



# CROSS-BORDER POPULATION MOVEMENT FACTSHEET

## AKOBO PORT AND ROAD MONITORING

### AKOBO COUNTY, JONGLEI STATE, SOUTH SUDAN

## SOUTH SUDAN DISPLACEMENT CRISIS

AUGUST 2021


### CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Akobo town is located in the eastern side of Akobo County, Jonglei State, close to the land and river border crossings with Ethiopia. Akobo is a key point of trade and transit between South Sudan and Ethiopia. Since the beginning of the crisis in 2013, this route has been used by South Sudanese heading to or coming back from refugee camps in Ethiopia. Since May 2015, REACH has been recording arrivals and departures of South Sudanese households (HHs) in four locations, Gadrang Road, Koatkoangthor Road, Tundol Port and Market Port, on a daily basis.

In order to provide an indication of wider trends, data is collected on the volume of movement, as well as the motivations and intentions of those travelling. REACH teams interviewed arrivals and departures at the HH level. For movements larger than three HHs, a short alternative survey is used to assess HH and individual numbers by speaking to the Transport Focal Point (TFP), such as the driver or transport authority.<sup>1</sup> Due to insecurity and other issues, data is not always collected on a daily basis. To correct for this inconsistency, data presented for general movement trends across months represents an average based on the number of days of data collection each month. **The data presented here is not representative, nor does it capture all movements in and out of Akobo. Rather, it is indicative of movement trends for the assessed population.**<sup>2</sup>

The following findings are based on primary data collected between the 2nd and 31st August 2021.

### MAIN DESTINATIONS OF INBOUND AND OUTBOUND HHs




### INBOUND TO SOUTH SUDAN

**32%** of inbound HHs that reported intending to **stay more than six months** in their final destination in South Sudan.

#### DEMOGRAPHICS

Proportion of recorded travellers by demographic group:



**93%** of inbound HHs were partial HHs.<sup>6</sup>

#### PREVIOUS LOCATION IN ETHIOPIA

Primary reported locations from which inbound HHs were leaving:




#### INTENDED DESTINATION IN SOUTH SUDAN

Primary reported intended destinations for inbound HHs:



#### PUSH FACTORS

Primary reported push factors for inbound HHs to leave their last location:<sup>8</sup>



#### REASONS FOR COMING TO SOUTH SUDAN

Primary reported pull factors for inbound HHs, May to August 2021:<sup>8</sup>

	May 2021	June 2021	July 2021	August 2021
Proximity to family/home	41%	51%	69%	60%
Attending a ceremony	18%	20%	4%	16%
Presence of work opportunities	29%	20%	10%	12%

### OUTBOUND FROM SOUTH SUDAN

**52%** of outbound HHs that reported intending to **stay more than six months** in their final destination outside of South Sudan.

#### DEMOGRAPHICS

Proportion of recorded travellers by demographic group:



**86%** of outbound HHs were partial HHs.<sup>6</sup>

#### PREVIOUS LOCATION IN SOUTH SUDAN

Primary reported locations from which outbound HHs were leaving:




#### INTENDED DESTINATION IN ETHIOPIA

Primary reported intended destinations for outbound HHs:



#### PULL FACTORS

Primary reported pull factors for outbound HHs to go to another country:<sup>8</sup>



#### REASONS FOR LEAVING SOUTH SUDAN

Primary reported push factors for outbound HHs, May to August 2021:<sup>8</sup>

	May 2021	June 2021	July 2021	August 2021
Distance from family/home	19%	16%	21%	23%
Lack of health services	17%	29%	24%	23%
Lack of food	22%	23%	14%	19%

### GENERAL MOVEMENT TRENDS

The findings in this factsheet are based on data from the REACH Port and Road Monitoring (PRM) data collection and the TFP survey, the latter of which captures larger movements between Akobo and Ethiopia.<sup>1</sup>

#### TYPE OF MOVEMENT

Total monthly number of HHs and individuals recorded in August 2021:

	HHs	Individuals	% of HHs	Inbound transport	Outbound transport
Inbound to South Sudan from Ethiopia	72	396	35%	1	3
Outbound to Ethiopia from South Sudan	119	565	57%	0	1
Internal movement within South Sudan	17	95	8%		

During the data collection period, in addition to interviewing 138 HHs (794 individuals) travelling by foot or in small vehicles and boats (PRM data collection), REACH also used the TFP tool to estimate the number of HHs travelling on larger boats. In August, one inbound transport was recorded carrying an estimated 15 HHs (55 individuals) and 3 outbound transports were recorded carrying an estimated 15, 5, and 35 HHs (85, 27, and 95 individuals respectively).

### VULNERABILITIES

**82%** of total **inbound HHs** reported that at least one member of the HH had a vulnerability,<sup>5</sup> including:

- 44%** Separate/unaccompanied child
- 40%** Breastfeeding

**62%** of total **outbound HHs** reported that at least one member of the HH had a vulnerability,<sup>5</sup> including:

- 41%** Breastfeeding
- 25%** Separated/unaccompanied child

Notes:  
1. The TFP tool asks the driver (or another focal point) to give details of the number of individuals and number of households travelling. This methodology is used if the number of households travelling exceeds 3 households and therefore cannot all be interviewed. For more details, please access the Port and Road Monitoring Terms of Reference [here](#).  
2. While internal movement within South Sudan was also recorded in Akobo over the data collection period, this factsheet covers crossborder movement between South Sudan and Ethiopia, and vice versa, only.  
3. KI stands for Key Informant.  
4. Outbound transport focal points were asked what security concerns they anticipated on their onward journey based on historical trips.  
5. Respondents may select multiple vulnerabilities.  
6. Partial HHs are those where not all members of the self-identified family unit were reportedly travelling. Please note, family units in South Sudan often extend beyond the nuclear family.  
7. Four percent (4%) of HH also reported Ayod County as a primary intended destination for inbound HHs.  
8. Reported presence of services or opportunities is indicative of respondents' perceptions and does not necessarily reflect availability.