Annex 1: Interim Cooperation Framework (2016-2017): Results and Resources Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | **Indicators, baseline, targets** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **Indicative budget** |
| **Outcome 1: Enhancing the resilience of communities** | **Indicator 1.1:** % of targeted communities using 11 coping strategies or below. Coping Strategy Index (CSI), disaggregated by sex of household head  **Baseline (2014)**: (rCSI): 50% of targeted communities use more than 11 coping strategies  **Target (2017):** 100 % of targeted communities reduce the number of coping strategies to 11 or below (out of a score of 56)  **Indicator 1.2:** Number of targeted communities have increased assets over the baseline  **Baseline (2014):** None of targeted communities have average of 2.4 functional assets  **Target (2017):** 250 communities have community assets over the baseline average of 2.4 functional assets | Post Distribution Outcome Monitoring  Resilience Context Analysis  Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System (FSNMS) | Community participation in activity and site selection and management starts at project inception and remains ongoing  Value of entitlement is attractive against work norms  Entitlements and complementary resources are sufficient to prevent negative coping strategies  Entitlements are supplemented by complementary foods, provided by partners or otherwise available  Households have access to local functioning markets  Limited price/currency inflation or fluctuation | **USD 194 million** |
| **Indicator 1.3**: % households with acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS)  **Baseline (2015):** 44% with population in target areas have acceptable food consumption.  **Target (2017):** 65% of target population have acceptable food consumption scores. |

| **Results** | **Indicators, baseline, targets** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **Indicative budget** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2: Strengthening social services for the most vulnerable** | **Indicator 2.1:** Proportion of births attended by skilled health professionals  **Baseline (2013)**: 11%  **Target (2017)**: 25% | In-Patient Department records, Health MIS, Ante Natal Care records | Investment in health infrastructure and human resources required  Lack of resources and insecurity | **USD 383 million** |
|  | **Indicator 2.2:** Moderate acute malnutrition treatment recovery rate in children and pregnant and lactating women  **Baseline (2014)** : 85%  **Target (2017)**: No less than 75% | Programme monitoring, partner reports, Health MIS | Partner capacity must be present  Ability to access care points and funding |  |
|  | **Indicator 2.3**: % of children and adults enrolled in education (sex-disaggregated)  **Baseline (2015)**: 35% Primary Net Enrollment Rate (30% girl, 39% boys); adults: 16% women, 40% men  **Target (2017):** 40% Primary NER (35% girls, 45% boys); adults 20% women, 44% men | Monitoring reports with sex-disaggregated figures, Education MIS | Peace prevails in most states and IDPs return home  Increased insecurity |  |

| **Results** | **Indicators, baseline, targets** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **Indicative budget** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 3: Strengthening peace and governance** | **Indicator 3.1:** Number of targeted governance and security reforms are implemented  **Baseline (2015):** The constitution review process, legislative, military and civil service reforms agreed as part of the peace agreement  **Target (2017):** 16 civil service institutions reformed, 3 rule of law institutions’ Acts reviewed, permanent constitution drafted.  **Indicator 3.2:** Percent of respondents who report increased personal safety and security disaggregated by gender.  **Baseline:(2015):** 28.1% (male 27.1% and female 29.5%) respondents withconfidence in peace, safety and security  **Target (2017):** 50% (48% men and 52% women)  **Indicator 3.3**: Percent of transitional governance mechanisms with CSO/media participation.  **Baseline (2015):** 0[[1]](#footnote-1)  **Target (2017):** 80% | | Government gazette  Permanent constitution and NCRC reports  Government line ministries reports  National perception survey and Information | Peace agreement holds  Donors actively and urgently re-engage  Political will to implement this response  UNCT is able to bring in the right internal capacity and agility  High level buy in from Organized Forces ensures UNCT is given access to state owned armories and stock  TGoNU will not be able to take joint decisions.  Competing interests within IGAD member states may compromise implementation of the agreement  Failure to pass a new UNMISS mandate that enables engagement on core aspects of the peace agreement  Macro-economic stability does not improve, perpetuating tensions, grievances and diminishes opportunities for recovery and return | **USD 144 million** |
|  | | South Sudan Interim Cooperation |
| **Results** | **Indicators, baseline, targets** | | **Means of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **Indicative Budget** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 4: Reinvigoration of the local economy Reinvigorated** | **Indicator 4.1:** Number of value chain enabling strategies in agriculture, livestock and fisheries  **Baseline (2015):** 4 strategies  **Target (2017):** 4 additional strategies  **Indicator 4.2**: Number of Cooperatives and Micro Small and Medium sized Enterprises in place for production and marketing of produce  **Baseline (2015): 70**  **Target (2017): 60** new cooperatives and MSMEs formed  **Indicator 4.3:** # of people benefiting from micro-finance/lending initiatives  **Baseline (2013):** 25, 000 clients  **Target (2017)**: 30, 000 clients (50% women and 50% men) | WFP and FAO crop assessment Reports  Purchase for Progress (P4P) reports  Business registration reports from Ministry of Justice | Peace agreement is implemented in its letter and spirit and provides a stable policy and regulatory environment with wide ranging structural economic reforms carried out in a calibrated way whilst protecting the poor  Macro-economic reforms and exchange rate stabilization initiatives are in place  Private sector is willing to invest and engage  Communities are able to accept change and uptake new technology and interventions  Donors are convinced of the sustainability of peace and begin to support development programmes  Economic services may not be targeted properly  Increased economic activities may not benefit women equally/in proportionate measures  Donors may not be willing to support the peace agreement in a comprehensive and cohesive way  Macro-economic stability may not improve, perpetuating tensions, grievances and diminishes opportunities for recovery and return | **USD 156 million** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | **Indicators, baseline, target** | **Means of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **Indicative resources** |
| **Outcome 5 - Cross-cutting improvement of the status of Women and Youth** | **Indicator 5.1:** % of women in parliament; % of women in cabinet ministerial positions  **Baseline (2015)**: 26.5%; 10%  **Target: (2017)** 30% and 15% according to the prevision of the Peace agreement | Ministry of Information/ South, Records of Parliament | Direct or indirect pressure of conservative forces against women’s engagement;  Government commitment to women empowerment.  Direct or indirect pressure of conservative forces against youth empowerment | Cross-cutting: Resources provided under the four outcomes |

1. 5 suggested institutions/mechanisms in the peace agreement with an allocation for CSO involvement, not started any activity [↑](#footnote-ref-1)