

Research Terms of Reference

Integration and social inclusion in Areas of Return

SSD2311

South Sudan

November 2023
V1

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

Country of intervention	South Sudan		
Type of Emergency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural disaster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>specify</i>)
Type of Crisis	<input type="checkbox"/> Sudden onset	<input type="checkbox"/> Slow onset	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	FCDO		
IMPACT Project Code	32AZT		
Overall Research Timeframe (<i>from research design to final outputs / M&E</i>)	04/12/2023 to 16/02/2024		
Research Timeframe	1. Pilot/ training: 04/12/2023	6. Preliminary presentation: NA	
<i>Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)</i>	2. Start collect data: 05/12/2023	7. Outputs sent for validation: 02/02/2024	
	3. Data collected: 15/12/2023	8. Outputs published: 16/02/2024	
	4. Data analysed: 22/12/2023	9. Final presentation: 16/02/2024	
	5. Data sent for validation: 22/12/2023		
Number of assessments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single assessment (one cycle) <input type="checkbox"/> Multi assessment (more than one cycle) <i>[Describe here the frequency of the cycle]</i>		
Humanitarian milestones <i>Specify what will the assessment inform and when</i> <i>e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;</i>	Milestone	Deadline (can be tentative)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Donor plan/strategy	__/__/__	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Inter-cluster plan/strategy	__/__/__	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cluster plan/strategy	__/__/__	
	<input type="checkbox"/> NGO platform plan/strategy	__/__/__	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Close of FCDO fund	30/04/2024	
Audience Type & Dissemination <i>Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience</i>	Audience type	Dissemination	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic	<input type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Operational	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre)	

			<input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]	
Stakeholder mapping <i>Has a detailed stakeholder mapping been conducted during research design to identify all actors that could contribute to and/or benefit from the research?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		X	No
General Objective	To explore the integration of returnee populations in areas of return in Rubkona County, especially in regards to social inclusion markers, social connections and facilitators ¹ , in order to support humanitarian partners in developing community-centred and accountable programming while following a do-no-harm approach that promotes social cohesion.			
Specific Objective(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To identify the push and pull factors in returnees' deciding their areas of return. 2. To explore social inclusion markers, including access to livelihoods, basic services (education, health, shelter), and humanitarian assistance, and whether disparities in service provision have impacted community relations. 3. To explore social connections and relationship dynamics² between returnees and "host community"³ members in areas of return. 4. To identify challenges that returnees and "host communities" could face in the mid-to long-term in regards to integration, and in particular social inclusion. 5. To identify returnees' movement intentions in the mid to long term and the factors that will shape these decisions. 			
Research Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are returnees choosing to settle in and/or leave their current location 2. How do social inclusion markers differ between returnee and "host community" populations? 3. How are relationships between returnees and "host communities" in areas of return? 4. What challenges could returnees and "host communities" face in regards to integration in the medium- to longer-term? 5. What are returnees' movement intentions in the next six months, and what factors shape these decisions? 			
Geographic Coverage	Rubkona County, Unity State, South Sudan			
Secondary data sources	Bentiu Camp 2023 ISNA Bentiu Camp 2020 FSNMS+ IOM DTM Population Count, Bentiu IOM / UNHCR Population Movement Dashboard			
Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IDPs in camp	<input type="checkbox"/> IDPs in informal sites		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IDPs in "host communities"	<input type="checkbox"/> IDPs [Other, Specify]		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugees in camp	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugees in informal sites		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugees in "host communities"	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugees [Other, Specify]		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Host communities"	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Returnees		
Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Geographical #: _ _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Displacement status #: 2 Population size per strata is known?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender #: 2 Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes X No	
Data collection tool(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Structured (Quantitative)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Semi-structured (Qualitative)		
	Sampling method		Data collection method	
Semi-structured data collection tool # 1 <i>Focus Group Discussions with returnees</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus group discussion (Target #): 16 <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_____ 	
Semi-structured data collection tool # 2 <i>Key Informant Interviews with humanitarian actors</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #): 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Focus group discussion (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_____ 	
Target level of precision if probability sampling	__% level of confidence		__+/- % margin of error	
Disaggregation by gender and age <i>Are you planning to conduct sex/age disaggregated analysis?</i>	Gender		Age	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
Data management platform(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IMPACT	<input type="checkbox"/> UNHCR		
	<input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]			
Expected output type(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Situation overview #: 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Report #: __	<input type="checkbox"/> Profile #: __	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: __	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation (Final) #: 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Factsheet #: __	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Interactive dashboard #: __	<input type="checkbox"/> Webmap #: __	<input type="checkbox"/> Map #: __	
	<input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] #: __			
Access	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)			
Visibility <i>Specify which logos should be on outputs</i>	REACH			
	Donor: FCDO			
	Coordination Framework: NA			
	Partners: NA			

2. Rationale

2.1 Background

The population in Rubkona county, Unity state, is extremely vulnerable. IPC estimates suggest 80% of the population will face acute food insecurity between November 2023 and July 2024.⁴ Rubkona also hosts the largest IDP camp (formerly Protection of Civilians site)⁵ in South Sudan, with an estimated population of 100,000 people in October 2023.⁶ Disease outbreaks,⁷ “critical” rates of acute malnutrition,⁸ and “deplorable” WASH conditions⁹ underline severe

humanitarian needs inside the camp. The situation in Rubkona is aggravated by years of catastrophic flooding, the loss of traditional livelihood activities, and a collapse in social support systems.¹⁰

Since the conflict in Sudan broke out on 15 April 2023, the already severe humanitarian situation in Rubkona has deteriorated. Widespread disruption to supply chains, spiraling costs for basic goods, and disease outbreaks have increased humanitarian needs.¹¹ Furthermore, the arrival to Rubkona county of approximately 40,000 people fleeing the conflict from Sudan has stretched scarce resources,¹² especially food supplies.¹³

Returnees arriving in Rubkona have been met with critical conditions, including measles outbreaks¹⁴ and water shortages.¹⁵ Furthermore, many returnees (mainly those in the IDP camp) are not registered to receive humanitarian assistance. This, combined with a lack of viable livelihood options, has led them to depend heavily on social support networks to access food and other basic needs. However, pre-existing vulnerabilities among the population in Rubkona likely reduce their ability to absorb and support new arrivals. And those returnees without such networks will face considerable challenges. Already, for instance, some recent arrivals have reportedly *returned* to Sudan due to severe conditions inside the Bentiu IDP camp.¹⁶

In the coming months, a severely food insecure IDP population and an increasingly large returnee population will continue to cohabitate. Of the 50,000 people arriving from Sudan to Unity state, approximately 70% intend to remain in Rubkona county.¹⁷ An escalation in fighting in South Kordofan and West Kordofan states, Sudan, could trigger further displacement.¹⁸ At the same time, flooding and protection concerns in the run up to elections scheduled for late-2024 in South Sudan might prevent internally displaced persons in Rubkona from relocating.¹⁹ Taken together, these factors raise the importance of new mid- to long-term approaches that mitigate tension and integrate diverse groups' perspectives. This is all the more critical ahead of 2024, when it's possible that the humanitarian response in Rubkona will downscale as a result of global funding cuts.

2.2 Intended impact

This research aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the integration of returnee populations in Rubkona County, especially in regards to social inclusion. The assessment will study social inclusion markers, such as the access to livelihoods and other basic services, as well as the provision of humanitarian assistance, in order to compare experiences for the different groups ("host community" and returnees) and assess the social inclusion in the area.

Besides, **it will aim to support a more comprehensive overview of the relationships between returnees and "host community" members in Rubkona.** More specifically, it will study how returnees and "host communities" are establishing social bonds and bridges, and how this is translating into collaborating to share resources, settle disputes, and participate in decision-making processes. Furthermore, as returnees look to reconnect with relatives and/ or reclaim their ancestral land,²⁰ this assessment will outline the challenges both population groups expect to face in the medium to long term.

The main actors we aim to inform are humanitarian partners that deliver assistance and programmes in Rubkona county, so informed approaches on how to better assist all population groups residing in the area can be taken while promoting social cohesion among these groups. Understanding both the current dynamics, as well as the possible challenges that populations will face in the mid to long term, will be essential for stakeholders to increase the cost-effectiveness of humanitarian interventions, especially in a year when funding will decrease dramatically in South Sudan, while the region is still experiencing one of the most acute humanitarian emergencies in the world.

3. Methodology

3.1 Methodology overview

This assessment follows a qualitative approach comprised of Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIs). FGDs are held with two distinct population groups: 1. South Sudanese returnees from Sudan who arrived

in Rubkona county since the onset of fighting in Sudan in April 2023; and 2. “Host community” members¹ residing in Rubkona county prior to the onset of fighting in Sudan in April 2023. Discussions will be disaggregated by gender to capture a diverse range of perspectives. FGD participants will be heads of household or, failing that, adult household members familiar with household decision-making. Key Informant Interviews will be held with two types of informant: 1. Humanitarian actors operating in Rubkona (to include coordination- and field-level staff); and 2. Community leaders representing the “host community” and, if possible, returnees.

3.2 Population of interest

The geographic coverage for this assessment will be locations in Rubkona county, Unity state, specifically those that have received returnees fleeing the conflict in Sudan. Rubkona county is selected because (a) it has received a large number of returnees from Sudan, many of whom are likely to remain in spite of critical conditions. Furthermore, any escalation in fighting in South and West Kordofan states, Sudan, will likely trigger even more displacement into Rubkona; (b) it faced severe humanitarian needs prior to the onset of fighting, manifest in acute food insecurity, disease outbreaks, and a considerable reliance on humanitarian assistance. Ultimately, then, the population are ill-equipped to absorb the large number of arrivals. This may have adverse impacts on social inclusion and integration between returnees and “host community” members; (c) operational and logistic factors were also taken into consideration, as REACH hosts a permanent base in the area, and another REACH assessment on livelihoods coping will take place at the same time.

Specific data collection sites will include locations where returnees are living among the “host community” (e.g., Bentiu town, Rotriak) and locations where returnees are living in camp/ informal settings (e.g., Bentiu IDP camp). Such locations will be identified by stakeholders including humanitarian actors, local government representatives, community leaders and REACH staff, through the community engagement and mobilization process, where specific information on the areas where returnees are settling will be discussed and shared to ensure proper sample representation. It is expected that in some locations these areas will be distributed among the whole community, while in others they could potentially be segregated in different blocks.

3.3 Secondary data review

Secondary source	Purpose of source
<u>IOM DTM Bentiu IDP Camp Population Count (October 2023)</u>	- Latest population count of Bentiu Camp
<u>IOM ISNA Quantitative component in Bentiu Camp (October 2023)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verify/triangulate primary data and findings - Inform research design and project rationale - Provide “baseline” data on specific AAP indicators - Indicate movement intentions among camp population
<u>WFP & IOM FSNMS+ Bentiu Camp (October/ November 2020)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verify/triangulate primary data and findings - Inform research design and project rationale - Provide “baseline” data on specific AAP indicators - Indicate movement intentions among camp population
<u>MSF Bentiu IDP Camp Reports</u>	- Verify/triangulate primary data and findings

¹ In the framework of this research, the concept of “host community” will consider individuals who resided in Rubkona before April 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide information on health and WASH conditions in particular, including assistance focused on these themes
<u>World Bank Durable Solutions Profile for South Sudan</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide demographic information on the population in Bentiu - Provide overview of humanitarian needs in the camp - Provide information on assistance in the camp

3.4 Primary Data Collection

The data collection team consists of the Public Health Unit (PHU) Research Manager (RM), one REACH Field Officer, and one translator. The REACH Field Officer will support with logistical aspects (e.g., facilitating introductions to authorities and humanitarian partners, mobilising participants, arranging transportation). He will also support the RM as a translator during data collection.

Data collection follows a qualitative approach for two main reasons. First, we have neither the time nor resources to conduct quantitative data collection at the necessary scale. Second, and more importantly, our research focuses on returnees' decision-making and their perceptions of the conditions they experienced since arriving in Rubkona. Therefore, our research questions are fundamentally descriptive in nature, and qualitative methods are most appropriate.

Data collection involves FGDs with people living in Rubkona county (returnees and “host community” members) and KIIs with community leaders/ representatives and humanitarian partners. FGDs are used to explore relationship dynamics between returnees and “host community” members, the impact of humanitarian assistance on dynamics. We also want to identify returnees' movement intentions, with a view to exploring how the situation in Rubkona may evolve in the coming months. KIIs with community leaders/ representatives serve to contextualise and triangulate FGD findings; KIIs with humanitarian actors will identify how partners are shaping the response to meet the needs of both returnees and “host communities”, and the challenges this raises.

Data collection will take place between December 4th and 14th in multiple locations of Rubkona county. **FGD participants and key informants are sampled purposively** following consultation with key stakeholders, including the REACH Field Officer, community leaders and humanitarian partners. **FGDs are conducted separately with returnees and “host communities”, to capture both groups' perspectives on relationship dynamics. FGDs are also conducted separately with men and women,** to capture diverse perspectives on returnees' integration and movement intentions.

The team aim to conduct a minimum of two FGDs per day. On this basis, and assuming that the team spend 10 working days in Rubkona (however with 2 days for travel and mobilisation), it is possible to conduct at least 16 FGDs (8 with men and 8 with women). Each FGD should not take longer than ninety minutes in order to mitigate fatigue or frustration among participants. They will comprise of between four and six people. The team will aim to conduct a minimum of one key informant interview per day of data collection, ideally lasting less than one hour. The number of KIIs depends on the progress of FGDs with returnees, prioritizing the latter versus the former, as well as the availability of key informants in the location assessed. Based on conversations with stakeholders on the ground during the research design of this assessment, we are aiming to conduct at least one interview with RRC representatives (ideally for Rubkona County Commissioner), and four interviews with different community leaders, based on the different community structures that are present in the area (namely the community leaders, community high committee, women's forum, and youth forum).

The minimum number of exercises and our target sample is as follows:

Table 1 - Focus Group Discussions

Group	Number of FGDs
“Host community” male	4
“Host community” female	4
Returnee male	4
Returnee female	4
Total	16

Table 2 - Key Informant Interviews

Group	Number of KIs
Community leaders (e.g., chiefs, headmen)	4
Relief and Rehabilitation Commission	1
Total	5

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

During data collection, at least one member of the team will take detailed notes while the other moderates discussion through a translator. The notetaker will interject and ask questions as they see fit. Ideally, notes are typed directly onto a laptop – the Data Compilation Exercise (DCE) tool template – to ensure they are as close to verbatim as possible and that they capture additional details such as participants’ body language, expressions and non-verbal responses throughout the conversation. If the notetaker prefers to use paper and pen, they will type their notes into the DCE tool template ideally on the same day of data collection. Once this is complete, the written notes shall be destroyed. The team will both review the final transcripts to ensure all key points are captured. Completed transcripts and debrief forms (which summarise the reliability of the data, challenges faced during data collection, and issues pertaining to sensitivity and do-no-harm) are saved in a dedicated folder space under password protection.

Qualitative data is analysed using a Data Saturation and Analysis Grid (DSAG). Depending on time available, each transcript is entered into the DSAG within 24 hours of data collection – to identify commonalities, key findings, issues worthy of follow-up in the next day’s data collection, and opportunities for optimising the data collection tool(s). At all times during the analysis, team members will follow the IMPACT Standards Checklist for Semi-Structured Data Processing and Analysis.

3.6 Limitations

Due to the qualitative nature of this assessment, findings are considered indicative only. However, in stratifying focus groups by gender and visiting multiple areas of settlement, we expect to capture a diverse range of perspectives.

The limited time available for this assessment – and the small number of interviews we will conduct – likely means we will not reach saturation on any of the key themes. Where possible, we will corroborate findings using secondary data and, if necessary, remote follow-ups with key stakeholders.

4. Key ethical considerations and related risks

The proposed research design meets / does not meet the following criteria:

<i>The proposed research design...</i>	<i>Yes/ No</i>	<i>Details if no (including mitigation)</i>
... Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to avoid unnecessary duplication of data collection efforts?	Yes	
... Respects respondents, their rights and dignity (<i>specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants' time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided</i>)?	Yes	
... Does not expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection?	Yes	
... Does not expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection?	Yes	
... Does not involve collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatising for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)?	Yes	
... Does not involve data collection with minors i.e. anyone less than 18 years old?	Yes	
... Does not involve data collection with other vulnerable groups e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.?	No	Secondary data suggest returnees faced severe protection risks prior to and during their displacement. It's possible, then, that participants include survivors of protection incidents.
... Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of personally identifiable information ?	Yes	

5. Roles and responsibilities

<i>Task Description</i>	<i>Responsible</i>	<i>Accountable</i>	<i>Consulted</i>	<i>Informed</i>
<i>Research design</i>	<i>FSL SAO, PHU RM</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>DCC</i>	<i>CC</i>
<i>Supervising data collection</i>	<i>FSL SAO, PHU RM</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>DCC</i>	<i>CC</i>
<i>Data processing (checking, cleaning)</i>	<i>FSL SAO, PHU RM</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>DCC, IMPACT HQ</i>	<i>CC</i>
<i>Data analysis</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>DCC, IMPACT HQ</i>	<i>CC</i>
<i>Output production</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>PHU RM</i>	<i>DCC, IMPACT HQ</i>	<i>CC</i>

<i>Dissemination</i>	PHU RM	PHU RM	DCC	CC, IMPACT HQ
<i>Monitoring & Evaluation</i>	PHU RM	PHU RM	DCC	CC, IMPACT HQ
<i>Lessons learned</i>	PHU RM	PHU RM	DCC	CC, IMPACT HQ

Responsible: the person(s) who executes the task

Accountable: the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone

Consulted: the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented

Informed: the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed

6. Data Management Plan

Administrative Data			
Research Cycle name	Social in cohesion in areas of return		
Project Code	32AZT		
Donor	FCDO		
Project partners	None		
Research Contacts	Spencer Robinson, spencer.robinson@impact-initiatives.org Leire Fernandez, Leire.fernandez@impact-initiatives.org		
Data Management Plan Version	Date: 17/11/2023	Version: 01	
Related Policies			
Documentation and Metadata			
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data? <i>Select all that apply</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Data analysis plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Data Cleaning Log, including: <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion Log <input type="checkbox"/> Value Change Log
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Code book	<input type="checkbox"/> Data Dictionary
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Metadata based on HDX Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Analysis and Saturation Grid
Ethics and Legal Compliance			
Which ethical and legal measures will be taken?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent of participants to participate	<input type="checkbox"/> Consent of participants to share personal information with other agencies
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No collection of personally identifiable data will take place	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender, child protection and other protection issues are taken into account
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All participants reached age of majority	[Other, Specify]
Who will own the copyright and Intellectual Property Rights for the data that is collected?	[Specify]		
Storage and Backup			
Where will data be stored and backed up during the research?	<input type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT/REACH Kobo Server	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Kobo Server: [specify]
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT Global Physical / Cloud Server	<input type="checkbox"/> Country/Internal Server
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	On devices held by REACH staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical location [specify]
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]	
Which data access and security measures have been taken?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Password protection on devices/servers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data access is limited to REACH staff
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Form and data encryption on data collection server	<input type="checkbox"/> Partners signed an MoU if accessing raw data

	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]			
Preservation					
Where will data be stored for long-term preservation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT / REACH Global Cloud / Physical Server	<input type="checkbox"/>	OCHA HDX	
	X	REACH Country Server	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]	
Data Sharing					
Will the data be shared publically?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	X	No	
Will all data be shared?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	X	No	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No, [Other, Specify]			
Where will you share the data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	REACH Resource Centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	OCHA HDX	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HumanitarianResponse	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]	
Data protection risk assessment					
Have you completed the Indicators Risk Assessment table below?	X	Yes		No, no information that potentially allows identification of individuals is to be collected.	
[Please complete the first 4 columns in the Indicators Risk Assessment table below]					
Risk indicator (including direct and indirect identifiers)	Type of identification risk	Disclosure implications	Benefits	Class	Required mitigation
KI_role_organization	Possible to trace back to the KI	Loss of privacy	Follow-up for data cleaning] B2	To be deleted permanently after analysis is done
[Add relevant number of rows for risk indicators]					
Responsibilities					
Data collection	Leire Fernandez, Leire.fernandez@impact-initiatives.org				
Data cleaning	Leire Fernandez, Leire.fernandez@impact-initiatives.org				
Data analysis	Leire Fernandez, Leire.fernandez@impact-initiatives.org				

Data sharing/uploading

Leire Fernandez, Leire.fernandez@impact-initiatives.org

Endnotes

¹ Home Office Indicators of Integration framework, 2019. Access through:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1074688/home-office-indicators-of-integration-framework-2019-horr109.pdf

² By “relationships”, we aim to explore how returnees and “host communities” (a) allocate and share resources with one another, (b) settle disputes, (c) make and implement decisions, (d) engage with humanitarian actors, and (e) participate in livelihoods activities.

³ Host community is in inverted commas because the large majority of Rubkona’s population are IDPs; FSNMS R29 shows 89% of people in Rubkona are internally displaced.

⁴ IPC. “Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) for Acute Food Insecurity and Acute Malnutrition. November 2023 to July 2024.” November 2023.

⁵ Since 2020, the UN Mission in South Sudan redesignated the sites in Juba, Wau, Bor and Bentiu as displaced persons (IDP) camps under the sovereign control of the government of South Sudan. See Salifu, S. (2023) ‘In South Sudan, Protection of Civilians sites are transitioning into Internally Displaced Persons Camps’. *United Nations Peacekeeping*, 24th March. Available [here](#).

⁶ IOM DTM, *Population Count Bentiu ICP Camp*, October 2023. Available [here](#).

⁷ MSF (2022) ‘South Sudan: MSF and Ministry of Health implement Hepatitis E vaccination campaign in Bentiu’. 4th April. Available [here](#).

⁸ Concern Worldwide (2022) *Nutrition and Mortality, SMART Survey Report, Bentiu IDP Camp, Unity State, South Sudan*. Available [here](#).

⁹ MSF (2021) ‘Hepatitis E on the rise among poor sanitary conditions in Bentiu camp’. 25th August. Available [here](#).

¹⁰ Krystalli, R. *et al.* (2019) *The Currency of Connections: The evolution of pre-displacement connections in Bentiu, South Sudan*. Washington, DC: Mercy Corps.

¹¹ REACH (2023) *Emergency Food Security Update: Rubkona County, Unity state*. November. Available [here](#).

¹² IOM Population Movement Tracker, *Sudan Response*, available [here](#). As of 20th November, 34,797 people were recorded entering Rubkona. See *Destination State/County for Movement* under “Movements” tab.

¹³ REACH (2023) *South Sudan cross-border displacement: Rapid food security assessment in areas of return – Rubkona County, Unity State*. Available [here](#).

¹⁴ MSF (2023) ‘Measles in South Sudan: People Escaping Conflict in Sudan Face New Health Crisis’. 23rd August. Available [here](#).

¹⁵ Radio Tamazuj (2023) ‘Returnees face water shortage in Rubkona’. 25th June. Available [here](#).

¹⁶ Radio Tamazuj, 2013, ‘100 returnees in Unity State flee back to Sudan citing hunger’. Available [here](#).

¹⁷ IOM Population Movement Tracker, *Sudan Response*, available [here](#). As of 20th November, 51,045 people intended to travel to Unity state. Of these, 34,927 intended to stay in Rubkona. See *Intentions* tab.

¹⁸ United Nations Integrated Transition Assistance Mission in Sudan (2023) ‘Statement on the Situation in South and West Kordofan States’. 20th August. Available [here](#).; ACLED (2023) ‘Sudan: Heightened Violence in Kordofan Region as More Militia Groups Step Into the Conflict’. Available [here](#).; International Crisis Group (2023) *CrisisWatch*, Sudan, October entry. Available [here](#).

¹⁹ Jock, L. N. (2023) ‘Bentiu IDPs Demand Security Reforms Before South Sudan’s Elections’. VOA, 17th October.

²⁰ Bateman, P. (2023) ‘UNMISS Assesses Security and Humanitarian Situation in Remote Border Communities’. UNMISS, 11th October. Available [here](#).