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Executive Summary

The proposed South Sudan Emergency Food and Nutrition Security Project (EFNSP) primarily seeks to provide emergency food security assistance to the most vulnerable sections of the population and prevent or address malnutrition, especially among children and pregnant/lactating mothers. Activities under the project are organized into two main components: (i) Provision of emergency support for immediate food and nutrition security requirements, and (ii) laying the foundation for recovery of the crop and livestock. Project activities are expected to have an impact on society in several sectors such as employment, income, production, tenure security and way of living of the communities among others. However, implementation of certain project aspects may trigger negative impacts on the society. This Social Impact Assessment (SIA) report contains detailed assessment of the project impacts (positive and negative) association with implementation of various subcomponent activities. The report also alludes to the status of their agricultural production in the project area, community livelihoods, opportunities and challenges faced by project stakeholders, in addition to defining a mitigatory path for the identified negative impacts.

Some of the project activities are envisaged to affect people’s employment, income, production, way of life, culture, political systems, environment, health and well-being, personal and property rights. However, most potential impacts are likely to be positive, and the anticipated negative impacts are largely minor and they can be avoided, prevented or minimized altogether, and the probability of their occurrence is also limited. Most of the suggested measures to address negative impacts include development of community grievance handling mechanism and involvement of the local communities in the development of project sub components and identification of the project participating households.
1 Introduction

Agriculture provides the primary livelihood for majority of households in South Sudan and accounts for 36 percent of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (GoSS, 2012). Over 80 percent of the total area in South Sudan is arable with favourable soils, water and climatic conditions (GoSS, 2011). However, inadequate agricultural support services, weak institutions, and poor infrastructure have led to near collapse of the country’s agricultural production systems (World Bank, 2012). The country continues to experience recurrent episodes of acute food insecurity as only less than four percent of its area is currently cultivated (WFP, 2011). The agricultural sector is dominated by low-productivity subsistence farmers, with yields significantly lower than those observed in the neighbouring countries (Sebit, S., 2011). Limited use of productivity enhancing technologies, capacity constraints, high labour costs, and poor infrastructure hinder progress and constrain production, productivity and competitiveness of the agriculture sector (FAO/WFP, 2012).

The long history of armed conflict and frequent episodes of violence in rural areas, coupled with precarious nature of food production caused by extreme climate (from drought to flood) and continued reliance on scarce manual labour, have exacerbated low agricultural development. Although several development partners are active in agriculture, most interventions are focused on emergency relief, given the high incidences of food insecurity and the threat this poses to national security (USAID, 2009).

1.1 Project justification

With a population of 8.26 million people (SSCECSE, 2008), fertile soils and large swaths of productive land, South Sudan is reliant on oil for its development, and on donor support for the livelihood of its population. Studies have proved that, increased agricultural production increases demand for related sectors, such as rural transformation and services, infrastructure, agro-business, trade and tourism, and transport and communication (World Bank, 2007). While public revenues and government expenditure depend primarily on the oil industry, this provides very limited employment opportunities because Oil Companies normally employ foreign workers and
the oil is exported crude while refinery industry is located out of the country. Much of household income and employment are generated predominantly by crop production and livestock rearing (GoSS, 2009; 2011a): 78 percent of households depend on crop farming or animal husbandry as their primary source of livelihood (GoSS, 2009). Therefore, activities in agriculture sector are crucial to achieve the country’s overall objective of economic growth and poverty reduction. The SSEFNP is consistent with the South Sudan Economic Development Strategy through its focus on rural development as a vehicle for improving livelihoods, incomes and ensuring food security of its population.

1.2 The SSEFNSP objective

The development objective of the Emergency Food and Nutrition Project is to; (a) to provide food and nutrition support for the protection of lives and human capital of eligible beneficiaries; and (b) to help farmers re-engage in agricultural production in selected drought affected areas in South Sudan. The proposed EFNSP will focus on two main areas of support: (i) providing emergency support for immediate food and nutrition security requirements, and (ii) assisting farmers to re-engage in crop and livestock production to meet their own food security requirements.

1.3 Objective of the social impact assessment

Project although is expected to yield positive benefits to participating household and the communities within the project area in general, is likely to trigger a number of social concerns. The SIA was premised at identifying project major social impacts (positive and negative) prior to project commencement, and aid in crafting practical enhancement strategies for the positive one and mitigation measures for the negative impacts to ensure project operation conforms to both national and international social safety policies and regulations including the World Bank Operation Policies (WB OP) particularly the OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples and OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement, as well as national legal framework such as the Transitional Constitution of the Republic of South Sudan (TCSS), the Land Act, the Investment and Promotion Act, National Environment Policy and Protection Bill, the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Policy, and relevant provisions of the Local Government Act particularly those focusing on land ownership, user rights and agriculture.
1.4 Project location

The project will be implemented in the five States of South Sudan that include; Northern Bahr El ghazel, Unity, Upper Nile, Jonglei and Eastern Equatoria. This broad regional approach will complement the existing activities carried out by government and other development partners. The entire project area is categorised as high agricultural potential with high to medium population densities. It is fairly accessible and reliant on trade and agriculture as major economic activities thus, best positioned to generate quick wins and development benefits from public and private investment, and likely to act as a springboard for agricultural development for the entire country.

1.5 Assessment approach/methodology

The assessment was premised on review of extant literature on the post conflict agriculture development, land tenure systems, household’s livelihoods and incomes, socio-economic characteristics of project area, and the relevant legal and policy frameworks. Stakeholders consulted comprised of communities from different ethnic groups within the project area including women and youth representatives, traditional chiefs and community leaders at Payam and Boma level as well as government officials at State and County levels. Consultations were conducted in the form of both formal and informal interviews. Focus group discussions were conducted to capture views and opinions of different groups on the project aspects. The consultations also aimed at familiarizing the project with beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

1.6 Structure of the SIA Report

The report is organized in to seven chapters. Chapter one gives the overview of project justification, EFNSP objectives, and objectives of SIA, the assessment methodology, project location and structure of the report. Chapter two provides the description of the project components, subcomponents activities and how project operation will likely trigger social change in the area. Chapter three describes the baseline conditions and establishes the basis for discussion of project impacts in Chapter five. Chapter four reviews the relevant legislation and compliance requirements associated with project operations. Chapter five revisits the project activities and how they may impact on society, and proposes appropriate enhancement and
mitigation measures. Chapter six pulls the project alternatives together at the level of economic viability and agro production systems and also justifies the preferred options. Chapter seven evaluates the public perception, while Chapter eight sets the Social Management Plan of the project and communicates all aspects of social monitoring.
2 Description of Emergency Food and Nutrition Security Project.

The project will focus on providing emergency support for immediate food and nutrition security requirements, and laying the foundation for recovery of the crop and livestock sectors. The project’s design is informed by the following main considerations and principles: (i) the need to quickly respond to the emergency needs of the most vulnerable, while also helping affected communities to reclaim their livelihoods by reinforcing their resilience; (ii) prioritizing life-saving interventions that address urgent survival needs while also providing support to mitigate lasting impacts of the food scarcity on people's health, ability to learn, and earn a living; (iii) impartial and conflict-sensitive targeting of assistance to avoid exacerbating ongoing tensions in the country; (iv) flexibility in geographical targeting to maintain relevance and appropriateness of the project in addressing the ever changing food insecurity hotspots in the country; and (v) strengthening the ‘relief-development’ nexus. The project will be organized around the following two main components;

a) Component 1: Support to Human Capital and Livelihoods Protection

This component is aimed at increasing access to food for the food insecure and most vulnerable, protect the human capital of children and enhance coping strategies by poor households in addition to preventing any negative impact associated with project operation. These groups will be supported through unconditional food transfers as well as nutrition support. It is worth noting that unconditional food support is a productive expenditure and is necessary to meet the Project Development Objective as it would: (i) help protect the future of a generation of young children who are faced with malnutrition; (ii) protect socio-economic assets by preventing negative coping strategies, such as selling productive assets and incurring debt, which would undermine future production and productivity; and (iii) allow for more rapid re-engagement in production and rebuilding of livelihoods when security improves and favorable conditions for production return. This component is premised on two subcomponents namely:

- Support to Unconditional Food Transfers where the main focus will be on provision of food assistance, as General Food Distribution (GFD) to the broad universe of eligible beneficiaries in a selected affected area so as to counter starvation, prevent hunger
related deaths, livelihood erosion and also mitigate against conflict that could arise from lack of food.

- Support to Integrated Management of Malnutrition; support will go towards an integrated nutrition security intervention that specifically seeks to meet the urgent nutritional requirements of children under the age of five and both pregnant women and lactating mothers.

b) **Component 2: Support to Re-engagement in Crop and Livestock Production**

Agriculture is the major source of livelihoods for the population that is currently affected by food scarcity. Most households engage in production both to meet the food and nutritional needs of their families and to earn cash income from sales of grains, live animals, and livestock products. The objective of this component is to help farmers, affected by conflict and drought to re-engage in crop and livestock production when conditions favorable to production occur. This component has two subcomponents namely:

- **Support to Crop Production including** (i) purchase and distribution of agricultural inputs and planting materials such as seeds and tools, in the form of starter packs, (ii) rebuilding or distribution of assets for postharvest handling and food storage, (iii) provision of extension services around the package of production inputs and postharvest handling technologies supported by the project. Where feasible and appropriate, this support will be extended to urban households as well as beneficiaries in Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites to enable them to undertake production for example through kitchen gardens.

- **Support to Livestock Production will focus on livestock production** to improve food security, incomes and nutrition of affected communities. Project support will be provided for three major interventions: (i) restocking of livestock – mainly small ruminants (sheep and goats) and backyard poultry; (ii) animal health care through campaigns, vaccinations, de-worming, provision of mobile veterinary services; and (iii) advisory services and capacity building for livestock farmers. These activities will stimulate livestock recovery within a very short time after the onset of rains. The target farmers would be identified by the community through the involvement of local leaders and social mobilization efforts. The targeting mechanism will give preference to: (i) women
headed households that are already keeping livestock, and (ii) households where women are predominantly involved in livestock management and the women are already organized in groups that have gained experience in sharing breeding stocks such as bucks.

**Component 3: Support to Project Implementation Arrangements;** this component is designed to finance administrative costs of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), including, financial management, procurement, environment and social safeguards management, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of activities under the project.

To ensure adequate management of environmental and social aspects during project implementation, there is need for establishment of an Environmental and Social Management capacity within the Ministry. Therefore, as part of this capacity development and to ensure that the environmental and social impacts of project subcomponents are adequately addressed, the Ministry of Agriculture, and Food Security (MAFS) has extended the contract of Eco Innovations International Ltd to continue strengthening the environmental and social safeguards activities during project implementation. As per World Bank guidelines, the project is a Category B for environmental safeguards.
3Baseline socio-economic conditions of the project area

This section provides a brief description of the project area focusing on the relevant human environment/area of influence to the project and the existing socio-economic conditions including social trends, livelihood profiles, social organization, gender construction, area demography, social services and labor requirement and availability.

The methodology for elaborating the area baseline information and descriptions involved researching secondary information. In addition review of various reports on agricultural developments, emergency relief, and livelihood projects in South Sudan was undertaken. Information obtained from these secondary sources was organized and collated with primary information from the various stakeholders’ consultative meetings in which participants provided key characteristics of livelihoods, and set out salient socio-economic characteristics of their respective areas.

2.2 Project geographical focus

The project will be implemented in; Northern Bahr El ghazel, Unity, Upper Nile, Jonglei and Eastern Equatoria. This assessment was conducted in the representative counties of the above states. Selection of representative counties was based on the area’s agricultural potential, population densities (medium to high densities), accessibility, and security conditions. The suitability of the above regions for agriculture is discussed below. Most of the inhabitants live by subsistence farming, and also raise cattle, sheep and goats. Some of the crops are sold, while most are consumed locally. Agriculture is a predominant activity.

There is bimodal rainfall pattern (March-June and Sept-Nov) with precipitation ranging between 1,350-1600 mm annually in Eastern Equatoria and average temperature ranges between 27\(^0\)-32\(^0\)C in January to February and 30\(^0\)-35\(^0\) Celsius from December to March. The availability of reliable rainfall makes the area very favorable for crop production, where warm temperatures favor rapid crop maturity and ripening, and also very essential in post-harvest management. The area temperature also enhances vapour-transpiration thus preventing continuous leaching of nutrients following long periods of rain that characterise the area. The Eastern Equatoria Region is
characterised by luxuriant and deciduous broadleaf woodlands vegetation type. The area has mixed terrain comprising of plains, highlands and mountains, with rain forest concentrated particularly on the highlands. The project area is underlain by parches of sandy-loam and loam-clay soils existing in varying proportions across the Greenbelt Zone. Soil texture, depth and water retention capacity declines towards Ironstone Plateau Zone and beyond.

Greater Upper Nile is predominantly agro-pastoral with fishing and wild foods as important supplements to traditional social production systems. Crop performance tends to be very unreliable due to poor agricultural practices. The area is also characterized by unpredictable weather patterns, which forces many households into limited crop production in preference for nomadic pastoral life style. It is home to many ethnic groups that for a long time have conflicted with each other over pasture, water and cattle. These long standing conflicts have periodically resulted in serious food insecurity and depletion of resources (natural, social and human). Since 1999, political instability and conflict have escalated, and disrupted traditional social organisation. Labour is also not readily available due to wide spread lack of transportation, prohibitive distances, and low population density.

The current challenges to sustainable agricultural production include; (i) recurrent inter and intra-tribal hostilities, (ii) lack of social cohesion, (iii) local political leadership, (iv) poor infrastructure, (v) limited access to major markets, (vi) under-utilization of Nile River Basin for transport, (vii) untapped water-dependent production potential, and (viii) strong social traditions that prioritize other income sources than agriculture. The development strategy of the area is, so far, focused on strengthening the capacity of households to maximize opportunities availed by the Nile Basin. The social, natural and security conditions are an imminent challenge to increased agriculture production in both the short and medium terms.

2.3 Natural capital

Land is a principal asset together with complementary resources such as tools and labour. Agricultural land is for the most part openly available in the project area, held in “common” by the community, and managed within the existing traditional structures. Agriculture is dominated by growing of a variety of crops including sorghum, maize, millet, cassava, groundnuts, rice,
sweet potatoes, fruit, sesame, tobacco, sugarcane, soya beans and vegetables such as *sukuma wiki*, beans, cowpeas, ground nuts, Bambara nuts and sim-sim (GoSS 2004-2011). Livestock keeping (sheep, goats, and relatively few cows) alongside crop husbandry is practiced. Generally, livestock keeping in the Greater Equatoria Region is low mainly because of cattle raiding by pastoral tribes and to some extent weather patterns.

There is also a variety of naturally occurring uncultivated foods which form a significant part of the diet in many households and these include; mushrooms, termites, honey, shea nuts, desert date, borassus palms, wild yams and other tubers. The area is also rich in natural forests that are a source of game meat and wild food plants including roots, fruits, berries and leafy vegetables. The forests are also a major source of timber, poles and grass used in the construction of houses and other structures. Mountains and hilly areas also exist and are considered cultural sites and sacred places by local communities. The area is also traversed by several water bodies (streams tributaries, and rivers) that are used for fishing and other activities such as irrigation.

### 2.4 Land ownership and use

Land ownership and use in rural areas falls under the customary law. The right to use land is linked to the customary kinship structure in which land is communal every member of the community has an accessional right to use land. Procedures for one to acquire land for cultivation varies and largely depends on the customary set up of the area but in many cases the paramount Chief/Headman recommends the applicant to the community for permission to use a certain portion. The chiefs are also responsible for regulating the use of common land reserved for grazing, fishing, hunting and gathering. For ancestral agriculture land, consent prior to allocation is sought from the landlords. Special arrangements also exist for allocating land to outsiders (Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), returnees and members of other tribes and clans) but on a temporary basis where once allocated, they are not allowed to cultivate perennial crops or trees.

Save for access to agricultural, the system tends to discriminate against women. Their rights are defined by rules of descent and ethnicity and are commonly mediated through male relatives,
despite the existence of legal provisions that recognize equal rights. This therefore creates divergence between law and practice regarding women rights to own land.

Access/use of land and land ownership continue to be a significant driver of on-going inter and intra tribal conflicts. The provisions of the Land Act, 2009 and of the Draft National Land Policy, particularly the ones protecting community land rights are being challenged by the growing number of large-scale land acquisitions, resettlement of returnees and IDPs. Implementation of the various provisions in the above laws is further compounded by weak judicial systems that cannot fully guarantee communal land rights. With the absence of a viable land tenure system and land law, the question of land would continue to adversely affect the productivity of agriculture, forestry and livestock sectors. The important role that farmers, communities, the private sector and government play in improving productivity in the 3 sectors would only be assured when the question of land is resolved and when any individual or group can have full legal right to own and use land.

2.5 Human capital

State of education
The Equatoria Region has an average literacy rate of 50 percent compared to the national average of 40 percent. School going children of age 6-13 attending primary school (Net Attendance Rate) oscillates between 58-60 percent in the Greater Equatoria Region compared to the national rate of 40 percent. The number of students attending primary school regardless of age (Gross Attendance Rate) is higher than the national rate of 65 percent (GoSS 2012). Project area similar to most parts of South Sudan is characterised by limited number of schools, poor location relative to most homesteads, lack of teachers and a culture that discourages girls from attending school. These factors combined, to a large extent are responsible for the low school enrolment and high numbers of school dropouts. Early marriages where girls bear children at a tender age are also seen as a major challenge to education.

However, significant efforts by government and NGOs (War Child Holland, War Child Canada, Act for Humanity, Child Fund Korea, among others) have been directed towards improving education in the area by focusing on primary education, girls’ education, teacher training and
institutional development. Of particular relevance to project operation is teacher training, interactive radio instruction and the program to promote girls education. The former could easily support the project extension service delivery especially in transmitting messages and offering a platform for agriculture training in rural areas.

2.6 Social capital

The project area is comprised of a vast array of different ethnic groups many of which are sedentary farmers who have harmoniously lived together for a long period of time. Exchange opportunities exist with the neighbouring crop-deficit areas, but this social interaction and exchange of goods is constrained by poor infrastructure and services. With mobility restricted to the outside, support and exchange mechanisms are mainly confined within community members. However, inter-marriage and production differences necessitate exchanges across different ethnic groups.

Labour for cash or food is sometimes practiced among community members. However, labour constraints are increasing by the day as many households choose to prioritize household production, and youth migrate to urban areas. It is important for the project operation to take into account that labour exists, but has to be organized and mobilized through sensitizing and motivating youth to engage them in productive agriculture.

Family composition has helped maintain social capital; families with large numbers of members tend to be more resilient and have greater adaptive capacity than smaller ones. Similarly households with stronger kinship and clan networks are more capable of restarting livelihood activities. However, many families in the project area have gone through shocks and impacts, which has inadvertently affected them and rendered many as vulnerable.

The communities are characterised by a well-defined social organization made of development committees that mobilize communities along development or social agenda. Community is also governed and regulated by a defined leadership structure comprising of Boma Chief, Payam Administrator and County Executive Director who work closely with elders, landlords and clan leaders in ensuring social harmony and development in the area. In the project areas, attempts for
farmers to organise themselves into farm groups to boost output and access to markets have not been successful, however some effort is being undertaken by NGO’s (CARITAS, NPA, Sudan AID among others).

2.7 Economic or financial capital

Generally, production is characterised by low output but despite this, farmers are able to spare some produce for sale to meet household basic needs, education, and medical services. Financial services are not readily available for the majority of rural population, and those available are highly selective. The majority of clients are micro-entrepreneurs, and there is no lending for agricultural activities like inputs and tools. Informal financial services also exist, and mainly consist of in-kind loans e.g. grain for milking cows and and labour exchanges between relatives or neighbours in the Eastern Equatoria.

2.8 Poverty and basic services

According to the GoSS, 2012 the Great Equatoria Region is second to Bahr el Ghazal in poverty levels and the Human Development Index (HDI) for South Sudan; and ranks WES as the wealthiest relative to CES and EES in that order. Poor households form the majority of the population and the rich especially in rural areas are considered those with bicycles or motorcycles and can easily access markets for their produce. The better–off cultivate 5 feddans and above, keep a fairly sizeable number of animals (4 cattle and 15 goats) while the poor cultivate less than a feddan and in most cases keep one cattle and/or a few goats. The middle class and the better off also provide employment for the poor in the form of land preparation, planting, weeding and harvesting.

Many rural areas are nearly bereft of access to basic services, and the capacities of local governments in such areas to perform their functions is extremely low because of insufficient powers, lack of resources, corruption, lack of infrastructure and geographical isolation from centres of services.
Main household sources of income and expenditure

The project area has a range of income options for its population. Crop sales provide the main source of income and these enjoy significant potential for expansion. Commonly traded crops are sorghum, sesame, ground nuts, cassava, simsim, and vegetables. Honey also is another important source of income in addition to wild fruits and game meat and labour exchanges.

Generally, the poor spend biggest proportion of their income on staple cereals and live very close to the borderline with little opportunity to think about any other expenditure other than food. Medical expenses also account for household expenditures as most children are malnourished and are susceptible to different diseases. In times of difficulty, other expenditures can be reduced to allow increased access to essential needs. It is at these times that the poor become dependent upon kin ties. The better off in society allow greater expenditure on minimum non-staple (MNS) items (soap, salt, batteries, essential clothing, households’ items, taxes, repaying of outstanding loans, reciprocation of kin support; education, medical among others).

2.9 Trade and market services

Teak timber, poles, vegetables, wild fruits, game, honey, charcoal and surplus cereals are important trade items within the project area. Markets have low volumes of domestic agricultural products and a large percentage of goods are imported from neighbouring countries and South Sudanese Pound is the major trading currency in the project. However in both the labour and commodity markets, payment in kind has also existed for many years as a common form of exchange. In some circumstances tobacco is used as the mode of exchange for cash, cereals, and goats, while honey and chicken provide other sources of exchange.

Payment in kind also has to some extent, facilitated inland cross regional trade. For example, the Dinka from Western Flood Plains in Bahr el Ghazal Region regularly trade their cattle or labour with the Luo/Jurchol farmers in surplus cereal areas; the Nagishot trade with the Didinga and the Boya or Lotuka (who tend to have more cattle) for payment in cash and also includes payment in kind consisting of sorghum, dried meat, simsim, groundnuts, okra, wild foods, dried fish, tobacco or honey. In some areas, especially the northern part and to some extent the Eastern Equatoria State, seasonal arrangements are made to allow cattle to graze in exchange for milk. In the
planting season, the poor communities trade their labour with middle or better off households in exchange for food.

Access to traditional markets, sometimes is un accessible due to the wars, however in some areas have gradually improved. Trade has also expanded to the previously unknown markets of……. However, exchange opportunities and market access is constrained by the poor state of roads especially during the wet season, where movement of goods and grain becomes very difficult. This often increases the price of goods in high demand areas. In some cases, inability to move grain to areas of demand has resulted in huge post-harvest losses, exacerbated by high humidity and endemic pests. Such variations distort cash flow, labour markets and limit trade opportunities, disrupting the path to recovery and rural development. Inadequate cash in the economy and safe places to keep savings and /or banking services also affect trade and exchange. Limitations also exist on market information systems as most traders’ access price information informally through contacts with other markets.

2.10 Agricultural development

Agriculture remains the predominant sector within the project area in terms of livelihoods, employing 83 percent households. Over 90 percent of the total land area within the project area is considered suitable for agriculture. However, agricultural practices remain highly traditional with only 30 percent of the household reporting any expenditure on inputs. Production is primarily rain fed, subsistence in nature, characterized by primordial technology, and use of seed stock sourced from poor yielding varieties save for cassava and groundnuts in Torit in EES. The role of the private sector to develop mid-large scale commercial and irrigated agriculture has become insignificant due to the war. The problem is complicated by the absence of policies that allow private sector to access agricultural land.

Farm production costs for most crops are generally much higher compared to other countries in the region. This is primarily attributed to high labour costs and a low return on investment (poor yields) among others. Effort to mechanise farming is constrained by inability of farmers to afford operational and maintenance costs of agriculture tools and equipment, and ox ploughing that could substitute mechanization is limited by among others low number of oxen and heavy nature of soils in some of parts of Greater Equatoria Region.
Another initiative to increase household production is represented by the formation of farmer groups, where farmers come together to cultivate large pieces of land. However, this initiative is yet to be embraced by the community as such, as previous attempts by NGOs and the community were futile. Shifting cultivation and intercropping are also widely used as a means of improving soil fertility.

Despite the existence of extension workers within the project area, agriculture extension services delivery remains largely inadequate. High levels of uncertainty and vulnerability are also factors that affect the productivity of agriculture. With about 15-20% of the population relying on humanitarian relief assistance, much of Government’s effort has been in ensuring the security and stability of the population. However, agricultural rehabilitation and recovery programs are gaining momentum.

Agriculture production is further constrained by post-harvest crop losses caused by high humidity, pest infestation and vermin, and seasonal climatic variations (droughts and flooding). The problem is exacerbated by lack of roads and market infrastructure to move commodities from surplus regions to deficit areas, and because of a high rate of illiteracy, the productivity of labour is very low affecting the productivity of both farm and non-farm income.

### 2.11 Gender participation in agriculture

Although women have traditionally been the main movers of household farming, their contribution has neither been understood nor appreciated. Roles and responsibilities tend to vary from place to place influenced by local area social and cultural traditions shaped by effects of the armed conflict. Men and women often perform separate roles in agriculture but women often end up with more tasks and more time at work, and these are likely to vary across different States and ethnic groups in South Sudan. For example in Western Equatoria where households rely mainly on agriculture as compared to Eastern Equatoria or Jonglei where pastoralism is the mainstay, the role of men and women in tilling the land and planting crops varies.

To a large extent, farming is considered a family affair - men are responsible for land preparation, planting and harvesting, while women are involved in weeding, storing and controlling how produce is used. This role comes with further responsibilities for all domestic
chores in the household and extended families. Women have usually less control than men over what is produced. In the case of surplus production, women sell at the market but men take control over the income.

However in some areas, women virtually do all on-farm activities in addition to their domestic chores-cleaning, cooking, looking after children, the sick and elderly, fetching water and fuel-wood. There are many female-headed families as a result of war, HIV, and rural urban migration. Generally, women have low access to capital, little product diversification and low incomes compared to men. Also the long distances to market centres precludes them from getting fair prices for their produce thus decreasing their participation in key economic activities. Understanding the role of women and empowering them with resources, skills and decision-making will undoubtedly be a major factor to improve agricultural productivity in South Sudan.

2.12 Youth participation in agriculture

Youth participation in agriculture is commonly low. This is attributed to a number of factors, such as: rural-urban migration in search of employment and pursuit of a better future; perception of farming as a supplier of subsistence requirement; and the traditional role of youths in society who are mainly dedicated to hunting, maintenance of security and participation in community activities. In addition to this, low farm-gate prices due to poor infrastructure have discouraged many youth from engaging in commercial farming. On the whole, their participation is motivated by desire to gain immediate income, which is the reason why they are involved in vegetable growing, provision of labour during land preparation and trading.

2.13 Safety and health in agriculture

Official data on the incidence of occupational accidents and diseases in the agricultural sector is virtually non-existent. This is partly due to lack of awareness about such incidents and failure to link them to agriculture, combined with absence of legal framework to protect farmers from on-farm hazards. Furthermore some fatalities, that are the result of farm work, are just reported plainly as death, while non-fatal and minor injuries are not considered occupational issues.

Diseases and accidents caused by agricultural work are also conditioned by a range of factors, such as climate, fauna, insect and snake bites, poor living conditions and illiteracy. Many farmers
are also exposed to extreme temperatures for long hours in the fields, and injuries from the use of sharp tools. During land clearing, farmers are exposed to snakes’ bites and insect stings, some of which are fatal or injurious. In EES, women reported rampant stings from scorpions especially during harvesting season.

Most farmers are also at a risk from a wide range of farm related diseases and disorders such as direct contact with environmental pathogens, fungi, infected animals, and allergenic plants which pose risk of skin diseases. Compared to men, women have a high incidence of injuries and diseases; and yet are insufficiently reached by health services. Most of them have practically no education, training or access to information on the risks involved in their work.
4 Review of Legal and Institutional Arrangements

Agriculture and land tenure system have several legal and social implications and are mediated by climate, economic, social and culture norms. In general, it is useful to think of agriculture as any other natural resource based activity whose intensification could lead to both benefits and negative impacts on society. Interventions to modernise agriculture need to respect local traditions and systems as well as avoid environmental degradation. It requires legal and institutional measures to secure the rights of the land users, and to conform to relevant environment and natural resource regulations. The relevant World Bank Operational Policies that guided the SIA were OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples and OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement, to identify potential social impacts and propose appropriate enhancement and mitigation measures. Therefore a set of relevant and applicable institutional frameworks, regulations and policies were considered during preparation of this SIA.

3.1 Transitional Constitution of the Republic of South Sudan (2011)

Article 28 of the Transitional Constitution of South Sudan (TCSS) defines the right of every citizen to acquire or own property, while Article 169 clearly states that land, in South Sudan, is owned by the people, and its use is regulated by the government. This right however, can only be limited by public interest in circumstances and procedures determined by the law for the exercise of eminent domain. The constitution also guarantees equal rights for men and women, and rights of residence for every South Sudanese in any part of the country. However a divergence between law and practice is observed on equal rights of women and men on land, in allocation of land to outsiders (returnees and IDPs) who are given temporary land tenancy. Communal land rights are increasingly being threatened by large scale land acquisitions for agriculture and development purposes. Therefore of relevance to project operation is strengthening communal land ownership rights as guaranteed by the TCSS.

3.2 South Sudan Land Act (2009)

The Act defines land use and management in South Sudan in addition to setting principles for legal rights on land in the country. The Act classifies land into public, community or private. It
gives the owner full rights to use land for livelihood, farming or cattle rearing in accordance with existing laws and regulations. The Act also contains provisions aiming at: (i) resolving land disputes; (ii) recognizing customary law and practices; (iii) establishing a land administrative system; (iv) promoting a land regime favourable to investment opportunities; (v) facilitating the reintegration and resettlement of internally displaced persons, returnees and other categories of persons whose rights to land were or are affected by the civil war; (vi) promoting land management system to protect and preserve the environment and ecology; and (vii) guaranteeing a fair and prompt compensation to any person who lost a right of occupancy. Even though the Act underlines equal rights to access and ownership of land for all, women’s rights to access and use land are still not realized and are often mediated through male relatives. The Act also aims at strengthening communal land rights through improving community security of tenure.

The Land Act contains provisions on land administration and management, which is supposed to be based on the principles of decentralization, participation and transparency (S. 41(2)) according to which each state should manage and administer the land within its jurisdiction. The main decision-making power lies at State level. Nevertheless the lack of coordination between institutions at various levels of the government, the lack of capacity and of financial resources undermines their performance.

At the State level, the Departments of Land and Town Planning and the Surveying Department in the State Ministries of Physical Infrastructure (MOPI) are currently responsible for state-level land administration; town planning; regulation of land tenure, usage and exercise of rights in land; land survey and registration; and coordination of different levels of land administration and management (S. 43). They are also responsible for maintaining the land registry in coordination with the MOHPP (S. 54 (2)). The State Legislative Assembly deals with legislative matters and the State High Courts and the State Courts of Appeal deal with land disputes at the State level. The Land Act has established the County Land Authorities (CLA) (S. 44) and Payam Land Councils (PLC) (S. 48) with primary responsibility over land matters in their respective jurisdictions.
According to the Land Act, the CLA have the power to ‘hold and allocate public lands vested in it with the approval of the Concerned State Ministry in the State subject to town and municipal planning in the County” (s. 46). The CLAs also assist traditional authorities in the exercise of their attributions and advice communities on issues related to land tenure, usage and exercise of their rights (S. 46). The PLCs are responsible for “the management and administration of land in the different Bomas composing the Payam” (S. 48) and to assist traditional authorities in managing communal land and solving land-related disputes arising under their administered territory (S. 50).

The project is consistent with the institutional framework established by the Land Act. The focus on the establishment of the CLA and on the development of the capacity of its staff and MOPI staff for management of communal land tenure is in line with the provisions of the legal framework and of the draft National Land Policy (NLP) as highlighted below.

3.3 National Land Policy 2015

The principal aim of the draft National Land Policy (NLP) is to strengthen security of tenure for all citizens without discrimination. The policy emphasizes equitable access to land by all people through a variety of policies and strategies, including the retention of customary tenure systems which provide access to land as a social right in rural areas, and through land programs in urban areas that provide security of tenure to serviced land at reasonable cost. The policy recognises that provision of equitable and secure access to land, is an important component in poverty eradication.

Recognizing that women are often denied the opportunity to enjoy land rights and access to land on an equal basis with men, the policy emphasizes the importance of initiating a legal reform and legal action on behalf of women who seek to exercise their land rights. Customary tenure arrangements require legal reform to breakdown existing barriers to women holding rights to land on the basis of equality with men. Specific priority is given to the rights of widows to inherit land and the rights of female-headed households to secure land on an equal basis with men. The policy also recognizes the need to ensure that refugees, IDPs and returnees have secure land rights for future peace and security of the country. The policy supports efforts that facilitate
the transition from displacement to a “future of long-lasting peace and sustainable development”\textsuperscript{1}.

3.4 National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Policy (NALEP) 2011

This policy calls for participation of private sector and communities’ in the provision of extension services. It is aimed at ensuring that extension messages meet farmer needs by adopting approaches, which facilitate the development of demand driven approach in extension service delivery. It also focuses on developing human resource capacities commensurate with emerging needs in extension service. The policy further aims at strengthening extension service delivery to facilitate a move from dependency syndrome to sustainable production by rural farm households.

NALEP implementation framework objectives include: (i) empowering rural households in adoption of appropriate technologies; (ii) strengthening stakeholders’ linkages, coordination and networking among extension service providers; (iii) developing and strengthening human and institutional capacity of extension service providers; and (iv) developing an effective research-extension–user partnership and linkages that will facilitate a system responsive to farmer’s needs. The EFNSP is consistent with relevant provisions of NALEP aiming at building capacity and strengthening key institutions towards a sustainable extension system that can lead to increased agriculture and productivity.

3.5 Local Government Act 2009

The Act provides for establishment powers, structure and functions of local governments. It defines the decentralized structure of the government administration. It also contains provisions for land administration and management in accordance with the Land Act and defines roles and responsibilities of traditional authority councils in the dispute resolution prowess. It also, gives wide-ranging powers to Local Government Councils to perform important functions in improving agriculture and community livelihoods.
3.6 South Sudan Water Policy 2007

The policy provides for the establishment of water management institutions at the central, state and county levels and lays the foundations to set up strategies for development of sub-sector for rural and urban water supply in addition to water resources management. The policy also underpins the use of water resources in accordance with international agreements and obligations, and the relevance of forests as watersheds. The policy further stipulates that access to sufficient and quality water is a human right. It also calls for Private-Public-Partnership (PPP) in water sources management and water supply in which local communities also participate in the management and maintenance of water sources.

3.7 National Environment Policy and Environment Protection Bill 2014

The Environmental Protection Bill aims at promoting sustainable development through (i) sound environmental management, (ii) strengthening environmental governance, (iii) harmonizing environmental legal framework, (iv) decentralizing environment management, (v) curtailing environmental degradation, and (vi) generating reliable environment information and data.

The national environment policy is based on the principles of good governance, sustainable development, precautionary principle, and the polluter Pays. It also gives guidance on mainstreaming environment and natural resource management in development programs and underpins the relevance of carrying out Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) prior to project development.

Agriculture development is seen as ambitious driver of environment degradation being dependent both on natural resources and on the capacity of the environment to accommodate the waste, which it generates. Hence agriculture development activities including those in the SSEFNSP are likely to trigger environment and social concerns; and will have to conform to the relevant provision of this policy.
3.8 Institutional framework for project implementation

The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Security, (MAFS) is responsible for transformation of rural livelihoods through transformation of agriculture from traditional/subsistence system to market oriented and profitable agricultural production. The MAFS main goal is to ensure food self-sufficiency, poverty reduction and contributing significantly to the national GDP. The ministry’s objectives include drafting policies that quickly boost agricultural production, availing agricultural inputs and credit facilities at affordable costs, rehabilitating/expanding rural infrastructure, providing research and extension services and market linkages, developing institutional and human resource capacity.

The Government, through the Project Implementation Unit in the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Security will be responsible for implementation and monitoring of the project. The Minister and Deputy Minister are the ministry’s political heads and guide policy formulation. The two Under Secretaries (for Programs and Finance) are charged with the day-to-day running of the ministry and double as the accounting officers. The Ministry has five directorates headed by Director Generals and these include Agriculture Research, Training and Extension, Agriculture, Finance and administration, Forestry and Planning and Programming.
5 Potential Social Impacts

The project aims at providing food and nutrition support for the protection of lives and human capital of eligible beneficiaries and helping farmers re-engage in agricultural production in selected drought affected areas in South Sudan. Most of the social impacts associated with project operation are likely affect employment, income, production, way of life, culture, community, political systems, environment, health and well-being, personal and property rights, apprehensions and aspirations of the communities. The ultimate project beneficiaries include the poor, insecure and most vulnerable people and farmers in drought prone areas. These groups will be supported through unconditional food transfers as well as nutrition support.

It’s anticipated that project implementation could lead to improvements in alleviation of poverty, improved food security through better crop yields, better extension service, diversified agricultural resource base, and improved household income. The broader positive project impact include improvement in livelihoods, food security, more consistent inclusion of women in agriculture and reduction of poverty of the vulnerable segments of the community. The project will also result in a multiplier effect on the local economy through development of entrepreneurial activities such as access to market outlets, agro-input supply, and rural financial services. Hence leading to better-managed land resources which will translate into fewer social conflicts. Productive self-employment opportunities especially for women and the youth are likely to increase due to increasing number of out-growers targeted by the seeds and extension components. At the national, state, county and community levels, the EFNSP will promote rural development strategies that integrate social concerns. The EFNSP will contribute to the decentralization process through community management of natural resources and integrated ecosystem management decision-making processes as enshrined in the Land Act, 2009.

However, the project may lead to an increase in areas brought under cultivation and overall numbers of livestock units, which may increase demand on natural resources or degrade the surrounding environment. Specifically the project operation may trigger the following impacts (i) Change in the areas land use system, (ii) Change in community culture and norms, (iii) Social disorder associated with selection of participating household out of the many in the community.
who would wish to be involved among others. Detailed assessment of anticipated impacts is outlined in the tables below;

### Table 1: Project positive impacts, drivers and benefits to society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>IMPACT DRIVER</th>
<th>EXPECTED BENEFICIAL IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution and provision of food to the vulnerable.</td>
<td>Support to Unconditional Food Transfers where the main focus will be on provision of food assistance, as General Food Distribution (GFD) to the broad universe of eligible beneficiaries in a selected affected area so as to counter starvation, prevent hunger</td>
<td>Rural development as a vehicle for improving livelihoods, incomes and ensuring food security of the affected population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in agro- production system</td>
<td>▪ Adoption of productivity enhancing technologies including use of improved seeds ▪ Implementation of an effective extension services delivery system that provides skills, knowledge and information package to farmers/producers for informed decision making to improve their farming and production practices.</td>
<td>▪ Facilitate a transition from family to market oriented production systems. ▪ Generate high return on investment in agriculture activities. ▪ Allow locally produced goods to compete with food imports hence help conquer border markets. ▪ Support farmer’s sustainable production for self-reliance. ▪ Increase the general wellbeing of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in local business</td>
<td>▪ Improved research and access to knowledge and technologies will support production of improved certified seeds to be then produced by the private sector. ▪ Increased production will stimulate demand for agro-business and trade within and outside the project area</td>
<td>▪ Development of agricultural markets and return to local market dynamics where locally produced goods will replace those from external relief agencies and importation. ▪ Increase demand for quality inputs, improved seeds, credit facilities, agro infrastructure and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>IMPACT DRIVER</td>
<td>EXPECTED BENEFICIAL IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improvement in the local economy | ▪ Improved livelihood, food security, income from increased production will create economically empowered households.  
▪ High household incomes and revenue from local business will lead to high purchasing power of most rural households leading to investments in human capital. | ▪ Revenue from increased trade will enable investment in supplies  
▪ Trade opportunities will reinforce economic growth through a multiplier effect, according to which households with increased income will spend more money on their household needs increasing the income of those who will sell them goods.  
▪ An improved economy will create employment opportunities, and expand trade beyond project area. |
| Improved peace and security     | ▪ Household prioritization of family production  
▪ Harmonious exchange opportunities between food surplus areas/ tribes and food deficit ones | ▪ Food security caused by reduction of chronic food shortages will lead to peace and security  
▪ Reduced conflicts or potential conflicts over land |
| Improved women’s access to agriculture | ▪ Creation of an environment more conducive to women’s participation | ▪ Better rationalization of roles in agriculture  
▪ Improved production due to improved weeding for consistent inclusion of women in agriculture. |
### Table 2: Potential impacts, evaluation, relevance and mitigation measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description/potential impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increased vulnerability of communities, land grabbing and concentration of land in the hand of a few people as consequence of issuance of land titles | The likelihood of this risk is high. Land documentation process, while trying to strengthen security of tenure of communities and individuals, can have the reverse effect of weakening such rights. This is especially true when individual titles are issued because it creates a market where land can be commercialized, and in absence of a land valuation system and of safeguards for communities, it can lead to concentration of land in the hand of few elites. | - No individual titles will be issued. Titles will be given to communities and not to individuals;  
- Community members will be educated about their land rights and there will be periodic awareness campaigns  
- CLBCs will oversee the allocation of land to individuals and in the overall community  
- Guidelines will be drafted together with communities to support them in negotiating large scale land deals |
| Pressure on land resources | - The likelihood of this impact s high, its extent wide, severity will be significant as more people who come will need to use these land resources.  
- Rising population pressures, inter and intra-tribal conflicts, deteriorating resource base and increasing intensification of the traditional production systems have led to an increase in the number of land-related conflicts, and introduction of investments in such areas may attract outside migrants that will increase pressure on existing resources. | - The project will strive to achieve a balance between yield and cultivated area increases  
- The project will work with communities to devise measures to support sustainable investments and ensure the inclusion of migrants into their communities.  
- Support local leadership in national laws that protect natural resource  
- Support local effort to promote resource conservation |
| Insecurity and social disorder because of changes in society composition | The likelihood of this impact is medium, its extent localized, and severity low since the area has over time experienced a change in society composition and leadership has developed mechanism to deal with this. This could be a | - Support local initiative to develop mechanisms of dealing with a diverse population.  
- Empower local leaders in handling an increased number of disputes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Analysis Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion in the Area</td>
<td>Consequence of disruption of social cohesion in the area or conflicts caused by breakdown of community cultural norms and social values due to change in agro production system.</td>
<td>• Involve communities in decision making during implementation to address their concerns. • Undertake awareness on project benefits and undertake farmer field days, study tours and exchange visits for communities to showcase good practices to stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Capturing</td>
<td>Impact likelihood is high. The lack of education and capacity at local level can benefit only a few groups and can eventually create conflicts between members of society and such elites, which in some cases can be represented by foreigners.</td>
<td>• Recognize and work with local administration structures and build community capacity taking advantage of available opportunities. • Support the development of local and community decision-making to ensure that the project largely benefits communities rather than individuals, such as community driven development approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on Existing Roads, Schools and Hospitals</td>
<td>The likelihood of this impact is high, severity is also rated high and duration is long because these infrastructures are already in poor state.</td>
<td>• The project will provide support local communities in improving basic infrastructure. • Encourage communities to participate in community improvement activities such as road improvement and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Exposure to Pesticides, Herbicides and Fertilizers</td>
<td>Impact likelihood is low.</td>
<td>• Because of the high import cost, the project will not support the use of pesticides, herbicides, and not even mineral fertilizer substance management. • Promote integrated pest management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict among communities and individuals during the boundary demarcation process</td>
<td>This is a high risk, which can trigger negative impacts during the boundary delimitation exercise, since boundaries between communities are not well defined and boundary delimitation can revive existing conflicts between communities and among individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Train farmers in proper use of agriculture equipment and tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use collaborative dispute resolution methodology during the boundary demarcation process integrating it with traditional systems to solve disputes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of training on collaborative dispute resolution for community leaders, awareness and sensitization campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preparation of guidelines for disputes resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown above, the project will have several positive impacts which will ultimately support the revitalization of the agricultural sector and the improvement of the well-being of communities and individuals. This feeds into the country’s overall objective of economic development and poverty reduction, since more than 70 percent households in South Sudan depend on crop farming or animal husbandry as their primary source of livelihood. The project operations will also augments the National Agriculture Sector Investment Plan (NASIP) whose main objectives are to: (i) ensure food security for all by increasing food production to meet the immediate consumption needs of the population; (ii) create an enabling environment for the transformation of agriculture from a subsistence system into a modern, socially and economically sustainable; (iii) invest in research and development to double yields of food crops; (iv) support smallholders, commercial farmers, processors and agribusiness with provision of extension services and agricultural education.
6 Analysis of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

During project design, a number of alternatives were considered. The key alternatives mainly related to: (i) the relative project resource allocation between the immediate “short-term relief” interventions and the more medium-term “resilience oriented” crop and livestock production activities (i.e. resource split between Component 1 and component 2); and (ii) reliance on local NGO to provide implementation support to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) for component activities. In terms of resource split between component 1 and component 2, consideration was given to three permutations: (i) allocating all project resources to component 1 and then deferring support for proposed component 2 activities through the South Sudan Agricultural Development and Food Security Project (ADFSP), the preparations of which were fairly advanced before being put on hold because of the conflict; (ii) an even (50:50) resource split between component 1 and component 2; and (iii) an 85:15 resource split that is skewed in favor of component 1.

Option (i) was rejected primarily because of the ill-timing of the approval of ADFSP—expected later in the year, after the next cropping season. Deferring support to farmers for own crop and livestock production would undermine their transition back to self-reliance and would increase the probability that they face hunger later in the year, as many of them are just one failed planting season away from serious food insecurity. This would have the net effect of perpetuating the reliance on food support and would also undermine a key design principle of linking relief and development. Option (ii), which would be an intermediate position, was rejected because of the sheer magnitude of the currently unmet immediate “relief” needs in the country.

In this case, allocating 50 percent of project resources to component 2 would deny much needed support to many hungry and malnourished people. Option (iii) strikes a balance between the two competing imperatives and has the added benefit that it essentially kick-starts livelihood recovery activities planned under ADFSP, thereby allowing for faster implementation of ADFSP activities immediately following approval. Fiduciary considerations and the inability of the Bank to monitor and verify any field activities (mainly because of travel restrictions to the field as a
result of insecurity) precluded the possibility that implementation of component 2 activities would be contracted to local NGOs. The design however allows for participation of local NGOs in implementation, as partners to FAO.
7 Public consultations in the project areas

Public consultations were held in selected communities within the project area to introduce the idea of the proposed project operations to the community members, and also solicit their views on the likely project impact on society. The information gathered during the consultations helped to spin out appropriate mitigation measures so as to prevent or avoid adverse impacts on society during project operations.

7.1 Consultation approach/methodology

Stakeholders consulted included representatives from the communities, community leaders, and selected public officials at State, County and Payam levels. Capturing stakeholders’ views largely encompassed asking them to express their agreements or disagreements using the Likert scale (strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, neither agree nor disagree = 3, agree = 4, strongly agree = 5) on project social acceptability, community expectations and fears as outlined below.

7.2 Stakeholders’ response analysis

Generally, community members welcomed and strongly (mean= 5.00) supported the idea of the project operation in their area and agreed on (mean= 4.7) that the project would alleviate the current food shortages and would be consistent (mean=4.9) with the aspirations (increased agriculture production) of most members in these communities. The public also strongly believe that project operations will: trigger employment opportunities and improve household incomes (mean=5.00), not induce irreversible stress and social tension on society (mean = 4.2) nor alter community activities’ (mean= 4.0). The stakeholders were optimistic that project implementation will induce forward and backward economic benefits (mean=4.3) trigger infrastructure development (mean 4.5), and not likely to affect cultural and traditional setup of the area (mean=5.00).
8 Social Management Plan

The Social Management Plan (SMP) aims at preventing the identified adverse project impacts to society and to maintain and promote social cohesion throughout the project cycle. It communicates all aspects of planning, design and project operation relevant to society in addition to identifying project specific activities likely to trigger adverse social impacts, and also propose appropriate mitigation measures to prevent or minimise the impacts. Therefore, This SMP sets the management of all activities within the project scope alongside socially acceptable practices and helps in monitoring any deviation from such practices using the following approaches (strategies): (i) good agricultural practices (ii) area selection and management, and (iii) social cohesion and harmony.

8.1 Social management

Social cohesion and sustainability will be achieved by sound society management, involving good society mobilization and good project operation and practices. Developing an acceptable criteria and including local leadership in selecting participating households will avoid conflicts and lead to project acceptability and sustainability. All project activities should be managed in such a way that they do not cause involuntary displacement especially of the vulnerable groups in society, loss of employment and livelihood, or threat rights of individuals and groups to use and own land. In addition, influx of people in the project area in search for opportunities should be handled properly. The project operations should endeavour to;

- Strengthen existing (traditional) institutions and through dialogue with local leadership assist in the development of new frameworks for addressing long-term development and regional planning that addresses demographic changes;
- Work together with local leadership to mobilize farmers and participating households in formal groups and encourage them to build the capacities of their members in agribusiness and business competiveness so as to take advantage of any available opportunities.
- Raise awareness and sensitization of project benefits in scale and duration so as to gain
community support of all project activities.

- Promote gender equality and development through inclusion of many women among the participating households as much as possible, and empower women by increasing their number of female beneficiaries in the project in addition to safeguarding their rights.

- Support the efforts of the local authorities in improving public services and infrastructure and where possible investment in the improvement of these services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rising population pressures, inter and intra-tribal conflicts, increase of land/boundaries-related conflicts and possible work migration from attract neighboring countries. | ▪ Strengthen the existing institution and local leaders to handle increased number of disputes and social problems  
▪ Strengthen social safety nets to ensure project largely benefits indigenous people.  
▪ Support local initiatives in implementing national and regional migration laws.  
▪ Empower local leaders in handling an increased number of disputes and social problems;  
▪ Involvement of community leaders in delivering the change  
▪ Public awareness and sensitization about the project benefits  
▪ Strengthen local efforts to mobilize the community into development efforts | Implementing partners MAFS in cooperation with judiciary, community elders and leaders | Throughout the project cycle          |

Insecurity and social disorder as consequence of change in society composition and leadership has not developed mechanism to deal with this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                                                                      | ▪ Support local initiative to develop mechanisms of dealing with a diverse population.  
▪ Empower local leaders in handling an | Implementing partners MAFS, local leaders and community elders, county and | Throughout the project cycle       |

<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased number of disputes and social problems;</td>
<td>payam authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Involve communities in decision making during implementation to address their concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthen efforts of the local leadership to equip them with measures to ring fence commodities and business opportunities for only local communities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Build capacity of county and payam authorities to deal with such phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only few groups benefit from the project activities and can create conflicts between groups of the society and such elites, which in some cases can be represented by foreigners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry out Specific outreach activities to the groups, Subsidy on farm inputs by the government, Use radios, TV, and internet services and mobile SMS in passing on messages, Group demonstration of technologies, use participatory methods of technology transfer</td>
<td>Implementing partners MAFS, Local administration authorities, Local leaders</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support local administration structures to build community capacity in taking advantage of available opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Build capacity of communities in taking advantage of opportunities arising from the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>TIME FRAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in place social safety nets to ensure that the project largely benefits communities and individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementing partners MAFS</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support community driven development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local authorities and leaders to deal with increased number of disputes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited gender involvement. The likelihood of this impact is high, severity is also rated high and duration is long because these infrastructures are already in poor state.</td>
<td>Support existing effort in reducing the work burden of women such as tree planting and energy conservation and mechanised farming.</td>
<td>Implementing partners MAFS</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase female beneficiaries in the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local initiatives in safeguarding women rights through equal opportunity policies</td>
<td>Introducing simple mechanization to facilitate functions usually implemented by women. For instance, as hand weeders, small mills will also reduce the burden on women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact likelihood is high, extent is wide covering entire project area, and severity is high and duration long-term.</td>
<td>Support the efforts of the local authorities to improve public services</td>
<td>Implementing Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local initiatives to enhance basic services and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>TIME FRAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for Chance Find of Physical and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>▪ Stop construction activities and delineate area</td>
<td>Local leaders Implementing Partners</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Secure area to prevent damage and/or removal of objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Notify responsible authorities and Ministry of Culture, Youth, and Sports immediately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Work with authorities on decision about how to handle the find and proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Work with the local communities to strengthen management of cultural and archaeological sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak capacity for environmental and social management at state and county levels</td>
<td>▪ Develop partnerships with NGOs and CBOs for environmental and social management;</td>
<td>MAFS national Secretariat County officials., NGOs</td>
<td>Throughout project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Stimulate the operation of Payam and County Farmers fora.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

EFNSP is socially justified. Social Justification rests on its contribution and provision of food and nutrition support for the protection of lives and human capital of eligible beneficiaries and helping farmers re-engage in agricultural production in selected drought and conflict affected areas in South Sudan.
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