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### BASIC INFORMATION

#### A. Basic Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Parent Project ID (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>P169274</td>
<td>South Sudan Safety Net Project (SSSNP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Estimated Appraisal Date</th>
<th>Estimated Board Date</th>
<th>Practice Area (Lead)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing Instrument</th>
<th>Borrower(s)</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Project Financing</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Development Objective(s)**

Provide access to income opportunities to selected poor and vulnerable households and strengthen safety net delivery tools.

**Components**

- Labor Intensive Public Works "Plus"
- Direct Income Support
- Strengthening Safety Net Delivery Tools and Project Management

### PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US$, Millions)

#### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Financing</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which IBRD/IDA</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Gap</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DETAILS

**World Bank Group Financing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Development Association (IDA)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA Grant</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Introduction and Context

1. **The nearly five-year conflict in South Sudan has significantly eroded the country’s development potential, worsened the humanitarian situation, and deepened vulnerabilities.** Hundreds of thousands have lost their lives, and nearly 4.5 million people have been displaced internally or are seeking asylum in neighboring countries. Around 6 million South Sudanese, were severely food insecure in September 2018, making South Sudan one of the most food insecure countries in the world. The following groups have been disproportionately affected by the conflict: (i) internally displaced persons (IDPs); (ii) children and youth, particularly unemployed youth; (iii) women, especially survivors of gender-based violence; and (iv) disabled, elderly, and female-headed households.

2. **Despite an abundance of natural resources and potential oil wealth, South Sudan’s economy is in crisis, with output contracting, and inflation and parallel exchange market premium soaring.** Real GDP has contracted by 6.9 percent in FY17 and 11 percent in FY16 due to the ongoing conflict, oil production disruptions and below-average agriculture production. Annual inflation reached alarming triple digit levels to about 650 percent in September 2017, and the South Sudanese Pound (SSP) has depreciated by 790 percent (July 2018). Declining oil production and revenues have put additional pressure on the economy already weakened by the civil war.

3. **Development indicators in the country continue to be some of the lowest in the world.** Currently, South Sudan ranks 187 out of 189 countries in the Human Development Index. About two million children continue to be acutely malnourished. Governance challenges persist, and the political situation remains highly uncertain and fluid, with local level violence being a common occurrence. It has been estimated that some US$ 1.7 billion will be needed in 2018 alone to effectively respond to the humanitarian need of 7.1 million South Sudanese.

4. **The on-going economic crisis, coupled with conflict and insecurity, has exacerbated already tenuous poverty and vulnerability levels.** The incidence of poverty has worsened from 51 percent in 2009 to 66 percent in 2015, falling to the current rate of 82 percent in 2016. Vulnerability has also been exacerbated: it is estimated that a 10 percent consumption shock risks pushing about 160,000 additional people into poverty, while a 20 percent shock would push more than 300,000 people into poverty. South Sudan is also vulnerable to a number of natural disasters, such as floods, droughts, and heat waves, which further exacerbates people’s welfare and livelihoods.

5. **The generational impact of the conflict and economic crisis has resulted in the unraveling of the social fabric.** Trust among people, and in the Government, has broken down, and the capacity of institutions to adequately provide services and foster an environment of impartiality and accountability is nearly absent. High levels of deprivation and lack of economic opportunities have further increased risks of elite capture, predatory behaviors by institutions, and funds mismanagement. The poor and vulnerable are particularly affected by these developments and are
increasingly marginalized in the political and social spheres. Women and children disproportionately bear the brunt of the abuses, and gender-based violence (GBV) remains one of the most critical threats to their protection and wellbeing.

6. **While a peace deal has been recently signed, the long-term prospects for achieving a peaceful resolution to the ongoing conflict appears tenuous.** A peace deal was signed on September 12, 2018, but was immediately violated, thereby creating skepticism as to the viability of the newly signed peace agreement. A Peace Day celebration was held successfully on October 30, 2018, and the Deputy Chairperson of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-in-Opposition (SPLM-IO), returned to Juba as part of the peace deal. In addition, a joint circular was issued on November 11, 2018 announcing that the National Committee of Humanitarian Affairs will be relocated immediately to Juba to facilitate humanitarian and relief work in opposition held areas, in collaboration with the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management and UN/NGOs. While these are seen as positive steps in the de-escalation of tension between the warring parties, a great deal more needs to be done before peace can be consolidated.

**Sectoral and Institutional Context**

7. **Given the magnitude of the urgent need in the country, social protection in South Sudan has de facto taken the form of humanitarian support, financed almost exclusively by donors as emergency food assistance.** Nonetheless, a number of projects are now aiming to provide safety net support to poor and vulnerable households in an effort to build resilience, albeit still small compared to the humanitarian sector. Despite these efforts, safety net interventions continue to be fragmented, unpredictable, and not at significant scale, which would be capable of giving poor and vulnerable households assurance of reliable income. Serious weaknesses also exist within the Government in terms implementation capacity and fiduciary accountability. Moreover, implementation of safety net programs has become increasingly difficult given the highly volatile country context.

8. **Development partners are now considering mechanisms to coordinate their efforts with the aim of enhancing community recovery and resilience, aligning support along geographic areas.** The Partnership for Recovery and Resilience (PfRR) has now been established as a coordination platform to bring together the multiple donors and NGO partners to undertake integrated actions for recovery and resilience in a select number of locations.

9. **In this context, the World Bank has been supporting efforts to establish a more reliable, systematic and predictable delivery of safety net through the ongoing Safety Net and Skills Development Project (SNSDP).** With an IDA credit of US$ 21 million, SNSDP aims to provide access to income opportunities and temporary employment to the poor and vulnerable households and put in place building blocks for a social protection system. To this end, the project has two components: (i) safety net systems building, and (ii) public works. It also piloted complementary “cash-plus” support that included water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and financial literacy training to participants. The SNSDP is implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), in collaboration with the Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare (MGCSW) and Ministry of Labor, Public Service, and Human Resource Development (MLPSHRD). It is operational in 7 counties, six of which are being implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) on behalf of the Government, with the seventh by Action Africa Help-International (AAH-I).

10. **The SNSDP has achieved key results despite the challenges of implementing in a highly fragile and uncertain environment.** The project has reached some 313,000 individuals in about 52,000 poor and vulnerable beneficiary households, of which 74 percent are women and 30 percent are IDPs, and has provided them with nearly US$ 13 million for participation in labor intensive public works focused on: road rehabilitation and maintenance;
clearance of drainage structures; routine clearing of public spaces; and small-scale farming and food production in the rural locations. Basic safety net delivery tools were established, including: (i) objective and transparent targeting mechanism; (b) Management Information System (MIS); (c) transparent and accountable payment transfer mechanisms, in partnership with commercial banks, based on biometric and geographic information system (GIS) tagged authentication; and (d) robust Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) based on community platforms and appeals structures. Mobile and GIS based real-time data tracking and monitoring was also piloted in Juba. Lastly, coordination and oversight structures within local governments were established, which could serve as the initial pillar of a coherent national social protection system in the future.

11. However, due to the increasing insecurity and restricted access, worsening economy, escalating needs, and weak capacity, the challenges of implementation increased over time. Existing implementation modalities impeded the SNSDP in reaching the opposition held areas, where the needs were the most acute. In addition, the outbreak of violence in 2016 resulted in the pause of activities for about a year, as implementing NGOs were no longer present and operating in the country. Once the project restarted implementation in June 2017, further time was lost in bringing on board new implementing partners (IPs). Further, implementing a cash-based program was also not without high operational risk, including inadvertently channeling resources to warring parties, and thus fueling the conflict. The uncertainties raised by the on-going peace process further risk fiduciary accountability of project support.

12. The proposed South Sudan Safety Net Project (SSSNP) builds on the experience of the SNSDP in providing safety net support to the poorest and most vulnerable households in selected locations. It aims to bridge the humanitarian-development nexus by addressing urgent needs through a scale up of the cash for work opportunities based on participation in labor intensive public works, while also rehabilitating community assets and strengthening safety net delivery tools for longer term development.

13. Due to the increasing instability and the need to provide access to safety nets to a wider population, the SSSNP would also include significantly different features that are adapted to the changing country situation. This project will be directly implemented by UNOPS, rather than through the Government. This arrangement will provide additional fiduciary accountability in an uncertain and high risk situation, and further strengthen the humanitarian-development linkages by facilitating UNOPS to engage with communities and build their capacities. As such, it has the mutual benefit of joint learning of how to implement development activities in profoundly challenging areas. Second, the project will target both Government and opposition-held areas, and will manage the heightened social and fiduciary risks and uncertainties of working in these areas by enhancing community outreach and citizen engagement, strengthening key delivery tools, including the GRM, MIS and payment mechanism, and reinforcing peace dynamics for local level community unity and cohesion using the safety net platform.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

**Development Objective**

---

1 Due to capacity constraints by the Government to manage and implement operations, particularly in terms of fiduciary accountability, the Government has requested the World Bank in a letter dated August 14, 2018 to provide financing directly to third party organizations for implementation of all projects.
14. The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to provide access to income opportunities to selected poor and vulnerable households and strengthen safety net delivery tools.

**Key Results**

15. The proposed SSSNP is expected to contribute to:
   a. Increased access to income opportunities to selected poor and vulnerable households
      • Beneficiaries of social safety net programs, of which female (core indicator)
   b. Strengthen safety net delivery tools
      • Percentage of beneficiary payroll generated by the MIS
      • Percentage of payments made using biometric authentication
      • Percentage of complaints resolved through the GRM

**D. Project Description**

16. The proposed project would be a US$ 40 million IDA grant with three components to be implemented over two years. The components are: (i) Labor Intensive Public Works “Plus” Interventions; (ii) Direct Income Support; and (iii) Strengthening Safety Net Delivery Tools and Project Management. Some of the proposed project activities, particularly under Component 1, would contribute towards climate change adaptation in the targeted geographic areas.

**Component 1: Labor Intensive Public Works “Plus” Interventions**

17. This component would scale up the public works component under the SNSDP to continue providing access to temporary income, supported by a “plus” approach. It would provide income for poor and vulnerable households through a cash transfer, linked to participation in labor intensive public works, to sustain household assets, and smooth consumption during economic hardships. Public works activities would continue to be labor intensive, be selected by the communities based on their priorities, and focus on activities that would benefit the community at large. Focus would be given to support female participation, ensuring that selected activities are appropriate for gender appropriate. The enhanced community assets, particularly those aimed at integrated watershed management, would lead to better natural resource management, thereby contributing to climate change adaptation. All activities would focus on maintenance and/or rehabilitation of existing structures. Innovations tried under the SNSDP aimed at promoting food security and livelihoods opportunities would be given priority. Gender consideration would be given to the selection of public works activities to ensure that they are appropriate for women’s needs and do not exacerbate GBV risks. It would continue to promote intensive community engagement and be delivered using the operational tools established under the SNSDP.

18. The public works implementation would be augmented through the provision of complementary support to ensure that a more integrated package of services is provided, utilizing the “plus” approach. Learning from the experiences of SNSDP, it is expected that complementary activities would support beneficiaries to use the cash received under the labor intensive public works intervention more effectively. These would include: (i) provision of financial skills trainings (i.e., promotion of savings groups, provision of financial literacy training, etc.), (ii) WASH trainings; and (iii) early childhood development (ECD).
and nutrition messages. These services were selected as priorities as they would address key needs in the community, while also supporting the building of human capital.

19. **In light of the prevailing violence against women, particular efforts would be made to mitigate additional risks of GBV.** Mitigation measures will be incorporated in the project design, complemented through in-depth awareness raising campaigns and community consultations, among other measures. The proposed project would also coordinate with the UNICEF’s Health and Child Protection Program and work to identify available response services and improve the referral systems for potential survivors should incidence of GBV/sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse occur. GBV-sensitive reporting channels will be developed to be integrated into the within the GRM. Guidance on how to mitigate GBV risks will be included in the Project Operations Manual (POM), building on on-going analytical work on design features which can mitigate GBV in safety net interventions\(^2\) and on regional experience (i.e. Kenya).

Component 2: Direct Income Support

20. **This component would provide direct income support to poor and vulnerable households who are unable to participate in labor intensive public works activities.** Targeting criteria would include: (i) Child headed households with no alternate income support; (ii) Poor and vulnerable households headed by pregnant and/or lactating women lacking able-bodied member and alternate income support; (iii) Poor and vulnerable households headed by an elder (as identified by the community) lacking alternate income support; and (iv) Poor and vulnerable households headed by persons who are disabled or chronically ill requiring fulltime care and lacking alternate income support. In extreme cases where implementation of labor intensive public works activities will not be possible, the targeting criteria of this component would be expanded to also include poor and vulnerable households with able-bodied members lacking alternate income support. Conditions for when this would be applied would be detailed in the POM.

21. **The delivery of the direct income support would be closely aligned with the operational processes and cycles of the labor intensive public works “plus” intervention, as beneficiaries of both components would be from the same communities.** Moreover, this component would be delivered using the same operational tools that have been established under the SNSDP to be used for the delivery of component 1. The annual value of the direct income support would be equivalent to that of component 1, provided over the same period and at the same time. Households supported by this component would be encouraged to participate in relevant complementary activities provided under the labor intensive public works “plus” interventions.\(^3\) It is expected that standardizing the delivery of the two components would promote greater cost-efficiency by leveraging on economies of scale and avoiding overlap and duplication of efforts, as well as minimizing potential grievances and tensions among the two groups of beneficiaries.

Component 3: Strengthening Delivery Tools and Project Management

22. **This component would continue to strengthen safety net delivery and operational tools which**

\(^2\) This refers to the analytical work on “Safety First: Social Safety Nets and GBV, funded by the Rapid Social Response (RSR) Trust Fund.

\(^3\) Participation in these activities would however not be mandatory and a criterion for receiving the direct income support, as it is not clear if all eligible households would have required members to take part in the activities, and whether all the trainings would be relevant for all of the households selected.
have been put in place under the SNSDP Given the heightened implementation, fiduciary and safeguards risks in the country, the proposed SSSNP will put significant efforts and resources to establish a broader set of risk mitigation tools to ensure effective delivery of the cash transfer components. These include: (i) an enhanced GRM to better address grievances and emerging social risks, promote transparency and inclusion, and reinforce community mobilization and cohesion; (ii) a fully functional MIS to strengthen accurate reporting and oversight and ensure data security and protection; (iii) strengthened payment mechanism for accurate and timely payments with compliance checks; (iv) intensified citizen engagement and community sensitization to systematically reinforce peaceful cooperation, inclusion, and unity; and (v) project implementation and management costs. Findings and recommendations from on-going analytical works four would also inform the design and implementation of this component.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

23. Following assessments of a number of key agencies engaged in the social protection sector, UNOPS is recommended as the direct Recipient of the IDA grant for this proposed project on an exceptional basis under the Financial Management Framework Agreement (FMFA) between the World Bank and UN agencies. The financial management arrangements will be governed by the FMFA, which provides for the use of the UN’s Financial Regulations. UNOPS will follow its own procurement procedures as Alternative Procurement Arrangements allowed by the World Bank’s new Procurement Framework Policy Section III.F.

24. Engaging UNOPS as the direct Recipient of the IDA grant has many advantages for the world Bank, for the beneficiaries, and for UNOPS. Through its partnership with UNOPS, the proposed project can ensure proper fiduciary management in a high risk and politically uncertain and volatile environment arising from the current peace process. Second, UNOPS has nation-wide presence, including in the most conflict-affected and formerly opposition held areas, and can scale up quickly, which has been a key gap in the SNSDP. This also provides an opportunity for the World Bank to learn from implementation experience and challenges on how to implement safety net programs in such profoundly challenging areas. Further, UNOPS will remain in country and continue with implementation even in the event that the peace process fails, and large-scale violence erupts once again, allowing for less interruption in terms of implementation and more sustained support to the beneficiaries. For UNOPS, engagement with the proposed SSSNP is also beneficial, as it helps them to strengthen linkages between the humanitarian-development nexus and engage with the community and local level structures and build their capacity. This is critical for recovery and resilience as well as for creating enabling conditions for longer term development.

25. UNOPS would collaborate closely with relevant ministries to ensure successful implementation and M&E. At the national level, a National Advisory Committee (NAC) comprised of Undersecretaries of the relevant ministries would be established to provide policy and strategic guidance and coordination. In addition, a National Technical Committee comprised of the relevant Director Generals and Directors would be formed to provide technical support in implementation of the proposed project. At the local levels, the current structures established under the SNSDP would continue to support daily implementation and

---

4 Relevant analytical works include: Strengthening GRM to Ensure Gender Inclusion and Empowerment to Minimize Conflict Risks; Mobile Money Usage in South Sudan; Targeting Approaches in South Sudan; and Enhancing SP Systems for Conflict-Sensitive Delivery, among others.
coordination. At all levels, the corresponding staff of the UNOPS will engage closely with the government structures to ensure coordination and collaboration in implementation of the proposed project, although these may be constituted differently in the most conflict-affected and difficult to access areas based on the existing structures and systems on the ground. Support would be given to strengthen the technical, implementation, coordination, and monitoring capacity of the relevant ministry counterparts and community and local level structures.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

Project locations will include the existing seven geographic areas served by the Safety Net and Skills Development Project (SNSDP) in South Sudan (Torit, Kapoeta East, Tonj South, Gogrial West, Bor, Pibor, and Juba), as well as three new geographic areas, including the most conflict-affected and formerly opposition held areas, some of which will be aligned with donor priorities (Bor and Torit). The selection of new locations will be based on pre-established criteria for geographic selection and assessments of conditions on the ground. The current SNSDP has been serving the most poor and vulnerable communities in 7 counties distributed among the three greater regions, two of which are in one of the most conflict-affected state. Relevant salient physical characteristics in these 7 counties include limited paved roads as well as the lengthy rainy season, which extends from March until October. The rainfall exacerbates the already-poor conditions of roads as well as waste water and storm water drainage, for which there is very little formal infrastructure.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Tracy Hart, Environmental Specialist
Simon Sottsas, Social Specialist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safeguard Policies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintenance and/or rehabilitation of waste and sanitation management; (iii) integrated watershed management; small-scale food production; (iv) maintenance and/or rehabilitation of existing developed water sources; and (v) maintenance and/or rehabilitation of school fences, school classrooms, simple storage facilities, health facilities, and community centers.

In order to avoid and/or minimize the anticipated potential social and environmental impacts, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared for each of the five sub-project categories listed above. The ESMF includes generic Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). Individual sub-projects will be screened to eliminate any category "A" activities as defined by OP 4.01.

Feedback mechanisms will be set up to capture any potential project-related grievances and preventive mitigation measures to address issues like gender-based violence (GBV) and sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) will be put in place. Focal points within beneficiary communities will be trained to identify and respond to issues of gender-based violence (GBV) and other issues. There will be women's-only meetings so that SEA and GBV concerns can be more openly voiced.

Through the previous project, a grievance redress mechanism (GRM) has been implemented, with structures that start from the group level to the Quarter councils, Payams and community support teams at county, state and national levels. This project has improved community access to the appeals committee (APC). There are toll-free numbers for beneficiaries to access GRM.

The Social Assessment and ESMF will be updated and re-disclosed once the three additional geographic areas not yet selected are known and prior to when activities in those areas start.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no private sector activities financed in this project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed project will not take place in or near natural habitats. Any activity that will potentially affect natural habitats will be excluded from financing. This will be ensured through application of a screening process to each potential sub-project.

The proposed project will not take place in or near forests. Any activity that will potentially affect forests will be excluded from financing. This will be ensured through application of a screening process to each potential sub-project.

The list of potential sub-projects includes soil and water conservation sub-projects as well as land productivity activities. These activities are expected to lead to livelihood improvements that could ultimately result in the increased use of chemicals and fertilizers, and subsequent environmental and health risks. In order to offset or minimize the anticipated impacts, the ESMF includes measures to manage and avoid the potential negative impacts resulted from the implementation of sub project activities.

Chance find procedures have been included in the ESMF in the case that physical cultural resources are inadvertently discovered.

OP/BP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples is triggered and is applicable to the SSSNP. Analysis by World Bank and other experts confirm that the overwhelming majority of people in the country meet the requirements of OP 4.10. The approach and implementation process of the proposed project therefore embed the basic principles of OP 4.10. The elements of an Indigenous People’s Plan (IPP) will be included in the overall project design; a separate IPP is not required. A Social Assessment has been conducted in line with the requirements of WB OP 4.10, including the majority of the ethnic groups in South Sudan as well as in the project area, namely the Dinka, Murle, and Nuer, and excluding only recent immigrants from other countries. Key identified risks include social ills, GBV, land conflicts, equity issues/targeting as well as elite capture, ethnicity of project staff, exclusion of nomadic pastoralists, inter-communal conflicts, violent attacks, and grievances of non-beneficiaries. Mitigation measures encompass, amongst others,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>OP/BP 4.12</th>
<th>OP/BP 4.37</th>
<th>OP/BP 7.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness campaigns, transparent disclosure of project activities, analysis of risks throughout the project lifecycle, meaningful consultations and participatory approach towards project activities on the ground including site selection, Codes of Conduct, integration of women into committees, transparent procedures on benefit sharing, and constant enhancing of the GRM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 4.12 will not be triggered for this project. Extensive consultations via a CDD approach will ensure that sub-projects will only be implemented on public lands free of individual or collective, non-government use OR land donated voluntarily for the project according to Voluntary Land Donation Guidelines outlined in the ESMF. As individual land ownership and respective land titling is not widely established, the proposed project will consider any household using lands prior to disclosed subproject commencement as having legitimate land use rights and such rights have to be donated freely to the project according to the above provisions, if noted land is considered necessary for subproject implementation. The project will ensure respective documentation and for any suggested subproject in contradiction with the above provisions, such subprojects will be considered unsuitable for project support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale dykes will be constructed from natural materials for the purposes of flood control. They are expected to average 3-5 meters, and will be screened to assure that they are less than 15 meters. Water harvesting infrastructure will be excluded from financing. There will be no reliance on existing dams for agricultural activities. All of the above will be ensured through application of a screening process to each potential sub-project. Generic measures for the design, construction, and maintenance of small dams are included in the ESMF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed activities related to water sector activities are limited to the rehabilitation or improvement of existing water wells, springs, and ponds, and as such, are not likely to have potential impacts on the nearby sources. New well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60  No  This is not applicable to the geographic areas served by this project.

KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:
The activities proposed under SSSNP would likely generate potential positive benefits for local communities in and around the project area by creating income opportunities to support their livelihoods and enhancing community assets. Due to the small-scale nature of the public work activities, the potential negative environmental and social impacts of the proposed project are expected to be localized, temporary, and easily mitigated through sensible construction management techniques, and diligent management practices. Feedback mechanisms will be set up to ensure meaningful consultations with communities, individuals, and institutions, and the project specific GRM will be strengthened to capture any potential project-related grievances. The project design does not foresee any activities that would result in any impacts requiring resettlement and/or livelihood restoration. In order to avoid and/or minimize the anticipated potential social and environmental impacts, an ESMF has been prepared informed by a Social Assessment, and includes elements of an Indigenous People’s Plan (IPP) as well as generic Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) for relevant sub-project thematic areas.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:
The sub-projects are labor intensive and very small in cash value. Potential indirect impacts include lack of operations and maintenance capacity to assure post-project continued impact and sustainability.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
For safety net projects, one project alternative is always unconditional versus conditional cash transfer. The proposed project will provide both types of support, with primary focus on labor intensive public works given the limited community assets and due to its potential contribution to climate change adaptation. With respect to the suite of sub-projects, there is screening to exclude involuntary resettlement (OP 4.12), or extensification of agriculture into natural habitats or forests. Small-scale dyke construction will make use of local materials only (e.g. soil, stones, vegetation), rather than manmade materials, in order to improve potential for maintenance as well as potential for replicability.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.
The UNOPS team will include an Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist to spearhead the implementation of the ESMF. In addition, the proposed project will deploy Environment and Social Safeguards Officers at the field level to: (i) contribute to and facilitate the active involvement of environmental and social stakeholder representatives in the national level; (ii) ensure that the outcomes of consultative meetings reflect the opinions and aspirations of all interest groups especially marginalized and/or disadvantaged groups (e.g. indigenous peoples, HIV orphans, etc.); (iii) Identify environmental and social needs and priorities (e.g. within the design and implementation of SSSNP activities; for training/awareness raising; or for technical support activities); (iv) sensitize the relevant line ministries at the...
national level; (v) document the environmental and social dimensions of forum discussions, and (vi) report these to the UNOPS project team in Juba.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The proposed SSSNP will support at least 65,000 poor and vulnerable households (about 429,000 individuals), to be implemented in the seven existing locations where SNSDP is operational, while also expanding to new geographic locations in the most conflict-affected and formerly opposition held areas. Selection of the new locations would be determined at the time of implementation based on the established objective targeting criteria and process, aligned with assessment of conditions on the ground.

Extensive meetings and consultations have been carried out throughout the SNSDP implementation through field visits, rapid social assessment exercises and assessment of mitigation measures with all the stakeholder. This has helped in preparing social assessment content and recommendations. These consultations have been carried out with institutional as well as grass-roots stakeholders. All the seven areas i.e. Kapoeta East, Torit, Bor, Juba, Pibor, Gogrial West and Tonj South counties where the SNSDP has been implementing have been consulted through field visits by PIU, IPs and other government officials. Their views on the project have been captured as discussed in the current Social Assessment. These consultations were carried out in the month of June, July, August, October and November 2018. As the proposed project prepares to implement in new areas, selection of which will be done at the time of implementation, a rapid social assessment will be conducted using tools developed during preparation, to identify risks and mitigation measures and inform implementation overall.

Subproject EMP and Voluntary Land Donation (VLD) documentation will be prepared as needed and subject to post-review by the World Bank. This documentation will be referenced and summarized in quarterly progress reports. Any significant environmental or social adverse impacts will be shared with the Government of South Sudan in accordance with national law.

B. Disclosure Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</th>
<th>Date of receipt by the Bank</th>
<th>Date of submission for disclosure</th>
<th>For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-Dec-2018</td>
<td>21-Feb-2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"In country" Disclosure
South Sudan
21-Feb-2019

Comments

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework
Date of receipt by the Bank | Date of submission for disclosure
"In country" Disclosure

South Sudan
21-Feb-2019

Comments

IPP issues treated as part of the Social Assessment.

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal? Yes

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

"In country" Disclosure

If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?

Yes

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?

Yes

OP 4.09 - Pest Management
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?
Yes

Is a separate PMP required?
No

If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?
NA

**OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources**

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?
Yes

Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?
Yes

**OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples**

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?
No

**OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams**

Have dam safety plans been prepared?
Yes

Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?
NA

Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?
NA

**The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information**

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?
Yes

Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?
Yes
All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?
Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?
Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?
Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?
Yes
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