



GROUP CASH TRANSFERS IN SOUTH SUDAN: CASE STUDY AND LEARNING BRIEF

South Sudan Red Cross and Danish Red Cross

July 2024



Contents

Introduction.....	3
Background.....	3
Methodology for this case study.....	5
Findings on GCTs in South Sudan	5
Assessment and planning of GCT projects	5
Selected GCT group projects	6
Transfer amount, instalments, and safekeeping.....	6
GCT management and horizontal accountability between group members	6
Challenges in implementing the GCT-supported projects	7
Key benefits of using the GCT modality	8
Key benefits reported by group members	8
Key benefits to the wider community	8
Other contributions to achieve GCT project outcomes	8
Community Engagement and Accountability.....	9
SSRC support to GCT-supported groups.....	9
Downwards accountability SSRC to communities.....	9
Downwards accountability from GCT-groups to community.....	10
Feedback from GCT-supported groups	10
Recommendations.....	11
Conclusion	12
Annex 1: Overall budget lines to consider when planning a GCT pilot (generic).....	13
Annex 2: Example of GCT project narrative and budget.....	14

Frontpage photo: Members of Raja Evergreen Association collecting cash at the SSRC Branch © SSRC volunteers

Introduction

Group Cash Transfer (GCT) is an approach that provides resources in the form of cash transfers to community groups to implement projects that can contribute to the immediate survival and recovery needs of a crisis-affected population. The approach seeks to transfer decision-making power to the groups, driving a locally led approach and putting communities at the centre of the action.

South Sudan Red Cross Society (SSRC) with the support of Danish Red Cross (DRC) piloted the GCT approach in 2023. The SSRC engaged in the GCTs pilot to complement their ongoing strategic priority towards using cash and voucher assistance in their interventions. The GCTs allowed communities to lead the priority setting, design, implementation, and monitoring of their group projects. The overall project aim was to stimulate and create avenues for communities to access food locally and to enable resilient livelihoods for the group members.

Background

1. Location

SSRC prioritised the pilot location in Raja in Western Bahr el-Ghazal State, South Sudan, following a review of the community's risk profile and its severe humanitarian situation, the capacities of SSRC branches in the region, and support already being received by the various branches in the country. SSRC and DRC are currently implementing a resilience project in Raja to strengthen the capacities of communities to manage changing and recurrent risks related to climate-related risks, health, and local conflict-related threats. The area has also witnessed an influx of returnees and refugees following the conflict in Sudan and the Central African Republic, further compounding the humanitarian situation in the country.

The targeted groups form part of the community affected by food insecurity in Raja due to recurrent cycles of floods, drought, and conflict. Raja is located North-West of South Sudan and is among areas devastated by civil war, malnutrition, and poor sanitary conditions. Food is scarce, and when it can be found, it is not necessarily affordable.

2. Co-design workshop

DRC and SSRC facilitated a co-design workshop in Juba in July 2023, which aimed to introduce the newly developed SSRC guideline on GCT, provide orientation on GCT co-design session and training of facilitators to support implementation of GCT. A total of 12 participants took part in the workshop, drawn from Red Cross Movement partners within South Sudan to include SSRC, IFRC, ICRC, PNS's and the HNS.

A second co-design workshop was undertaken in Raja, bringing together 23 participants (2 representatives from each of the 9 groups), one SSRC volunteer and 1 staff. Additionally, three (3) external stakeholders from public authorities also participated in the workshop. These included the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC) county chairperson, Director of Gender, Child and Social welfare, and the Director of Agriculture. SSRC staff from HQ and branch facilitated the session.



SSRC volunteers and group members during the co-design workshop in Raja © SSRC volunteers

3. Group selection and membership

With the support of SSRC field teams, SSRC mobilised the 9 community groups to develop concept notes including their proposed plans and budgets. These were reviewed and approved by the SSRC team at HQ. The submitted proposals and budget informed the transfer value for the GCTs. A total of four (4) groups received support from SSRC in the pilot stage for the implementation of their project ideas. The projects focused on food security (agriculture) (3 groups), protection, social cohesion, and livelihood (1 group), with each group receiving 4,000,000 South Sudanese Pounds. GCT co-design workshop Juba and in the field (Raja).

The four groups have a total membership of 292 individuals, 127 male and 165 female, as shown in the table:

S/no.	Name	M	F	Total
1	Bambara Farming Group	14	11	25
2	Guwa Farming Group	16	9	25
3	Raja Ever green Women group	0	61	61
4	Raja Youth Association	97	85	182
	Total	127	165	293

Methodology for this case study

The GCTs case study was employed primarily using a qualitative approach. The primary mode of qualitative data collection was through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with group members. SSRC and DRC also did a desk review of quarterly, and annual reports to triangulate the data collected. The study covered progress since the group received funding to date. Further, analysis of qualitative data was done by grouping collected information by themes guided by the learning study objectives to facilitate content and thematic analysis.

Findings on GCTs in South Sudan

Assessment and planning of GCT projects

The study found that design of the GCT projects was well informed by the Enhanced Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (EVCA) that SSRC conducted in the targeted locations as part of a Disaster Preparedness Project. **The EVCA process places communities at the centre of the action in identification of hazards and risks faced by communities, while prioritizing those with the highest impact in communities and working together to develop solutions to address them.**

The process began with community mobilization and community engagement, where communities agreed to undertake vulnerability and capacity assessments. This ensured communities had a genuine sense of ownership and assumed responsibility for the success of the process. This also ensured that many ideas on how to reduce disaster risks came from the community members themselves, an effort to ensure community ownership and sustainability of the project outcomes from the EVCA process.

The outcome of the assessment supported community members to take the lead in developing ideas to take action to address the risks identified. SSRC engaged in a participatory process with the community to support the establishment of groups to be supported as part of building community resilience.

While communities were at the centre of the action, SSRC staff and volunteers also supported in co-design sessions with community members. Likewise, they closely monitored and supported groups being supported throughout the programme.

Raja Evergreen association members at the shop set up with funds from the GCT, and Raja Youth Association engaged in Brick making © SSRC communications team



Selected GCT group projects

The four supported group projects cover key thematic areas identified by communities to address the needs identified by communities at the design stage. These are detailed below per group.

Bambara farming is implementing a project for production of vegetables such as tomatoes, onion, watermelon, and okra. This project is targeted to benefit the 25-member (14 male and 11 female) group directly through family nutrition, especially household members more vulnerable to the food insecurity situation, such as children, lactating mothers, and the elderly. Additionally, the money generated from sales of vegetables supports group members as seed money for small scale trading.

Evergreen Association is a composed of 61 women members from different families who come together to share experiences and skills aiming to empower each other and foster self-reliance. With funds from the GCT, the group set up a shop to sell commodities to communities at affordable prices. The team also started a vegetable farming, aiming not just to produce food for consumption and sale, but also to empower women to engage in farming / agricultural activities.

Guwa farming group, a farming group of 25 members (16 male and 9 female) used the GCT funds to start farming producing a variety of vegetables such as onion, watermelon, ground nuts, and okra, with the aim of improving household nutrition but also generating income from sale of the surplus production.

The fourth group is **Raja Youth Association**, a 182-member group (97male and 85 female) whose main objective is to foster peace and co-existence among communities in the area and addressing protection issues related to prevention of sexual- and gender-based violence (SGBV) in the community and to promote safe hygiene and sanitation practices. The group furthermore used the GCT to roll out several income-generating activities, including production of locally produced construction materials such as bricks, a demo plot for agriculture to foster youth employment. Proceeds from its income generating activities will be channelled towards activities that promote sustainable peace in their community areas.

Transfer amount, instalments, and safekeeping

All groups received a total of 3,000,000 SSP (equivalent to USD 1,330) as the first instalment followed by the amount of 1,000,000 SSP (equivalent to USD 350) as the second instalment that was paid after monitoring the progress of implementation of each group's proposal. At the time of the post-distribution monitoring in May 2024, all groups reported having received the pending balance of 1,000,000 SSP (equivalent to 350 USD).

All groups reported that SSRC gave them the money directly from their office (cash in hand), and that this was a satisfying method. All interviewees reported that they felt safe receiving and traveling with the cash. Three groups collected the cash by walking to the SSRC office and the last group used a motorbike as they were located further away. Three groups reported that they kept the cash at home with the dedicated group finance focal point in a safe box. One group reported to use a trader in the market for safekeeping. The trader is not a member of the group but is a trusted merchant in the town and a person many of the group members reporting having good relations with over time.

GCT management and horizontal accountability between group members

The groups each have an executive body made up of 6-7 members. Each group has a chairperson being deputized by a Vice Chairperson, finance focal person, and the secretary. These functions work hand in hand to steer the groups on behalf of the members. In addition, the groups also consist adequate representation of both genders, both in the overall membership as well as the executive committees.

The groups were asked several questions on how they managed the GCT expenditures and budgeting. Most of the interviewees mention that they based the projects off a workplan / action plan where the chairperson and executive body were responsible for the approval of expenditures. The action plan was agreed by the groups and presented to the SSRC, whereas the decision making on expenditures was reported to be solely by the executive body and chairperson of each group. Interviewees across all groups stated that they found the purchases made with GCTs effective in achieving the group projects and the GCTs were overall spent according to their project proposals to SSRC.

Three of four groups reported disagreement between group members, although this was perceived differently by some interviewees from the same groups. The primary argument reported was that some group members wanted to re-distribute the GCTs to individual members. It is uncertain from the data if the suggestions to benefit individual members would also impact project objectives directly. In any case, it is important that SSRC consider stronger communication around the justification for group cash rather than / or alongside individual cash transfers.

Groups mentioned that they were unable to get receipts for everything they purchased to be able to document expenditures, hence, SSRC may consider provision of training on book-keeping to the group members to address this challenge. SSRC acknowledged the difficulties relating to this and accepted this as a condition for providing GCTs.

The groups had scheduled weekly meetings to share information and review progress of implementation as well as resolve any disputes that may have arisen. The continuous close engagement ensures that the group members remain accountable to each other.

The groups also have peer-to-peer learning exchange visits between groups, which also serve as opportunities to share experiences, progress of project implementation (including expenditure), and to motivate each other. These sessions also serve as platforms for ensuring horizontal accountability both within and between groups.



GCT group receiving cash. Due to lack of alternate payment service providers, the GCT groups received cash from SSRC office in Raja.

Challenges in implementing the GCT-supported projects

Participants in 8 out of 13 interviews were confident that the GCT amount was enough to complete their projects, whereas three said no and two were unsure. The primary reason mentioned that impacted the value of the GCTs is the price inflation and the general poor economic situation. Some interviewees indicated that the project design was too ambitious in what it wanted to achieve. Both are important points to consider in future planning of GCT projects and can be incorporated through allowing flexibility for groups to change their projects throughout implementation.

Another challenge that impacted the implementation of projects for several groups was the accessibility to water for agricultural activities. While they invested in water pumps as part of the project, these broke down. Projects may need to consider where other partners with WASH expertise could be brought in to deliver these services (incl. local government). One group consisting mainly of youth reported instability in commitment to the GCT project, partly due to other commitments.

Key benefits of using the GCT modality

Key benefits reported by group members

Improved food availability: Through the GCT programmes, members have benefitted from availability to food produced from their farms especially vegetables such as tomatoes, onions, ground nuts and okra, which contribute directly to household nutrition. In addition, through the supply of farm produce to local markets, the groups are also contributing to improved availability of food in local markets.

Improved Incomes: The group members have benefitted from improved incomes from selling food commodities and items generated from their projects. The incomes received from sale of the products are used as savings and loans by community members.

Skills development: Through peer-to-peer support, group members embarked on skills development for their members that include baking of bread and cakes, handicrafts, brick making etc. These are expected to contribute to enhanced self-reliance by group members through improved income-earning abilities.

Conflict and dispute resolution: Through the initiatives by groups aimed at promoting peaceful co-existence among communities, group members including the youth from different communities, are now engaging in joint projects and initiatives aiming to improve the well-being of group members as well as communities. Group members expressed a desire to continue working together.

Team spirit and collaboration: Through working together, the GCT has continued to foster a team spirit and collaboration among community members. Additionally, the groups have potential of building strong networks and collaborations with other stakeholders including public authorities. For instance, the groups currently have good collaboration with the county Directorate of Gender and Social Welfare as well Directorate of Agriculture.

Through the ongoing GCT projects, the groups expect to continue to reap the benefits while also expecting these to reach the community at large and beyond the project, especially through the income generating activities but also through community-wide initiatives such as peace and cohesion, prevention of SGBV, and hygiene and sanitation promotion.

Key benefits to the wider community

As the GCT-supported groups sold their production locally and at reasonable prices, the key benefit reported to impact the wider community was the mitigation of market price inflation. Furthermore, the production created an availability of dry-season vegetables in markets, which were not previously available. Resultingly, community members can save on travel time to central markets by being able to purchase vegetables and bread locally instead. Groups also reported that other community members see the benefits of the GCT projects and are eager to join the group in future activities.

Other contributions to achieve GCT project outcomes

The groups reported that they benefitted from voluntary labour, although primarily from group members, while other community members also supported occasionally. Some groups received or borrowed tools, while one group got a radio from another organisation to receive information. The groups also felt encouraged by their communities to engage in the work. However, several interviewees also mentioned that they did not get any other support, which could be researched deeper to understand if they, for example, did not need it or know where or how to look for this.

Communities also contributed to the project through donation of land for agriculture and food production. Each group received different sizes of land where they are practicing their food production activities. The land is provided free off charge for the groups.

Meeting spaces have also been provided by community members for the GCT groups to meet and conduct other social events.

Community Engagement and Accountability

SSRC support to GCT-supported groups

SSRC staff and volunteers have generally engaged with the groups in monitoring the projects, but also through supervision, support, and training of group members. The groups reported feeling encouraged and able to share their challenges with SSRC. Meanwhile SSRC reports that there is a need to further support groups with agricultural training and information sharing. SSRC in discussion with communities will engage the Agricultural County authority, and other non-governmental organizations or community-based organization specialising in Agriculture and food security to support the groups in further capacity strengthening efforts. Communities also plan to undertake peer to peer learning visits to draw lessons from groups that are doing better in agriculture and food security. This will contribute to enhanced capacities among the groups.

Downwards accountability SSRC to communities

SSRC has remained accountable to the communities throughout the project implementation period. This has included open sharing of information with group members, the general community, and public authorities on the objectives of the project, selection process and support received by the groups.

SSRC has provided several communication channels for the groups and community members to raise their complaints and feedback. This includes helpdesks during project activities, community review meetings, community chiefs, through the directorates of Agriculture, and Gender and Social services, and a telephone line dedicated to raising sensitive complaints. SSRC formed complaints and feedback committees in each community, to ensure all feedback and complaints are received, addressed, or escalated as may be appropriate.

Complaints and feedback received by SSRC included issues related to inflation, which have affected project implementation, complaints by community members who are not receiving GCT support, and feedback from the supported groups on the need for additional training and capacity strengthening in areas such as food production, entrepreneurship skills and book-keeping. Feedback was forwarded to the Project Officer, Head of Branch and to the CEA Coordinator who reviewed and engaged the project team on mechanisms for addressing the complaints and feedback. The received feedback was taken into consideration to improve the project and complaints were addressed accordingly. For example, to address inflation, group members were allowed to review their project plans taking into consideration the changes in prices. SSRC also continued to advocate for additional support to the groups by various actors, including the public authorities. In addition, SSRC engaged community members not receiving GCTs/not being members of the selected groups to understand the basis of selection and the limit of available support for more group members. Based on this feedback, SSRC also expanded the number of groups being supported by GCT and will continue to explore other opportunities for additional support both within the Red Cross Red Crescent movement and other external stakeholders.

As an accountability measure, representatives from the local authorities participated in selection of the projects and supported and witnessed the handing over of the cash to the groups. During the implementation process, SSRC has continued to engage the local authorities in monitoring of the project implementation

including the recently concluded post distribution monitoring (PDM). It is expected that this close collaboration between the SSRC, community, and public authorities will continue until the end of the project.

Downwards accountability from GCT-groups to community

SSRC drew the groups and their members which were supported from among the community in Raja and engaged the local community in the different phase of the project, including during community mobilisation and engagement. Further, the local community leaders and religious leaders have been involved in the project where they can experience the contribution of the project, as well as support in the resolution of challenges such as disagreements among group members and general advice or guidance.

Through informing the community leaders of the GCT support and disseminating their project plans, progress of implementation including expenditures, this enabled the community leaders to further disseminate this information to the wider community during public gatherings. In addition, the groups have weekly group meetings attended by representatives from public authorities and community leaders where additional information on progress is shared for further dissemination to the wider community.

The proposed projects are also contributing to the overall improvement of community well-being. The proposed projects were identified as resulting in improved food security included improved access and reduced time for travelling to the market. The group implementing a project on social cohesion aims to contribute to improved co-existence among communities living in Raja.



One of the GCT groups during their meeting in Raja

Feedback from GCT-supported groups

The PDM asked the group representatives about their perception of receiving GCTs for the projects rather than household level cash assistance. Most groups were happy with the group modality and felt that it created group cohesion and was encouraging in developing projects that benefitted the interests of the wider communities. A few would prefer household cash transfers over group cash, while this should also be held up against the general deprived economic situation in the communities.

The overall feedback to SSRC from groups expressed gratitude for the project with recommendations to continue the group modality. Meanwhile, the groups requested more assistance, particularly to purchase other types of seeds, equipment, and tools, to support with more trainings, and to increase the amounts to factor in inflation. Interviewees particularly applauded the approach for empowering communities.

Recommendations

- When group proposals include technical components (such as water pumps like in these group projects), the proposals should ideally include either or all: Funds for maintenance and repair of water pumps, training of group members to conduct the maintenance themselves, or partnership with other actors with expertise in water management. Alternatively, SSRC may support at the onset to assess the availability of less technical and less resource-heavy methods that can be incorporated.
- SSRC should consider provision of training on documentation and book-keeping to group members to ensure group members have improved skills in management of funds received through GCT.
- Group members should check their colleagues availability over time and support groups to set up systems to maintain members (e.g. establish group schedules according to other activities such as work or school). This will contribute to more affective participation by all group members and promote a commitment to the groups goals and aspirations.
- As South Sudan is experiencing high inflation and economic crisis, planning should take into consideration possible inflation that is affecting communities including those supported by the GCT. Alternatively, flexibility may be built into the projects to take into consideration unforeseen changes in the context.
- There is need for more transparent communication from SSRC to group members and communities to ensure enhanced awareness of group entitlements and expectations for group members and the community. This will contribute increased trust-building and accountability among group members and between groups and communities as well as public authorities.
- Consider how best SSRC can support linking groups to other structures to advocate for necessary inputs, training, and support. Ideally the supported groups are the direct requesters (e.g. for training from local authorities), while SSRC can help providing contacts, support to how to negotiate etc.
- Differentiate the amounts for the groups based on the content of their project proposals and other details such as location to SSRC, markets, and number of group members. If possible, also include transport for group officials collecting the cash depending on the distance they have to travel (e.g. one group had to spend money on transport whereas others did not).
- Connect interested group members to savings and loans associations to establish structures where groups can continue their investments without external inputs from SSRC/other actors.
- Strengthen information sharing before and during implementation on the objective of GCTs including both members of supported groups and the wider community.
- Support GCT groups to establish stronger accountability measures to their communities (non-participating members).
- Support groups to undertake peer-to-peer exchange to foster learning and exchange of ideas between groups. This will contribute to improved outcomes of projects.
- GCTs should be planned along with other activities that aim to support communities in strengthening their resilience. This ensures complementarity between GCTs and other project activities as well as close engagement between SSRC and the GCT groups.

Conclusion

The project in Raja, was initiated as a pilot for South Sudan Red Cross to implement GCTs. While it is too early to measure the overall success of the project and group projects, progress reported in the PDM shows promising results to support expansion of the GCT approach, not only by SSRC, but also Red Cross movement partners, and other actors both in and out of South Sudan.

The food security groups in Guwa and Bambara Farming groups have already harvested their vegetable products and supplied them to the local market contributing to food availability, not only for themselves but also other community members. They have plans to continue the projects by diversifying into production of maize, groundnut, sorghum among other crops. It is anticipated that the continued expansion and diversion will contribute to improved project outcomes including sustainability.

Through the GCTs, group members are also implementing initiatives aimed at promoting peaceful co-existence among communities. The continued joint implementation of activities, as well as promotion of youth from different communities will contribute to long term peace, social-cohesion and strengthened social networks necessary for enhanced resilience. The benefits of enhanced peace will also be experienced beyond the project implementation period.

Due to the benefits accrued to communities in the short and medium term and potential long-terms benefits of the GCT in terms of contributing to community resilience, SSRC plans to integrate GCT in future plans and response strategy to expand implementation of GCT not only in Raja, but also in other locations in South Sudan and contribute to the continued resilience of communities being supported by SSRC.

Annex 1: Overall budget lines to consider when planning a GCT pilot (generic)

Group Cash Transfers pilot (generic) budget lines	Comments
3-day co-design workshop in pilot [geographical area]	The workshop may be at NS/local partner-HQ level and then rolled out in district, or only in the targeted district
Material	
Printing of local adaptation of GCT guidance	This may be useful as hard-copy in co-design workshop(s) and for branches implementing
Printing of posters	For example, grant announcement, accountability set-up etc.
Assessment	
EVCA or rapid participatory assessment	Assessment should primarily be led by affected communities
Group support and management	
Establishing Project proposal screening and selection committee and selection of project proposals	Depending on who is engaged in this process, it may require allowances, transport and refreshments
Training of groups and other local stakeholders on the GCT approach	Training costs
Group project inception with wider communities and representatives of public authorities	Depending on context, this may include allowances and refreshments
Average GCT amount per group USD 1,500-5,000	Suggest to budget for 4-5 groups in one rural community; hence, budget for group projects in pilot could be around USD 15,000 per community targeted in pilot
Staff and volunteers	
Community facilitator(s)	Recommended one per one/two pilot communities depending on size and proximity; could also be shared staff with another project
Volunteer allowances	Volunteers may engage to follow up daily, especially in planning stage and support demand-led trainings
Demand-led trainings of groups	
Allowances for gov. dep's or other technical partners delivering demand-led trainings	This would depend on the demanded trainings by groups; not all groups will need trainings and not all trainings will need external facilitation. Ideally groups include any fees for demand-led trainings in their proposals Trainings should be facilitated where groups are based; small in scale, hence limited costs; groups can be requested to prepare refreshments as needed
Monitoring and CEA	
Peer monitoring / exchange learning and experience sharing between groups	If groups are in different communities, this may include transport and refreshments, otherwise limited costs
Post-distribution monitoring / joint monitoring visits with other stakeholders	Cost for NS branch or HQ staff to travel to site (ideally not done by community facilitator)
Accountability set-up and management	Should be linked to NS generic set-up but may require small cost
After action review and lessons learned workshop incl. group representatives and local stakeholders	Workshop costs + travel for group members from different communities

Annex 2: Example of GCT project narrative and budget

The following is translated and typed by SSRC to show an example of a group project and budget proposal.

Bambara farming group, Raja Payam

Date: 29/08/2023

Name of project: Winter vegetable gardening and field crops

Type of intervention: Food security

After long meeting with the member group brainstorming to identify a food security activity as a group, we jointly agreed on cultivation of vegetable crops as winter gardening with more focus on onion, main reason for onion crop is that, it has longer shelf life and can be stored for longer period than the other vegetable crops which are highly perishable such as tomatoes, but onion can be stored for longer time to obtain good price during scarcity. The other vegetable crops to be cultivated a long with onion can supply the market on daily or weekly basis to generate income for the group.

The crop produced can benefit the 25-member group directly through family nutrition especially the weaker groups at household level such as children, lactating mothers and the elderlies as well, likewise the cash income generated from sales of vegetable crops could settle variety of outstanding money issues to be raised by the member group inform of loans or incentives. Other beneficiaries is the larger community in need of vegetable crops who can also get them in the market to buy for consumption.

It is worth mentioning that the group has already started activity by the onset of rainy season cultivating two feddans at former Sudan Council of Churches premises south of Raja town planted with ground nuts and watermelon, work on first weeding finished earlier remaining work is second weeding and harvesting which cost will be included in this budget.

The winter gardening activities which are yet to begin will start in November by bush clearing at the shore of river Raja and nursery establishment for onion and other transplantable vegetable crops such as tomato. Total area proposed for this activity is more than one and a half feddans. Vegetable seeds and pesticides are not available in Raja town but can be purchased from Wau. Other prerequisite requirements is an irrigation pump a portable one plus fuel and lubricants to assist in irrigation which is vital especially for growing onion, inputs such as hand tools, wheel barrows and empty jerricans are also very essential for gardening activities.

The life span for this project is only one planting season ending towards April to May by harvesting of onion crop which could be sold out at once or stored for a while for better market price.

Project objectives

- Selling the products at Raja market for income generation to benefit the group members.
- Group members can also get free vegetables for home consumption which improves the nutrition in children, lactating mothers, and the elderly.
- Supply Raja with vegetable crops so that the consumers can get to buy.
- Contribute to stabilize the vegetable price in the market through regular supply.
- Group members receive better training and obtain best knowledge on the importance of vegetable on family feeding.

Challenges encountered and how to resolve

- Regular irrigation which may be affected by lack of fuel.
- Damage of vegetable seed due to lack of insecticide to apply for protection on the right time.
- Escaped animals and thieves which can be controlled by fencing and guarding the garden.

Coordination with other programs or actors

The line ministry, the Department of agriculture in the county is the main stake holder which can be consulted for advice, training, and other services.

Detailed work plan of the project proposal and budget

Work plan and budget of remaining activities at the ground nut and watermelon field of two feddans. Activities and budget as shown below.

Livelihoods costs and workplan

Activity budget at field level of g /nuts and watermelon: 1.5 feddans of area to cultivate	Cost SSP	When to implement
2 nd weeding	50.000	September
Harvesting of g/ nuts	50.000	October
packing of ground nuts	25.000	November
Total	125.000	
Activity budget at winter vegetable gardening: 1 feddan of area to cultivate	Cost SSP	When to implement
Establishment of seedling nurseries	10.000,	November
Fencing of the garden local materials	150.000	November to December
Bush clearing	100.000	November
Primary tillage	100,000	December
Harrowing	100.000	December
Seed bed preparation	150,000	January
Planting of vegetables	50,000	January
Planting of onion	150.000	January
First weeding	75.000	February
2 nd weeding	75.000	March
third weeding	50.000	April
Harvesting & packing	150,000	May
Total cost	1.160.000	

Water pump and accessories	Unit	Unit cost	Total quant.	Total cost
Water pump petrol operated	Lumpsum	500.000	1	500.000
Water pipe	Meters	7000	20	140.000
Petrol	Drum	400.000	3	1,200.000
Engine oil	Gallon	25.000	2	50.000
Wheelbarrow	Pcs	15.000	2	30.000
Cement for installation	Bags	15.000	2	30.000
Red bricks	500 pcs	5.000	1	5000
Labor cost	Lump sum	5.000	1	5000
Water jerricans	Pcs	2000	10	20.000
Total				1.950.000
Budget for purchase of seed and hand tools and pesticides	Unit	Unit price	Total quantity	Total cost ssp
Tomatoes	Package	10000	1	10.000
Onion	Package	30.000		30.000
Watermelon	Tin	15.000	1	20.000
Okra	Package	10.000	2	10.000
Rocket	Package	5.000	2	10.000

Pursoline	Package	5.000	2	10.000
Malathion	Tin	15.000	1	10.000
Urea	Package	10000	1	10.000
Seven	Package	10.000	1	10.000
Superphosphate	Package	10.000	1	10.000
Plane hoe	Pcs	1500	10	15.000
Local hoe	Pcs	1000	20	20.000
Rakes	Pcs	2000	5	10.000
Shovels	Pcs	5000	5	25.000
Total				200.000
Cost of one day training of members on transplanting of onion seedlings	Unit	Unit cost	Total qty	Total cost
Soda	Pax	800	30	24.000
Water	Pax	500	30	15.000
Tea & snacks	Pax	2000	30	60.000
Airtime	Lumpsum			1.000
Total				100.000

Summary cost of all expenses in SSP	
Activities at ground nuts and watermelon field	125.000
Activities at winter vegetable garden	1.160.000
Machineries and equipment	1.950.000
Cost of vegetable seed fertilizers, insecticides and hand tools	200.000
One day training on onion cultivation	100.000
Total cost*	SSP 3.535.000

* Rounded up to SSP 4,000,000 in the distribution

Feasibility of the project

Production wise; it is not possible to estimate the quantity of fore seen products from the vegetable excluding onion since the daily or weekly harvesting for sale at the market or home consumption by member group could not be estimated apart from the lump sum of revenue to be generated from selling the products which is recorded by the treasurer on regular basis. As for onion crop, production could be estimated and one feddan could yield more than twenty-five bags depending on soil fertility and adequate availability of irrigation water plus other factors like timely weeding and pest control if any.

Onion production on the other hand is labour intensive and labour cost becomes high due to current economic crises, but good production and market price which could reach one hundred thousand SSP per bag of 75 kgs weight during scarcity if the crop undergone proper storage could refund all the expenses incurred which improves the project feasibility for the group.

Remarks

The remaining amount from the project budget 265,000 SSP could be used on other unforeseen expenses such as cost for a member delegate to Wau for buying inputs needed for the project to cover the transport cost, living cost, and renting for transportation of purchased inputs to Raja.

End of the proposal.