The three-wave survey recorded the views of 8,843 people from 12 counties across 9 states and special administrative areas, covering urban, rural and IDP camp environments. Respondents were asked questions about their daily experiences of safety, based on indicators of ‘everyday peace’ developed through focus groups. They also shared their views on a wide range of related topics, including elections, governance arrangements, security arrangements, trust in public authorities, civic space, national identity, and social cohesion, among others.
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1. More respondents disagreed (~47%) strongly disagree/disagree than agreed with the statement: "the national government cares about my community.

2. Responses to the question: "who is most influential in making decisions about the safety of your community?" showed that National Political Leaders have limited influence in decisions about safety at a local level. Governors and County commissioners are most influential in the majority of areas. However, this is not the case in outlier Aweil, as the majority (~55%) believe that the Paramount Chief holds the most influence in decisions about safety in Aweil (where a number of local agreements have been brokered by traditional authorities). By contrast, only 2% of respondents in Rubkona (where displacement levels are high) said the Paramount Chief was influential.

3. Traditional Authorities are perceived to have power in motivating families to engage in armed struggle, with a third of all respondents agreeing with the statement: "If Traditional Leaders in my community told my family that a member should join an armed group, we would comply." However, this varied by location; in Yei, Yambio and Rumbek, very few respondents agreed ("agree" or "strongly agree"). Whereas, in Yiro West, Aweil, Bor South and Juba almost half of the respondents felt that traditional authorities could encourage their family members to join armed groups ("agree" or "strongly agree").

Conclusions:
- National leaders face a legitimacy challenge; many citizens believe the national government neither cares about their community, nor has great influence to make decisions that effect their safety.
- The most unsafe, and displaced communities feel the weakest stake in national government - and these are the most difficult populations to reach through public consultations and service delivery. However, if they are continuously excluded, the national government will face difficulties in establishing a trusted and meaningful central state for all South Sudanese.
- National leaders should work through local leaders (formal and traditional) as they have high levels of trust among citizens, particularly traditional authorities, state governors and local governments.
- In contexts like Yiro and Aweil, policy makers may find traditional authorities to be an important partner in dissuading citizens to join armed groups.
Q: Do you agree with the statement: "The National Government cares about my community."

Overall Respondents
- Strongly agree 408 (12.86%)
- Agree 794 (25.02%)
- Neither agree nor disagree 377 (11.88%)
- Disagree 829 (26.13%)
- Strongly disagree 664 (20.93%)
- Not answered 101 (3.18%)

Respondents by Year
- 2022: 50% Respondents

Respondents by Location
- Rubkona
- Juba
- Malakal
- Bor South
- Yirol West
- Aweil Centre
- Rumbek Centre
- Yambio
- Yei
- Wau
- Jur River

Environment Type
- IDP Camp
- Rural
- Urban

Gender
- Female
- Male
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PUBLIC AUTHORITY & Everyday Safety Levels

Q: "The National Government cares about my Community"

Responses for the statement "The National Government cares about my community" & Everyday Security

Very unsafe
- Aweil Centre: 24%
- Bor South: 24%
- Juba: 27%
- Jur River: 50%
- Malakal: 19%
- Rubkona: 41%
- Rumbek Centre: 17%
- Wau: 67%
- Yambio: 33%
- Yei: 54%
- Yirol West: 23%

Unsafe
- Aweil Centre: 50%
- Bor South: 59%
- Juba: 30%
- Jur River: 45%
- Malakal: 55%
- Rubkona: 38%
- Rumbek Centre: 22%
- Wau: 20%
- Yambio: 33%
- Yei: 31%
- Yirol West: 17%

Neither safe nor unsafe (nu)
- Aweil Centre: 24%
- Bor South: 30%
- Juba: 31%
- Jur River: 41%
- Malakal: 55%
- Rubkona: 45%
- Rumbek Centre: 61%
- Wau: 27%
- Yambio: 43%
- Yei: 28%
- Yirol West: 20%

Safe
- Aweil Centre: 17%
- Bor South: 60%
- Juba: 30%
- Jur River: 50%
- Malakal: 52%
- Rubkona: 39%
- Rumbek Centre: 28%
- Wau: 23%
- Yambio: 35%
- Yei: 35%
- Yirol West: 21%

Very safe
- Aweil Centre: 19%
- Bor South: 43%
- Juba: 17%
- Jur River: 16%
- Malakal: 16%
- Rubkona: 21%
- Rumbek Centre: 33%
- Wau: 26%
- Yambio: 26%
- Yei: 17%
- Yirol West: 18%
Q: Do you agree with: “The National Government cares about my Community” & Q: “What are the prospects for peace in South Sudan in the next 3 years?”

Responses for: “The National Government cares about my community” & “In your opinion what are the prospects for peace in S. Sudan in the next 3 years?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADM2 name</th>
<th>Wave 3 Respondents</th>
<th>Wave 3 Respondents</th>
<th>Wave 3 Respondents</th>
<th>Wave 3 Respondents</th>
<th>Wave 3 Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Neither good nor bad (nus...)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aweil Centre</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bor South</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jur River</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malakal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pibor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubkonha</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbe Centre</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wau</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambio</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yei</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirol West</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q: Do you agree with: "The National Government cares about my Community"
& Q: "Is South Sudan currently at peace?"

Responses for: "The National Government cares about my community" & "Is South Sudan currently at peace?"
Q: "Who is most influential in making decisions about the safety of your community?"

All Respondents
- Paramount Chief 18.51%
- County Commissioner 16.26%
- Governor 51.36%
- Head of Police in the State 5.32%
- MPs at the National Level 2.69%
- MPs at the State Level 1.3%
- Deputy Governor 1.3%
- Mayor 2.69%
- Paramount Chief 18.51%

Other (specified):
If traditional leaders in my community told my family that a member should join an armed group, we would comply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADM2 name</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aweil Centre</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bor South</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jur River</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malakal</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pibor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubkonan</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wau</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambio</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yei</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirol West</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I feel comfortable disagreeing about important issues with other members of the community."
When armed groups are fighting in this area, is it primarily about national political issues, local political issues, both national and local political issues, or not about politics at all?

- Both national and local political issues
- Local political issues
- National political issues
- Not about politics

Which of the following actors do you trust most to help your community negotiate agreements with armed groups nearby so they can pass peacefully through your area?

- Civil society
- Faith leaders
- International actors
- Local government (country level)
- National government
- Organized forces (military, police)
- State government
- Traditional authorities

**ADM2 name**

- Rubkona
  - Civil society: 17%
  - Faith leaders: 36%
  - International actors: 34%
- Juba
  - Civil society: 27%
  - Faith leaders: 12%
  - International actors: 8%
  - National government: 35%
  - Organized forces: 9%
- Malakal
  - Civil society: 15%
  - Faith leaders: 26%
  - International actors: 17%
  - Local government (country level): 11%
  - National government: 20%
- Bor South
  - Civil society: 14%
  - Faith leaders: 68%
  - International actors: 14%
- Yirol West
  - Civil society: 17%
  - Faith leaders: 30%
  - International actors: 12%
  - Local government (country level): 44%
- Rumbek Centre
  - Civil society: 16%
  - Faith leaders: 50%
  - International actors: 14%
- Aweil Centre
  - Civil society: 17%
  - Faith leaders: 8%
  - International actors: 9%
  - Local government (country level): 21%
  - State government: 38%
- Yambio
  - Civil society: 15%
  - Faith leaders: 23%
  - International actors: 10%
- Yei
  - Civil society: 18%
  - Faith leaders: 18%
  - International actors: 10%
  - Local government (country level): 32%
  - State government: 12%
  - Traditional authorities: 17%
- Wau
  - Civil society: 13%
  - Faith leaders: 9%
  - International actors: 21%
  - Local government (country level): 21%
  - State government: 13%
  - Traditional authorities: 18%
- Jur River
  - Civil society: 13%
  - Faith leaders: 22%
  - International actors: 21%
  - Local government (country level): 13%
  - State government: 18%
  - Traditional authorities: 18%
COMMUNITY GRIEVANCES AND ACTORS
Influential Actors within Community - Cattle-raiding

How much of a problem is cattle-raiding in this area?

Responses
- Not answered
- Not a problem at all
- Very small problem
- Small problem
- Moderate problem (nu...)
- Big problem
- Very big problem

Which of the following actors do you trust most to help your community reach peaceful agreements about conflict over cattle?

Actors
- Civil society
- Faith leaders
- International actors
- Local government (cou...)
- National government
- None of the above
- Not answered
- Organized forces
- State government
- Traditional authorities

ADM2 name
- Rubkona
- Juba
- Malakal
- Bor South
- Yirol West
- Aweil Centre
- Rumbek Centre
- Yambio
- Yei
- Wau
- Jur River

Respondents
- 0%
- 50%
- 100%

Number of times respondents have been displaced (>=)
- 0
- 100