

SENSITIVE - PROTECT: NOT FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF
THE IGAD SPECIAL ENVOYS

**Report on the IGAD Cessation of Hostilities
Implementation Workshop**

(15-16 November 2014)

(Draft 17 November 2014 v2)



1

17/11/2014



Executive Summary

1. An IGAD-led COH implementation workshop took place at the Elilly Hotel, Addis Ababa on 15-16 November in accordance with Serial 1a of the Addendum to the Cessation of Hostilities Implementation Matrix (09 November 2014).

2. The participants representing the Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRSS) and Sudan People's Liberation Movement / Army in Opposition (SPLM/A-IO) worked in a spirit of cooperation, transparency and professionalism to achieve the following aims and objectives:

Aim: Prepare maps, agree timelines and allocate responsibilities for the implementation of the COH, in accordance with the re-dedication agreement (09 November 2014), its matrix and addendum.

Objectives:

- Improve understanding of COH / ceasefire processes
 - Develop plans to ensure commitments are met
 - Agree specific arrangements for the disengagement, separation and withdrawal of forces
 - Provide a platform for subsequent permanent ceasefire negotiations
3. The parties agreed the following:
- The territory they currently dominate, and the main boundaries between forces;
 - The areas requiring special arrangements where forces are in close proximity and require immediate separation;
 - Resupply routes;
 - Designated commanders in conflict areas;
 - A revised implementation timeline;
 - Pre-conditions for the participation of the SPLM/A-IO in the IGAD MVM
4. There were three points of contention between the parties:
- Eleven towns/villages, and three counties (out of 33) where control/dominance is disputed, which need to be verified by the IGAD MVM;
 - The participation in the conflict and withdrawal of allied forces. However, GRSS agreed to present the withdrawal plan for the Ugandan People's Defence Force (UPDF) by 1200hrs on 19 November 2014;
 - SPLM/A-IO participation in MVM (IGAD and the parties agreed to resolve this issue, based on the pre-conditions, by 1800hrs on 18 November)
5. The following subsequent action is recommended:
- Distribute minutes and key agreements of the workshop to the parties;
 - Follow-up on outstanding issues and deadlines;
 - MVM conducts verification of disputed areas in coordination with the parties;
 - Finalize maps, with COH related information, and distribute on a wide scale in order to increase sensitization and public awareness of the COH;
 - Build on the information received to develop a sustainable permanent ceasefire agreement.



Handwritten signature and date: 17/11/2014

Report on the IGAD Cessation of Hostilities (COH) Implementation Workshop (15-16 November 2014)

1.0 Background

1.1 The re-dedication of, and implementation modalities for, the COH agreement signed on 23rd January 2014 between GRSS and SPLM/A-IO was signed on 9 November 2014. Subsequently, in accordance with Serial 1a of the Addendum to Cessation of Hostilities Implementation Matrix, an IGAD-led COH implementation workshop was conducted on 15-16 November 2014 at the Elilly Hotel, Addis Ababa.

1.2 The COH workshop was supported by the IGAD Monitoring and Verification Mechanism (MVM), with United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) representation, and facilitated by a security advisor provided by the troika.

1.3 The COH workshop aim, objectives and end-state were as follows.

Aim: Prepare maps, agree timelines and allocate responsibilities for the implementation of the COH, in accordance with the re-dedication agreement (09 November 2014), its matrix and addendum.

Objectives:

- Improve understanding of COH / ceasefire processes;
- Develop plans to ensure commitments are met;
- Agree specific arrangements for the disengagement, separation and withdrawal of forces;
- Provide a platform for subsequent permanent ceasefire negotiations.

End-State:

- Improved understanding of COH / ceasefire processes and parameters;
- Master map(s) produced with boundaries, separation areas, security zones, withdrawal lines and resupply routes;
- Implementation timelines agreed;
- Command responsibilities allocated.

2.0 Participation

2.1 The following participants represented GRSS:

MG Samson Mabior
BG Gabriel Goor
BG Thomas Gador
COL Benjamin Makuer
COL Kongor Reech
MAJ Matur Dharuai

2.2 The following participants represented SPLM/A-IO:

BG Gatokor Gatluak
COL Daniel Gatbel
COL Gathon Jua



Handwritten signature and date:
17/11/2014

BG Ket Gang
COL Koang Thor
MAJ Pour Nienkel
MG Chuol Ghaga (16 November only)

3.0 Outline Agenda

3.1 The outline agenda for the workshop was as follows.

Day 1:

- Opening Address
- Aim, objectives, end-state and agenda
- Review COH commitments,
- Establish COH terminology and definitions
- Establish party areas and boundaries
- Establish Special Arrangement Areas
- Agree information requirements for Day 2

Day 2:

- Review boundaries between parties, Special Arrangement Areas, separation zones and disputed areas
- Declare resupply routes
- Declare withdrawal plans for allies
- Agree revised timeline
- Agree dissemination and sensitization plans
- MVM update and participation in the mechanism by the parties

4.0 Points of Agreement and Dispute

4.1 Party areas and boundaries (as at 16 November 2014)

- The parties agreed that GRSS controls the greater regions of Greater Bahr El Ghazal and Greater Equatoria:
- The parties also agreed that they are dominant in the following counties

GRSS	SPLM/A-IO
<i>Unity State</i>	
Pariang	Mayom
Abiehmnom	Rubkona
	Gut
	Koch
	Leer
	Mayendit
	Panyijar
<i>Jonglei State</i>	
Bor South	Ayod
Twic East	Uror
Duk	Akobo
Greater Pibor Administrative Area	Nyiroi
Pochalla	Fangak

17/11/2014

SENSITIVE – PROTECT-NOT FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE IGAD SPECIAL ENVOYS

Pigi County (Disputed) Control of Korfolous, Atar and Canal to be verified by the MVM	
<i>Upper Nile State</i>	
Panyikang	Longochuk
Malakal	Nassir
Fashoda	Ulang
Akoko	Maiwut
Baliel	
Melut	
Renk	
Manyo (Disputed) – both parties agree they are not dominant in this county	
Maban (Disputed) – both parties agree they are not dominant in this county	

4.2 The result of these agreements was the production of **Force Boundary Lines** as depicted on Master Map 1

Forces Boundary Line (COH definition): Forces loyal to either party should not cross the boundary line unless they are already positioned in a "special arrangement area" or have been allocated an approved resupply route. Boundary lines can also be applied when forces are progressively withdrawing.

4.3 The parties further agreed that the following towns / villages would be designated as **Special Arrangement Areas**:

Special Arrangement Areas (SAAs) (COH definition): SAAs are locations where forces from one party are in occupation, in an area dominated or threatened by the other party. Aimed at separating forces in close proximity. SAAs comprise of an area dedicated to the party in occupation, surrounded by a separation zone where forces from both parties are not permitted to enter.

GRSS	SPLM/A-IO
<i>Unity State</i>	
Mayom	
Bentiu	
Wang-Kay	
<i>Jonglei State</i>	
Ayod	
<i>Upper Nile State</i>	
Kaka	Wadekona
Nassir	

4.4 Accordingly, it was agreed to apply **Separation Zones** to the SAAs in order to disengage and separate the forces (see Master Map 2)

Separation Zone (COH definition): A zone where forces from both parties are not permitted to enter, unless approved for resupply purposes, and defined by a radius from the perimeter of the occupying force position. A separation zone ensures that forces are separated to the effective range of their weapon systems.

4.5 The following towns / villages were disputed by the parties. The control of these towns/villages requires verification from the MVM

Disputed Areas
<i>Upper Nile State (Renk County)</i>
Duk Duk

Handwritten signature and date: 17/11/2014

Girbarnat
Gerger
Gongbar
Upper Nile State (Maban County)
Beneshowa
Jamam
Doro
Upper Nile State (Baliet County)
Gel Achel
Upper Nile State (Longuchok County)
Guel Guk
Unity State (Rubkona County)
Northern Unity Oilfields
Jonglei State (Duk County)
Pajut

5.0 Resupply Routes

5.1 The parties declared the following as preferred ground resupply routes

Resupply Route (COH definition): a ground route allocated to a party to provide essential resupply to forces in special arrangement areas; a security zone of 5km is imposed either side of the allocated route

5.1.1 GRSS:

- Resupply to Ayod. By road from Bor
- Resupply to Malakal. By road from Juba to Bor to Ayod to Canal, then across the River Sobat.
- Resupply to Mayom and Wang-Kay. By road route from Warrap
- Resupply to Bentiu. Priority 1 – road route from Warrap. Priority 2 – River Nile from Juba to Adok and then road route through Leer. Priority 3 – road route from Rumbek to Mayendit to Bentiu
- Resupply to Nassir. By road or River Sobat from Malakal

5.1.2 SPLM/A-IO: The SPLM/A-IO did not wish to declare any resupply routes, stating that all resupply was received through local support. However, SPLM/A-IO reiterated the need to sensitize their commanders on the proposed GRSS resupply routes, which cross their areas, before any attempts to use them were made.

6.0 Declaration of Military Commanders

6.1 The parties declared the following commanders as responsible for the areas stated.

6.1.1 GRSS:

Upper Nile State	
Renk	BG Stephen Buoy
Melut, Paloich and Adar	BG Justin Nhial Batoang
West Bank (Kaka / Manyo)	BG Zacharia Akol
Nassir	BG Peter Yual Akol
Malakal and south in Pigi County (Jonglei)	MG Johnson Oliny

Handwritten signature and date: 17/11/2014

State)	
Jonglei State	
Ayod (Jonglei State)	BG Maduk Aler Gatluak
Unity State	
Bentiu (Rubkona and Mayom Counties)	MG Tayib Gatluak

6.1.2 SPLM/A-IO:

Jonglei State	
Ayod, Akobo, and Uror Counties	MG Simon Gatwich Duol
Fangak and Pigi Counties	MG Gabriel Gatwich Chan (also known as Gabriel Tanginye)
Upper Nile	
Eastern Upper Nile	MG Garoth Gatkuoth
Malakal area and south the Korfolous (Jonglei State)	MG Thomas Mabor Dhoi
Renk	BG Peter Puok Kong
Western Upper Nile / Manyo County	BG Joseph Gai Gatluak
Unity State	
Mayom and Rubkona Counties	MG Peter Gadet Yak

7.0 Withdrawal of Allies

7.1 GRSS allege that SPLM/A-IO is receiving support (equipment and training) from allies in the following areas:

7.1.1 Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF), and SAF proxies including Janjaweed, Popular Defence Forces (PDF), and Misserya, supporting SPLM/A-IO in the following areas:

- *Bordering Unity State*: Heglig, Lalop, Karasahna, Tor, Kilo 23, Tumsah, Panyakuach, Kilo 8, and Jamo/Panyang
- *Bordering Upper Nile State*: Kuek, Um Jallah, Hamrah and Magenit (west border), Jebelein, Joda and Tibun (eastern border), Kilo 10 and Bouth (Renk border)

7.1.2 Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), supported by the Khartoum government, operating in Western Bahr El Ghazal and Western Equatoria States where they are conducting attacks in coordination with SPLM/A-IO attacks in Unity and Upper Nile States.

7.1.3 SPLM/A-IO fervently denies they are receiving the support described by GRSS.

7.2 SPLM/A allege that GRSS is receiving support (manpower, weapons [including artillery, armour, attack helicopters and ammunition] from allies in the following areas:

- Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) in Rubkona and Mayom
- SPLM/A-North in Pariang and Rubkona (Unity State), Fashoda, Dajo, Maban, Pachima and Wendesa (Upper Nile State)
- Egyptian military experts supporting GRSS in Nassir and Ayod
- UPDF in Bor South County (Jonglei State)
- Ethiopian opposition forces

Handwritten signature in blue ink
17/11/2014

7.2.1 GRSS fervently denies they are receiving support from JEM, SPLM/A-N or Egyptian fighters, but accept they are receiving support from UPDF in Bor South County

7.3 Progressive withdrawal of the UPDF from Bor South:

- GRSS agreed they would withdraw UPDF from Bor South within the 30-day allocated period, but requested a further 72 hours (until close of business on 19 November) to declare where the UPDF would withdraw to
- SPLM/A-IO explained that an acceptable withdrawal, from their perspective, would be to Nzara (Western Equatoria State), where UPDF units were based to support regional operations against the LRA.

8.0 Participation in the Monitoring and Verification Mechanism (MVM)

8.1 After the workshop participants received an extensive briefing on the MVM, SPLM/A-IO presented the following pre-conditions in order to participate in the mechanism:

- Deploy Monitoring and Verification Team (MVT) members to their respective teams, from Pagak.
- Provide a support office for SPLM/A-IO MVT members in Pagak.
- If required, convene Joint Technical Committee (JTC) meetings in Addis Ababa
- Agree and sign the MOU between SPLM/A-IO and the IGAD MVM, including an agreement to pay negotiable allowances to SPLM/A-IO MVM members.

8.2 The GRSS delegation commented that the issue of allowances is shared by both parties, and further suggested an allowance of \$100 / day. The MVM leadership commented that this issue is dependent on the IGAD partners, and both parties should continue to participate in the mechanism without pre-conditions.

8.3 The IGAD MVM Chairman agreed to the deployment from Pagak of SPLM/A-IO MVT representatives, and the convening of JTC meetings in Addis Ababa (when required). It was agreed that IGAD and the SPLM/A-IO would endeavor to resolve the issue of the MOU, and allowances, by close of business on 18 November.

9.0 Revised Implementation Timeline

9.1 The parties agreed that the following timelines for the implementation of the COH matrix and addendum provisions are more realistic:

- MVM verification of disputed areas complete by 24 November
- Forces separate and, if necessary redeploy to designated areas: 16-30 November
- Separation zones established and monitored: 16-30 November
- Progressive withdrawal of allies: GRSS to present withdrawal plan for UPDF by 1200hrs on 19 November
- Confirmation of redeployment dispositions: 1 December



Signature
17/11/2014



SENSITIVE – PROTECT: NOT FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF
THE IGAD SPECIAL ENVOYS

9.2 SPLM/A-IO reinforced the need for time to sensitize their military commanders in the field, but agreed to work in good faith towards achieving the timelines above. Parties agreed to keep IGAD updated on the sensitization process.

9.3 Parties were reminded of their obligation to ensure that all forces remain in place while the sensitization and subsequent disengagement and separation process takes place.

10.0 Conclusion and Subsequent Action

10.1 All workshop aims and objectives were achieved, with the main area of contention being the development of plans to progressively withdraw allies. Some areas of dispute remain, which can be verified by the MVM. A successful and productive workshop, the parties worked in a spirit of cooperation, transparency and professionalism, and showed promising signs of an eagerness to cease hostilities.

10.2 The following subsequent action is recommended.

- Distribute minutes and key agreements of the workshop to the parties
- Follow-up on outstanding issues and deadlines
- MVM conducts verification of disputed areas
- Finalize maps, with COH related information and distribute on a wide scale in order to increase sensitization and public awareness
- Build on the information received to develop a sustainable permanent ceasefire agreement



Handwritten signature
17/11/2014

