



**The World Bank**

Emergency Locust Response Program Phase 3 (South Sudan and IGAD) (P174546)

---

# Project Information Document (PID)

---

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 09-Apr-2021 | Report No: PIDA30528

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Eastern Africa	Project ID P174546	Project Name Emergency Locust Response Program Phase 3 (South Sudan and IGAD)	Parent Project ID (if any)
Region AFRICA EAST	Estimated Appraisal Date 12-Apr-2021	Estimated Board Date 01-Jun-2021	Practice Area (Lead) Agriculture and Food
Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), South Sudan - Ministry of Finance and Planning	Implementing Agency South Sudan - Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Intergovernmental Authority on Development	

## Proposed Development Objective(s)

To respond to the threat posed by the locust outbreak, protect and restore livelihoods and food security, and strengthen systems for preparedness.

## Components

- Surveillance and Control Measures
- Livelihoods Protection and Rehabilitation
- Coordination and Early Warning Preparedness
- Project Management, Monitoring, and Communication
- Intra-Regional Platform for the Management of Desert Locusts and Other Trans-Boundary Pests

**PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)****SUMMARY**

Total Project Cost	53.70
Total Financing	53.70
of which IBRD/IDA	53.70
Financing Gap	0.00

**DETAILS****World Bank Group Financing**

International Development Association (IDA)	53.70
IDA Grant	53.70

Environmental and Social Risk Classification

High

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

**B. Introduction and Context****Program Context**

1. **On May 20, 2020, the World Bank's Board of Executive Directors approved the Emergency Locust Response Program under the Multiphase Programmatic Approach (ELRP-MPA).** The ELRP-MPA is a regional response to the desert locust crisis in Africa and the Middle East, which makes financing available for countries to respond to the challenges posed by the desert locust invasion. The first phase of the ELRP-MPA is supporting the Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Republic of Kenya, Republic of Uganda, and Republic of Djibouti, while the second phase is supporting the Federal Republic of Somalia. The third phase will be supporting investment of US\$ 53.7 million to respond to locust impacts in the Republic of South Sudan.

2. **The worst desert locust (DL) upsurge in a generation threatens the food security and livelihoods of tens of millions of people across East Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia.** The Greater Horn of Africa already had over 12 million forcibly displaced people (including 4.2 million refugees) and around 22 million people in acute food insecurity levels by the time the locusts arrived in fall of 2019. The locust invasion has worsened food insecurity, and food shortages due to the COVID-19 pandemic are further amplifying food insecurity in hard-hit areas, which could lead to more displacement and localized conflict. The potential for severe localized losses of food, fodder, and forage could result in over three million additional people in IPC 3+ status.

3. **The poor are particularly vulnerable to crisis-induced livelihood loss and income shocks from locust damage, as they are the least able to save and smooth consumption in the face of crisis.** At times of crisis, vulnerable households adopt negative coping mechanisms—for example, eating next season's seed, selling off productive assets, and withdrawing children from school to meet short-term needs, which could result in adverse long-term effects, deepening the challenge of breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty. This is made worse by COVID-19 impacts.

4. **While the swarms receded from most of East Africa and all the invasion countries during the summer months of 2020, excessive breeding along the Red Sea have caused the swarms to return to East Africa in August 2020.** As of mid-October 2020, the FAO-indicated threat levels from locusts were "Dangerous" for Yemen, Ethiopia and Somalia, and "Serious" for parts of Kenya, and "Threatened" for Uganda. As of mid-November 2020, swarms had already entered



Kenya from Ethiopia and Somalia and breeding had taken place in Samburu county. It is expected that by early Spring 2021, the locusts will reach South Sudan via Kenya and Uganda, despite ongoing control efforts, and is expected to devastate an already dire food insecurity and humanitarian context with very limited institutional capacity to effectively respond without concerted international support.

5. **The DL upsurge requires a coordinated regional response given the transboundary nature of the crisis.** Since 2019 swarms have spread from the Arabian Peninsula to East Africa and to Western Asia. Therefore, it is critical that every affected country acts urgently to control locust population growth and shares information and lessons learned to enable a speedy and effective response. Efforts to respond to the locust impact in one country will have a regional spillover benefit, which underscores the need for a coordinated response, providing a strong rationale for funding from the IDA Regional Window.

6. **The ELRP-MPA provides a framework for participating countries to respond through three pillars.** The first pillar, surveil and control, helps affected countries locate and control existing swarms and assess the impact of the locusts and the control measures. The second pillar, protect and restore, is designed to bolster food security for affected households and restore affected farming and pastoralist households to productivity through a combination of social protection and technical interventions in agriculture and livestock. The third pillar, preparedness, invests in national planning and readiness against DL and other transboundary pest risks through institutional development, capacity building, training, and strategic partnerships with other countries through relevant regional and international bodies.

### **Country Context**

7. **South Sudan has a long history of violence and economic volatility, eroding the country's development potential, worsening the humanitarian situation, and deepening vulnerabilities.** The civil war between December 2013 and September 2018 devastated all economic sectors and led to one of the largest humanitarian crises in the world, which has been exacerbated by the recent locust invasion and floods. Frequent droughts also remain a challenge, including the record drought in 2017, which led to the declaration of famine for parts of the country. The revitalized peace agreement in September 2018 and the formation of the Transitional Government of National Unity in February 2020 brought a welcome but fragile peace. However, delays in achieving critical milestones, including unifying the army and establishing the united Parliament, continue to threaten the sustainability of the peace process.

8. **South Sudan is one of the poorest countries in the world due to a combination of conflict, economic mismanagement, and climate shocks, despite being highly rich in natural resources.** The country ranks second to last in the World Bank's Human Capital Index 2020. Despite the high levels of deprivation, spending by the Government continues to be skewed toward the defense sector at the expense of poverty reduction and strengthened resilience, such that the security sector broadly accounted for more than 70 percent of the total budget over the past three fiscal years. In the national budget for FY20, the combined public expenditure on basic services (health, education and rural development) constitute only about 7.4 percent, while infrastructure constitutes 54.4 percent and security constitutes 19 percent.

9. **Despite an abundance of natural resources and potential oil wealth, South Sudan's economy is in crisis, exacerbated by on-going insecurity, COVID pandemic, and natural disasters.** Real gross domestic product (GDP) contracted by 6.9 percent in FY17 and by 3.5 percent in FY18, and then recovered modestly with a 3.2 percent growth rate in FY19 following the cessation of hostilities and reopening of damaged oil wells. Nonetheless, the economy is beset with large macro-fiscal imbalances due to widening fiscal deficits, high inflation, and a soaring foreign exchange rate premium. The financing gap in the FY20 budget is estimated at US\$496 million, with US\$159 million in accumulated arrears with respect to advance oil sales. Double digit inflation has remained through FY20 due to the monetization of



the fiscal deficit. The South Sudanese Pound (SSP) continues to be highly depreciated, and the gap between the official exchange rate and the parallel market rate remains large. Between 2015 and 2017, real consumption declined for virtually all households, and the incidence of poverty worsened from 66 percent in 2015 to an estimated 89.5 percent in 2019. There has also been a corresponding increase in the depth of poverty. The World Bank estimates that a 10 percent consumption shock would force about 160,000 additional people into poverty, while a 20 percent shock would force more than 300,000 people into poverty, disproportionately impacting those already living in poverty or extreme poverty and possibly widening the poverty gap to 60 percent.

10. **Climate-induced natural disasters are increasing in intensity and frequency.** Two successive years of unprecedented flooding in 2019 and 2020 have displaced over one million people. An FAO assessment of the most recent 2020 floods notes that 45 percent of the total cereal area in nine counties of Jonglei state were damaged—just under 27,000 ha and just under 12,000 tons of cereals. Episodes of high-intensity rainfall in July and August 2020 led to significant flooding in riverine and low-lying areas in parts of Jonglei, Upper Nile, Unity, and Western Equatoria, including areas that were severely affected by the 2019 floods.

11. **Food insecurity is high and increasing.** Since 2014, South Sudan has required at least US\$1 billion every year in humanitarian aid, with about 80 percent going to food aid. As of November 2020, over 7.5 million people in South Sudan were food insecure—of which 6.5 million were in crisis or worse levels of food insecurity, making South Sudan one of the most food insecure countries globally. About 1.6 million people are newly vulnerable due to increasing food shortages, food price hikes, high inflation, unemployment, and loss of livelihood assets and income sources. This includes the urban poor and approximately 10 percent of the rural population who are in stressed levels of food insecurity and will likely shift to crisis or worse levels during the lean season. In 2021, an estimated 10 million people will be facing acute food insecurity, with the projected food assistance need for January 2021 increasing greatly compared to the last five-year average.

12. **The COVID-19 pandemic is further worsening food insecurity in South Sudan, significantly impacting poor and vulnerable households.** Results from the first round of the South Sudan COVID-19 Household Monitoring Survey conducted in June 2020 show that “half of all households report a fall in income since the start of the pandemic, including one in eight who say they have lost all income from their main activity.” About 45 percent reported not being able to buy their main staple food at some point due to lack of money as well as unaffordable increase in price. Four in five households during the survey also reported skipping meals or running out of food.

13. **The DL is the latest of a series of transboundary pest to become a continuing threat to South Sudan’s food system.** When the DL upsurge affecting East Africa finally crossed into South Sudan in February 2020, it was the first time since World War II according to best estimates. The DL upsurge has been driven by climate change, and recent analyses point to the potential for DL outbreaks to become more frequent as increased rainfall patterns set in. South Sudan therefore needs to rapidly build its knowledge and expertise on how to identify and manage DL, not just for this upsurge but for the potential increasing threat in the future.

14. **Women and girls are disproportionately impacted by worsening poverty and food insecurity, and gender-based violence (GBV) is one of the most critical threats to their protection and well-being.** Poverty is more prevalent among female-headed households, such that of the 62 percent of households headed by women, 83 percent are poor, compared to 73 percent for male headed households. GBV is commonplace, with about 65 percent of women and girls reporting some form of physical or sexual assault in their lifetime. Key factors that influence GBV include normalization of violence, whether related to conflict or intercommunal strife; breakdown of rule of law; and increases in opportunistic crime



(largely due to high levels of poverty). Ultimately, GBV and sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) can undermine women and girls' access to school, work and income, and ultimately the welfare of entire families.

#### **Sectoral and Institutional Context**

15. **South Sudan has vast agricultural potential.** Agriculture, livestock, forestry, and fisheries play a significant role in South Sudan's economy, accounting for 36 percent of non-oil GDP. About 80 percent of households list agriculture as their primary source of livelihood, accounting for over 60 percent of female employment and more than one-third of male employment in 2018. Despite opportunities, only about 3 million hectares of land is cultivated due to the protracted conflict, displacement, and lack of investment in the sector, and most food is imported from Kenya, Sudan, and Uganda.

16. **The agriculture sector has been characterized by low crop production and high crop losses, translating to high food prices and low food security.** South Sudan has five times the agricultural land per capita of Kenya, Uganda, or Ethiopia on average, but its cereal yield per capita is only 44 percent of those neighbors, and it meets only 17 percent of its own seed needs. After factoring in post-harvest loss, the cereal gap in 2020 has been over 500,000 metric tons (22 percent higher than the previous 5-year average). COVID-19 border closures and travel restrictions have put additional pressure on prices for cereals and processed commodities. Domestic crop production has not bounced back after the peace agreement because the sector is starved of funding.

17. **Perennial underfunding has severely constrained the ability of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) to implement large-scale programs.** The core team of specialists working for the MAFS are technically strong, but the human resources and technical resources for implementation and managing the sector need to be rebuilt. At the local level, the capacity gaps are even more pronounced. As a result, agriculture investments have been confined largely to humanitarian responses carried out piecemeal by donors, UN Agencies, and NGOs. More recently, projects are being co-created with MAFS to ensure technical quality and national ownership.

18. **The MAFS is trying to take measures to develop and transform the sector.** The MAFS and associated ministries have developed a Comprehensive Agriculture Master Plan (CAMP), an Irrigation Development Master Plan, National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Policy (NALEP) and several draft policies/bills on seed systems, livestock, fisheries, nutrition and land administration. Implementation of these policies and plans is lagging and there are noticeable policy gaps that hinder agricultural growth including punitive intra and inter-county checkpoint taxation laws, and duties on imported agricultural inputs and equipment. Extremely low government funding for the agricultural sector does not allow for any meaningful investments in the research and extension systems needed to rebuild farming and food production in the country. Budget execution continues to be problematic, with significant divergences between budgets and outturns. Efforts by development organizations (UN, NGOs) have minimally bridged the public extension gap and do not address the fundamentals necessary for a functioning agriculture system.

19. **In the meantime, donor-led humanitarian efforts have largely meet urgent food needs, as South Sudan lacks a reliable safety net system to respond to wide-spread vulnerabilities.** The safety net sector in the country is largely comprised of humanitarian assistance to the poorest and most vulnerable, mainly in the form of food aid provided by organizations such as the World Food Programme (WFP). While this is a critical interim response, it does not create systemic support that address the underlying fundamentals of poverty and vulnerability and gaps exist in terms of national coverage and coherence across approaches. Insecurity and limited infrastructure create serious difficulties in access, and monitoring risks to effectively respond to changing contexts continues to be weak, with the lack of a field presence and robust third-party monitoring as the main constraints. Weaknesses in administrative capacity, human and financial resources, and delivery systems also highly constrain the Government's ability to establish a national safety net



system. Fiduciary accountability within the Government is limited, with insufficient internal checks and financial and procurement compliance.

20. **The World Bank has been supporting efforts to lay the foundation for a reliable and systematic national safety net system since 2014**, first through the Safety Net and Skills Development Project (SNSDP, P143915) and currently through the South Sudan Safety Net Project (SSSNP, P169274). The SSSNP a US\$ 40 million IDA grant that builds on the experiences and lessons learned from the SNSDP to expand safety net coverage to a more significant number of the neediest and most vulnerable populations, while building capacity, structures, and systems that could be used prospectively as a platform for recovery and resilience once the country situation improves. It will reach 65,000 poor and vulnerable households across 10 counties, some of which have been, or are at risk of being, impacted by the DL outbreak (i.e. Torit, Kapoeta East). The project is being implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Services, in close collaboration with the GRSS and key development partners.

21. **The proposed South Sudan Emergency Locust Response Project (SSELRP) will bring together efforts in the agricultural and social protection sectors to effectively respond to the threat posed by the DL outbreak.** In doing so, it will address what has come to be known as the crisis within a crisis—the first locust invasion in about 70 years, compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic. As such, the project will move to end the locust upsurge as quickly as possible and provide income and production support to affected households and communities. It will also invest in ecologically sensitive efforts to rebuild the production system back in a more sustainable way by supporting a combination of quick-return food and nutrition security interventions. Lastly, the project will invest in early warning and system preparedness to respond to future locust threats. In doing so, the SSELRP will help to address impacts of a natural disaster that could devastate food security of a significant number of South Sudanese, thereby potentially serving as a driver of future humanitarian crisis and fragility.

## C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

### Development Objective(s)

22. **The project's development objective (PDO) is aligned to the program development objective (PrDO) and theory of change of the ERLP-MPA**, which is “to respond to the threat posed by the locust outbreak and to strengthen systems for preparedness.” The PDO of the proposed ERLP Phase 3 is *to respond to the threat posed by the locust outbreak, protect and restore livelihoods and food security, and strengthen systems for preparedness*

### Key Results

23. Several of the PDO and intermediate indicators for the project derive from the MPA and will feed into overall program progress, while others will measure specific activities programmed by GRSS. Indicators will be disaggregated by gender as appropriate.

#### Outcome 1: Control of desert locust outbreak implemented:

- Land area (ha) sprayed for locust control (ha)
- Land area (ha) of affected pasture/rangeland restored to productivity (ha)
- Land area (ha) of affected agricultural land restored to productivity (ha)

#### Outcome 2: Livelihoods in locust affected areas supported



- Affected households (number) supported by social safety nets, of which females are the direct recipients of benefits (percent)
- Share of locust-affected farmers (including crop farmers, livestock owners and beekeepers) reporting renewed agricultural activity, of which female-headed farms (percent)
- Number of farmers and pastoralists served by permaculture nurseries, of which female (percent)

**Outcome 3: Country's preparedness against locust outbreaks strengthened**

- South Sudan's locust control plan developed (Yes/No)
- Early warning system developed and functioning (Yes/No)

**D. Project Description****Project Components**

24. In line with the ELRP-MPA, the SSERLP will have three technical components and one project management component. Component 1 will address the most immediate threat of damaging swarms of locust by supporting surveillance and control operations and managing the risk around those operations. Component 2 will safeguard the food security of affected households and aid in restoring the agriculture and pastoral linked livelihoods impacted by the swarms. Component 3 will support medium- to longer-term objectives of building the information, institutions, and systems to increase the country's readiness to address any future transboundary pest shocks to its production systems. There will also be a separate capacity building grant for IGAD that will finance the creation and operation of an information platform in East Africa to help member countries better coordinate action against transboundary pests. This is described under Components 3 and 4, and it will have a separate financing agreement.

25. **Component 1: Surveillance and Control Measures.** This component will limit the growth and spread (driven by climate change) of the current desert locust upsurge while mitigating the risks associated with control measures and their impacts on human health and the environment. It will strengthen the capacity of agriculture staff at the national, state, and county levels and of communities in locust-affected areas by providing appropriate equipment, technology, and training on locust identification, swarm management techniques, and damage assessment. Beneficiaries include the communities affected by locust swarms, the surveillance and control field teams and MAFS staff from the payam to the national level. The component will be divided into two sub-components, namely Sub-component 1.1 on Swarm Surveillance and Monitoring and Sub-component 1.2 on Swarm Management Measures.

- **Sub-component 1.1 on Swarm Surveillance and Monitoring will support surveillance and rapid response teams in locust prone areas to monitor for new swarms** entering the country; investigate sightings by communities; raise awareness among communities about locusts, effective control, safety issues regarding pesticides, and locust identification; and guide response teams to swarms for control operations. The project will provide technical assistance to communities, farmer organizations, and officials at the county, payam, and boma levels to monitor for swarms, collect the relevant data, and submit it to the relevant authorities.
- **Sub-component 1.2 on Swarm Management Measures** will finance direct control operations and undertake assessments of losses due to the desert locusts and the impacts of pesticides on human, animals, and environment. This subcomponent will support the scale up of integrated pest management among affected communities and introduce management techniques. Associated with swarm control activities, the project will also finance measures to enhance the safety of communities and control teams.



26. **Component 2: Livelihoods Protection and Rehabilitation.** This component focuses on helping households and communities affected by the locust upsurge, the recent floods, and other drivers of food insecurity in parts of the country. Through its two subcomponents, it will (1) address immediate food security needs of affected vulnerable households through direct income support leveraging the SSSNP; and (2) investing in food production systems and restoring the natural resource base to stimulate rapid food availability and to build a stronger resource base for pasture and crops moving forward.

- **Sub-component 2.1 on Safeguarding Food Security and Protecting Human Capital will provide emergency direct income support, in the form of unconditional cash transfers, to locust affected households** to protect against livelihood and asset loss and meet their urgent food needs, smooth consumption gaps and enhance purchasing power for basic commodities. The emergency cash transfer will be provided through the existing operational tools, systems, procedures and arrangements established under the ongoing World Bank-funded SSSNP to ensure effective and accountable delivery of the emergency direct income support of the SSELRP. Efforts under the SSSNP to enhance local government and community capacity, with a focus on ensuring effective participation of women, and intensify citizen engagement and community sensitization on safety net and social issues will facilitate transparent and accountable implementation and management and coordination of activities under this sub-component. All risk mitigation measures undertaken by the SSSNP, particularly around issues of insecurity and accountability of cash transfers, potential elite capture and fiduciary mismanagement, GBV, and COVID contagion, among others, will be applied to the delivery of the emergency cash transfer for locust response.
- **Sub-component 2.2 on Food Production and Building the Natural Resource Base for Crops and Livestock will help households return to production for improved food security and restore the biodiversity of the affected areas** by investing in land use systems that integrate crops, trees, and livestock to restore lost biodiversity caused by desert locusts and the measures to control the swarms. Communities will be encouraged to plant multi-purpose trees to produce fodder, fuel, construction materials, fruit, and other products. The project will promote indigenous planting cultivars for both shrubs and fruit trees so that the vegetation will be well suited to the ecosystem and that native pollinators would be adapted to use.

27. **Component 3: Strengthening South Sudan's National Prepared Systems.** This component will support investments in the research/informational, institutional, and strategic elements of desert locust management by the GRSS' and its strategic partners. In 2017, MAFS, in collaboration with partners, established task forces at national, state, and county levels to coordinate the response to fall armyworm (FAW), and it is applying that structure to the DL threat. A key outcome of this subcomponent would be updated versions of the MAFS Five-Year Strategic Action Plan that would form part of a larger framework of plant protection and transboundary threat management. FAO will be contracted to run the implementation of this component in close collaboration with MAFS staff and other stakeholders. The project will provide investment support in the following areas: applied research in dl control techniques; training and technical assistance; policies and regulations; and establishing linkages with regional and international organizations.

28. **Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring, and Communication.** This component will finance project management, monitoring and communication costs for implementation support, financial management (FM), procurement, environmental and social management, communications, and knowledge management. The communications activity will help promote increased community awareness about the impacts of the locust swarms and the response efforts to support communities before, during, and after the crisis. Citizen engagement, community empowerment, mobilization and participation will be critical to developing community-led responses that will address immediate concerns and build resilience going forward.



29. **Component 5: Improving Regional Coordination Through IGAD Information Platform.** This component reflects lessons learned from implementing Phase 1 of the ELRP, which revealed the need for improved communication and collaboration across national and regional boundaries. The current upsurge has reinforced the need for increased flow of information between countries where DL is endemic and those where they are not as this has determined membership in some early warning systems for the former but not the latter. There is also a need to bridge the communication gap between technical experts who can manage the monitoring, warning, and response system, and the non-technical/political stakeholders who manage the enabling environment for response. Such regional coordination also facilitates decision-making around investments in early warning and response systems, helping all parties identify the most sustainable and feasible system to support in East Africa. The project, therefore, IGAD in its multi-donor effort to establish an Inter-Regional Platform for the Management of Desert Locusts and other Transboundary Pests. This platform would be a permanent structure within IGAD and would enhance regional efforts to strengthen regional and national capacity for coordination, monitoring, surveillance, and control operations and improve early warning and early response. This activity will have a separate financing agreement that will be negotiated directly with IGAD.

#### Project Beneficiaries

30. **Geographic targeting for the project is determined by a combination of food insecurity, existing desert locust impacts and threat, and predicted desert locust breeding risk.** Under Components 1 and 2, the initial beneficiaries include households in the counties directly impacted by swarms and those indirectly impacted by the loss of food production that has happened under the East African upsurge. Four counties will receive support for preparedness activities under Components 1 and 3 because, based on modeling by DL experts, they have the potential to become breeding grounds in the future. Geographic targeting for the additional food security financing will allow the project to cover more of directly and indirectly affected households, including those affected by reduced food availability and those whose access to pasture was impacted by herds moving away from the swarms. Final targeting will be driven by criteria including security and accessibility; IPC ratings for an area; the potential for agriculture, livestock, and/or fisheries investments; and the presence of existing donor programs to serve the local population.

31. **The primary direct beneficiaries will be served under Component 2: Livelihoods Protection and Restoration,** mainly through the provision of emergency safety nets under subcomponent 2.1 and through food production building of the natural resource base for crops and livestock under subcomponent 2.2. Community-based participatory approaches utilizing transparent and objective criteria will be used to identify and mobilize beneficiaries.

#### Legal Operational Policies

##### Triggered?

Projects on International Waterways OP 7.50	No
Projects in Disputed Areas OP 7.60	No

#### Summary of Assessment of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts

32. Anticipated environmental risks from component 1 will range from direct and indirect impacts to local populations of farmers and pastoralists dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods such as pasture and crop fields, and potentially impacts on ecologically sensitive areas such as water bodies, wetlands, forests, national parks, and reserves. However, the three pesticides: (Chloropyrifos 240g/l ULV and Malathion 95% ULV - chemical pesticide) and,



(metarhizium acridum - biopesticide), identified for use are of ultra-low volume (ULV) type, and as such their risk to the environment and applicators should be moderate as preference was on formulations that are highly specific to the species of locust to control and relatively safe to other species of insects, animals and humans. Its is also very easy for MAFS and FAO to map out targeted spray areas, establish strict operational procedures and enforce them to ensure ecologically sensitive areas (such as water bodies, national parks and reserves) are excluded out. There are also potential adverse effects on the occupational health and safety of control teams and on local communities where both ground and aerial spraying will take place. Sub-Component 1.2 of the project however already has some built in mitigation measures to ensure provision of PPE, adequate training, setting up of ERPs, communication strategy to support for ERPs and health and safety surveillance of the frontline teams to ensure their exposure limits is always monitored and timely rotations take place. The risks associated with handling, transportation, storage and disposal of empty insecticide drums, bags or other containers, from contaminated or damaged personal protective equipment (PPE) or from accidentally spilled insecticides cannot be underscored. Risks associated with the construction and operation of the four pesticide facilities will be site specific, temporal in **nature** and limited to: impacts on environmental and occupational noise, dust, vegetation, soils, indoor air quality, lighting, waste management, and construction and operation related occupational hazards. A detailed assessment of the project overall impacts and mitigation measures will be included in the project Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Waste Management Plan (WMP), Community Health and Safety Management Plan (**CHSMP**) and the Integrated Pest Management Plan. Even though there are known and proven proposed mitigation measures that will be put in place, SOP, training of field control teams and operators, and the technical and supervision support to be provided by FAO, including the spatial area to be covered, the project Environmental Risk is considered High.

33. The SRR is high for this operation at this stage. The project will finance the construction of field pesticide storage facilities—one main facility in Juba, two smaller satellite facilities in Renk and Torit, and a mini facility in Kapoeta—that are secure and weatherproof to ensure that communities are not inadvertently exposed to the chemicals. These pesticide storage facilities represent a potential danger to communities and the environment if not well secured. This will require proportionate investment in secure storage facilities. There is no new land acquisition anticipated under this operation. In areas where small portions of land might be **required**, voluntary land donation approach will be applied. There is also a potential risk of a surge in grievances related to spraying. Setting up systems for good community outreach that include vulnerable groups with clear messaging addressing potential safety concerns for humans, livestock, could help in avoidance or mitigating these concerns.

34. Social risks could emanate from the country FCV context with varying intensity to the potential project area. These social risks exacerbate due to (i) the multiple roles of women (reproductive, productive (farmers) and family head), (ii) exclusion of remote areas in project targeting due to inaccessibility under subcomponent 2.1 on direct cash transfer, where the vulnerable groups may not benefit from this project, (iii) lack of functional grievances mechanism (although UNOPS will use the GRM established for SSSNP project), (iv) conflict due to cash transfers and increased vulnerability of women and girls, (v) intra-communal tensions over implementation issues, (vi) project supported assets becoming targets for violent groups, (vii) exacerbating project beneficiaries to insecurity due to project support, (viii) mobility due to project benefit collection may increase insecurity of beneficiaries, and (ix) adverse effects from influx of labor for construction activities and implementing agency workers.

35. In addition, the key social risks and impacts identified include; (i) Resurgence of violence that places inputs, equipment and structures at risk of damage or complete destruction; (ii) Security and health risks (iii) GBV; (iv) Conflicts over provision of employment or contracts; (v) Disputes over use of land and property for project activities where ownership and access rights are contested (for both public and private property, as well as protected areas), based on historical and current large-scale displacement and seasonal migration due to conflict, ethnic / political affiliations, or cultural norms and customary land tenure laws (which discriminate against women); (vi) Inadequate implementation of



E&S safeguards tools due to lack of capacity amongst the implementing partners (IPs). Violence (political, criminal, ethnic, etc.) and GBV are two forms of concern as result, escalating social risks. The GBV risk has been rated high, the project will prepare a GBV action plan commensurate to the high risk. Based on this assessment, the overall social risk level is considered high.

#### **E. Implementation**

##### **Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

36. **The project will be implemented by the Government of Republic of South Sudan and the MAFS will be the implementing agency.** MAFS will maintain a project coordination unit (PCU) and will use direct contracting to bring in lead technical partners for implementation, as necessary. The MAFS is the lead technical ministry for food security and has been responsible for the provision of safety nets and agriculture interventions to meet urgent household needs and improve crop production.

37. **The MAFS will engage lead technical partners, namely FAO and UNOPS, under Standard Output Agreements, to ensure rapid, accountable, and smooth implementation and achievement of results.** Specifically, under the overall management of the MAFS, FAO will be contracted to lead the implementation of activities under Components 1, 2.2, and 3 of the project, while UNOPS will implement Sub-Component 2.1. MAFS will lead project management, oversight, and coordination through Component 4.

38. **FAO is the lead international agency on DL response and emergency food production.** It developed the standard operating procedures for DL management and operates the Pesticide Referee Group, an advisory body on the different pesticides for locust control. FAO's South Sudan Office is one of the largest FAO operations globally, and it works directly with MAFS on policy, regulatory, and investment issues across the sector. Through its ongoing Emergency Livelihood Response Program, FAO has developed technical designs and procedures to response to food insecurity situations with the tools and training for rapid food production.

39. **UNOPS has proven capacity to implement safety net programs globally and in South Sudan.** It is the implementing agency for the SSSNP, in close collaboration with MAFS. Through the SSSNP, UNOPS strengthened its relationship with local authorities and communities in project locations and enhanced its implementation capacity for community-based delivery mechanisms, all of which can be leveraged for a quick and smooth implementation of the cash transfers under the SSELRP. UNOPS continues to operate nation-wide regardless of outbreaks of violence and operates successfully in the most remote and conflict-affected areas.

#### **CONTACT POINT**

##### **World Bank**

Melissa Williams  
Senior Rural Development Specialist

Nadia Selim  
Social Protection Specialist

**Borrower/Client/Recipient**

Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

Workneh Gebeyehu

Executive Director

Abdi.Jama@igad.int

South Sudan - Ministry of Finance and Planning

TBD TBD

TBD

tbd@tbd-grss.gov

**Implementing Agencies**

South Sudan - Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security

Josephine Lagu

Minister

minister@mafs.org

Intergovernmental Authority on Development

Abdi Jama

Coordinator, IGAD Food Security, Nutrition and Resilience An

Abdi.Jama@igad.int

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT**

The World Bank

1818 H Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20433

Telephone: (202) 473-1000

Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

**APPROVAL**

Task Team Leader(s):	Melissa Williams
	Nadia Selim

**Approved By**

Practice Manager/Manager:		
---------------------------	--	--



**The World Bank**

Emergency Locust Response Program Phase 3 (South Sudan and IGAD) (P174546)

---