



# Sudan-South Sudan cross-border assessment: Integration and social cohesion in areas of return

December 2023 | Rubkona County | Unity State | South Sudan

## KEY MESSAGES

- Since the onset of fighting in Sudan in April 2023, over 60,000 returnees have been recorded entering Unity State from two Points of Entry (PoE). The underlying vulnerabilities to which the population in Rubkona County are exposed creates a situation in which “host communities”<sup>1</sup> are ill-equipped to absorb the impact of large number of new arrivals, as needs continue to grow and resources remain scarce.
- While the social dynamics among these groups are positive and inclusive due to their shared origins, language, religion, culture and, in most cases, the pre-existence of social and/or familial connections, assessment results indicate that overcrowding of shelters, lack of access to basic services and overall destitution could be the main causes to potentially disrupt these otherwise positive relationships.
- The influx of returnees, and refugees, to Rubkona County is likely to continue in the upcoming months, with the potential to spike dependent on conflict dynamics in southern areas of Sudan. Therefore, the need to establish long-term solutions for the populations in the area is now more paramount than ever. Without proper shelter and the availability to access livelihoods, these populations have no choice but to rely on humanitarian assistance.

## CONTEXT & RATIONALE

Since the outbreak of fighting in Sudan on April 15 2023, humanitarian agencies have recorded a total of 580,345 people crossing the border from Sudan to South Sudan, of whom 79% are South Sudanese nationals and 20% Sudanese nationals.<sup>2</sup> Of those recorded arriving in South Sudan, over 60,000 were recorded entering Unity State, either through Panakuach PoE (28,895 individuals) or through Joda PoE in Renk County, and subsequently using Onward Transportation Assistance (OTA) to reach their final destination, which in the vast majority of cases has been Rubkona County.<sup>3</sup> The latest information also indicates that as many as 12,000 refugees have recently made their way to Rubkona County.<sup>4</sup>

Rubkona County, home to Bentiu, the capital of Unity State, has experienced a series of compounding shocks, including political unrest and localized violence during the South Sudanese civil war and its aftermath, and more recently, catastrophic flooding between 2019 and 2021. These events led to the forcible displacement of a large percentage of the population in the area, while eroding their traditional livelihood activities, mainly cultivation and cattle-rearing. Furthermore, they reduced both the household and communal coping mechanisms available to communities. In turn, populations in Rubkona County depend heavily on humanitarian assistance, and the prospect of full livelihoods recovery seems very distant.

As of September of 2023 approximately 342,397 people reside in Rubkona County, with over 177,000 (52%) of them being Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).<sup>5</sup> More than 100,000 IDPs reside in Bentiu IDP camp (former Protection of Civilians site).<sup>6</sup> The remaining population is distributed across different sites, mainly Rubkona town, Bentiu town (and IDP sites) and Rotriak settlement.

With the onset of conflict in Sudan, the already severe humanitarian situation in Rubkona has further deteriorated as a result of disruptions to supply chains, spiraling costs for basic goods, and disease outbreaks, among other factors.<sup>7</sup>

Moreover, the arrival to Rubkona County of over 60,000 people fleeing the conflict in Sudan has stretched scarce resources, especially food supplies.<sup>8</sup> The latest Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) conducted in South Sudan estimated that 80% of the population in Rubkona County will face acute food insecurity between November 2023 and July 2024, with 5% of the population experiencing famine-like conditions between September and November 2023.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the latest updates indicated that the resumption of Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA) provision was the only lifeline for the population to avoid the situation to further deteriorate.<sup>10</sup>

Returnees arriving in Rubkona have, therefore, been met with critical conditions. Furthermore, many of them did not receive humanitarian assistance for prolonged periods of time following their arrival, which together with a lack of viable livelihood options has led them to depend heavily on social support networks to access food and other basic needs. Considering the pre-existing vulnerabilities among the host community population of Rubkona County, their ability to absorb and support these new arrivals is very limited, and as the population numbers increases, resources will likely grow scarce. With the possibility of escalation in fighting in South and West Kordofan States in Sudan, further displacement into Unity State in general, and Rubkona County in particular, could occur.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, flooding and protection concerns in the run up to elections scheduled for late-2024 in South Sudan might prevent internal displacement and relocation, both as a coping mechanisms and as a long-term livelihood option.<sup>12</sup> 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 in 2024, with cuts in funding for the humanitarian response accentuating the need to prioritize emergency areas.

This research aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the current situation in Rubkona County, focusing on the integration of returnee populations, especially in regards to social inclusion markers and access to services. The assessment also focuses on understanding social dynamics and how this translates into collaboration between communities to share resources.

## METHODOLOGY

Primary data collection consisted of 14 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and was conducted between December 4 and 14, 2023 in Rubkona County. Assessment locations were selected based on their large returnee population as well as logistical feasibility, and included Bentiu and Rubkona towns, Rotriak and Bentiu IDP camp. Every group included between four and six participants who were identified through community engagement and mobilization processes, aiming to include a diverse range of perspectives.

FGDs were held separately with South Sudanese nationals who had fled Sudan ("returnees"), and individuals who had resided in the assessment locations prior to the onset of fighting in Sudan in April 2023 (referred to as host community). Discussions were also disaggregated by gender to capture diverse perspectives and allow for more inclusive discussions.

The same FGD tool was employed for both population groups, and it explored social inclusion markers, including access to livelihoods and other basic services, as well as the access to humanitarian assistance, in order to compare experiences among the two different groups. The tool also explored relationship dynamics in regards to social cohesion between "returnees" and "host communities." Among the "returnee" population group, a specific section on movement dynamics was added to better understand the choices of Rubkona County as their area of return and their movement intentions in the short and mid-term. Qualitative findings are indicative of the situation at the time of data collection, and are not statistically representative.

A secondary data review was conducted before and after data collection, including the use of IOM-DTM population flow monitoring data, as well as other documents prepared by humanitarian actors. This secondary information informed the approach of the research prior to data collection and was also used to better situate the results of this assessment in the broader scope of the humanitarian response in South Sudan.

## Returnee movements to areas of return

Historically, displacement driven by conflict, climate shocks, and lack of access to resources has been widespread in South Sudan, primarily within the borders of modern South Sudan, but also across borders with neighbouring countries, mainly Ethiopia and Sudan. Previous research on population movement dynamics indicates that, in the case of Unity State, the majority of large-scale cross-border population movements were to Sudan, and they mainly occurred previously to South Sudan's independence – as for the available data recorded between 1983-2012.<sup>13</sup>

In all FGDs conducted with returnees, participants reported that the vast majority of those choosing Rubkona County as their final area of return identified it as their original or ancestral land. This reportedly also applied to returnees who had spent the entirety or vast majority of their lives residing in neighbouring Sudan. This link to the area was identified as one of the main pull factors for returnees' decision on settling down in Rubkona County, especially for those who entered South Sudan through Joda PoE in Renk, and used OTA to reach their final destination. In the context of understanding integration these findings are pertinent, as the connection with the land plays a crucial role in shaping the sense of belonging and inclusion among the community.

Moreover, the presence of relatives in the area that could support them during their reintegration was identified as another main factor for returnees to choose their area of return. In multiple occasions, participants in different groups stated that their original areas of residence were payams that were now inaccessible due to standing water as a result of catastrophic flooding, with some returnees reporting that they only found out about this inaccessibility upon arrival to Rubkona County. Therefore, returnees reportedly had to resort to establishing themselves in the areas where their relatives had been displaced to, namely Bentiu town sites, Rubkona town, and the Bentiu IDP camp.

The case of Rotriak is slightly different, with assessment findings indicating that returnees staying in Rotriak settlement were the only group among all four assessed locations that did not indicate the presence of relatives in the area of return as a main pull factor for their decision. This higher-ground area was established in 2021 after the Unity government allocated plots of land for IDPs affected by catastrophic flooding. Since then, the population in the area has increased as conditions remained dire in other areas of Rubkona County, and Rotriak offered more possibilities to access resources due to the availability of dry land. According to assessment findings, Rotriak has now reportedly become the main area of settlement for returnees crossing to South Sudan through Panakuach PoE, either because their original payams in Unity State are inaccessible due to standing water, or because they lack the means for onward transportation to other areas.

An indication of the differences among returnee

perceptions of integration in the different assessed locations is that, in all locations except for Rotriak, returnees stated that most people either were already leaving or thinking of leaving their current areas of settlement – namely Rubkona town, Bentiu town sites and Bentiu IDP camp. Most importantly, when asked about which areas returnees were leaving to or considering for onward movement, participants in all FGDs in the three above-mentioned locations stated that the predominant choice for most people was to return back to Sudan. This highlights how dire the situation has become in Rubkona County, with returnees willing to undertake journeys back to Sudan, potentially risking being exposed to serious protection risks, both on the way and upon arrival. The predominant destinations in Sudan that returnees aimed to return to are camps along the border with Renk, such as Al Algaya refugee camp, where they had been told assistance was being provided, as well as areas in southern Sudan where conflict hadn't broke out yet, with the expectation that they could still access livelihoods. Participants also mentioned that, to a lesser extent, returnees were also thinking of moving to other onward destinations within South Sudan, but this option was considered less advantageous due to the uncertainty about safety conditions and access to resources.

In all FGDs, the main push factor for returnees to leave their current areas of settlement in Rubkona County was identified as the lack of access to food and feelings of excessive hunger. Other widely mentioned factors included the lack of livelihood opportunities and the perception of the situation in South Sudan being worse than expected, leading to feelings of helplessness about the possibilities to reintegrate and earn a living. Moreover, some of the other factors most commonly mentioned by participants were the absence of livelihood opportunities, the lack of humanitarian assistance and unwillingness of returnees to rely on the host community for the long-term. Last but not least, overcrowding of shelters in these areas of return was mentioned in all locations except for Rotriak – the only location in which participants indicated that returnees were able to build their own "rakoobas" instead of relying in sharing a shelter with relatives or other members of the "host community."

On the other hand, the main pull factors for returnees to stay in their current areas of settlement included the lack of monetary resources to cover travel expenses to other areas and the presence or possibility of conflict that could impede movement and/or make onward destinations dangerous for them. Moreover, among the FGDs held with returnee women, they expressed that, overall, women preferred to stay in the current locations and adapt to the existing possibilities in terms of alternative livelihoods and coping mechanisms that were already employed by the host community for subsistence, rather than engaging in long and arduous movements to onward destinations. This finding is better understood when considering the perspective of gender and how protection risks are heightened for women in transit, as has been widely reported by South Sudanese women fleeing Sudan into South Sudan.<sup>14,15</sup>



## Integration, social inclusion, and cohesion

Integration is a cross-cutting issue that is grounded in the concepts of social inclusion and social cohesion.<sup>16</sup> However, the concept of social cohesion is open to debate and different angles have been taken by different actors.<sup>17</sup> Within the aid sector in particular, different definitions for social cohesion co-exist, with organizations defining this concept based on their mandates and programmatic focus.<sup>18</sup> For the purpose of this assessment, and considering the nature of Rubkona County as one of the geographical areas of South Sudan with high humanitarian needs, the topics covered during FGDs focused on the most immediate needs to achieve social inclusion - which entail economic inclusion, equal access to basic services, and civic and political participation - as well as exploring the social dynamics among the host community and returnees to understand the longer-term concepts needed to attain social cohesion.

Nevertheless, integration is a social process characterized by being multi-dimensional and multi-directional, affecting all aspects of life for both population groups, in this case returnees and the "host community," and which goes beyond access to services and includes the ability of the newcomers to establish themselves in a new place and within a new community.<sup>19</sup> To ultimately achieve social cohesion, both "horizontal" and "vertical" processes are required, with the former referring to inter- and intra-group relationships, and the latter focusing on the relationships between individuals and the state.<sup>20</sup> While the present research has a bigger focus on concepts pertaining to "horizontal" social cohesion, "vertical" processes are crucial to ensure equitable and sustainable access to resources, and in this research they had been investigated to some degree through questions related to access to basic services and humanitarian assistance and the relationships between the different population groups with humanitarian actors and local institutions. Overall, it is also very important to keep in mind that integration and social inclusion are context specific, and therefore need to be both understood and planned in the basis of the context.<sup>21</sup>

### Access to livelihoods and coping mechanisms

In most FGDs, the host community expressed that, previously, they were able to access traditional livelihood sources, mainly livestock rearing and agricultural activities. However, over the last few years, and as a direct consequence of the effects of catastrophic flooding in the area, they were now unable to engage in these activities. In the Bentiu IDP camp, participants from the host community expressed that since their arrival on site they had not been able to engage in traditional livelihood activities, and that they had resorted to the establishment of tea shops and restaurants, in addition to other activities that included the collection and selling of firewood and grass that was used to build shelters ("rakoobas"). Moreover, within Bentiu IDP camp, since its inception, residents have been provided

with humanitarian assistance, including HFA, and August 2023 was the first time when distribution ceased for a prolonged period of time. In the case of returnees, most of them expressed that prior to the onset of fighting in Sudan, they were able to access different types of livelihoods, which in most cases were not related to the more traditional activities of agriculture and livestock rearing.

Currently, both population groups explicitly mentioned that there is a lack of livelihood sources. Among the host community, they underscored that traditional livelihoods were not possible anymore, and that only in Rotriak a minority of households were able to engage in livestock rearing and/or cultivate some small areas where soil conditions deem it possible. In this scenario, the population has resorted to engage in alternative livelihood sources, with the most common being fishing, both for selling and for own consumption. Other alternatives include the creation of small businesses and engaging in casual labor, mostly generated by organizations working in the area recruiting from the local population for the implementation of some activities. As part of their integration process, returnees have reportedly been engaging in the same type of alternative livelihoods as the host community, with the most notable difference being that returnees stated they had fewer opportunities to engage in casual labor, as they felt they were not being targeted as much by the actors in charge.

For both population groups, resorting to coping mechanisms to deal with the shortage of food and/or resources to obtain food was very high. In the case of the host community, the most common strategies employed, reported in all FGDs, were to collect and consume water lilies (including the roots, which points towards very high food consumption gaps), and the collection and selling of firewood. In the case of returnees, while these strategies were also reported often, the most common mechanism employed was the sharing and/or borrowing of resources among households - which relied on the existence of social connections with the host community. This strategy was much less frequently reported among the host community group, and it therefore characterized the profile of returnees, highlighting their reliance on the host community to be able to cope and sustain themselves in the absence of access to sources of food or income.

Lastly, depending on humanitarian assistance was only reported as a strategy by the host community, but not at all among the returnee population. This finding correlated with the fact that returnees stated that they had been unable to access humanitarian assistance after the one-off distribution that they received upon their arrival in South Sudan. However, at the time of data collection, resumption of HFA was ongoing, and returnees were starting to register with the relevant actors in the area. It is worth noting that the use of emergency coping strategies to cope with shortages of food, such as prioritizing children to receive the available food, skipping meals, or even going for days without eating, were reported in both population groups, but more commonly among the returnee population.

The most common challenges to adapting to alternative livelihoods and coping mechanisms more widely used in the area was distance, as the “host community” population claimed that in order to access waterlilies, as well as to collect firewood, they need to engage in arduous journeys, which at times can take days. The lack of proper equipment, especially to engage in fishing activities, which are by far the preferred strategy, was the lack of access to fishing equipment and canoes, as fish are reportedly only found in areas where the water is deep.

## Access to basic services

Health, shelter, and education were the three main sectors probed for during the interviews of both groups. While interviewees stated that health facilities run by (I)NGOs are available in the area, the main challenge identified was the lack of resources within the facilities, especially lack of medicines. Both population groups stated that, in the best-case scenario, they would be able to access diagnostic tests, and in some cases mild painkillers. However, in most cases, they were only prescribed the needed medication for their condition, which they had to then buy for themselves in the markets, something that they claimed was unaffordable in their current situation.

The shelter situation in Rubkona County appears to be one of the major concerns for both population groups, but in particular for returnees, who in most cases have not had the chance to build their own shelters and are resorting to being hosted by host community members, in most cases based on pre-existing social connections with some households. This heavy reliance of the returnee population to be sheltered by the host community was identified as one of the main factors that could potentially result in a disruption of the so-far stable and positive dynamics among these groups. The two main reasons why building new shelters was reportedly so challenging were the lack of materials, especially the lack of plastic sheets that can be used for roofing, and the lack of space, which was a problem in most cases. This was less commonly reported in Rotriak, where space was reportedly still available due to its better-off location in higher grounds not affected by flooding. Both population groups, but especially the host community stated that they have not received assistance in the form of non-food items (NFIs) for a long time, which is leading to a rapid deterioration of their current shelters due to the harsh climatic conditions experienced during this past season.

In regards to education, the main challenge for the population was the high fees that are needed to pay in order to enrol children in schools. Since most households reportedly cannot afford to pay such fees, participants expressed that the majority of children in the area were not receiving education. This led to children resorting to spend their majority of time in the streets, in some instances using their time to engage in some forms of labour to support their families with making an income, such as cleaning the fish before being sold in the market or transporting goods between distant places with wheelbarrows.

Lastly, the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector was repeatedly brought up in discussions unprompted, and was characterized by FGD participants as one of the main challenges that populations currently face. In particular, the lack of access to enough drinking water was mentioned in different discussions, and further corroborated through transect walks in the areas assessed. Participants in the interviews stated that there are not enough boreholes to sustain all the people residing in these areas, which is leading to overcrowding at the water points and restrictions on the number of water containers that can be filled per household.

## Community perceptions of humanitarian assistance

Based on the information gathered, the main priorities identified by community members in terms of assistance needs were the following: increased availability and accessibility of drinking water; distribution of NFIs; access to education; and livelihood assistance (such as the provision of fishing equipment). The need for more water points was the most commonly, and unprompted, need identified by both population groups, especially in Rotriak, where incidents at water points were reported and identified as a major factor leading to friction among community members and population groups.

Moreover, topics related to how affected populations preferred to receive information on the assistance provided were discussed with both population groups. Participants indicated that communication with humanitarian partners was non-existent, with both the host community and returnee groups claiming that humanitarian partners do not reach out directly to them, and that the role of informing affected populations about assistance opportunities is deferred to community leaders. Only in Bentiu IDP camp did participants say that humanitarian partners were directly engaging in providing information, mostly via megaphone and, in some cases, via house visits, when the type of assistance was considered more sensitive (such as provision of cash assistance).

For those areas in which the channel of communication was via community leaders, participants explained that humanitarian partners would normally reach out to local authorities, who would later engage with community leaders, to inform them about the assistance being provided and how people could access it. The perception of whether this communication channel was fair and effective was varied. While diverse opinions were expressed among both population groups, there were more instances among the host community identifying this process as fair and effective, while in most cases among the returnee groups they criticized this process and were concerned that it could lead to people missing assistance opportunities or not being directly targeted by the community leaders. In addition, this communication channel was also used in reverse, meaning that affected populations needed to approach community leaders, instead of going directly

to humanitarian partners when they had feedback and/or complaints regarding assistance provided. Some participants stated that this process was questionable, as they did not know if their complaints were actually reaching the intended stakeholders, and that they would prefer to have more direct communication channels at their disposal.

Whether participants were satisfied with the communication systems in place was also seemingly correlated to their perceptions regarding their relationship with local institutions and authorities, as well as humanitarian partners. In most cases, especially among the host community, relationships with local authorities were reportedly seen as positive and favorable. In the case of the returnee population, participants viewed local institutions and authorities as the gatekeepers of information, with some participants expressing serious concerns about whether the communication of assistance opportunities and selection of beneficiaries was done in a fair and transparent way by community leaders. Moreover, among many different groups, especially among the returnee population, participants stated that they lacked direct links with humanitarian partners and noted that not enough effort was being made to properly monitor or supervise the job that community leaders do on their behalf.

## Social dynamics

Participants from both population groups affirmed that social dynamics among them are overall very positive, indicating that they are living peacefully and that no major tensions or frictions have occurred as a result of their different statuses. In the context of Rubkona, it is very important to note that, as reported during data collection, returnees choosing this as their area of return are, in their vast majority, originally from the area. According to assessment findings, this is a very important element as to why social integration has on the whole been positive, despite the dire conditions that populations in Rubkona were facing even before the onset of conflict in Sudan in April 2023. Shared characteristics, such as language, religion, and culture among both population groups are key factors to facilitate social inclusion and integration. Most importantly, the shared perception among both groups that returnees belong to this land, even if they had lived in neighbouring Sudan for prolonged periods of time, was named as the key factor as to why social dynamics were positive between populations. Host community FGD participants raised that returnees were seen as family, as in most cases they also still maintained family ties and social connections with host community members. Moreover, there was an overwhelming feeling of understanding among the host community as to the reasons that had led returnees to flee Sudan in search of safety and security and the reassurance that they were welcomed in their ancestral land. While some minor disagreements had arisen among the two population groups, participants stated these were mainly related to small conflicts among children that could potentially trigger some arguments between households, but in general, they were able to resolve them without major consequences. Nevertheless, returnees in

different groups reported that their reliance on the host community was extreme, and that it was almost impossible for them to access any resources without their help, which was considered a major barrier for social integration, as it diminished the possibilities for returnees to settle down in their area of return and fully integrate in the society as independent individuals.

## Key takeaways and projections

Based on the information gathered during the assessment, the following are some key takeaways and projections that could potentially take place, depending on how the situation evolves in the coming months:

- Particularly in Rotriak, participants among the returnee FGDs reported wanting to stay and seemed overall unwilling to relocate, even through humanitarian-facilitated movements. The land in Rotriak was perceived as the best option in the area for its size, which could allow for expansion and the possibility to build new shelters, as well as for its location, providing easier access to possible livelihood opportunities. Moreover, Rotriak was seen as a place where humanitarian assistance is more likely to be received, since multiple stakeholders had visited the area and assessed the populations' needs.
- Most participants among both population groups stated that, if water levels were to recede, they would be willing to relocate to their original payams across Rubkona County and Unity State. However, this scenario seems unlikely, as the effects from the catastrophic flooding in the area are still present, and a high risk of upcoming flooding during the next rainy season remains.
- Due to the overall feeling expressed by FGD participants that assistance was insufficient to cover the basic needs of populations in Rubkona, both host community members and returnees identified displacement as a risk factor to monitor in the coming months. This was especially the case among the returnee population, as returnee participants clearly stated that if the situation remained similar they would feel forced to relocate to other areas in order to access resources. Among both population groups the resumption (and potential increase) of humanitarian assistance were named as the main factors for them to remain in their current areas of settlement.
- The lack of assistance, especially of HFA, was recognized as the main factor that could potentially lead to tensions or conflict among the two groups, and even within the pre-existing host communities. Participants linked the effects of protracted hunger with protection risks, such as domestic violence and children begging in the streets.
- There was a general feeling among both population groups that they were only able to live in the present

moment, with participants explicitly stating they were “focusing on survival,” and were unable to think about possible mid- to long-term scenarios for their future. Moreover, participants identified flooding and insecurity as the main barriers for any possible opportunities to relocate or access livelihoods.

- Among the host community in particular, some of the factors pointed out as potential drivers of conflict among population groups included the continuous

influx of returnees in the area that could further exacerbate the current constraints. These include overcrowding of public areas and individual shelters, the potential for disease outbreaks, and the overall lack of resources to share among host community and returnees, which could, all in all, lead to tensions and potential deteriorations of social dynamics.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 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.
- 2 UN-IOM and UNHCR. “[Population Movement from Sudan to South Sudan](#).” Dashboard
- 3 Ibid
- 4 Radio Tamazuj. “[Over 12,000 Sudanese refugees arrive in Rubkona County](#),” February 2024.
- 5 South Sudan CCCM Cluster. “IDP Site Masterlist.” September 2023.
- 6 IOM DTM, [Population Count Bentiu IDP Camp](#), October 2023.
- 7 REACH. [South Sudan cross-border displacement: Rapid food security assessment in areas of return – Rubkona County, Unity State](#). August 2023.
- 8 Ibid
- 9 IPC. “[Integrated Food Security Phase Classification \(IPC\) for Acute Food Insecurity and Acute Malnutrition. November 2023 to July 2024](#).” November 2023.
- 10 REACH. [Emergency Food Security Update: Rubkona County, Unity State](#). November 2023.
- 11 United Nations Integrated Transition Assistance Mission in Sudan. ‘[Statement on the Situation in South and West Kordofan States](#)’. 20th August 2023; ACLED. ‘[Sudan: Heightened Violence in Kordofan Region as More Militia Groups Step Into the Conflict](#)’. August 2023.; International Crisis Group. [Crisis Watch, Sudan](#), October 2023.
- 12 Jock, L. N. ‘[Bentiu IDPs Demand Security Reforms Before South Sudan’s Elections](#)’. VOA, 17th October 2023.
- 13 REACH. [Population Movement Baseline report](#). September 2020.
- 14 Social Science in Humanitarian Action Platform (SSHAP). [Crisis in Sudan: Briefing note on displacement from Sudan to South Sudan](#). July 2023.
- 15 Nonviolent Peaceforce. [Crisis upon crisis: Conflict & Climate Induced challenges in Rotriak, South Sudan](#). November 2023
- 16 International Organization for Migration (IOM). [Integration and social cohesion: key elements for reaping the benefits of migration](#).
- 17 Holloway, K. and Sturridge, C. [Social cohesion in displacement: the state of play](#). HPG working paper. London: ODI. October 2022.
- 18 Ibid
- 19 [Home Office Indicators of Integration framework](#), 2019.
- 20 Holloway, K. and Sturridge, C. [Social cohesion in displacement: the state of play](#). HPG working paper. London: ODI. October 2022.
- 21 Ibid

### About REACH

REACH is a leading humanitarian initiative that collects primary data and produces in-depth analysis to help aid actors make evidence-based decisions in support of crisis-affected people. With this in mind, our flagship research programmes aim to inform the prioritisation of aid according to levels of need - both crisis-level planning and targeted rapid response - as well as decisions around appropriate modalities of aid. Through our team of assessment, data, geospatial, and thematic specialists, we promote the design of people-centred research and set standards for collecting and analysing rigorous, high quality data in complex environments. Visit [www.reach-initiative.org](http://www.reach-initiative.org) and follow us [@REACH\\_info](https://twitter.com/REACH_info).