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Foreword

Despite unparalleled international investment in South Sudan, renewed and widespread conflict broke out in December 2013, less than three years after the population voted for independence from Sudan. Tens of thousands have been killed and over 1.5 million displaced.

It is only our South Sudanese friends who can win peace for South Sudan. But we as international partners can help or hinder them.

In our parliamentary report of 2007, we argued strongly for a greater emphasis on the implementation of Article 1.7 in the CPA, clearly demanding a comprehensive approach to reconciliation. In our last inquiry, published in 2010, we stressed the same message. Today, we can see the disastrous effect of the South Sudan leadership’s failure and unwillingness to peacefully address the legacies of the past civil war. Key to changing the situation is that these leaders - and all of us as friends of South Sudan - must embody some humility and openness to learn from what we have done well, and where we need to improve.

We urge the UK and our international partners to stand firm in our long-term commitment to the South Sudanese people, to learn from past experiences and from those dedicated peacemakers who have much to teach us, and above all to reconnect with the culture, society and politics of South Sudan to ensure that our support contributes to long-term peace.

There have already been a number of reports that have contributed to the debate around how we need to recalibrate our approach to South Sudan. Our Hearings have particular importance because they have offered an opportunity to bring a very wide range of people and expertise together, initially with the submissions received from over 30 organisations and individuals, and then in oral evidence and confidential sessions which allowed the Committee to talk to NGOs, Ministers, advocacy and human rights groups, as well as international political representatives.

This report distils some of that evidence into concrete recommendations for the international community. It is one step in a process that needs to lead to action, and the APPG will be using these recommendations to continue its efforts to influence policy and enhance political engagement. The contents reflect the views of the panel only and all errors are ours.

This report is at times critical. However, we express great appreciation and huge respect to everyone who has given their time and expertise to our inquiry and all who work tirelessly for peace, justice and development for all the peoples of Sudan and South Sudan.

Signed
William Bain MP
Mark Durkan MP
Sir Roger Gale
Earl of Sandwich
Lord Alton
Baroness Cox
Baroness Kinnock
Peter Everington, Expert
About the All Party Parliamentary Group for Sudan and South Sudan

The All Party Parliamentary Group for Sudan and South Sudan is a political campaigning group promoting the cause of peace, human rights, justice and development for the people of Sudan and South Sudan across Westminster and Whitehall.

The Group was formed in 1998 in response to concerns raised by Sudanese Diaspora Groups about the political, economic and social situation in their country and as a result of the desire of UK Parliamentarians to highlight this situation. Based in Westminster, the group has established a growing membership of over 100 British MPs and Peers across political parties. Since its inception the Group has acted as the key forum in Parliament for actively debating and highlighting key issues on Sudan and South Sudan.
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Executive Summary

When South Sudan erupted into conflict in December 2013, the last flickers of the optimism that had followed independence were extinguished. The responsibility for South Sudan’s current state of conflict must ultimately lie with the country’s political leadership. Yet, this does not preclude the question of what the international community could have done differently following South Sudan’s independence and what lessons can be drawn for future engagement.

International political will was not the problem. South Sudan’s independence was met with widespread international enthusiasm and substantial diplomatic and financial support. We need not, therefore, ask ourselves whether we engaged enough with South Sudan, but rather, whether our strategy for engagement was constructive. Based on evidence from top-level diplomats, international NGOs, South Sudanese religious leaders, civil society representatives, independent experts and the UK government, this report seeks to present an answer to that question, and from that answer, draw out some practical lessons and actionable recommendations for improving international engagement with South Sudan in the future.

Throughout our inquiry, the evidence pointed to a widespread disconnect between the activities of South Sudan’s international partners and political and social realities inside the country. Whilst some international actors had an excellent understanding of the unfolding situation, comprehensive conflict analysis was not properly integrated into donor development planning and was paid insufficient attention by many, leading to faulty assumptions and missed opportunities.

The committee heard that there was a tendency within the international development community to emphasise stabilisation and short-term outcomes over transformation and long-term goals. This increased the gap between the kind of support that was required and that which was offered. Moving forward, the international community must pursue an approach better tailored to South Sudan’s needs by integrating conflict sensitivity into all development and peacebuilding activities, giving greater attention to those at the social and political fringes, and working more closely with South Sudanese staff and analysts. Diplomatic attention must more carefully balance important regional priorities with emerging domestic developments and this will require much greater investment in diplomatic resourcing.

The long term need for reconciliation must be addressed. The submissions illustrated how the failure to implement proper reconciliation and healing processes in the past has allowed the tensions and grievances from previous conflicts to persist. These open wounds have been a significant driver in the recent outbreak of fighting. There is no ‘good time’ to begin reconciliation, but from now on sustained peacebuilding efforts should focus on
addressing these longstanding unresolved issues as well as the fresh rifts caused by the latest bout of violence and the recent history of poor governance.

Witnesses stressed that reconciliation must be multi-layered and look to achieve far more than a settlement between warring factions. There must be a formal and informal South Sudan directed national dialogue as well as community level reconciliation and healing processes. Justice and accountability mechanisms must also be integrated into any post-conflict transition. Contrary to what happened following the CPA, this will require international partners to increase engagement following any peace settlement, and we can begin preparing for these now by supporting human rights monitoring activities and engaging with a much broader range of civil society actors.

The committee heard that South Sudan’s independence period has been marked by shrinking political space, a problem ingrained in the culture of war which dominates South Sudanese politics. To counteract this, the international community could do more to help bolster independent media and support cross-cutting and harder to reach civil society groups in order to promote a vibrant and open political space. Some criticism was levelled at international actors for failing to maximise past opportunities to challenge the authoritarian trajectory in governance that South Sudan’s political elite has been able to maintain.

Concerning security sector reform (SSR), the APPG learned that the international community was too slow with its interventions following the CPA, enabling developments within the security sector that were detrimental to reform and difficult to undo. International SSR efforts were further hampered by a failure to properly respond to the known divisions within the fractious security sector, avlack of attention to the police, poor coordination and a lack of political and diplomatic leverage.

The UN Mission is now sheltering unprecedented numbers of IDPs in its bases and for this timely readjustment of focus, UNMISS was commended. However, the disconnect between overarching strategy and local realities is probably most evident in the work of this mission. UNMISS needed to both better understand its national and local operating contexts and, importantly, to face up to available analyses. In the Independence period and the first few months of the conflict, UNMISS’s complex mandate integrating peacekeeping with state-building meant that UNMISS worked too closely with the Government of South Sudan, compromising both its image of neutrality and its ability to protect civilians. The UN Security Council did well to revise the Mission’s mandate in May to prioritise civilian protection but a number of submissions stressed that UNMISS now needs significant support from the international community to improve both the conditions of IDP camps and its ability to successfully protect the 95% of displaced persons living beyond the confines of its bases. Effective communication of UNMISS’s mandate will be key to enabling future activities.

It was widely recognised that international donors have given substantial support to the humanitarian response. Due to the scale of the crisis, however, a number of areas were identified as demanding greater attention, including: IDPs living outside of UN bases, the prevention and response to gender-based violence and improving access to education. The UK was praised for its on-going long term commitment to supporting education in South Sudan and other actors should be encouraged to follow its example. The APPG learned that economic development would benefit from greater investment in the agricultural and pastoralist sectors, with sufficient timescales for projects and respect for primary and secondary community rights (which have been too often trampled on to irreversible effect). Protecting oilfields from further damage would also be a major investment in the future of South Sudan. Throughout all economic development planning, there must be an understanding that the current distribution of wealth and opportunity is tied up with political and military interest and undermined by massive and pervasive corruption.

The lessons to be learnt are many, but the APPG has identified three central issues that form the heart of our findings:

- **International partners must resist a preference for short-term fixes that come at the expense of transformative solutions.** The APPG believes that the situation in South Sudan is a long-term and complex problem that demands a suitably sustained, far-sighted response. We cannot expect to achieve lasting peace with quick fixes. In the past, this type of approach has engendered a neglect of reconciliation and healing at all levels. As a result, the international community has been building assiduously on cracked foundations, and, inevitably, the country has crumbled. Moving forwards,
reconciliation and healing must be a central concern.

• **Practitioners must allow the conclusions of conflict analysis to affect and alter activities:** It is not enough simply to conduct conflict analysis. This analysis must be allowed to permeate diplomatic engagement and programme design and to challenge entrenched ways of working. Power dynamics pervade the behaviour of domestic actors in South Sudan and where our activities have not reflected this, mistakes have been made. Donors should recruit and encourage individuals with more country experience, more courage to challenge the status quo within and without their organisations, and a demonstrable desire to engage deeply with peoples and issues. Donors must also give these personnel the time and resources to explore and integrate conflict analysis and undertake regular risk monitoring. Technical staff and political analysts have been working side by side but not together. Unless we successfully bridge this disconnect, we may continue to offer a response, but could do better to support a resolution.

• **The international community must engage more widely, deeply and consistently with the people of South Sudan.** Peacebuilding must be South Sudan-led and owned if it is to take root and flourish. This presents the international community with the complex and delicate challenge of ensuring that important issues are addressed without being the ones to address them. This will not be easy but the APPG believes that this difficult balance would be more achievable if the international community were to work more closely with the people of South Sudan and display the level of inclusivity that it hopes a future government would also demonstrate. South Sudanese from much wider sections of society should be more frequently consulted formally and informally. South Sudanese staff should be more heavily involved in planning and delivery of donor activities and given greater responsibilities. International personnel should on average spend more time outside of the donor bubble to explore the country and talk to a wider range of people. The South Sudanese, all South Sudanese, must be considered partners in peace.
# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF</td>
<td>Common Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHPR</td>
<td>Committee for National Healing, Peace and Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Peace Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Disaster Emergency Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>UK Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPKO</td>
<td>Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUSR</td>
<td>European Union Special Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO</td>
<td>UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoS</td>
<td>Government of Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSS</td>
<td>Government of South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Inter-Governmental Authority for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>National Congress Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRC</td>
<td>National Constitutional Review Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAG</td>
<td>Other Armed Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td>Rest and Relaxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCSO</td>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator Support Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoSS</td>
<td>Republic of South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>Sudan Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLA</td>
<td>Sudan People's Liberation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLM</td>
<td>Sudan People's Liberation Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLM-DC</td>
<td>Sudan People's Liberation Movement – Democratic Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRSG</td>
<td>Special Representative of the Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSDP</td>
<td>South Sudan Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSDF</td>
<td>South Sudan Defence Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIM</td>
<td>South Sudan Independence Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>Security Sector Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKSR</td>
<td>United Kingdom Special Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMISS</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKTI</td>
<td>United Kingdom Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overarching Vision and Strategy

Whilst the international community has funnelled significant resources, time and energy into South Sudan, violence and instability persist and have progressively degenerated. Ultimately, this is because South Sudan’s politicians have been unwilling to address the root-causes of unrest.

International partners have provided substantial support to the South Sudanese people through basic service delivery, complex and expensive humanitarian logistics, and through funding a peacekeeping mission. It is also essential to recall that the relationship between Sudan and South Sudan was defined by extreme volatility through 2011-2013. The shutdown of South Sudan’s oil production, the full military confrontation in Heglig in April 2012 and the situation in Abyei all demanded serious attention. International partners played an active role in averting full-scale military confrontation between the two countries, paving the way for oil exports to recommence and working to address cross-border conflict dynamics.

However, international partners must also show humility as well as celebrate achievements. Civil unrest in South Sudan, whether directed against the Turco-Egyptian Turkiya (1821-1883), the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium (1898-1956) or the Government of Sudan (1956-2011) has always reflected perceived political exclusion, the sense that communities are marginalised and unable to meaningfully participate in their country’s governance. International partner strategy, if there was a unified, clearly developed one in South Sudan, has been unable to transform this root-cause of conflict.

Two particular aspects of international community engagement with South Sudan have undermined its well-intentioned efforts towards the fledgling state and discouraged a focus on underlying problems. The first of these aspects is a tendency towards technical, process-driven approaches based on international ‘best practice’. This discouraged more long-term, transformative activities and overlooked authoritarian tendencies in order to achieve success in the imperative of improved Sudan-South Sudan relations. The second is the disproportionate attention given to Juba and the central government.

When state-building and development are approached with an emphasis on technical
which international engagement with South Sudan could have inadvertently reinforced rather than alleviated some root drivers of conflict. Moving forward, it is imperative that international engagement with South Sudan better responds to local realities, promotes inclusion and closes the disconnect between government and civil society by working actively towards resolving it. This will entail a greater effort to reach outside of Juba, engaging with a broader range of actors and tailoring plans to meet country-wide needs as opposed to technical ends: in short, reflecting the inclusiveness that we encourage the GoSS itself to emulate.

Recommendations

Any future statebuilding work must be balanced by longer term transformative activities involving independent institutions and communities. Purely technical and process-driven approaches to state-building and development in South Sudan should be avoided.

An understanding and sensitivity towards the root-causes and drivers of conflict should inform and shape every state-building, peacebuilding and development initiative. Everybody, whatever their power or position in the development, economic or political spheres, must look upon it as a personal responsibility to ensure that strategy is not set in stone and is alive to ongoing developments.

The international community must engage with the whole country, expanding its support to activities and initiatives that reach not only those who are easily accessible, but also those at the political, social and geographic peripheries. Moving forward, a much broader range of South Sudanese must be the agents and drivers of development and peacebuilding.

Conflict and Political Analysis

There was a widespread recognition among international partners that conflict analysis was important and the APPG heard that decision-makers had reasonable access to information and power analysis. However, there was a lack of willingness to really engage with the issues this analysis threw up, which could have required riskier longer-term programming. The weaknesses in the international community's overarching strategy were compounded therefore by the failure to adequately act on comprehensive, integrated conflict and political
A long time prior to the outbreak of conflict in December 2013, the schisms within the SPLM and their potential to be divisive nationally were clearly apparent. However, international prioritisation of Sudan-South Sudan relations, though reasonable, provided limited room for manoeuvre in South Sudan. Throughout 2013, evidence of growing tensions within the party was visible both to South Sudanese and international observers. Signals of political turbulence within the governing party included the dismissal of the elected Governor of Unity state (albeit in questionable electoral conditions) and the suspension of Cabinet Affairs Minister Deng Alor and Minister of Finance Kosti Manibe on alleged corruption charges as well as growing public criticism of President Salva Kiir by Vice-President Riek Machar and Secretary General of the SPLM Pagan Amum Okiech. There were numerous serious and sustained armed rebellions between 2011-2013 and the number of conflict-affected South Sudanese who were internally displaced reached 188,526 by the end of November 2013.

At the community level, the post-independence period was marked the rapid restriction of political space, increased intimidation of political dissenters, increased misuse of power by the security services and rampant corruption by those who claimed to represent. These attacks on individual dignities were not well documented and did not permeate far into the consciousness of international personnel living in South Sudan. Violent skirmishes occurred involving numerous tribes, a number of which continued to feel disaffected and marginalised despite secession. Massive proliferation of small arms, cattle raiding, militia rebellions and domestic violence continued to be widespread. War in Jonglei and Unity was resurgent and in some parts had not really stopped since before the CPA. Community conflicts also broke out in Warrap and Lakes States after independence.

The EU, UN, US and UK should be commended for putting pressure on the Government over reported human rights violations by the SPLA and in their response to the Jonglei crisis. The APPG also heard that diplomatic representations to the SPLA about the need to resolve internal political divisions were frequent. However, despite political awareness and engagement with some of the core issues, overarching development strategy towards South Sudan was not adapted.

Following the eruption of conflict in December 2013, international development partners were unabashedly unprepared for the political instability or the violence that followed. Whilst the speed at which conflict escalated and the levels of its intensity perhaps could not have been predicted, the potential for large-scale violence was known long before the fighting initially broke out. Importantly, in light of the available analyses, the international community should have adapted its approach more significantly to counteract these tensions to respond, for example, to armed rebellion, shrinking political space, corruption or politicisation of Traditional Authority.

Although a significant amount of conflict analysis and political reporting was undertaken and available, a real problem was therefore the disconnect between the existing conflict analysis stemming from research and political reporting and the more technical development plans (for example, the New Deal Compact) which were being pursued on a separate track and which developed their own momentum without paying sufficient attention to the rapidly evolving political backdrop.

These technical plans transferred established state-building practices which had been used elsewhere and pasted them onto South Sudan without enough consideration of the specificity of the situation. Consequently, the international community overemphasised stabilisation programmes and invested in security only to find that this money was used by factions to strengthen themselves against their rivals. A greater focus on dialogue and reconciliation would have begun addressing these divisions, rather than entrenching them.

However, the disconnect was not limited to development actors. This is starkly illustrated by the fact that, just six weeks before the outbreak of the conflict and despite clear warnings of mounting tension by the EUSR and EU political officers, the post of EU Special Representative for Sudan and South Sudan was terminated and the mandate was merged with that of the EU Special Representative for the Horn of Africa, who already had a wide remit.

Within parts of UNMISS too, there was a tendency to take political developments too lightly or worse, to willingly overlook them. When President Kiir dismissed his cabinet in July 2013 in order to purge his political rivals, including Riek Machar, UNMISS failed to fully appreciate the great and dangerous rifts that this had created. Indeed, as late as 18 November 2013, the then SRSG briefed the UN Security
Council that she was cautiously optimistic about recent developments in South Sudan.

There was also a lack of recognition by UNMISS of the deep-seated tensions at the community level. The UN mission’s attention to these local conflict dynamics could have been improved by widening the scope and resourcing of its analysis to outside of Juba and the state capitals. There was too little engagement with the views of those who did not live in the main towns and as a result, the UNMISS leadership in Juba and the state capitals was perhaps aware of the extent of the residual trauma from the civil war era, but did not respond adequately to how this was feeding into contemporary political developments. The lack of infrastructure combined with the high levels of insecurity outside Juba has meant that expanding research beyond the capital is no easy task. However, the committee heard that with an increase in numbers and the right level of logistical support, teams of UN civil affairs staff showed considerable variation in their skillset and motivation, from excellent to bordering lazy. It was possible for these individuals to get out of their bases and state capitals much more often and some with appropriate motivation and skills did a fantastic job in supporting reconciliation initiatives and showed a great understanding of their states. The problem has been one of low priority placed by the whole mission in engaging with the people of South Sudan - why, for example, in a mission base of thousands have a single desk for a lone civil affairs officer? - and culture: little presence within towns centres and UN staff largely living in base bubbles. These two factors contributed to a situation in which communities deeply resented the huge resources spent on simply maintaining the (relatively comfortable) bases of UN staff.

The lack of focus on conflict dynamics at both the national and local levels was further compounded by a longstanding tendency to work towards donor driven deadlines, which creates a preference for quick fixes as opposed to long-term solutions to complex problems. The result of this in South Sudan was that the view of the country as being in a post-conflict state was not re-assessed even when political developments implied the contrary, and despite the availability of research and analysis documenting these dynamics. Therefore, although it was becoming rapidly apparent that more needed to be done to address root causes of conflict in South Sudan, this evidence was not attributed enough significance. There was, the committee heard, a simplification of history and social dynamics in order to suit external priorities and narratives.

It is crucial that a robust political and conflict analysis is more fully factored into development plans in the future. South Sudan, although the world’s newest country, has a long and complex history involving oppression and violence and the impact of this history on the present situation must be fully appreciated in order for the problems faced by the fledgling state to be comprehensively addressed.

**Recommendations**

**Comprehensive conflict analysis must not be a tick box exercise but a real and ongoing endeavour that has the power to shift priorities and change programme direction.** Donors should guarantee that employees are given time to consider commissioned conflict analyses on a regular basis. Consultant contracts should include provisions for follow up consultations to ensure that their work appropriately informs the design of initiatives. Development programmes need to be subject to more regular and thorough political risk review.

**UNMISS should significantly and immediately beef up its civil affairs components** and invest in in-house conflict analysis and community outreach capacity. Community Liaison Assistants should be deployed to enhance dialogue with local communities, get timely information about potential threats to communities and map local conflict dynamics. In all areas, UNMISS should be staffed by suitably skilled and motivated individuals, including South Sudanese analysts at higher levels of responsibility.

**The UK government in collaboration with other donors should use its influence and expertise to ensure that conflict-sensitivity is prioritised in a new reform roadmap.** National and sub-national conflict analysis should engage non-state actors, including civil society, women, religious groups and others. Findings should be translated into practical sectoral measures, for example focused on promoting conflict sensitive, equitable and inclusive governance at the state level.

**DFID should redeploy conflict advisers in South Sudan.** This will be critical for embedding conflict sensitivity into humanitarian programming.

**Diplomatic Engagement**

The UK and wider international community have a deep responsibility to provide diplomatic support to peace and development processes in South Sudan. The UK, as a member of the Troika, was heavily involved in the diplomatic process that produced the Comprehensive Peace
Agreement. Indeed, along with the Netherlands, Italy, Norway and the USA the UK is a guarantor signatory to the agreement.

Prior to the Referendum on Self-Determination for southern Sudanese the UK also participated in a diplomatic surge to ensure that the vote could not be derailed, and in doing so helped set in motion the final step which led to the establishment of an independent South Sudan. Following the plebiscite on January 9th 2011, the UK Foreign Secretary – along with dignitaries from around the world – attended celebrations to mark South Sudanese independence on 9 July.

The Comprehensive Approach to Sudan and South Sudan adopted by EU Foreign ministers in June 2011 demonstrated understanding of the enormous range of security, governance, economic, capacity and humanitarian challenges that would be faced by an independent South Sudan. In practice the major focus of diplomatic engagement remained the prevention of renewed conflict between Sudan and South Sudan and on dealing with outstanding CPA issues. Despite broader deficiency in responding to conflict analysis in domestic affairs, the APPG heard how the prioritisation of this work responded to careful conflict analysis. Ultimately, full-scale military confrontation between the two countries was averted and critical cross-border reconciliation and relationship building took place along the explosive North-South border. This work required skill and dedication and should be celebrated.

However, overarching diplomatic strategy should have more carefully balanced these important regional priorities with extant and emerging domestic issues in both countries. A more adequate response to the number and complexity of issues would have required much greater investment in diplomatic resourcing. The APPG is hugely concerned about the apparent disconnect between international engagement and domestic developments in South Sudan. By early 2013, it was clear that South Sudan was moving into a critical phase, but a gap between the international community’s development agenda and the reality of internal political developments was increasingly apparent.

- In June 2013, the EU decided to terminate the post of EUSR and merge it with the EUSR for the Horn of Africa.
- The UK was without a substantive UKSR for the period from mid-September 2013 - July 2014. The UKSR was transferred in September to work on a project for UKTI and although he kept his UKSR title for a couple of months, the APPG heard he was effectively working full-time at UKTI. Matt Cannell finally arrived in post in July.

- Senior western officials warmly welcomed the July 2013 reshuffle and championed it as a step forwards for the country. This was an extremely divisive moment and belied the limitations of our technical approach to state-building.
- The US-hosted conference on support for South Sudan’s economy in Washington coincided with news of Salva-Kiir’s decision to humiliate his Vice-President.
- A major South Sudan investment conference to showcase business and investment opportunities took place in Juba on 4-5 December 2013, just 24 hours before a Press Conference in which Riek Machar accused the President of ‘dictatorial tendencies’ and 10 days before the outbreak of conflict in Juba.

The APPG heard that this disconnect can in part be explained by the sheer complexity of issues which needed to be addressed in South Sudan. This analysis, that the current crisis is primarily a reflection of the enormity of creating a new state in the aftermath of decades of war, bears much truth. However, a number of other lessons must also be drawn:

- **There must be more efficient sharing of information between diplomatic corps and development actors:** The APPG heard that whilst the diplomatic corps tend to pay great attention to domestic politics, much of the program work is managed by the development agencies that are less connected to what is going on. This disconnect is perhaps most acute when programmes are managed by contractors.
- **More diplomatic resources should be expended in support of national reconciliation at the grassroots level, including within the security sector, as well as civil society inclusion in policy processes:** Since the CPA, there has been a number of peace initiatives including a number of UK supported initiatives. However, with a few exceptions there was little appetite for long-term, grass-roots, locally led engagements.
- **The disconnect between international diplomatic and development staff in South
Sudan should be narrowed; a) Greater importance should be attached to country and language experience in selection of staff – there is a general overestimation as to the current level of English spoken in South Sudan; b) Greater use of senior South Sudanese analysts and team members should be encouraged; c) the diplomatic community should spend more time outside of their desks and living quarters to explore and interact with the city and country.

- Diplomatic capacities should be hugely increased to deal with the number, complexity and scale of issues: Diplomatic strategies should be long term and not respond to crisis or conflict resolution opportunities only. Greater senior level politically experienced staff should have been in place in Juba during the Interim Period.

- Greater and more straightforward diplomatic coordination is needed: The United Nations, African Union, the “Troika”, the EU, IGAD countries and China are all important member of the international community that have occasionally aligned to push the situation forwards. The complexity of the issues and long chains of diplomatic actors means that the united force of the international community has rarely been brought to bear.

- Diplomats, academics and political analysts should work more closely with development actors in sharing information and analysis: This does not mean that external economic and security priorities tangle with humanitarian and development programmes but that there is increased information flow about political developments.

- China offers valuable perspectives on development. Work to engage China more deeply should be extended: China is the infrastructure builder of choice in the country and the developer of the oil industry, yet still rarely expresses opinions on important issues from mass killings to toxic oil waste. It has, however, occasionally strayed into more active and positive diplomacy in the South Sudanese context and could be an important diplomatic partner.

Recommendations
Diplomatic strategy must avoid too narrow a focus on state-building rather than nation-building. It is South Sudan’s political leaders, not the international community, who must take primary responsibility for nation-building. It is impossible for outsiders to build someone else’s nation unless the vision and political will to do so is there. But, despite this caveat, more could certainly have been done to nudge things in the right direction. A technical approach to state-building is unlikely to work if the state itself is not seen as sufficiently inclusive.

Diplomatic resourcing should be substantially increased rather than decreased in order to provide capacity to respond to the number and complexity of issues to be addressed. It is important to retain the post of a dedicated UKSR for Sudan and South Sudan while both countries are still at such a critical stage and reductions in size of the FCO/DFID joint Sudan/South Sudan Unit should be reversed. The development agenda should be properly informed by political analysis and risk assessment including information from political reporting.

Long-term, political engagement to establish a more inclusive political settlement and reform of the security sector in South Sudan must take precedents over quick wins and milestones. Priorities should include planning for and supporting the adoption of a more comprehensive peace process in South Sudan that emphasises: justice, reconciliation and healing for past abuses; the development of a reform roadmap concerned with building political accountability in the long-term, fostering democratic checks and balances on executive power, and delivering a people-focused security sector reform agenda linked to DDR; and fostering political buy-in and commitment to reform. Planning should include a period of evaluation focused on identifying lessons from the last nine years of state-building and development support in South Sudan.

Diplomatic strategy must avoid too narrow a focus on state-building rather than nation-building.
The Role of Reconciliation

The importance of ensuring wide-reaching, multi-layered reconciliation and healing processes in South Sudan should not be underestimated, as it has been to date.

Undoubtedly, the violence that has taken place in South Sudan since 15th December 2013 has caused such terrible grief and such deep rifts that long-term healing and reconciliation will be necessary for the country to overcome the conflict. Yet, reconciliation and healing processes are not only required for the crimes committed in the last 12 months. The failure of leaders, communities and international partners to support proper reconciliation and healing in South Sudan following the signing of the CPA in 2005 left unaddressed the deep-seated trauma and longstanding disaffection that have resulted from South Sudan's long troubled past. This is widely considered to have been a major factor leading to the outbreak of conflict in 2013. If these divisions and grievances are allowed to persist, South Sudan will struggle to achieve sustainable peace.

Both South Sudanese actors and the international community could have made much more robust efforts to implement reconciliation and healing processes prior to the December 2013 outbreak of conflict. In the 2005 CPA, there is a mention of a national reconciliation and healing process in clause 1.7, but there was no sincere commitment to it by the parties at the negotiating table nor follow up from international observers. Civil society groups who would have pushed for greater attention to reconciliation and healing processes were not included in discussions on the CPA. Similarly, in South Sudan’s Transitional Constitution, real and genuine peacemaking was recognised as a necessity. In practice, however, reconciliation activities were never given the attention they required and were largely ignored by both South Sudan’s political elite and the international community, enjoying less funding following 2005 than before.

The lack of concentrated effort by international actors to promote effective reconciliation and healing in South Sudan was due, the committee heard, to a preference for focusing on short-term goals and more immediate solutions, leading to an emphasis on stabilisation as opposed to reconciliation. As a result, reconciliation and healing initiatives such as the Committee for National Healing, Peace and Reconciliation
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Reconciliation support will need to be complemented by an independent mechanism for investigation and prosecution of serious crimes, possibly in the shape of a mixed court. Otherwise a culture of impunity will prevail, preventing future reconciliation.

All reconciliation, healing and transitional justice activities must recognise the legacy of decades of conflict. They must not just focus on violence since Dec 2013, but also on the civil war, CPA and post-independence periods. In order to heal the trauma and wounds caused by violence in the civil war, including south-south fighting in the 1990s in addition to the crimes committed in the current conflict. The alleged corruption and crimes of government officials and security services since the CPA must also be investigated and addressed.

The South Sudanese must decide on the shape of reconciliation and justice processes and take ownership and responsibility for implementation. These activities must be supported by legislation and budgeting at the national level. The role of the international community should be to empower South Sudan's citizenry through the provision of resources, technical assistance and diplomatic support, but not to steer it.

IGAD Peace Process

A successful peace process that achieves a durable ceasefire is a necessary precondition to more comprehensive and people-centred reconciliation and healing processes. Since the start of 2014, the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) has taken the lead on the peace process between South Sudan's warring political leaders and the international community has been largely coherent and united in its support. Sustained and coordinated engagement from international actors is required to ensure that the IGAD-led peace process moves in a positive and productive direction. Unfortunately, the current process is not working. It lacks coordination, the regional powers that make up the forum are divided and forum shopping has been allowed to begin with separate tracks opening up in Arusha and Khartoum. International donors must bear some responsibility for this state of affairs.

Lessons from the CPA period have taught that any peace negotiations in South Sudan must extend beyond the political elite and be inclusive of civil society groups if they are to produce lasting solutions. Dozens of civil society and
community groupings exist in South Sudan with a diversity of interests that extend far beyond the representation of Salva Kiir and Riek Machar. For a peace agreement to be durable, the negotiations and wider political process must acknowledge this diversity and civil society representatives must be allowed a voice. There are signs that some communities who do not feel represented in Addis Ababa are increasingly considering violence as a means to be heard.

IGAD has recognised this need for inclusivity and has sought to give civil society groups a meaningful place at the table, but achieving this has proved challenging. The selection of civil society representatives became highly contentious as Salva Kiir and Riek Machar sought to influence and manipulate the selection to their advantage. In June, the SPLM/A in Opposition boycotted the peace talks on account of their dissatisfaction with who had been invited to the roundtable. Despite the challenges of ensuring inclusivity, IGAD must remain persistent and an emphasis on inclusion should be maintained whilst at the same time convincing leaders with troops on the ground to cease hostilities. Other international actors such as the Troika can help by supporting IGAD and putting consistent pressure on the South Sudanese political elites to allow more open peace negotiations. Furthermore, the UN and the Troika can also support the peace negotiations by managing internal tensions between IGAD member states and ensuring that these do not spill over and affect the process.

At the same time, the civil society organisations should work to make themselves robust negotiating partners by ensuring that they are internally cohesive and properly representative. This will not happen without inter-community reconciliation within South Sudan. Having had little opportunity to participate politically, civil society groups can be fractured and inexperienced, and consequently, vulnerable to manipulation. There is also a false assumption that ‘civil society’ will hold views more conducive to peace; often communities facing the costs of crisis can hold more extreme positions than their leadership. The international community must be patient and supportive in seeking the best strategies for engaging civil society as viable partners of peace and this should include immediate support to grassroots intra and inter-community reconciliation initiatives.

International actors must decide whether they have confidence in the IGAD process or not. If not, then alternative avenues must be investigated, but only in close coordination with the IGAD process. If so, there is an urgent and massive need to do as much as they can to ensure that the process is well communicated to the people of South Sudan, is increasingly coordinated, that internal political divisions do not undermine it and that forum shopping does not persist.

Increased communication between high-level political tracks and the people of South Sudan is essential. With small arms so widely spread, violent skirmishes could easily persist unless the sense of having reached a ceasefire permeates all levels of society; a single man in Khaki can derail even the most carefully led peace process. Moreover, proper communication of the process in Addis Ababa will help to moderate the sense of marginalisation and disconnect felt by the vast majority of the population. It is simply shambolic in the context of the dominant ‘inclusive’ paradigm that there are not more efforts to do so.

**Recommendations**

All actors must now decide whether they are 100% behind the IGAD led process. If so, they must act within an agreed and coordinated framework, deal with internal regional divisions and restrict forum shopping: 1) Parallel tracks need to be put on hold; 2) the Troika, the AU and the UN should manage tensions and rivalries among the IGAD member states, ensuring that the process is free from manipulation by the mediators; 3) China and the US should double efforts to come together in a joint strategy, particularly to influence divided regional players. The Troika, the AU and the UN should continue to support IGAD’s emphasis on openness and inclusivity in the peace process, applying pressure on the warring parties where necessary. The inclusive approach should not be compromised for the sake of expediency. International actors must push for a transparent selection process for civil society representatives that reflects a broad cross-section of South Sudanese society.

International actors should help to ensure that the process is being well communicated to the people of South Sudan to increase the likelihood that any cease-fire agreements will be respected. Innovative initiatives using radio, mobile phone communications and edutainment tools such as forum theatre should be strongly considered.

**National Dialogue**

The peace process in Addis Ababa will not, on
its own, be enough to lay the foundations for substantive and comprehensive reconciliation in South Sudan. Processes of formal and informal national dialogue must take place within South Sudan and this must be led by the South Sudanese people. This will need to connect government with civil society as well as build horizontal bridges to allow wider South Sudanese consensus, participation and agency.

Whilst the peace negotiations in Addis Ababa are needed to bring about an initial end to the fighting, only this kind of national dialogue process, owned and directed by the South Sudanese, can legitimately bring about a more substantive, transformative solution to the conflict which addresses the root causes of the fighting and works towards lasting reconciliation. International partners, therefore, must encourage such a process but must do so sensitively, supporting the dialogue without taking the reins, leaping into limiting partnerships and undermining South Sudanese ownership.

This is not going to be easy but preparations and initiatives must begin now. One way forward could be to support numerous different grassroots approaches, implemented by those who are already working tirelessly for peace without funding. ‘Marking plans’ which seek profile for project support can be set to one side and money should not simply be thrown at fledgling initiatives, adversely affecting their working culture. As learnings develop from this work, initiatives with traction and internal momentum can be helped to expand as appropriate. To do this, we will need engaged people who can leave their logframes behind for periods of the day, see far into the work and understand what it really means.

Past efforts at organising a formal national dialogue process have been destabilised by political rivalries and, partly as a result, have suffered from a lack of international engagement. When he was Vice President in 2012, Riek Machar announced plans for South Sudan’s first national dialogue conference which was intended to act as the launch of a comprehensive national reconciliation process under the auspices of the Office of the President and the South Sudan Peace and Reconciliation Commission. However, Salva Kiir suspended plans for the conference in April 2013 when he reduced Vice Presidential powers. The business of national level reconciliation took a political turn from which it will be difficult to draw back.

The Committee for National Healing, Peace and Reconciliation (CNHPR) was set up by Salva Kiir in April 2013 as an independent body tasked with developing an agenda for national reconciliation based on the preferences of the South Sudanese people. The CNHPR is led by religious leaders at the national and state level so that it is independent from both South Sudanese politicians and international actors. In the final months of 2013, the CNHPR moved very slowly. This was partly because Church leaders were preoccupied with the Jonglei crisis, but the international community could have made greater effort to facilitate the Committee into action. After the conflict erupted in South Sudan in December 2013, the Committee agreed that it should do what it can to help resolve the crisis whilst at the same time retaining a focus on long-term national reconciliation. It has planned a national conference for 2016 which, together with extensive consultation of South Sudanese at the grassroots, will aim to develop a plan of national reconciliation that will have South Sudanese agency at its heart.

In October, the CNHPR held a four-week training process in Yei, Central Equatoria, bringing together around 80 representatives from all ten states across South Sudan. Whilst these four weeks were only the start of the CNHPR’s grassroots consultation process and whilst it is little known in the country and the CNHPR needs to build greater trust among the communities, this initiative was important in allowing people to sit down together in the midst of a conflict and it is currently the only genuinely indigenous process working towards a nationwide vision of reconciliation. The United Kingdom should join Norway, Switzerland and Canada in carefully supporting this initiative.

Recommendations

Any national dialogue process should not take place outside of South Sudan and should be thoroughly inclusive, not only reaching established groups and those who are hardest hit by the conflict, but also involving those with influence who have not typically been engaged, including cattle camp leaders, traditional leaders and women’s groups.

The international community, including the UK, should support the work of the CNHPR in its efforts to bring about a national dialogue process to achieve a basis for national reconciliation. They can be formal initiatives or facilitated in intermediate ways such as ensuring greater freedoms for expression and stronger mediums for information exchange.

The international community should help to
ensure that all elements of the national dialogue process are properly communicated across South Sudan in order to promote greater civic engagement, manage expectations, and increase ownership of the outcomes.

Community Level Reconciliation and Healing

In addition to a national dialogue process, initiatives at the grassroots level are also needed to address local, often resource centered, disputes between communities. At this level, traditional mechanisms of dialogue, reconciliation and healing are required. Such initiatives will need to be bolstered by political commitment from all parties as well as international donor support, requiring strong diplomatic back up as well as funding.

In order for community level reconciliation and healing processes to carry any traction, it is essential that they are reflective of local traditions and preferences. This means that these initiatives will vary across South Sudan in order to adapt to the practices of different communities. The Dinka, the Nuer and the Nilo-Hamites have varied traditional healing mechanisms as well as some overlapping practices. Churches, communities and other national organisations have experience of this local peacebuilding work. Such experience is valuable and must be utilised. Again, the international community should not seek to direct these initiatives but be able to recognise them where they exist, and see that they will require resources and funds.

Recommendations

The international community offers financial support for the implementation of long-term locally led community level reconciliation and healing initiatives that incorporate traditional healing mechanisms and local preferences. Numerous local initiatives, many already working without financial support, can be helped in their long-term work and those that gain traction should be assisted to expand or share their experiences. To do this well will require a reconfiguration of grant management capacities allowing room for creativity, failure, lesson learning and time for real engagement.

Justice and Accountability

The absence of transitional justice mechanisms during both the CPA period and South Sudan’s independence has allowed for the impunity of elites and a lack of accountability for the perpetrators of violence. In this context, where rule of law is lacking and war crimes go unprosecuted, true national reconciliation will be unachievable. Moving forward, it is crucial that the South Sudanese are able to implement mechanisms of transitional justice in order to hold to account those guilty of human rights violations. As with reconciliation and healing processes, the shape and form of transitional justice mechanisms must be decided by the South Sudanese. Importantly, as lessons from transitional justice experiences around the world tell us, it is not just the implementation and reach of these mechanisms which must be inclusive, but also their design.

Whilst the process of developing and implementing systems of justice will be long and difficult, initial steps can be taken immediately. A process of consultation and information gathering about what justice mechanisms communities think could be most appropriate should begin as soon as possible. There should not be an expectation that one locally based system of justice will apply across the country, and variations in traditional practices should be allowed for, so long as access to justice is equally open to all. It could be that the remit of transitional justice mechanisms may stretch to breaches of economic and social rights as well as human rights violations, but this would be for the people of South Sudan to determine.

An obstacle to successful transitional justice is the practical difficulty of gathering information about the human rights violations that have been perpetrated during South Sudan’s conflicts. This obstacle can be mitigated in the medium term by ensuring that there are systems for rigorous documentation of abuse in place. International actors can make a valuable contribution in this area. The AU and UNMISS both have a responsibility for documenting human rights violations and the AU has been working positively in this regard over the past few months. They established a commission of inquiry in March 2014 to investigate abuses committed during the conflict and have released an interim report based on the findings of several fact-finding missions to South Sudan.

There is room for the UN Office of the High
Commissioner for Human Rights to have a greater presence in South Sudan, reinforcing independent documentation of human rights abuses, and supporting the work and independence of the South Sudan Human Rights Commission. However, it is also important that there is a greater emphasis on locally led human rights monitoring as international bodies are limited in their reach and South Sudan-led monitoring and documentation will provide the most comprehensive and accurate narrative of crimes and abuses committed, if some of the most contentious. In-country monitors, however, would not have the capability to document the conflict rigorously and systematically without training and support. The American Bar Association has suggested the deployment of investigative teams comprised of independent international investigators who could both support the AU inquiry whilst at the same time training up South Sudanese investigators in order to build local monitoring capacity.

**Recommendations**

The international community should support the AU in its human rights monitoring, helping it to rigorously document the conflict with transparency, independence and balance. Independent teams of investigators should be deployed to help bolster the work of the AU (and others) whilst simultaneously building local monitoring capacity by employing South Sudanese staff. Political weight should be used to ensure that human rights staff have access and free movement to investigate human rights abuses.

The AU should publish the final report of its Commission of Inquiry on South Sudan unabridged as a strong, public report with recommendations on accountability and justice to ensure civilians are protected from human rights abuses going forward by fostering accountability on both sides in the conflict.

The UN Security Council should encourage the OHCHR to work more actively in South Sudan and help support human rights monitoring, whilst the Human Rights Department of UNMISS must continue to document and produce public reports on human rights violations.
Chapter 3: Governance and Civil Society

Media and Political Space

The independence period saw a restriction in political space in South Sudan. The APPG heard from civil society submissions about the “pervasive climate of fear” in South Sudan, which has necessitated secrecy and self-censorship in public outreach and discourse. Civil society has not been given the freedom and resources it needs to hold politicians to account, to inform and shape the new nation and its values, and to extend and protect those freedoms of speech and expression that underpin the very concept of democracy. This missing space for dialogue was important for many reasons, one of which was to enable citizens to hold up a mirror to themselves; to build a nation as well as a state.

The problem of political space is deep seated and stems from the persistent culture of war that permeates politics and society. After the CPA was signed, the military culture remained the dominant paradigm, demanding obedience, bullying and force, rather openness and dialogue. Civil society submissions referred to this as ‘bush culture’ and stressed that it remains the primary modus operandi of administration in South Sudan. In 2013, the government presented the ‘Voluntary and Non-Governmental Humanitarian Organisations Bill’ which sought to limit the activities of civil society organisations in key areas such as tackling corruption, promoting good governance and advocating against human rights violations.

Media freedoms and freedom of expression are fundamental requirements for functioning democratic governance and meaningful political participation. Yet, through 2012-2013 extrajudicial means to silence journalists, dramatists, artists, musicians and media outlets were increasingly used to restrict freedoms of expression and the press. The alleged assassination of columnist and blogger Isaiah Diing Abraham Chan Awuol in December 2013 is just one well-known example of the arrests, intimidation and physical attacks undertaken by security officials and individuals within government. According to the Union of Journalists of Southern Sudan, media workers avoid covering sensitive subjects such as human rights abuses and official corruption, for fear of harassment. There is a pressing need to support independent media and cultural institutions capable of curating and protecting political and cultural debate. The public are also increasingly aware of the politicisation of public space undermining even the positive potentials that
the media represents.

The historic link between political freedoms and churches in conflict is notable. Churches provided safe spaces for freedom of expression throughout the wars, especially following the collapse of the 1972 Addis Ababa agreement. Churches in South Sudan have also regularly played an important role in peace and reconciliation in local and national domains. They have provided sanctuary for marginalised cultures and communities, even in times of deepest conflict, and must maintain their independence to do so in the future. It is not yet clear whether churches will maintain neutral spaces in the ongoing South-South civil war: Kiir and Machar are each associated with different churches in Juba but so far both of these are preaching a message of reconciliation and peace.

A vibrant civil society is a must for South Sudan if political space is to be protected and extended. However, restriction on freedoms of expression makes it hard for civil society to play this role. International diplomatic support and resourcing are needed to help transition from this situation but the potential pitfalls are many. Since the outbreak of conflict in December 2013, civil society efforts have on occasion been negatively affected by the support of international actors who sometimes ‘create’, or are seen to create, and champion particular groups. Civil society actors known by the international community are also often those who know how to mobilise resources and are therefore defined by a degree of competition as much as collaboration. As a result, international support can sometimes promote fragmentation rather than cooperation between civil society groups. This must be avoided by reaching out to cross-cutting groups and champions who work tirelessly with or without money, but who could be more effective with support.

Recommendations

The state-building agenda and formal processes of national dialogue will not lead to democratic and accountable governance unless political space and freedoms of association and expression are safeguarded. Alongside technical state-building activity, international partners must support independent institutions and community initiatives, for example, independent media and cultural institutions capable of promoting public dialogue and debate.

International partners should scale up support to independent media institutions and provide technical assistance and diplomatic pressure to improve South Sudan’s media legislation. This work will need to be supported diplomatically.

Policy makers should work towards strengthening horizontal ties amongst South Sudan’s citizens and not only focus on the vertical ties between the government and the population. Civic participation should be encouraged at the community level.

International actors should support a wider range of civil society groups and take care to ensure that they engage with groups beyond those that are currently the best resourced and most outspoken. This will require donors to display courage and creativity in reaching beyond traditional networks and ideas.

Governance and Political Participation

The CPA project aimed not only to bring an end to Sudan’s second civil war but also to lay the foundation for the transformation of the Sudanese state, promising democratisation, security sector reform, state-building and reconciliation. The reconfiguration of the relationship between citizens and the state through inclusive political participation, sound economic management and SSR was necessary to achieve these lofty goals. However, without strong political commitment from the parties for democratic reform and with delays in the timeline due in part to slow diplomatic pressure by the international community, the CPA contained the seeds of its own downfall and set the scene for South Sudan’s extraordinary governance failures.

First and foremost, the CPA was a military and elitist peace with participation limited to the Sudan’s ruling National Congress Party and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM). It therefore did not reflect the South’s diverse constituencies and established an institutional basis for single-party control. During the interim period and accelerating into the independence period, South Sudan went on to build on its undemocratic past. The line between party and state is now blurred at both national and local levels with SPLM officials accused by many of massive corruption and of centralising too much political power within the executive.

South Sudan is not an electoral democracy. The transitional constitution, passed at independence, gives broad executive powers: the president cannot be impeached and has the authority to fire state governors and dissolve the
Rare chances to increase political participation have been missed or sabotaged: 1) The process by which the South Sudan Development Plan 2011-2013 (SSDP) was developed was too ad-hoc, patchy and internationally led; 2) The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States emphasized the importance of national ownership and buy-in but, in the context of the rise in political tension in 2013, the SSDP was adopted as the central plan. This reduced opportunities for citizen engagement in the process and led to major complaints from civil society organisations such as the Civil Society Platform; 3) The Constitutional Review Process, so important in redressing the overbearing executive powers enshrined in the Transitional Constitution, was hamstrung by disagreements regarding composition of the National Constitutional Review Commission tasked with organising broad public consultations, budget shortfalls and logistical problems. It was left dependent on international assistance and its public outreach never reached more than a small elite circle.

The independence of South Sudan has failed to reconfigure the relationship between the citizen and the state. Instead it has replicated authoritarian tendencies seen in Sudan, where lack of opportunities for political participation leads communities to consider alternative means to get their voices heard. As outlined in Chapter 1, the approach of the international community has not always challenged this trajectory, and at worse, has reinforced it.

The Participation of Women

Since gaining independence in 2011, South Sudan has taken a number of steps towards improving the participation of women in politics. The constitution states that both national and state legislatures and executives should have 25% of seats reserved for women and currently a third of the National Assembly is female. However, there is still a strong disparity between male and female participation and questions remain around the extent to which female parliamentarians are themselves part of a political elite, and whether they can be said to comprehensively represent women at the grassroots.

Recommendations

- International actors should provide significant diplomatic and financial support to encourage a broad, inclusive reinvigorated constitutional review process and internal SPLM reform involving nationwide consultations. This process
(not a technical review exercise), with sufficient time and genuine political will, could help to promote a more inclusive political system.

International partners should recognise the allegations of massive government corruption in South Sudan. We must face up to the underlying security and political dynamics that are barriers to dealing with corruption and try harder to address them. Unless the culture of governance in South Sudan can change, the majority of people will neither respect nor engage with decision-making processes.
Chapter 4: Security

Security Sector Reform

In 2005, southern Sudan had no formal security sector to speak of, let alone a functioning and accountable security sector able to provide state protection to the population. SSR is an essential prerequisite for any long term development from fragile post-conflict environments into sustainable polities. We recognise that the international community supported through 2005-2013 a number of multilateral (UNMISS, SSR, UNDP, DDR, UNPOL etc.) and bilateral (e.g. UK, US, Switzerland) initiatives costing hundreds of millions of dollars. The APPG heard that this work has demonstrably failed and that a number of key lessons must be learned: 1) SSR must be timely and responsive; 2) SSR must be based on solid analysis; 3) SSR must not be piecemeal and must be coordinated; and 4) SSR must not rely solely on technical work without sufficient diplomatic and political components.

The CPA made provision for two armies to exist in Sudan, the SAF and SPLA, and despite a stated commitment to proportionate downsizing of both these forces, the reality was that both sides intended to maintain as much military might as possible. This exacerbated the huge challenge that faced the newly formed Government of Southern Sudan, which needed to create a police force, army, and national security organisation out of a fractured and highly armed society. SSR interventions did not begin until 2007-8, well over two years after the signing of the CPA. This meant that international assistance had not ramped up before irreversible events had taken place which subsequent interventions were incapable of addressing. In particular, the wholesale integration of 60,000 personnel from the South Sudan Defence Forces following the Juba Declaration established the precedent for the President to use the SPLA as the principal vehicle for accommodating foes, buying their loyalty through position and payroll. It is not clear what alternative mechanism could have been developed, but precluding this system of settlement early could have forced a more genuine political reconciliation and done much to change the course of history. Lack of early attention to the police was also a serious omission from the international approach and undermined state-community relations and confidence building.

The committee heard that the international community did not act upon known political dynamics, resulting in programmes that were unsuited to the context. For example, during wartime, the SPLA (along with Other Armed
Groups in southern Sudan) had not only been a military movement but had also provided political, social and welfare functions to large swathes of the population. The result was that by late 2012 over 230,000 salaries were being drawn on the SPLA payroll alone – including to provide support to retired soldiers, widows, orphans and wounded soldiers. The SPLA was a large and unstable patronage system holding together former adversaries, influential political rivals, community authorities, peace spoilers and many community members themselves. These facts, among others, were not adequately understood not integrated into programming, and the two DDR programs that ran 2009-2001 and 2013-2014 cost hundreds of millions of dollars and demobilized fewer than 13,000 individuals (with tenuous links to the SPLA).

The APPG also learned that SSR interventions lacked an internationally guided and coordinated plan. Interventions ranged from building costly and unusable barracks (US funded) to Juba-focused capacity building (UK and US funded) that did not reach areas of need. There were a number of successful projects at the lowest levels of the security forces but the disjointed and short-term nature of interventions meant the overall impact was small and piecemeal.

Whilst the international community failed to act upon key dynamics, the Government of South Sudan did not face up to them or chose to maintain the status quo. The 2008-9 White Paper on Defence was not underpinned by detailed analysis and never considered the effect of military integration or the ethnic dimension of the SPLA. Working behind closed doors, the GoSS and SPLA also developed a separate military strategy that entirely failed to confront the factional nature of the army and in doing so accepted and reinforced existing multiple hierarchies and expensive lines of patronage.

Initiatives lacked the political level support to back up interventions and hence address those real and complex political and security interests behind SSR inertia. The UK, along with the US (the two primary providers of bilateral support to SSR in South Sudan) directed the majority of their support through commercial contractors. Although highly skilled, these did not have the requisite political and diplomatic leverage to influence local, state and national actors to take the tough decisions which genuine SSR requires.

SSR cannot proceed except hand in hand with reconciliation. Following the Juba incidents in December 2013, the army split along well-established lines of informal authority based on historical personal loyalties, patronage, ethnicity and wartime experience which had not softened through the years of ‘peace’. It is hard to see how effective SPLA transformation programs can be without addressing these fault lines within the army, the human stories and the motivations that go with them. This will require hard political and diplomatic work at the senior leadership and grassroots level, enabling intra-SPLA confidence building and reconciliation. As part of any future peace implementation plan, greater efforts must go into reforming the army and police force, taking full account of this political dimension.

**Recommendations**

**International actors should give greater priority to security sector reform, and explicitly engage and respond to its political dimension, by supporting long-term initiatives which address fault lines in the army.** This is the only way in which internationally supported programmes for SPLA transformation can be effective. A similar approach is also needed to other security and uniformed services composed of former SPLA soldiers including the South Sudan Police Service, the Wildlife Service and the Prison Service.

**International actors should ensure that support to police, civilian law enforcement and human rights monitoring is supported much sooner following any future settlements than it was in the past.** This support should also reach out much further into remote communities.

**The IGAD monitoring and verification mechanism is critical to the process of understanding the current state of the army and security forces, and the nature of conflict, and should be supported.** This work is vital to future peace-building, reform and development initiatives, and will provide baseline data for a much-needed Strategy Security Review, once the conflict is over.

**Future security sector reform planning requires a well thought through DDR programme for ex-combatants, with real livelihood options based on solid social, cultural and economic understanding.** Internationally supported initiatives should be tested for context applicability and revised before going live. Resultant processes must in turn be integrated with wider national development plans.

**There is a need for continuous and robust diplomatic engagement with key GoSS stakeholders to reinforce program initiatives.** At the heart of SSR is the need to establish
genuine democratic civil control of the sector. This failed between 2005 and 2013 because of a lack of domestic political will. Interventions with the security forces must be bottom-up and top-down, championed and coordinated internationally. A multilateral body with influence over the future government in-country should be selected to champion and coordinate security sector reform activities.

Any future international assistance to the SPLA must prioritise building accountability and respect for human rights, including establishing an effective and cohesive chain of command and clear expectations around its role in maintaining stability; and ending the culture of impunity for human rights violations and addressing corruption.

Peacekeeping

The United Nations peacekeeping mission in South Sudan, UNMISS, has a vital role to play in protecting South Sudanese civilians at risk. Despite its significant flaws (major shortcomings in the integration of political analysis is dealt with in Chapter 1) the mission is indispensable and has made history with the vast number of civilians it is sheltering in its bases. The international community must therefore continue to support the work of UNMISS, help it to focus on its core task of protecting civilians, and assist the mission to expand its remit of operation to allow it to access vulnerable civilians.

At the outbreak of conflict in December 2013, UNMISS had a broad mandate. This integrated humanitarian and peacekeeping duties with political and state-building duties. Many in the international community felt that this led to a lack of coherence in the implementation of the mandate as different members of the UN management structure prioritised different aspects of UNMISS’s mission.

The integrated nature of the mandate also meant that UNMISS was perceived by many observers as neglecting its humanitarian duties and prioritising the more ‘exciting’ political aspects of its mission. During its protection activities, it relied heavily on the government compromising both its mission and its neutrality and demonstrating a lack of understanding at the strategic level of the political tensions present in the country since its inception. For example UNMISS shared intelligence with GoSS security personnel which was misused for state military purposes on at least two occasions. This in turn had repercussions for the aid community, as NGOs which cooperated with UNMISS and used their bases as safe locations for office infrastructure were then sometimes seen by opposition figures as having colluded with the government.

UNMISS continues to suffer from a perceived lack of neutrality and does not enjoy trust from the government, opposition or communities. In particular, the relationship between UNMISS and the government has soured as GoSS resents UNMISS criticisms of its conduct. At the same time, other South Sudanese actors still perceive UNMISS as having a government bias.

UNMISS must be supported to learn how to appropriately communicate its actions to constituencies in South Sudan in order to repair its reputation of bias and partiality.

In May 2014, the UN Security Council adopted a new mandate for the UN mission, which removed state-building responsibilities and made the protection of civilians a priority. We welcome this refocus on civilian protection. UNMISS has since significantly revamped its protection work and now continues to shelter over 100,000 civilians in its bases. Never before have so many civilians been provided protection on UN bases.

Nevertheless, a great deal more needs to be done before UNMISS can be said to fulfil its mandate to protect civilians in South Sudan and it will require support from the international community in expanding and improving its activities. Conditions on the PoC sites still require urgent improvement particularly in the area of security for women and girls. UNMISS must also expand its focus to the vast majority of civilians living beyond its bases; 95% of displaced people live outside UNMISS PoC camps (around two thirds within South Sudan).

Recommendations

UNMISS must be supported to expand its protection of civilians beyond PoC areas. The international community including the UK should increase its funding to UNMISS to help it expand its protection of civilians outside of the existing PoC sites, based upon cohesive strategic planning that promotes a shared vision across all areas of UNMISS. UNMISS troop deployment should be strategically reconfigured to allow troops to be sent to the highest-risk areas, including areas held by opposition forces, in order to achieve the most comprehensive protection of civilians.
UNMISS must increase its presence in non-government controlled areas in order to display a less partisan approach.

UNMISS should begin to improve security in the spaces outside of PoC camps by increasing their patrols. These should include regular military and civilian patrols in and around towns and along roads to markets and water sources, as well as rapid response capacity. DPKO should actively encourage staff to regularly leave bases to patrol, to act when needed, and to interact with communities.

UNMISS should make use of available land to support IDPs, so that humanitarians can improve service provision and meet minimum humanitarian standards. There is an urgent need to improve overcrowded conditions and to address protection issues in PoC sites.

There is need for a sufficient number of skilled and well-equipped UN police within the bases (both individual and Formed Police Units), with a particular focus on protecting women and children from sexual and gender-based violence. The UNSC should make a point of ensuring these police are adequately equipped, properly trained and that a significant portion of them are women.

UNMISS must not handover the responsibility for PoC sites in the current context where ethnic targeting of civilians remains a real threat and civilians have said that they will continue to rely on UNMISS bases for physical protection. The legal status of these bases under UNMISS authority means that soldiers and armed actors are unable to enter the sites. Transferring the responsibility of the sites will increase IDPs’ susceptibility to violence given that fighting and strong ethnic tensions still exist in the country, particularly in areas surrounding IDP sites.

Returns of IDPs should only take place when it is safe for people and only on a voluntary basis. Any attempt to promote returns must be based on proper consultations with communities, a realistic analysis of the political and security context, and insist on the voluntary nature of return with dignity.

The UN mission must make every effort to rebuild its in-country reputation and to display its neutrality. UNMISS must clearly communicate its mandate to the government, the opposition, armed actors and the people and it should appropriately distance itself from all parties to the conflict. At all times, UNMISS should act with transparency and accountability and conduct its activities in accordance with the Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) civil–military guidelines and in-country guidance.

UNMISS should increase its engagement with communities, particularly those outside of Juba and the state-capitals in order to both explain its mandate more widely and become more sensitive to local conflict dynamics and hotspots.
Humanitarian Strategy

The international community’s response to South Sudan’s ongoing humanitarian challenges, whilst remarkably forthcoming, has been weakened by flawed analysis, a lack of willingness to face up to political analysis, a lack of coordination as well as practical and logistical challenges beyond control. The donor community must be commended for the substantial funding response to the crisis. Indeed, the UK alone has pledged £99.5 million since December 2013 with a laudable emphasis on education, particularly for girls, along with the decision to continue with that programme despite the ongoing disaster. This demonstrates an understanding of underlying conflict causes and long-term needs and should be applauded.

Yet there are ways in which the focus and delivery of international aid could be improved to maximise its impact. Following the signing of the CPA, development programming assumed greater political stability than was in fact the case. Consequently, there was a tendency in the donor community to shift from a focus on humanitarian assistance to placing too much emphasis on development. In practice, the APPG heard that the two approaches should have been maintained in parallel and conflict prevention work was supported but not integrated enough into broader programming. The disconnect between donor activities and local realities meant that at times ambitious development plans and unrealistic time-scales were developed whilst humanitarian agencies were struggling to meet basic needs through a lack of resources.

The committee heard that there have also been shortfalls in funding mechanisms. Set up in the hope of rectifying the downfalls of previous funding, the Multi Donor Trust Fund performed poorly, with some donors eventually choosing to channel their funds bilaterally. Although mechanisms like the Basic Services Fund have been deemed more effective in terms of their reach and pace of response, they were smaller and there remains an overall lack of coordination within and amongst aid agencies in their activities. Worryingly, similar Multi-Donor Trust Funds have since been established in other fragile environments.

Aid effectiveness has also been hampered by instability and violence on the ground, including attacks on aid workers and looting of resources. Logistical challenges stem from the lack of infrastructure and security and illegal roadblocks and checkpoints have hindered humanitarian access. Indeed, the APPG was told
that operational space has become increasingly limited since 2012. As a result of these challenges, aid agencies became increasingly dependent on UNMISS for operational support which has jeopardised INGO reputations among the South Sudanese who have questioned their independence and neutrality. Furthermore, due to the complex nature of South Sudan’s ongoing crisis, aid organisations have become increasingly risk averse and subject to bureaucratic obstacles. As a result, too much focus was placed on easily accessible areas and a lack of focus on really difficult, remote areas, which saw little engagement. Donors must accept that reaching some key locations will be more expensive and require longer-term engagement.

Whilst around 100,000 IDPs are sheltering on UNMISS bases, this only counts for 5% of the internally displaced in South Sudan. The majority of South Sudan’s IDPs are living beyond the parameters of formal camps, some in remote locations or continually on the move, but also a significant number in urban centres. All these groups are inadequately supported in their basic needs. Donors must therefore support humanitarian agencies in expanding their outreach beyond UNMISS bases to reach such individuals.

The Humanitarian Needs of Women

The submissions reported that in South Sudan, there is a culture of silence surrounding gender-based violence (GBV) leading many women and girls not to report their abuse and limiting their access to lifesaving GBV support services. Although the GBV sub-cluster in South Sudan has had some successes, efforts to prevent and respond to GBV have typically been under-resourced by both the GoSS and the international community. There has been a striking rise in GBV since the outbreak of conflict in December 2013. Humanitarian agencies were unprepared and now more than 90% of IDPs are located in areas with no dedicated GBV services. The committee learned that this could have been mitigated if more effort was made to tackle GBV in South Sudan prior to the conflict. Moving forward, prevention and response to GBV should be considered a priority of the humanitarian response. There is also currently inadequate attention given to the particular challenges faced by women who have been displaced. Women in PoC camps lack security, facilities and representation in camp committees. The fragmentation of families as a result of the conflict has left displaced women particularly vulnerable and often stigmatised. Attention to these gender-specific issues should be maintained across humanitarian activities.

Recommendations

The international community should pressure the GoSS to provide unhindered humanitarian access and diminish regulations placed on humanitarian agencies.

Humanitarian agencies themselves should work to build their operational independence from UNMISS and take care to communicate their independence from the mission to the South Sudanese people. Donors must work to coordinate their activities and should support humanitarian agencies in expanding their operations beyond UN bases.

Humanitarian agencies and NGOs should do more to support local organisations and civil society in a sustained manner and be willing to provide core funding if this will assist the establishment of proper internal structures.

Particular care should be taken to integrate the humanitarian needs of women across the humanitarian response. This should involve better prevention and response to GBV both in areas hard-hit by the conflict and in those states less affected by the crisis. It is also necessary to pay greater attention to the particular challenges faced by displaced women with consistently gender-sensitive needs analysis. In PoC sites, female representation on camp committees must be safeguarded and the UK has a responsibility to ensure that UK supported WASH facilities are made safer for women and girls.

The international community should deliver on the call by OCHA for donors to provide US$ 600 million to the humanitarian response by the end of February to take advantage of the access to hard to reach communities during the dry season.

Economic Development

The 2012 decision by the GoSS to shut down oil production, amidst a dispute with Khartoum over oil transit fees, illustrates the divergence in the political preoccupations and economic planning of the fledgling government and their development partners. This move suspended 98% of the government’s annual revenue, undermining the government’s ability to support the development plan financially (the
national budget had never been adjusted to the plan's goals) and adding great strain to its own patronage networks which had previously been fed by the steady flow of corrupted funds. The panel heard that there is a need to protect oilfields from damage and install an internationally agreed oversight mechanism for oil revenues and receipts from taxation, such that oil revenues begin to benefit South Sudan's people. Protection of the oilfields from further damage would be a major investment in the future of South Sudan.

The APPG heard concerns that, in general, investment, aid and government spending have been skewed towards Juba and safe areas and that limited investment outside of this centre may have accentuated regional divisions. There are obvious security and cost implications of major construction initiatives, not least because of the existing tensions in South Sudan, but difficult and expensive projects will be required to address perceptions of marginalisation and severe underdevelopment in remote areas. Further concerns that were heard included the focus on smaller projects and a lack of combined efforts by large development institutions. A country-wide network of all-weather roads could have done more for security, governance, agriculture, commerce and development than the 120 projects costing up to $1bn, which were implemented across ten sectors and sub-sectors in 2012/3. Road construction and maintenance could also employ thousands, whilst ensuring that the roads were sustainable. Similarly, a major investment in the renewal of the river transport system would transform security, markets and infrastructure in the wet season, as well as the ability of government and peacekeepers to move around the country. The panel was also encouraged to recommend greater strategic cooperation with China, which is the biggest infrastructure provider in South Sudan.

The CPA opened an extraordinary window of opportunity to reform and stimulate agricultural and pastoralist productivity that had been closed since the 1970s. South Sudan is a majority agro-pastoralist society, but similar to other states in the region (e.g. Kenya, Uganda) pastoralism has largely been left to its own devices, because it has not been seen as a productive sector. Indeed, even state level strategic planning was not only blind to the benefits of pastoralism but also to the effects of agricultural expansion on pastoralist populations.

The APPG heard that, on the contrary, pastoralism in South Sudan harbours great potential to improve livelihoods as well as expand the tax base and support government revenue. In addition, the much-hailed agricultural fertility of land in South Sudan can be put to good use with careful thought. Appropriate investments in both will bear fruits and bring along with them a strengthening of accountability mechanisms – but only if due procedure is observed and companies and authorities act with integrity (to date too many private sector investment deals have been corrupt triangles between senior politicians, companies and politicised community representatives). Simultaneously, careful investments in the pastoralist sector may prompt an effective strategy in reducing and mitigating the long history of livestock raiding practices. However, the APPG heard concerns that donor agencies may operate to timescales too short to appreciate the longer returns of agricultural projects.

‘Development’ in South Sudan – and the distribution of economic opportunities, education, and basic services – is not simply a problem of addressing known deficits. Rather they are political questions, often linked to military interests. Ensuring that assistance works to support a long-term transition to sustainable economic development and peace in South Sudan requires that planning and cooperation is done on the basis of solid local understanding and in the interests of South Sudanese populations. There have been allegations of corruption, including the buying off of Traditional Authorities to get around community land ownership rights. The committee learned that investment should be encouraged, but not at the price of primitive accumulation transferring the long-term land rights of communities for only short-term benefits.

Recommendations

International partners should work with South Sudanese communities to develop sustainable and conflict sensitive strategies to connect the pastoralist sector to markets. This will improve livelihoods, guarantee long-term community livelihoods, promote peaceful coexistence and improve accountability between citizens and state.

International partners should ensure that all public and private sector investment from their national companies is conflict sensitive and contributes to long-term peaceful coexistence and development in South Sudan. This means monitoring investments to ensure that the constitutional rights of South Sudan’s communities are respected in spirit as well as in
States (Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile) have closed.
• More than 90 schools in the country are occupied by fighting forces or by internally displaced people.
• Over 9,000 children have been recruited into the armed forces and armed groups since January 2014.
• Nearly half a million children and adolescents need education interventions due to the current crisis.
• Lack of education is one of the factors pushing families to leave South Sudan for neighbouring countries, so that their children can continue to go to school.

Illiteracy rates in South Sudan are the second highest illiteracy rates in the world. Although the international community has responded to this long-term need, and the UK should be particularly commended for its unfailing support to the education sector, there is a deficit in available educational opportunities in South Sudan. School dropout rates are very high, and very few children make it through to secondary education. The situation remains particularly acute with regards women and girls; as of July 2014, there were only about 600 girls in the last grade of secondary education. Those children who are in school have limited prospects of learning because school infrastructure is limited, classrooms are overcrowded, and there are chronic shortages of learning resources and teachers.

Despite education being identified as an integral part of the humanitarian response at the High-level Humanitarian Conference on South Sudan in Oslo in May, it is not being prioritised at an operational level in multi-sectoral rapid assessments or logistics cluster priority delivery lists, and was removed from the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) allocation of July–December 2014.

We also heard from South Sudanese respondents to our inquiry that the education sector can play an important long term role in healing and reconciliation. Schools can provide a strong civic education function based on “love, honesty, courage non-aggressiveness”. Voluntary work could be incorporated into the curriculum to connect youth to marginalised groups in the community and generate cultures of work.

Youth Development and Educational Opportunities

A long-term strategy for peace building must provide opportunities for South Sudan’s youth. High levels of unemployment and growing discontent have been linked to local level violence within communities across South Sudan. Despite strong recognition of this by the international community, we also heard that a largely technocratic approach to state-building has overlooked political and local conflict dynamics and did not sufficiently address under-development and a lack of opportunity, particularly for youth of South Sudan.

However, the youth of South Sudan, especially young children, have been particularly affected by the conflict. In addition to acute food shortages and the cholera outbreak following renewed fighting in December 2013, the Education Cluster was the only programmatic cluster not to receive Common Humanitarian Funds for the period July–December 2014. Schools have been forced to close due to the conflict and lack of funding. This has left children and adolescents at increased risk of recruitment into armed groups, child labour, and gender-based violence, and many are vulnerable to the cramped living conditions in IDP sites. If children are forced to miss a full academic school year, many of them may never return to school; another generation of South Sudanese without an education - this will impact severely on the long-term development of South Sudan. Since the current crisis in South Sudan began in December 2013:

• 1,188 schools in the three most affected

Development institutions should consider combining efforts to create large scale large infrastructure rather than piecemeal development projects. This could employ thousands and help establish the foundation for long-term development prospects.

International partners should work from now to determine the best way of ensuring that an internationally agreed oversight mechanism for oil revenues and receipts from taxation are in place. This is necessary if oil revenues are to benefit South Sudan’s people rather than reinforce exclusive political dynamics.
Recommendations

**Humanitarian decision-makers should ensure that 4% of all humanitarian funding for South Sudan be invested in emergency education.** Education should be regarded as an integral part of the humanitarian response, in line with commitments made at the High-Level Humanitarian Conference on South Sudan in Oslo in May 2013.

**Youth must be given a more prominent place in programming across the board.** Skills training, social programmes and cultural-behavioural change activities should be encouraged (for example to address bride wealth issues).

**The humanitarian agencies should take practical measures to facilitate the functioning of basic education programmes,** for example including education materials in emergency cargo in the supply pipeline.

**The donor community should encourage the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology to prioritise payment of teacher salaries including in the most-affected States.** The Ministry should actively support displaced people to take their exams and receive their certificates.

**International actors must work in both government and opposition controlled areas, to ensure that children do not miss out on education wherever they live.** All parties to the conflict should take all possible measure to safeguard schools, so they can be used for educational purposes.
Chapter 6: Recommendations

Overarching Recommendations

**International partners must resist a preference for short-term fixes that come at the expense of transformative solutions.** The APPG believes that the situation in South Sudan is a long-term and complex problem that demands a suitably sustained, far-sighted response. We cannot expect to achieve lasting peace with quick fixes. In the past, this type of approach has engendered a neglect of reconciliation and healing at all levels. As a result, the international community has been building assiduously on cracked foundations, and, inevitably, the country has crumbled. Moving forwards, reconciliation and healing must be a central concern.

**Practitioners must allow the conclusions of conflict analysis to affect and alter activities:** It is not enough simply to conduct conflict analysis. This analysis must be allowed to permeate diplomatic engagement and programme design and to challenge entrenched ways of working. Power dynamics pervade the behaviour of domestic actors in South Sudan and where our activities have not reflected this, mistakes have been made. Donors should recruit and encourage individuals with more country experience, more courage to challenge the status quo within and without their organisations, and a demonstrable desire to engage deeply with peoples and issues. Donors must also give these personnel the time and resources to explore and integrate conflict analysis and undertake regular risk monitoring. Technical staff and political analysts have been working side by side but not together. Unless we successfully bridge this disconnect, we may continue to offer a response, but could do better to support a resolution.

**The international community must engage more widely, deeply and consistently with the people of South Sudan.** Peacebuilding must be South Sudan-led and owned if it is to take root and flourish. This presents the international community with the complex and delicate challenge of ensuring that important issues are addressed without being the ones to address them. This will not be easy but the APPG believes that this difficult balance would be more achievable if the international community were to work more closely with the people of South Sudan and display the level of inclusivity that it hopes a future government would also demonstrate. South Sudanese from much wider sections of society should be more frequently consulted formally and informally. South
UNMISS should significantly and immediately beef up its civil affairs components and invest in-house conflict analysis and community outreach capacity. Community Liaison Assistants should be deployed to enhance dialogue with local communities, get timely information about potential threats to communities and map local conflict dynamics. In all areas, UNMISS should be staffed by suitably skilled and motivated individuals, including South Sudanese analysts at higher levels of responsibility.

The UK government in collaboration with other donors should use its influence and expertise to ensure that conflict-sensitivity is prioritised in a new reform roadmap. National and sub-national conflict analysis should engage non-state actors, including civil society, women, religious groups and others. Findings should be translated into practical sectoral measures, for example focused on promoting conflict sensitive, equitable and inclusive governance at the state level.

DFID should redeploy conflict advisers in South Sudan. This will be critical for embedding conflict sensitivity into humanitarian programming.

Diplomatic Engagement

Diplomatic strategy must avoid too narrow a focus on state-building rather than nation-building. It is South Sudan’s political leaders, not the international community, who must take primary responsibility for nation-building. It is impossible for outsiders to build someone else’s nation unless the vision and political will to do so is there. But, despite this caveat, more could certainly have been done to nudge things in the right direction. A technical approach to state-building is unlikely to work if the state itself is not seen as sufficiently inclusive.

Diplomatic resourcing should be substantially increased rather than decreased in order to provide capacity to respond to the number and complexity of issues to be addressed. It is important to retain the post of a dedicated UKSR for Sudan and South Sudan while both countries are still at such a critical stage and reductions in size of the FCO/DFID joint Sudan/South Sudan Unit should be reversed. The development agenda should be properly informed by political analysis and risk assessment including information from political reporting.

Conflicts and Political Analysis

Comprehensive conflict analysis must not be a tick box exercise but a real and ongoing endeavour that has the power to shift priorities and change programme direction. Donors should guarantee that employees are given time to consider commissioned conflict analyses on a regular basis. Consultant contracts should include provisions for follow up consultations to ensure that their work appropriately informs the design of initiatives. Development programmes need to be subject to more regular and thorough political risk review.

Overarching Vision and Strategy

Any future statebuilding work must be balanced by longer term transformative activities involving independent institutions and communities. Purely technical and process-driven approaches to state-building and development in South Sudan should be avoided.

An understanding and sensitivity towards the root-causes and drivers of conflict should inform and shape every state-building, peacebuilding and development initiative. Everybody, whatever their power or position in the development, economic or political spheres, must look upon it as a personal responsibility to ensure that strategy is not set in stone and is alive to ongoing developments.

The international community must engage with the whole country, expanding its support to activities and initiatives that reach not only those who are easily accessible, but also those at the political, social and geographic peripheries. Moving forward, a much broader range of South Sudanese must be the agents and drivers of development and peacebuilding.

Information and Strategy
milestones. Priorities should include planning for and supporting the adoption of a more comprehensive peace process in South Sudan that emphasises: justice, reconciliation and healing for past abuses; the development of a reform roadmap concerned with building political accountability in the long-term, fostering democratic checks and balances on executive power, and delivering a people-focused security sector reform agenda linked to DDR; and fostering political buy-in and commitment to reform. Planning should include a period of evaluation focused on identifying lessons from the last nine years of statebuilding and development support in South Sudan.

Peacebuilding, Reconciliation and Healing

The Role of Reconciliation

International partners must prioritise support to long-term accountability and inter-communal reconciliation. This must take place at the national, state and community levels and be connected by a process of national dialogue. For the sake of lasting peace and stability, South Sudan needs both justice and accountability and a broad-based national reconciliation process at the grass-roots level.

Reconciliation support will need to be complemented by an independent mechanism for investigation and prosecution of serious crimes, possibly in the shape of a mixed court. Otherwise a culture of impunity will prevail, preventing future reconciliation.

All reconciliation, healing and transitional justice activities must recognise the legacy of decades of conflict. They must not just focus on violence since Dec 2013, but also on the civil war, CPA and post-independence periods. In order to heal the trauma and wounds caused by violence in the civil war, including south-south fighting in the 1990s in addition to the crimes committed in the current conflict. The alleged corruption and crimes of government officials and security services since the CPA must also be investigated and addressed.

The South Sudanese must decide on the shape of reconciliation and justice processes and take ownership and responsibility for implementation. These activities must be supported by legislation and budgeting at the national level. The role of the international community should be to empower South Sudan’s citizenry through the provision of resources, technical assistance and diplomatic support, but not to steer it.

IGAD Peace Process

All actors must now decide whether they are 100% behind the IGAD led process. If so, they must act within an agreed and coordinated framework, deal with internal regional divisions and restrict forum shopping: 1) Parallel tracks need to be put on hold; 2) the Troika, the AU and the UN should manage tensions and rivalries among the IGAD member states, ensuring that the process is free from manipulation by the mediators; 3) China and the US should double efforts to come together in a joint strategy, particularly to influence divided regional players.

The Troika, the AU and the UN should continue to support IGAD’s emphasis on openness and inclusivity in the peace process, applying pressure on the warring parties where necessary. The inclusive approach should not be compromised for the sake of expediency. International actors must push for a transparent selection process for civil society representatives that reflects a broad cross-section of South Sudanese society.

International actors should help to ensure that the process is being well communicated to the people of South Sudan to increase the likelihood that any cease-fire agreements will be respected. Innovative initiatives using radio, mobile phone communications and edutainment tools such as forum theatre should be strongly considered.

National Dialogue

Any national dialogue process should not take place outside of South Sudan and should be thoroughly inclusive, not only reaching established groups and those who are hardest hit by the conflict, but also involving those with influence who have not typically been engaged, including cattle camp leaders, traditional leaders and women’s groups.

The international community, including the UK, should support the work of the CNHPR in its efforts to bring about a national dialogue process to achieve a basis for national reconciliation. They can be formal initiatives or facilitated in intermediate ways such as ensuring
greater freedoms for expression and stronger mediums for information exchange.

The international community should help to ensure that all elements of the national dialogue process are properly communicated across South Sudan in order to promote greater civic engagement, manage expectations, and increase ownership of the outcomes.

Community Level
Reconciliation and Healing

The international community offers financial support for the implementation of long-term locally led community level reconciliation and healing initiatives that incorporate traditional healing mechanisms and local preferences. Numerous local initiatives, many already working without financial support, can be helped in their long-term work and those that gain traction should be assisted to expand or share their experiences. To do this will require a reconfiguration of grant management capacities allowing room for creativity, failure, lesson learning and time for real engagement.

Justice and Accountability

The international community should support the AU in its human rights monitoring, helping it to rigorously document the conflict with transparency, independence and balance. Independent teams of investigators should be deployed to help bolster the work of the AU (and others) whilst simultaneously building local monitoring capacity by employing South Sudanese staff. Political weight should be used to ensure that human rights staff have access and free movement to investigate human rights abuses.

The AU should publish the final report of its Commission of Inquiry on South Sudan unabridged as a strong, public report with recommendations on accountability and justice to ensure civilians are protected from human rights abuses going forward by fostering accountability on both sides in the conflict.

The UN Security Council should encourage the OHCHR to work more actively in South Sudan and help support human rights monitoring, whilst the Human Rights Department of UNMISS must continue to document and produce public reports on human rights violations.

Governance and Civil Society

Media and Political Space

The state-building agenda and formal processes of national dialogue will not lead to democratic and accountable governance unless political space and freedoms of association and expression are safeguarded. Alongside technical state-building activity, international partners must support independent institutions and community initiatives, for example, independent media and cultural institutions capable of promoting public dialogue and debate.

International partners should scale up support to independent media institutions and provide technical assistance and diplomatic pressure to improve South Sudan’s media legislation. This work will need to be supported diplomatically.

Policy makers should work towards strengthening horizontal ties amongst South Sudan’s citizens and not only focus on the vertical ties between the government and the population. Civic participation should be encouraged at the community level.

International actors should support a wider range of civil society groups and take care to ensure that they engage with groups beyond those that are currently the best resourced and most outspoken. This will require donors to display courage and creativity in reaching beyond traditional networks and ideas.

Governance and Political Participation

International actors should provide significant diplomatic and financial support to encourage a broad, inclusive reinvigorated constitutional review process and internal SPLM reform involving nationwide consultations. This process (not a technical review exercise), with sufficient time and genuine political will, could help to promote a more inclusive political system.

International partners should recognise the allegations of massive government corruption in South Sudan. We must face up to the underlying security and political dynamics that are barriers to dealing with corruption and try harder to address them. Unless the culture of governance in South Sudan can change, the majority of
Security

Security Sector Reform

International actors should give greater priority to security sector reform, and explicitly engage and respond to its political dimension, by supporting long-term initiatives which address fault lines in the army. This is the only way in which internationally supported programmes for SPLA transformation can be effective. A similar approach is also needed to other security and uniformed services composed of former SPLA soldiers including the South Sudan Police Service, the Wildlife Service and the Prison Service.

International actors should ensure that support to police, civilian law enforcement and human rights monitoring is supported much sooner following any future settlements than it was in the past. This support should also reach out much further into remote communities.

The IGAD monitoring and verification mechanism is critical to the process of understanding the current state of the army and security forces, and the nature of conflict, and should be supported. This work is vital to future peace-building, reform and development initiatives, and will provide baseline data for a much-needed Strategy Security Review, once the conflict is over.

Future security sector reform planning requires a well thought through DDR programme for ex-combatants, with real livelihood options based on solid social, cultural and economic understanding. Internationally supported initiatives should be tested for context applicability and revised before going live. Resultant processes must in turn be integrated with wider national development plans.

There is a need for continuous and robust diplomatic engagement with key GoSS stakeholders to reinforce program initiatives. At the heart of SSR is the need to establish genuine democratic civil control of the sector. This failed between 2005 and 2013 because of a lack of domestic political will. Interventions with the security forces must be bottom-up and top-down, championed and coordinated internationally. A multilateral body with influence over the future government in-country should be selected to champion and coordinate security sector reform activities.

Any future international assistance to the SPLA must prioritise building accountability and respect for human rights, including establishing an effective and cohesive chain of command and clear expectations around its role in maintaining stability; and ending the culture of impunity for human rights violations and addressing corruption.

Peacekeeping

UNMISS must be supported to expand its protection of civilians beyond PoC areas. The international community including the UK should increase its funding to UNMISS to help it expand its protection of civilians outside of the existing PoC sites, based upon cohesive strategic planning that promotes a shared vision across all areas of UNMISS. UNMISS troop deployment should be strategically reconfigured to allow troops to be sent to the highest-risk areas, including areas held by opposition forces, in order to achieve the most comprehensive protection of civilians.

UNMISS should begin to improve security in the spaces outside of PoC camps by increasing their patrols. These should include regular military and civilian patrols in and around towns and along roads to markets and water sources, as well as rapid response capacity. DPKO should actively encourage staff to regularly leave bases to patrol, to act when needed, and to interact with communities.

UNMISS should make use of available land to support IDPs, so that humanitarians can improve service provision and meet minimum humanitarian standards. There is an urgent need to improve overcrowded conditions and to address protection issues in PoC sites.

UNMISS should make use of available land to support IDPs, so that humanitarians can improve service provision and meet minimum humanitarian standards. There is an urgent need to improve overcrowded conditions and to address protection issues in PoC sites.

There is need for a sufficient number of skilled and well-equipped UN police within the bases (both individual and Formed Police Units), with a particular focus on protecting women and children from sexual and gender-based violence. The UNSC should make a point of ensuring these police are adequately equipped, properly trained and that a significant portion of them are women.

UNMISS must not handover the responsibility for PoC sites in the current context where ethnic targeting of civilians remains a real threat and civilians have said that they will continue to
more to support local organisations and civil society in a sustained manner and be willing to provide core funding if this will assist the establishment of proper internal structures.

Particular care should be taken to integrate the humanitarian needs of women across the humanitarian response. This should involve better prevention and response to GBV both in areas hard-hit by the conflict and in those states less affected by the crisis. It is also necessary to pay greater attention to the particular challenges faced by displaced women with consistently gender-sensitive needs analysis. In PoC sites, female representation on camp committees must be safeguarded and the UK has a responsibility to ensure that UK supported WASH facilities are made safer for women and girls.

The international community should deliver on the call by OCHA for donors to provide US$ 600 million to the humanitarian response by the end of February to take advantage of the access to hard to reach communities during the dry season.

Economic Development

International partners should work with South Sudanese communities to develop sustainable and conflict sensitive strategies to connect the pastoralist sector to markets. This will improve livelihoods, guarantee long term community livelihoods, promote peaceful coexistence and improve accountability between citizens and state.

International partners should ensure that all public and private sector investment from their national companies is conflict sensitive and contributes to long-term peaceful coexistence and development in South Sudan. This means monitoring investments to ensure that the constitutional rights of South Sudan’s communities are respected in spirit as well as in word.

Development institutions should consider combining efforts to create large scale large impact infrastructure rather than piecemeal development projects. This could employ thousands and help establish the foundation for long-term development prospects.

International partners should work from now to determine the best way of ensuring that an internationally agreed oversight mechanism for oil revenues and receipts from taxation are in place. This is necessary if oil revenues are
to benefit South Sudan’s people rather than reinforce exclusive political dynamics.

Youth Development and Educational Opportunities

**Humanitarian decision-makers should ensure that 4% of all humanitarian funding for South Sudan be invested in emergency education.** Education should be regarded as an integral part of the humanitarian response, in line with commitments made at the High-Level Humanitarian Conference on South Sudan in Oslo in May 2013.

**Youth must be given a more prominent place in programming across the board.** Skills training, social programmes and cultural-behavioural change activities should be encouraged (for example to address bride wealth issues).

**The humanitarian agencies should take practical measures to facilitate the functioning of basic education programmes,** for example including education materials in emergency cargo in the supply pipeline.

**The donor community should encourage the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology to prioritise payment of teacher salaries including in the most-affected States.** The Ministry should actively support displaced people to take their exams and receive their certificates.

**International actors must work in both government and opposition controlled areas, to ensure that children do not miss out on education wherever they live.** All parties to the conflict should take all possible measure to safeguard schools, so they can be used for educational purposes.