSLAs. As mentioned under indicator 2.1 above, the County based the extension services are being offered by project staff, CAD officials and CORPs.

Output 3: Increased diversification of crops grown through integrated fruit trees, vegetables and cassava farming.

Indicator 3.1: Adoption of diversified crop types (fruit trees, vegetables & cassava) increased by 50% in at least 1000 households by 2017

Table 12: Number of farmers who adopted diversified crops (fruit trees, vegetables and cassava)

	Y1 (2015)	Y2 (2016)	Y3 (2017)
Target number of farmers	200 hh (10%)	600 hh (30%)	800 hh (50%)
Actual number of farmers	246 hh (m=146; F=100)		

The diversification of cropping as a strategy to address food insecurity aims to minimise the risk of crop failure as most households relied mainly on few traditional field crops such as sorghum, groundnuts and sesame for their livelihoods. The project planned to promote different crops such as; fruit trees, vegetables and cassava. Diversification is being promoted through the adoption of at least one of the crops that are being promoted, namely; vegetables, fruit trees and cassava. The plan is that, at least 1,000 target households adopt at least one of the crops being promoted under this component. However, during the period under review, a total of 289 (M=139; F=150) farmers were engaged in the production of these crops in the period under review as follows; cassava production 86 (M=67; F= 19) farmers, tree nursery 28 (M=19; F= 9) farmers and vegetable production 132 (M=60; F=72) farmers.

Indicator 3.2: Income per household from sale of vegetables increased by 50% (from 77 SSP to 138 SSP) in at least 120 supported households by 2017

Table 13: Income from sale of vegetables in SSP.

	Y1 (2014/15)	Y2 (2015/16)	Y3 (2017)
Target income per household (August 2014)	100 SSP (10%)	115 SSP (30%)	138 SSP (50%)
Actual average income per household from sale of vegetable	680 SSP	1,390 SSP	
Actual number of farmers who cultivated vegetables (January/February 2016)	143	132 (M=60;F=72)	

In the second season running, farmers undertaking vegetable production in 5 gardens continued to produce fresh vegetables for the market. Unfortunately, two vegetable gardens located in Wau County stopped production in January 2016 due to insecurity in the County. Data collected from vegetable sales as shown in the table 13 above indicate that so far, each of the 132 farmers (M=60; F=72) earned an average of 1,390 SSP since the beginning of cultivation season in December 2016. Vegetable production is still on-going till the onset of rains in late April and it is expected that the incomes earned by farmers will be higher. It is also worth mentioning that with devaluation of SSP, the prices of most commodities have been rising steeply and hence, the 1,390 SSP earned by households is less in real value terms than the baseline figure.

Indicator 3.3: *Each of the 200 households supported under fruit tree cultivation are earning at least 200 SSP per season from selling fruit tree seedlings by 2017*

Table 14: Number of farmers selling fruit trees.

	Y1 (2015)	Y2 (2016)	Y3 (2017)
Target number of households.	50 hh	150 hh	200 hh
Actual number of households.	NIL		

The sale of seedlings had not started by the end of the interim period and therefore, this indicator cannot be assessed. Three tree nurseries were established in August 2015 and the seedlings will be ready for planting from June 2016. However, two tree nurseries in Wau County which is not accessible due to insecurity. The other one which is in Jur River County has so far there are no sales recorded

Output 4: Improved post harvest handling and management & increased adoption of post harvest storage facilities and marketing of surplus farm produce.

Indicator 4.1: Adoption of effective post harvest practices increased by 80% in at least 2,100 farmers by 2017.

Table 15: Number of farmers adopting post-harvest management practices.

	Year 1 (2015/16)	Year 2 (2016/17)	Year 3 (2017)
Target number of households adopting post harvest management practices.	700	700	700
Actual number of households.	522 (M=333; F189)	N/A	N/A
Target number of granaries	100	N/A	N/A
Actual number of improved granaries constructed.	202	N/A	N/A

As table 15 above shows, adoption of improved post harvest management practices was reported in 522 (M=333; F189) households compared to the target of 700 households. On the other hand, 202 household level granaries have been constructed while the target was 100 granaries. The activities that promote better post harvest management practices were implemented only in Jur River and Raja Counties.

Indicator 4.2: Post harvest losses reduced by 50% in at least 400 farmers by 2017

Implementation of activities to improve post-harvest management and handling practices were started in November 2015 which is usually the beginning of harvest of crops. The farmers had been trained and were in the process of constructing improved granaries and therefore, it is too early in the implementation period to assess the achievement of this result.

Indicator 4.3: Incomes from sale of surplus farm produce increased by 50% (from 479 SSP to 718 SSP) in at least 2500 supported households by 2017.

Table 16: Income from the sale of surplus produce.

	Year 1 (2015/16)	Year 2 (2016/17)	Year 3 (2017/18)
Baseline average income	479 SSP	N/A	N/A
Target average income	719 SSP	N/A	N/A
Actual average income	1825 SSP	N/A	N/A
% increase in income	281%	N/A	N/A
Target number of households selling surplus produce.	800	1,000	700
Actual number of households selling surplus produce.	125 (M= 87; F=38)	N/A	N/A
% number of farmers who sold surplus produce vis-a vis the target	16%	N/A	N/A

From the table 16 above, it can be seen that, only 125 (M= 87; F=38) out of the targeted 800 farmers reported to have sold surplus produce in the interim period under review. The produce which was most sold was groundnuts. The low number of farmers selling the produce is attributed to low yields of crops in 2015 agricultural season. It is important to note that prices have risen steeply and by the time of reporting, a 50 Kg bag of sorghum was retailing at 850 SSP in Wau market which should be attracting more farmers to sell produce.

Indicator 4.4: Marketing of farm produce increased by 30% in at least 2500 farmers by 2017

Table 17: Number of households selling surplus produce.

	Year 1 (2015/16)	Year 2 (2016/17)	Year 3 (2017/18)
Baseline percentage of surplus produce sold	23%	N/A	N/A
Average actual percentage of surplus sold.	15%	N/A	N/A
Target number of	800	1000	700

households selling surplus produce.			
Actual number of households.	125 (M= 87; F=38)	N/A	N/A

The last row of table 17 above indicate that, only 125 (M= 87; F=38) farmers sold any farm produce in the period under review which was approximately 15% of the produce. The data collection measured the total of produce sold in kilograms as a percentage of the total produce harvested and stored. It was established that on average, 15% of the produce harvested were sold as surplus produce. On average, each 125 (M= 87; F=38) household sold about 360 Kg of produce which totals to 45,000 Kg (45 MT). However, it was still early in the dry season and more farmers are expected to sale produce as the lean season (May-August) approaches. Low number of farmers selling and low volumes of produce sold is largely due to poor yield of crops in 2015.

B. Activities

Result 1: Increased area of land cultivated using animal traction technology

A1 Promotion of animal traction (R1)

A1.1 Establish 8 ox-plough training centres

5 animal traction centers were established in Acumcum, Marol Akec, and Marial Bai bomas in Jur River County and Abushaka boma in Wau County.

A1.2 Train 250 animal traction trainers

The centres were used to train 90 (M=75; F=15) animal traction TOTs. The TOTs later trained 325 (M=278; F=47) farmers both at the centres and at the farm level. It is important to note that out of the farmers trained, 10 (M=7; F=3) of them were trained in donkey ploughing in Abushaka, Wau County. The following topics were covered in animal traction training; selection of oxen/donkey for training, ox-plough assembling and maintenance, making of yokes, proper harnessing of draught animals, reigning and walking, giving commands and pulling (dragging) the load, pulling the implements, primary cultivation, secondary cultivation, basic veterinary care and livestock nutrition.

A1.3 Avail 1700 traction equipment through agro-dealers.

In the period under review, the project contracted two agro-dealers to avail animal traction equipment to farmers. Kampala Hardware in Wau town was contracted to supply 400 ox-ploughs and ox-plough spare parts to farmers.

A1.4 Promote the sale of 1,700 ox-ploughs

Out of 400 ox-ploughs, 50 of them were used for training in the animal traction centres while 109 ploughs were sold to 72 (M= 70; F=2) farmers and farmers

groups/cooperatives. Makuac Blacksmith was recruited to supply 200 donkey ploughs and 50 of them were used for training while 4 had been bought by farmers.

A1.5 Promote the use of weeders to be used on a trial basis.

Weeders were not purchased due to the fact that they are not available in Country and agro-dealers could not supply them. Plans are underway to purchase them from Uganda for trials in 2016 agricultural season.

A1.6 Promote efficient farm tools through awareness raising and sale of tools by agro-dealers:

Use of efficient hand tools such as east African hoe, forked hoe and rakes were demonstrated to farmers in the demonstration farms and in FFS. A total of 135 (M=78; F=57) farmers benefited from demonstration on efficient use of east African hoes, rakes and sickles throughout the season. The demonstration is expected to result into increased adoption and use of efficient tools. As a result the demos which were held, 100 (M=37; F=63) farmers who planted cassava in the bulking farms purchased east African hoes for use in cassava cultivation. Even though the local *maloda* hoes are widely used in the project area, they have been found to be cumbersome to use as farmers have to squat or kneel down while using them. Therefore, due to these limitations, local *maloda* hoes are not suitable for digging deep in the soil especially when planting crops such as cassava and sweet potatoes.

1.7 Credit scheme for VSLAs/Farmers cooperatives.

The project facilitated the creation of VSLAs as instruments to mobilise resources for resilience and investment in the local communities. VSLAs are normally village-based and so far, there are 39 VSLAs which have been established since October 2014. They have a total membership of 939 (M= 498; F=441) with accumulated savings of 148,043 SSP and a total of loan portfolio 33,535 SSP. The groups have earned a combined 11,446SSP in interests from the loans they have given out.

To support farmers to increase agricultural production, the project provided agricultural loans to 298 (M=168; F=130) farmers organised in groups/cooperatives and VSLAs. A total of 255,275 SSP was disbursed to farmers as the principal amount to be repaid with an interest of 15%. The interest rate was set by the project steering committee. By the end of the interim period, a total of **59,522 SSP** had been repaid to the project on behalf of County Agriculture Committees (CACs). CACs as indicated in the project proposal are local level committees composed of; representatives of farmers, government officials and staff to oversee the agricultural activities under this project. It was proposed that it should be a sub-committee of County Development Committee. Data collected during the course of the interim period indicate that, most of the loans were used to; purchase food, buy farm inputs, hire ox-ploughs and labour.

Table 18: Details of VSLAs in the three Counties in Western Bahr el Ghazal state.

	County	Payam	Boma	Name of the VSLA/farmers groups	Male	Female	Total	Loan Needed (SSP)	Total amount to be Repaid + Interest (SSP)	Current Amount paid + Interest	Balance
1	Raja	Sopo	Sopo south	VSLA-Sopo-4	19	6	25	11,400	13,110	0	13,110
2	Raja	Uyu juku	Uyu juku north	VSLA Elephant	18	7	25	11,800	13,570	8000	5,570
3	Raja	Sopo	Mangayat	VSLA-Mangayat 1	10	15	25	17,150	19,722	8000	11,722
	Total Raja County				47	28	75	40,350	46,402	16,000	30,402
1	Jur River	Marial baai	Marial baai	Farmers group	13	12	25	36,300	41,745	11200	30,545
2	Jur River	Mapel	Marol Akech	Wo Ukuunyo	25	0	25	45,500	52,325	8340	43,985
3	Jur River	Marial baai	Achong Chong	Adirpiny farmers group	9	7	16	19,700	22,655	4000	18,655
4	Jur River	Kayango	Kayango	Guihr Kayango	11	14	25	8,085	9,298	0	9,298
5	Jur River	Kayango	Kayango	women group	8	17	25	9,890	11,374	0	11,374
6	Jur River	Wau baai	Cum chok	Piantok One	9	16	25	9,150	10,523	10242	281
7	Jur River	Wau baai	Cum chok	Piantok Two	10	12	22	7,800	8,970	8970	0
	Total Jur River				85	78	163	136,425	156,889	42,752	114,137
1	Wau	Mboro	Mboro	Mboro	14	8	22	25,500	29,325	0	29,325
2	Wau	Besselia	Ngoligbo	Ngoligbo women coperative society	3	10	13	20,000	23,000	0	23,000
3	Wau	Bussere	Halima	Afir	19	6	25	33,000	37,950	800	37,150
	Total Wau				36	24	60	78,500	90,275	800	89,475
	Grand Total				168	130	298	255,275	293,566	59,552	234,014

Result 2: Increased promotion and adoption of appropriate agricultural practices

A2 Agricultural extension & training (R2)

A2.1 Select 33 Community Own Resource Persons (CORPs) and 32 Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs) for training

As at the end of the quarter, there were 48 (M=45; F=3) CORPs/CAHWs who are selected to work in the 24 bomas. During the selection of the CORPs/CAHWs in consultation with the CADs, it was decided that they receive training in both livestock and crop production and thus they are both CORPs and CAHWs

A2.2 Train and deploy 65 CORPs and CAHWs

The CORPs/CAHWs were given training in basic principles of crop and livestock production and animal health care by CAD staff. Since the project started, the CORPs/CAHWs have received two phases of training each lasting 5 days. The training covered the following topics: introduction to the Project highlighting the South Sudan Rural Development (SORUDEV) programme approach, objectives and activities; roles and responsibilities of CORPs, community mobilisation, group dynamics, training skills, livestock production, veterinary practices, basic crop production principles, extension methods e.g. FFS.

A2.3 Establish 11 demo farms.

During the period under review, 5 demonstration farms were established in 5 bomas. The demonstration farms showcased good agronomic practices which farmers could learn from a later adopt in their farms. The 5 demonstration farms supported the learning of f 135 (M=78; F=57) farmers. The demonstration farms were established in the following bomas; Tharkueng, Gette, Kangi, Marol Akec, Khorjampus and Acumcum Yabulu and Kuru. Due to the traditional nature of farming where improved practices are not used, the project decided to showcase simple practices which farmers could easily adopt such as; mixed cropping, row planting, soil fertility improvement through use of farm yard manure, cultural practices to control pests and diseases and use of trash lines and grass strips to control soil erosion.

A2.4 Establish 10 Farmer Field Schools (FFSs)

8 FFS were established in the second interim period to facilitate farmer learning. Farmers practically participated in the FFS and learned new practices through; observation, experience and analysis. A total of 184 (M=112; F=72) farmers participated in the FFS from the beginning until graduation. The main topics covered in the FFS were; 1) land clearance; 2) and preparation; 3) planting; 4) weeding, pest and disease control and; 5) harvesting

A2.5 Establish 10 Young FFSs

Young FFS were supposed to be established in schools within the project areas. However, they were not established during the quarter since the schools were closed when the season had just started. The young FFS will be established in the next agricultural season.

A2.6 Train 10 Ministry of Agriculture & 12 project extension staff.

Two training sessions were held in the period under review, targeting both Project and CAD staff. The first training took place in March 2015 and total of 17 (M=15; F=3) participants attended. Six participants were drawn from the three CADs while the rest were project staff. The initial plan was to train 5 participants from each of the three CADs but due to lack of adequate personnel only 2 staff from each County attended the training. The purpose of the training was to equip participants with knowledge in; crop and livestock production, design and implementation of FFS, and effective delivery of extension services to the farmers. The training mainly targeted frontline extension staff and it is intended to equip the trainees with critical skills to provide more effective extension services to farmers.

Table 19: CAD staff who were sent for one month training in Yei.

S/no.	NAMES	SEX	Position	County
1	Charles Uchalla Muong	M	Extension Officer	Wau
2	Joseph Martin Khamis	M	Extension Officer	Wau
3	Khedir Tamim Bosh	M	Extension Officer	Raja
4	Elizabeth Victor Hassan	F	Extension Officer	Jur River
5	David John Koryom	M	Extension Officer	Jur River
6	Mohamed Abakar Musa	M	Extension Officer	Raja

The second training took place in October 2015 targeting the same participants as the training which took place in March 2015. The purpose of the sessions was to assess the achievements of the work plan, identify the gaps and conduct the training in areas where weaknesses were identified.

Towards the end of the interim period, 11 participants (5 project staff and 6 CAD officials) were sent for one month residential training at Crops Training Centre (CTC) Yei. The training will end in March 2016.

A2.7 Hold 11 field days in each Payam

During the period under review, 3 field days were held in 3 bomas in the three Counties which was attended by **825 (M=389; F=436)** farmers. Practices demonstrated were: harvesting, drying, post harvest management and marketing of farm produce. The field days were held during the harvest period which provided opportunity to farmers showcase best practices, display best practices and provide market for the farm produce. The best practices that were showcased to farmers were as follows:

- 1) How to determine moisture content in grains.
- 2) Drying grains to achieve the right moisture context.
- 3) Display of common pests of grains.
- 4) Improved granaries.

- 5) Post harvest practices; drying, threshing, winnowing and sorting.

A2.8 Support county/state/national agricultural shows/trade fairs.

These activities were not implemented due to lack of funds at the State Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources and Forestry that usually organises them mainly due to the current economic crisis in South Sudan. However, discussions have been held with the Director General (DG) in the State Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources and Forestry to organise a function to launch 2016 agricultural season and show case the services that the Ministry and partners have to support farmers. The fair will be held in March 2016 and the purpose of the fair will be to create awareness on strategies to increase agricultural production and sensitise farmers and stakeholders on the array of support services that the Ministry and its partners have on offer. The following will be done during the field day:

- 1) To provide farmers with the relevant information required to improve their agricultural practices
- 2) To promote appropriate varieties (diseases resistant and drought resistant) to respond to climate change.
- 3) To exchange views and share ideas between farmers and partners working in the field of food security.
- 4) To sensitise farmers on market opportunities available in the market.

A2.9 Reproduce extension materials from materials available.

SORUDEV partners with the support of EU Technical Assistant in charge of extension services agreed to produce extension manuals jointly. There were series of technical workshops which were held and it is expected that the manuals will be produced in the next interim. The technical guides are supposed to be produced by NRC on behalf of other partners and to be launched in June 2016.

A2.10 Avail improved seeds through agro-dealers.

Bulking of improved seed varieties was postponed from 2015 agricultural season to 2016 agricultural season due to the fact that, the farmers who were identified to bulk the seeds were not selected and trained in time. The training in seed production has been planned to take place in April 2016.

A2.11 Train & visit (T&V) to at least 3000 farmers

In the period under review a total of 2,442 (M=1,338; F=1,104) were trained in different technical areas. The trainings took place in the bomas either on farm or in designated social places such as schools.

Table 19: Number of farmers trained in different bomas supported by the project.

County		Male	Female	Total
Wau	Bazia centre	63	46	109
	Gumaba	45	34	79

	Bussere	37	38	75
	Napataguru	65	37	102
	Mboro	43	36	79
	Abushaka	37	40	77
	Ngondakala	29	35	64
	Baggari centre	47	56	103
Raja	Yabulu	58	33	91
	Ujuku	49	53	102
	Sopo	34	34	68
	Mangayat	64	49	113
Jur River	Marial Bai	56	40	96
	Cumcok	63	44	107
	Thurkueny	50	53	103
	Gette	43	47	90
	Barurud	45	46	91
	Kangi	60	48	108
	Athor	71	42	113
	Kuanya	61	46	107
	Kayongo	63	44	107
	Marol Akec	56	39	95
	Kuajina	56	42	98
	Khor Jamua	60	42	102
	Akorok	36	44	80
	Acumcum	47	36	83
	TOTAL			2442

A2.12 Procure and distribute improved seed varieties for bulking.

Bulking of improved seed varieties was postponed from 2015 agricultural season to 2016 agricultural season due to the fact that, the farmers who were identified to bulk the seeds were not selected and trained in time. The training in seed production has been planned to take place in April 2016.

A2.13 Participatory land use planning.

During a meeting held at the EU delegation in Juba in November 2014 attended by HARD's Programme Manager, with the team from NIRAS who were working on land governance, it was agreed that they would assist partners to pilot land use planning at the boma level. However, two bomas have been identified where planning on land use will be piloted in the next interim period.

Result 3: Increased diversification of crops grown through integrated fruit trees, vegetables and cassava farming

A3.1 Fruit tree farming (R3)

A3.1.1 Identify & select 8 nursery sites

4nursery sites were identified for fruit tree nursery production; Akorok boma in Jur River County, Bazia and Abushaka bomas in Wau County and Uyujuku center in Raja County. However, insecurity in Wau County curtailed implementation of nursery management activities.

Table 20: GPS locations of the tree nurseries.

County	Boma	GPS location
Jur River	Akorop	Latitude 07°52'01.92" Longitude 28°07'07.52"
Wau	Bazia	Latitude 07°06'23.94" Longitude 27°55'58.29"
	Abushaka	Latitude 07°43.110' Longitude 27°47.687'
Raja	Uyujuku	Latitude 07°28.620'Longitude 26°35.900'

A3.1.2 Procure nursery materials.

All the necessary nursery materials (wire mesh, watering can, hand tools, wheelbarrow and other assorted materials) were procured but finding viable seeds has been a challenge. As a result, local seeds of fruit trees were processed and planted in the nurseries.

A3.1.3 Develop nursery visibility materials.

Visibility materials – banners and signboards were developed and erected at the sites where the tree nurseries are located.

A3.1.4 Train 16 nursery attendants and 1,200 farmers on fruit tree management.

16 nursery attendants from the 3 tree nurseries were trained in all aspects of nursery management. The attendants were trained as TOTs and together with staff from department of forestry, trained 28 (M=19; F=9) farmers. Unfortunately, two tree nurseries in Bazia and Abushaka bomas are in Wau County which is currently affected by conflict and are therefore inaccessible.

A3.1.5 Undertake nursery management activities e.g. grafting, pruning.

Nursery management activities such as; weeding, pruning and watering were done during the course of the season. However, it was not possible to find improved planting materials for grafting were not found.

A3.1.6 Raise 4800 tree/fruit seedlings through groups to be sold to farmers.

The three fruit tree nurseries had 1,200 seedlings which were supposed to be ready for transplanting from June 2016. However, it was only the tree nursery in Jur River County which had 382 seedlings which will be ready for transplanting as from June 2016. More fruit tree nurseries will be established in the 2016 agricultural season. The seedlings in the tree nursery are as follows:

- 1) Lime – 271

2) Guava – 165

A3.2 Vegetable production (R3)**A3.2.5 Train 120 HHs in conservation agriculture & vegetable farming**

The project supported 132 (M=60; F=70) in 5 vegetable groups in the three Counties. The vegetable gardens were established in the last interim period but farmers continued to produce vegetables in the last interim period. During the period under review, vegetable growers were given more training in improved vegetable production practices which covered the following topics; production of quality farm yard manure, application of farm yard manure, soil moisture, mulching, pest and disease control. All the vegetable growers reported sales of fresh vegetables besides consuming vegetables at the household level. The most successful vegetables were as follows: Jews mallow (*kudhra*), purslane (*rigila*) and okra (*bamia*). The success of these vegetable is due to the fact that they are easier to grow and also widely consumed in the local towns thus there is ready market for them.

A3.2.8 Market vegetables

Vegetables grown were mainly sold in the markets of Wau, Uyujuku, Marial Bai and Acumcum. The farmers were connected to the main markets and trained in the demand and supply of different vegetables. In Wau town, the project met with market authorities to lobby for provision of market stalls for vegetable sellers. The authorities agreed to allocate stalls for vegetable traders following that vegetables were displayed on the ground due to lack of stalls.

A3.3 Cassava Improvement (R3)**A3.3.1 Identify/Select 5 cassava bulking sites,**

Cassava bulking farms were selected in Kayongo, Khorjampus, Kuajina, Baggari and Mangayat bomas. The selection was based on the following factors; i) willingness of the farmers to cultivate cassava, ii) lack of cassava improved cassava varieties and, iii) willingness of target farmers to share cassava cuttings with other farmers in the boma. Each bulking farm measures about 1 *feddan* (4,200 square metres).

A3.3.2 Avail improved cassava cuttings to farmers for bulking.

Cassava cuttings were availed to the farmers working on the bulking plot to plant. Each bulking plot was given 21 bags of cassava cuttings containing about 4,200 cuttings which were enough to cultivate about 1 *feddan* at a spacing of 1m x 1m.

A3.3.3 Establish 5 cassava bulking farms.

In the period under review, 5 cassava bulking farms were established and planted with early maturing and Cassava Mosaic Disease (CMD) resistant varieties. The gardens measure approximately one *feddan* each. The cuttings will be ready for transplanting at the beginning of the rainy season from June 2016. It is estimated

that 100 farmers will get about a bag of cassava cuttings which contains about 200 cuttings of 1 foot each.

A3.3.4 Train 900 farmers in cassava growing.

A total of 100 (**M=37; F=63**) farmers were trained in the following topics; selection of clean cutting materials, cutting cassava stems at the right length for planting, preparing land for cassava planting, making planting mounds, spacing requirements of cassava, soils suitable for cassava propagation & common pests and diseases and their control measures.

A3.3.5 Procure and bulk cassava cuttings.

Improved cassava cuttings were procured from farmers in Wau County who had been supported by the former SPCRP programme which was also funded by the EU.

A3.3.6 Select and trial individual cassava cuttings bulking farms.

The variety which was trialled is the sweet short term variety that takes about 12 months to maturity. This variety is tolerates drought very well and produces adequate foliage which is also used a vegetable.

A3.3.7 Propagate cassava for income.

The long term plan is to ensure that farmers cultivating cassava do it as an income generating activity. There is high demand for cassava products such as tubers, leaves, cuttings and cassava flour. It is expected that in the next interim period, farmers working on the bulking plot will be selling cassava cuttings to other farmers to cultivate.

A3.3.8 Market cassava

Project officers trained the farmer groups in business, finance and collective marketing skills, in order to get the best price for their crop. All 5 cassava bulking farmer groups meet regularly, and have organised activities to build skills such as value addition and processing. The groups are also serving as a useful forum for sharing information on potential threats to the cassava crop, such as livestock destruction and termite attack.

Result 4: Improved Post-Harvest Handling and Management (PHH&M); Increased adoption of post harvest storage facilities; and developing market information system.

A4.1 Post-harvest management (R4)

A4.1.1 Identify/select 400 beneficiaries.

The project identified 800 (M=510; F=390) farmers in improved post-harvest management practices. The farmers selected were those who produced surplus produce and who were willing to participate in the training activities and contribute resources towards construction of improved granaries.

A4.1.2 Train 400 farmers on post-harvest.

As at the end of the interim period, the project had trained 522 (M=333; F189) in improved post harvest storage practices. The training covered the following topics: drying to achieve the correct moisture content, food storage and food hygiene, common storage pests and control methods & improved granaries

A4.1.3 Identify and source store technician.

Through the Director of Halima Research Station in Wau, the project adopted the store design of the improved granaries which is recommended for smallholder farmers. The design is an improved form of local granaries with ventilation, doors and metal deflectors.

A4.1.4 Procure building materials.

The granaries were constructed mainly using local materials such as; timber, posts, grass and mud/bricks. The external materials bought from the shops were; iron sheets, wire mesh, timber and nails were purchased for improving the local granaries. The total cost of these external materials was about 3,000 SSP.

A4.1.5 Improve 400 stores.

A total of **202 improved** stores were either completed or were under construction as at the end of the interim period. The project provided external inputs which the farmers could not afford while the farmer provided local materials such as grass, timber and posts used for construction.

A.4.2 Marketing (R4)***A4.2.1 Train farmers on leadership.***

Five cooperative societies were identified during the interim period under review supporting about 370 (M=211; F= 159) farmers. Capacity assessments were carried out to determine & understand the challenges that they face in order to develop and implement interventions to enhance their operations. The findings of the assessments were as follows; most of them were dormant i.e. not holding regular meetings, the officials did not understand their roles very well, they were simply collecting produce and selling to middlemen and most of them did not have proper records. Three of the five cooperatives have been trained in basic principles of leadership and governance and the process to legalise their status is underway.

A4.2.2 Link farmers to private processors.

In November 2015, one day workshop was held which brought together agricultural produce traders and representatives of 10 marketing groups where opportunities for marketing were explored. It was established that there is high demand for farm produce especially sorghum, groundnuts and sesame as most produce are sourced

from the neighbouring states. Challenges such as poor roads and lack of transport to bring the produce to the market were discussed and it was agreed that farmers can pool their produce and then negotiate for prices and transport.

A4.2.3 Train 10 farmers groups dynamics.

235 (M=132;F= 103) members of marketing groups and cooperatives were trained for 3 days in the following areas; group development and group dynamics, principles of cooperatives, business planning, value addition, micro-processing, storage and transportation and options for marketing of agricultural produce. The training was conducted project staff and officials from department of cooperatives at the state Ministry of cooperatives and trade.

A4.2.4 Train 10 farmer groups leaders.

26 (M=17; F=9) leaders of farmers groups and cooperatives were trained for one day in group management and leadership. The training was conducted by officials from department of cooperatives.

A4.2.5 Facilitate legalize 10 farmer groups.

The process of legalising the groups was yet to be started. Some of them did not have by-laws or constitutions as required by the department of cooperatives.

A4.2.6 Develop Market Information System

Through the use of the mobile phones, 6 farmers marketing groups and 2 cooperatives societies were been mobilised and linked with the major buyers of farm produce in Wau town where they get frequent information on demand, supply and prices of cereals. The initial plan was to link the marketing cooperatives to the FAO led Agriculture and Food Information System (AFIS) for decision making but this service is no longer operational.

Challenges during the implementation period.

1. In the period under review, the project operated under the government's fixed foreign exchange rate regime which meant that, expenses that were incurred in South Sudanese Pounds were higher when converted into USD/Euro values due to continued devaluation of SSP. The problem was that there was very high funds absorption as the project obtained less pounds for using the official rate while the black market rate was higher. Most of the expenditure were done in South Sudanese Pounds. Since this was a legal requirement, the project had to comply with the exchange rate that was fixed by the central bank. However, this eased in the last quarter when the central bank of South Sudan adopted a floating foreign exchange regime.

2. Delayed and erratic rains in 2015 agricultural season impacted on the yields of the crops. Surveys done during the period indicated that the agricultural production in 2015 was below normal which was also corroborated by the most recent International Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) report. Therefore, farmers were not able to get the optimal yields based on the resources which they had invested and thus, some of the results could not be fully realised.
3. Insecurity in Wau County. In the last quarter of the period, there was widespread insecurity in Wau County which led to the suspension of activities. The issue was communicated and discussed with EUD in February 2016. It was agreed that, the situation be monitored for one more month before a final decision could be reached. It now been decided that activities should be relocated from Wau County to Jur River County.
4. High rates of inflation as a result of sustained devaluation of South Sudanese Pound eroded the purchasing power of the beneficiaries and undermined their capacity to participate in project activities. For instance, we noted that fewer farmers were saving in their VSLAs and even the value of the savings was also deteriorating.
5. Shortage of some essential goods in the market: There were intermittent shortage of fuel and other project supplies in the market throughout the period. The project responded to this by bulk purchasing and stocking of some of the essential goods.

2.3 Up dated logframe.
Table 17: Logframe matrix updated

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Current value	Targets			Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		reference year	reference date	(incl. reference year)				
				Y1(2015)	Y2 (2016)	Y3 (2017)		
Overall objective: Impact	SO - To contribute to increased food security, reduced vulnerability and enhanced livelihoods of rural households in Western Bahr el Ghazal (WBG) State.	OO Indicator 1: Average length of food stock (months) per household increased from 3.2 to 4.8 months by 2017.	Feb-16	3.52 months	4.16 months	4.8 months	1. South Sudan National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) records/reports	OO Assumption 1: Continued policy support. OO Assumption 2: Peace continues to prevail in Western Bahr el Ghazal state
		OO Indicator 2: Distress sale of livestock and other household assets among supported households to meet food needs during “hunger gap” period is reduced from 32% to 16% by 2017.	Feb-16	28.80%	22.40%	16.00%	2. Baseline survey report 3. WFP produced Vulnerability Assessment Mission (VAM) report 4. Project progress reports	
		OO Indicator 3: Monthly average cash expenditure on food per household among supported smallholder beneficiaries reduced from 328 SSP to 164 SSP by 2017.	Feb-16	259 SSP	230 SSP	164 SSP	5. Project midterm evaluation report 6. FAO Agriculture/food security analysis report	
		OO Indicator 4: Average number of meals per day in adults increased by 50% by 2017.	Feb-16	2.09 meals	2.47 meals	2.85 meals	7. FAO/WFP Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFAM) report 8. End evaluation report	

Specific objective(s): Outcome(s)	Op 1.1 - Increased area of land cultivated using animal traction without corresponding decrease in crop yields.	SO Indicator 1: Yields for the three main crops (sorghum, groundnuts and maize) per feddan increased by 50% in at least 3000 supported households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	Sorghum from 164 to 246Kg/feddan ; groundnuts from 302 to 413 Kg/feddan and maize from 169 to 254 Kg/feddan in 900 hhs	Sorghum from 164 to 246Kg/feddan; groundnuts from 302 to 413 Kg/feddan and maize from 169 to 254 Kg/feddan in 3,000 hhs	Sorghum from 164 to 246Kg/feddan ; groundnuts from 302 to 413 Kg/feddan and maize from 169 to 254 Kg/feddan in 2,200 hhs	1. Confirmatory baseline survey 2. Progress reports 3. Ministry of Agriculture reports 4. Mid-term evaluation 5. End evaluation	SO Assumption 1: South Sudan Pound /Euro exchange rate remains as budgeted or better to maintain value of EU grant. SO: Assumption 2: Weather conditions remain favourable for farming.
Outputs	Op 1.1 - Increased area of land cultivated using animal traction without corresponding decrease in crop yields.	SO Indicator 2: Monthly household incomes increased from 571 SSP to 800 SSP in at least 900 supported households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	629 SSP in 100 HHs;	714 SSP in 400 HHs,	800 SSP in 900 HH.	1. Source 1: Quarter reports (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 2. Source 2: Mid-term evaluation (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 3. Source 3: Ministry of Agriculture report (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 4. Source 4: End evaluation (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 5. Source 5: Field photos (Indicator 1.1, 1.2)	R1 Assumption 1: operational county structures are in place; R1 Assumption 2: Adequate security.
		SO Indicator 3: Proportion of food consumed derived from own production increased from 40 -90% in at least 3000 households by 2017	2014	Feb-16	10% in 900 HHs;	25% in 2200 HHs;	40% in 3000 HHs		
Outputs	Op 1.1 - Increased area of land cultivated using animal traction without corresponding decrease in crop yields.	Indicator 1: 3000 farmers have increased their knowledge and skills in use of draught animal power for cultivation by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% in 900 HHs;	25% in 2200 HHs;	40% in 3000 HHs	1. Source 1: Quarter reports (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 2. Source 2: Mid-term evaluation (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 3. Source 3: Ministry of Agriculture report (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 4. Source 4: End evaluation (Indicator 1.1, 1.2) 5. Source 5: Field photos (Indicator 1.1, 1.2)	R1 Assumption 1: operational county structures are in place; R1 Assumption 2: Adequate security.
		1.2 Indicator 2: Average land area cultivated per household increased by 50%, (from 2 feddans to 3.5 feddans in at least 2720 households using animal traction in cultivation by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% (2.2 feddans) in 800 hhs;	30% (2.8 feddans) in 2000 hhs;	50% (3.5 feddans) in 2720 hhs		

	2.1 Indicator 1: County-based extension delivery system established & functional to support at least 3000 farmers by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	900 HHs;	2200 HHs,	Y3: 3000 HHs	1. Source 1: Confirmatory baseline survey (Indicator 2.2, 2.3) 2. Source 2: Quarter progress reports (Indicator 2.1, 2.2, 2.3) 3. Source 3: Ministry of Agriculture reports (Indicator 2.1, 2.2, 2.3) 4. Source 4: Mid-term evaluation (Indicator 2.1, 2.2, 2.3) 5. Source 5: End evaluation (Indicator 1.2, 2.2, 2.3)	R2 Assumption 1: Adequate foods in households, so key players such as women are not distracted by the need to look for or earn food elsewhere.
Op 1.2 - Increased promotion and adoption of appropriate agricultural practices for 1500 smallholder farmers.	2.2 Indicator 2: Adoption of farm fertility improvement measures increased by 50% in at least 3000 farmers by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% in 900 HHs;	30% in 2200 HHs,	50% in 3000 HHs		
	2.3 Indicator 3: Adoption of agro-forestry practices such as tree planting increased by 50% in at least 800 supported households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% in 150 HHs;	30% in 450 HHs,	50% in 800 HHs		
	2.4 Indicator 4: Access to extension services increased by 30% for at least 3000 supported households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	5% in 900 HHs;	17.5% in 2200 HHs,	30% in 3000 HHs		
Op 1.3 Increased diversification of crops grown through integrated fruit trees, vegetables and cassava farming.	Adoption of diversified crop types (fruit trees, vegetables & cassava) increased by 50% in at least 1000 households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% in 200 HHs;	30% in 600 HHs;	50% in 1000 HHs	1. Source 1: Confirmatory baseline survey (Indicator 3.1, 3.2) 2. Source 2: Progress reports (Indicators 3.1, 3.2, 3.3) 3. Source 3: Mid-term evaluation report (Indicator 3.1, 3.2) 4. Source 4: End evaluation report (Indicator 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)	R3 Assumption 1: Adequate foods in households, so key players are not distracted by the need to look for food elsewhere. R3 Assumption 2: Buy-in from communities
	3.2 Indicator 2: Income per household from sale of vegetables increased by 50% (from 77 SSP to 138 SSP) in at least 120 supported households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% (100 SSP) in 30HHs;	30% (115 SSP) in 40HHs;	50% (138 SSP) in 120HHs		
	3.3 Indicator 3: Each of the 200 households supported under fruit tree cultivation are earning at least 200 SSP per season from selling fruit tree seedlings by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	50 HHs;	150 HHs	50 HHs		

	Op 1.4 Improved post harvest handling and management & increased adoption of post harvest storage facilities and marketing of surplus farm produce.	Adoption of effective post harvest practices increased by 80% in at least 2,100 farmers by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	20% in 500 HHs;	50% in 800 HHs;	80% in 800 HHs	1. Source 1: Baseline (Indicator 4.1.4.2.4.3) 2. Source 2: Progress reports (Indicator 4.1.4.2.4.3) 3. Source 3: Mid evaluation report (Indicator 4.1.4.2.4.3) 4. Source 4: End evaluation report (Indicator 4.1.4.2.4.3)	R4 Assumption 1: Adequate foods in households, so key players are not distracted by the need to look for or earn food elsewhere. R4 Assumption 2: No conflicting approaches by other agencies that make up take of technologies difficult.
		Post harvest losses reduced by 50% in at least 400 farmers by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% in 100 HHs;	30% in 280 HHs,	50% in 400 HHs		
		Incomes from sale of surplus farm produce increased by 50% (from 479 SSP to 718 SSP) in at least 2500 supported households by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	10% (526 SSP) in 800 HHs;	20% (574 SSP) in 1800 HHs,	20% (718 SSP) in 2500 HHs		
		Marketing of farm produce increased by 30% in at least 2500 farmers by 2017.	2014	Feb-16	5% in 800 HHs;	17.5% in 1800 HHs	30% in 2500 HHs		
Activities	A1.1.1 Establish 8 ox-plough training centres		2014	Feb-16	5 centres	4 centres		1. Beneficiaries lists 2. Financial Records 3. Training reports 4. Training curriculum 5. Activity photos 6. Minutes of meetings	A0 Assumption 1: Suitable staff can be identified and recruited (local and expatriate). A1 Assumption 1 Key staff will remain for the entire project life. A1 Assumption 2 No major livestock disease outbreaks occur. A2 Assumption 1 Death among key people trained by the project, including death from AIDS, will affect project sustainability.
	A1.1.2 Train 250 animal traction trainers		2014	Feb-16	90	160	0		
	A1.1.3 Avail 1700 traction equipment through agro-dealers.		2014	Feb-16	350 ox-ploughs & 170 donkey ploughs.	0	0	1. Beneficiaries lists 2. Financial Records	
	A1.1.4 Distribute 1700 ox ploughs		2014	Feb-16	15 of ox-ploughs and 10 donkey ploughs.	355 ox-ploughs and 160 donkey ploughs	0		

									A2 Assumption 2 Free community land will be available for demo farms.
	A1.1.5 Distribute 60 ox-weeders		2014	Feb-16	0	60 weeders			A3.2 Assumption 1: No major outbreak of crop diseases. A3.2 Assumption 2: Rains are adequate for cultivation. A3.2 Assumption 3: Community cohesion is maintained.
	A2.1.1 Select 33 Community Own Resource Persons (CORPs) and 32 Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs) for training		2014	Feb-16	58	0	0		A3.3 Assumption 1: Rain adequate for farming.
	A1.2.2 Train and deploy 65 CORPs and CAWHs		2014	Feb-16	48	40	0		A4.1 Assumption 1: Adequate political support.
	A1.2.3 Establish 11 demo farms		2014	Feb-16	5	6	0		A4.2 Assumption 1: The current demand for farm

									produce prevails. A4.2 Assumption 2: Processing does not alter preference; A4.2 Assumption 3: Consumer purchasing power maintained.
	A1.2.4 Establish 10 Farmer Field Schools (FFSs)	2014	Feb-16	8	8	0			
	A1.2.5 Establish 10 Young FFSs	2014	Feb-16	0	10	2			A0 Assumption 1: Suitable staff can be identified and recruited (local and expatriate).
	A1.2.6 Train 10 Ministry of Agriculture & 12 project extension staff	2014	Feb-16	1 training	1 training	1 training			A1 Assumption 1 Key staff will remain for the entire project life. A1 Assumption 2 No major livestock disease outbreaks occur.
	A1.2.7 Hold field days in each Payam	2014	Feb-16	3 field days	8 field days	0			A2 Assumption 1 Death among key people trained by the project, including death from AIDS, will affect project sustainability. A2 Assumption 2

									Free community land will be available for demo farms.
	A1.2.8 Support county/state/national agricultural shows/trade fairs	2014	Feb-16	0	1 state/national agricultural show	0			A3.1 Assumption 1: Rains are adequate for adequate for cultivation.
	A1.2.9 Reproduce extension materials from materials available.	2014	Feb-16	0	Number of copies will depend on the quotations received from NRC.				A3.2 Assumption 1: No major outbreak of crop diseases. A3.2 Assumption 2: Rains are adequate for adequate for cultivation. A3.2 Assumption 3: Community cohesion is maintained.
	A1.2.10 Advance loans for saving groups.	2014	Feb-16	298 farmers	300 farmers				1: Rain adequate for farming.
	A1.2.11 Avail improved seeds through agro-dealers	2014	Feb-16	N/A	N/A	N/A			A3.3 Assumption 1: Rain adequate for farming.
	A1.2.12 Train & visit (T&V) to at least 5000 farmers	2014	Feb-16	2,442 farmers	2,558 farmers	0			A4.1 Assumption 1: Adequate political support.
	A1.2.13 Recruit seed producers and supply them with seeds for	2014	Feb-16	0	1,250 farmers	0			Availability of quality seeds for bulking.

[illegible]

A1.3.6 Select & trial individual entrepreneur fruit tree/nursery for onward distribution/sale to farmers	2014	Feb-16	10 entrepreneurs	20 entrepreneurs	0	
A1.3.7 Identify and select 4 garden sites	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	0	0	
A1.3.8 Procure vegetable garden materials	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	0	0	
A1.3.8 Establish 4 vegetable gardens	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	0	0	
A1.3.9 Improve farm structure-wells, fence	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	0	0	
A1.3.10 Train 120 HHs in conservation agriculture & vegetable farming	2014	Feb-16	143 farmers	132 farmers	120 farmers	
A1.3.11 Select and trial individual entrepreneur vegetable farmer	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	0	0	
A1.3.11 Install simple water extraction technology to 4 sites	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	0	0	
A1.3.12 Market vegetables	2014	Feb-16	5 gardens	4 gardens	4 gardens	

A1.3.13 Identify/Select 5 cassava bulking sites	2014	Feb-16	5 cassava bulking sites	0	0	
A1.3.15 Avail improved cassava cuttings to farmers for bulking.	2014	Feb-16	5 cassava bulking sites	0	0	
A1.3.16 Establish 5 cassava bulking farms	2014	Feb-16	5 cassava bulking sites	4 cassava bulking sites	0	
A1.3.17 Train 900 farmers in cassava growing	2014	Feb-16	100 farmers	200 farmers	300 farmers	
A1.3.18 Procure and bulk cassava cuttings	2014	Feb-16	5 cassava bulking sites	4 cassava bulking sites	0	
A1.3.19 Select and trial individual cassava cuttings bulking farms.	2014	Feb-16	5 cassava bulking sites	4 cassava bulking sites	0	
A1.3.20 Market cassava	2014	Feb-16	5 cassava bulking sites	4 cassava bulking sites	0	
A1.4.1 Identify/select 400 beneficiaries	2014	Feb-16				
A1.4.2 Train 400 farmers on post-harvest	2014	Feb-16	522 farmers	200 farmers	0	
A1...3 Identify and source store technician	2014	Feb-16	5 technicians	0	0	
A1.4.4 Procure building materials	2014	Feb-16	82 farmers	318 farmers	0	
A1.4.5 Improve	2014	Feb-16	82 stores	318 stores	0	

[illegible]

Contracts and supplies.

Please list all contracts (works, supplies, services) above € 60 000 awarded for the implementation of the action during the reporting period, giving for each contract the amount, the name of the contractor and a brief description on how the contractor was selected.

There was no single contract above €60,000 awarded for the implementation of the action during the reporting period.

2.4 Work plan

Table 18: updated action plan for the future activities of the project³

Activities and sub-activities	2016												2017		Implementing body
	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb		
Title of activity: ox-plough promotion															
A1.1.1 Establish 4 animal traction training centres															HARD and animal traction TOTs
A1.1.2 Train 160 animal traction trainers															HARD and animal traction TOTs
A1.1.3 Link farmers to agro-dealers to supply animal traction equipment.															HARD and agro dealers
A1.1.5 Distribute 60 ox-weeders for trial purposes															HARD and animal traction TOTs
Title of the activity: Extension and training															
A1.2.2 Give refresher training to CAWHs/CORPs															HARD and CAD
A1.2.3 Establish 8 demo farms															HARD
A1.2.4 Establish 10 Farmer Field Schools (FFSs)															HARD
A1.2.5 Establish 10 Young FFSs															HARD and School Management
A1.2.6 Train 6 Ministry of Agriculture & 12 project extension staff															HARD and Consultant
A1.2.7 Hold 8 field days in each Payam															HARD and CAD

³ This plan will cover the financial period between the interim report and the next report.

[illegible]

A1.3.19 Select and trial individual cassava cuttings bulking farms.																									HARD and CADs
A1.3.20 Market cassava																									Cassava groups
Title of the activity: post-harvest management																									
A1.4.1 Identify/select 300 beneficiaries of post harvest management																									HARD
A1.4.2 Train 300 farmers on post-harvest																									HARD and CADs
A1.4.4 Procure building materials																									HARD.
A1.4.5 Improve 150 stores																									HARD and beneficiaries
Title of the activity: Marketing of surplus produce.																									
A1.4.6 Train farmers on leadership																									HARD
A1.4.7 Link farmers to private processors																									HARD
A1.4.8 Train 5 farmers groups dynamics																									HARD
A1.4.9 Train 5 farmer groups leaders																									HARD
A1.4.10 Facilitate legalize 5 farmer groups																									HARD
A1.4.11 Develop Market Information System																									HARD and department of cooperatives

3. Beneficiaries/affiliated entities and other Cooperation

3.1 Relationship with beneficiaries and affiliated entities.

How do you assess the relationship between the beneficiaries/affiliated entities of this grant contract (i.e. those having signed the mandate for the Coordinator or the affiliated entity statement)? Please provide specific information for each beneficiary/affiliated entity.

HARD implements the project directly and as such, there are not other partners that are party to this contract.

3.2 Relationship with State authorities.

How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

So far, the project has developed collaborative and supportive relationship with the State Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources and Forestry (SMoAARF). The project is implemented under the supervision of State Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources and Forestry. Over-sighting of the project by SMoAARF is done through different ways; first, there are monthly coordination meetings where progress of the project is presented not only to the Ministry but also other partners working in the food security sector, secondly; the Ministry has appointed a focal person to be responsible regular contact with the SORUDEV project; thirdly, The Director General and the focal person attend EU partners' quarterly coordination meetings and finally, there are one on one meetings with officials in the Ministry and field supervision visits.

At the County level, the staff at the three CADs participate in implementation of project activities. The project provided motorcycles to the CADs which are being used in the implementation and supervision of project activities which has immensely increased the mobility of staff. Moreover, as mentioned in the activities section above, the project has contributed to capacity development of CAD extension staff through exposure to training activities. However, one of the main challenges is that the staff of Jur River and Wau CADs are not based at the County headquarters due to lack of facilities. This makes it difficult for farmers to contact them when they are needed.

3.3 Relationship with other organisations

Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any)

None

- Contractor(s) (if any)

None

- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups

The project has developed rapport with beneficiaries and target groups and as there have been no cases of hostility towards the project staff and/or activities. The feedback that is usually obtained from local leaders which include executive chiefs and local government officials has so far been positive. The leaders are satisfied with the support that the project provides to the beneficiaries. HARD also has small operational bases within the communities which makes it easier for the beneficiaries to contact staff for support.

On the other hand, the project works with different beneficiary groups. The relationship with these groups has been good though in some cases, there are requests for free distribution of inputs which SORUDEV does not provide. This has at times led to a situation where some farmers are reluctant to participate in the project if the inputs are not supplied. Different approaches used by other partners when dealing with beneficiary groups at times conflict with the project approach. For instance, some other partners provide payments to beneficiary committees which are at variance with the approach adopted by SORUDEV project.

- Other third parties involved (including other donors, other government agencies or local government units, NGOs, etc.)

The other NGO/donor involved in the project is Christian Aid (CA) which has provided co-finance to the project. CA continues to provide on-going monitoring, technical and organisation support not only to the project but HARD as a whole. Some staff working on the project have also benefited from capacity development activities funded by CA. So far the monitoring feedback acknowledges the progress of the implementation of activities as being on track and some results have been achieved.

3.4 Synergies with other actions.

Where applicable, outline any links and synergies you have developed with other actions.

SORUDEV programme is being implemented in the greater Bahr el Ghazal region in the former four states. The programme is being implemented by 4 different NGOs, HARD being one of them. Furthermore, in the same region there are also EU funded projects being implemented under the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP). HARD continues to learn from and network with all these interventions so as to inform its implementation strategies and improve project performance. HARD has networked with and learned from NPA in the former Lakes state on the management of animal tractors centres and the role of blacksmiths in the production of local tools and spare parts of ox-ploughs. It is a model which the project is exploring considering that, in the rural areas there are blacksmiths that produce tools but are faced with lack of capital and raw materials.

Secondly, the project is also collaborating with ZEAT-BEAD partners to; share implementation experiences, collaborate and ensure there are synergies are derived and sustained. The project has agreed with UNIDO to collaborate on training of farmers and artisans in improved post harvest management. In addition, the project will mobilise farmers to take advantage of sorghum processing centre which is being set up by UNIDO in Kangi in Jur River County. The project supports farmers in the surrounding bomas of Kangi, Kayango, Barurud and Athor which are likely to take advantage of the sorghum processing centres thus providing an outlet to farm produce.

Thirdly, the project has also been in contact with GIZ on how best to make use of the proposed agricultural warehouse which will be constructed in Kangi, Jur River County. Since the warehouse will be run under the Public Private Partnership (PPP), the project will explore possibilities of having the private operator stock farm inputs such as; hoes, improved seeds and ox-ploughs as part of the goods to be sold in the warehouse. The

project is supporting smallholder farmers in the bomas neighbouring the proposed site for the warehouse and it would be a good market out let for their produce.

Fourthly, HARD is working in partnership with UNOPS on community mobilisation in feeder road construction. This road will provide vital link to the markets in Kangi and Wau besides increasing access to services such as health centres and schools. In addition, there are work groups which are being established along the feeder road and the project is will work with them to start VSLAs and also engage in agricultural production.

Finally, there are on-going discussions with FAO on how to work together with their project titled, Sustainable Agricultural Development through Input Supply, Extension and Services Project. The project is currently being rolled but so far, there have been communication in taking part in curriculum development for training of Community Based Local Extension Workers (CBLEWs). Since SORUDEV project has been working with CORPs, it would be important to link them with the FAO project so that they can be considered as CBLEWs if they meet the requirements. The FAO implemented project is also planning to offer loans to farmers/VSLAs which will later turn into revolving funds. Therefore, there are likely to be important lessons to learn from this initiative since the project has also offered loans to farmers in the period under review.

3.4 Previous grants.

If your organisation has received previous EU grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EU grants).

In 2010, HARD got funding from EU to implement a three-year food security project under the FSTP. The project was implemented in Jur River County which is one of the target counties for the current project. There were several results that were delivered by that project which is currently being built upon. The promotion of ox-ploughs was very successful and the project has been using the lessons learned such as the training of animal traction TOTs and the setting up of animal traction centres.

There were also some vegetable groups which were set up and are still operational. Some of them have been supported to establish VSLAs as a way of to mobilise their resources.

4. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

The project continues to ensure that the contribution of EU to the project is highlighted in different way. Banners, stickers, signboards, branding of project assets, EU flag and reports and publications have all been produced as part of visibility. During meetings, the role of EU is mentioned and it is included in all presentations which are made.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on the EuropeAid website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: Cleto Ireneo Kunda, Executive Director

Signature: Cleto Kunda

Location: Wau, South Sudan

Annexes.**Annex 1: Number of VSLAs per boma**

County	Payam	Target Bomas	Number of VSLAs
Jur River	RocRoc Dong	Akorok	1
	Marial Bai	Acumcum	2
	Kuajena	Marolakec	4
	Kuajena	Kuajena	2
	RocRoc Dong	Achot	1
	WuaBai	Tharkueng	2
	WuaBai	Cumcok	2
	Udici	Kayango	3
	Marial Bai	Marial Bai	0
	Kangi	Barurud	0
	Kangi	Athor	0
	Kangi	Kangi	0
	Udici	Gette	1
Raja	Uyujuku	Mangayat	2
	Uyujuku	Sopo	6
	Uyujuku	Uyujuku	5
	Uyujuku	Yabulu	1
Wau	Bessilia	Mboro	1
	Bessilia	Abushaka	1
	Bazia	Napataguru	1
	Bazia	Bazia	1
	Bazia	Gumaba	1
	Baggare	Ngodakala	1
	Baggare	Bagare	1
Total			39

Annex 2: Detailed VSLA data.

County	Payam	Boma	Number of males	Number of females	Total number of members	Total savings (SSP)	Total loans (SSP)	Interest earned (SSP)
Jur River	Rocrokdong	Akorok	16	14	30	750	655	-
Jur River	Marialbai	Acumcum	15	10	25	4,725	985	-
Jur River	Marialbai	Acumcum	17	8	25	2,905	1,900	-
Jur River	Kuajena	Marolakec	2	22	24	9,926	-	-
Jur River	Kuajena	Marolakec	20	10	30	1,905	-	-
Jur River	Kuajena	Marolakec	16	14	30	4,700	-	-
Jur River	Kuajena	Kuajena	15	10	25	-	-	-
Jur River	Rocroc dong	Achot	6	9	15	6,960	470	-
Jur River	Kuajena	Marolakec	16	14	30	1,800	-	-
Jur River	Kuajena	Kuajena	21	4	25	-	-	-
Jur River	Waubai	Tharkueng	25	0	25	13,028	2,400	,182
Jur River	Waubai	Tharkueng	0	25	25	10,000	3,430	643
Jur River	Waubai	Cumcok	7	15	22	12,755	3,000	3,363
Jur River	Waubai	Cumcok	13	11	22	12,370	3,350	2,565
Jur River	Uduci	Kayango	8	17	25	1,258	955	1,625
Jur River	Uduci	Kayango	8	17	25	1,258	400	470
Jur River	Uduci	Gette	11	14	25	8,840	3,310	335
Jur River	Uduci	Kayango	16	9	25	1,500	-	1,263
Raja	Uyujuku	Mangayat	11	14	25	9,375	-	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Mangayat	14	11	25	6,256	-	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Sopo	12	13	25	2,298	600	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Sopo	10	15	25	1,000	500	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Sopo	10	15	25	700	700	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Sopo	13	12	25	5,000	3,000	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Sopo	14	11	25	1,500	1,000	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Sopo	15	10	25	870	400	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Uyujuku	20	1	21	130	-	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Uyujuku	20	5	25	3,999	-	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Uyujuku	19	6	25	5,650	2,500	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Yabulu	20	5	25	3,000	300	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Uyujuku	14	11	25	260	-	-
Raja	Uyujuku	Uyujuku	17	8	25	2,200	-	-
Wau	Beselia	Mboro	13	10	23	6,800	1,800	-
Wau	Beselia	Abushaka	13	11	24	345	630	-
Wau	Bazia	Napataguru	11	14	25	980	350	-
Wau	Bazia	Bazia	16	9	25	-	-	-
Wau	Bazia	Gumaba	4	21	25	-	-	-
Wau	Bagare	Ngodakala	12	9	21	1,100	-	-

Wau	Bagare	Bagare	16	6	22	1,900	900	-
TOTAL			526	440	964	148,043	33,535	11,446

Annex 3: Photo gallery covering the four result areas.

1. Increased land area under cultivation.



Farmers using ox-plough in Marol Akec boma



Ploughing in Acumcum boma

2. Increased promotion and adoption of appropriate agricultural practices



Groundnut demonstration farm in Khorjamus boma



Learning improved practices in Ngondakala boma



VSLA activities in Abushaka boma



VSLA group in Bussere boma

3. Increased diversification of crops grown through integrated fruit trees, vegetables and cassava farming.



Cassava bulking farm in Kayongo boma



Vegetable production farm in Kuanya boma

4. Improved post harvest handling and management & increased adoption of post harvest storage facilities and marketing of surplus farm produce.



Dried maize cobs ready for storage



Improved granary demonstrated in Barurud boma

Annex 4: Visibility materials.



Signboard at Ngindakala boma, Wau County



EU flag



T-shirt



SORUDEV banner