



South Sudan - Protection

Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Overview

The continuation of conflict since December 2013 has created a complex humanitarian crisis in the country, restricting humanitarian access and hindering the flow of information required by aid partners to deliver humanitarian assistance to populations in need. To address information gaps facing the humanitarian response in South Sudan, REACH employs its Area of Knowledge (AoK) methodology to collect relevant information in hard-to-reach areas to inform humanitarian planning and interventions outside formal settlement sites.

Using the AoK methodology, REACH remotely monitors needs and access to services in the Greater

Upper Nile, Greater Equatoria and Greater Bahr el Ghazal regions. AoK data is collected monthly and through multi-sector interviews with the following typology of Key Informants (KIs):

- KIs who are newly arrived internally displaced persons (IDPs) who have left a hard-to-reach settlement in the last month
- KIs who have had contact with someone living or have been in a hard-to-reach settlement in the last month (traders, migrants, family members, etc.)
- KIs who are remaining in hard-to-reach settlements, contacted through phone

Selected KIs are purposively sampled and have knowledge from within the last month about a specific settlement in South Sudan, with data collected at the settlement level. About half of settlements assessed have more than one KI reporting on the settlement. In these cases, data presented at the settlement level is the modal (most frequent) response for KIs reporting on that settlement. If there is an even number of 'yes/no' responses, data is aggregated as 'no consensus'.

All percentages presented in this factsheet, unless otherwise specified, represent the proportion of settlements assessed with that specific response.

The findings presented in this factsheet are indicative of the broad protection trends in assessed settlements in May 2018, and are not statistically generalisable.

Assessment Coverage

1,488 Key Informants interviewed


993 Settlements assessed

54 Counties assessed

34 Counties with 5% or more coverage¹


Assessment coverage

Proportion of settlements assessed



Conflict composite indicator

Average of assessed settlements reporting 'yes' to three selected conflict-related indicators



¹ Data is only represented for counties in which at least 5% of settlements have been assessed. The most recent OCHA Common Operational Dataset (COD) released in February 2016 has been used as the reference for settlement names and locations.

This simple conflict composite aims to measure both perceptions of certain risks associated with conflict as well as the occurrence and impact of reported conflict. The composite was created by averaging the 'yes' responses of settlements reporting on the following indicators, with all indicators considered to have the same weight.

- Killing or forced recruitment cited as a main protection concern
- Incident of conflict resulting in civilian death
- Incident of shelter damage due to conflict




South Sudan - Protection


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Incidence of conflict and looting

Proportion of assessed settlements reporting incidents of conflict and looting in the last month



Proportion of assessed settlements reporting conflict as their primary protection concern



Main Protection Concerns

Primary reported protection concern for women (18 years and above) in assessed settlements

No answer	27%	■
None	20%	■
Sexual violence	15%	■
Domestic violence	13%	■
Looting	7%	■

Primary reported protection concern for men (18 years and above) in assessed settlements

No answer	27%	■
None	18%	■
Killing (other group)	17%	■
Looting	10%	■
Killing (same group)	10%	■

Primary reported protection concern for girls (below 18 years) in assessed settlements

No answer	26%	■
Early marriage	21%	■
None	20%	■
Sexual violence	11%	■
Abduction	8%	■

Primary reported protection concern for boys (below 18 years) in assessed settlements

No answer	28%	■
None	22%	■
Looting	7%	■
Killing (other group)	7%	■
Forced recruitment	6%	■

² Harassment refers to armed actors harassing civilians to disclose information.




South Sudan - Protection

Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan


Sexual and gender-based violence

Proportion of assessed settlements reporting sexual and gender-based violence as the main protection concern for women or girls



Unaccompanied or separated children

Proportion of assessed settlements reporting presence of children with no caretaker or relative



Landmines and unexploded ordnance

Top five assessed counties reporting presence of landmines or unexploded ordnance

Mayendit	75%	<div style="width: 75%; background-color: red;"></div>
Leer	56%	<div style="width: 56%; background-color: red;"></div>
Nyirol	19%	<div style="width: 19%; background-color: red;"></div>
Rubkona	19%	<div style="width: 19%; background-color: red;"></div>
Guit	15%	<div style="width: 15%; background-color: red;"></div>

Top five assessed counties reporting landmines contaminating roads

Mayendit	56%	<div style="width: 56%; background-color: red;"></div>
Leer	40%	<div style="width: 40%; background-color: red;"></div>
Guit	15%	<div style="width: 15%; background-color: red;"></div>
Rubkona	7%	<div style="width: 7%; background-color: red;"></div>
Aweil Centre	6%	<div style="width: 6%; background-color: red;"></div>

Community relations

Top five assessed counties reporting IDPs present and poor or very poor relationships with the local community

Maban	25%	<div style="width: 25%; background-color: red;"></div>
Nyirol	10%	<div style="width: 10%; background-color: red;"></div>
Raja	4%	<div style="width: 4%; background-color: red;"></div>
Wau	4%	<div style="width: 4%; background-color: red;"></div>
Awerial	3%	<div style="width: 3%; background-color: red;"></div>

Top five assessed counties reporting disputes about land ownership

Maban	75%	<div style="width: 75%; background-color: red;"></div>
Aweil Centre	39%	<div style="width: 39%; background-color: red;"></div>
Panyijjar	32%	<div style="width: 32%; background-color: red;"></div>
Aweil East	31%	<div style="width: 31%; background-color: red;"></div>
Kapoeta South	29%	<div style="width: 29%; background-color: red;"></div>




South Sudan - Protection


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Protection-related service access constraints and vulnerabilities

Proportion of assessed settlements with inadequate access to food reporting conflict or insecurity as the reason



Proportion of assessed settlements reporting safety fears preventing access to their preferred water source



Insecurity: health services

Top five assessed counties reporting area being insecure as main reason health facilities are not accessible in or from settlements

Leer	62%	<div style="width: 62%; background-color: red;"></div>
Mayendit	44%	<div style="width: 44%; background-color: red;"></div>
Uror	10%	<div style="width: 10%; background-color: red;"></div>
Wau	9%	<div style="width: 9%; background-color: red;"></div>
Rubkona	7%	<div style="width: 7%; background-color: red;"></div>

Insecurity: education services

Top five assessed counties reporting area being insecure as main reason education services are not accessible in or from settlements

Mayendit	19%	<div style="width: 19%; background-color: red;"></div>
Leer	16%	<div style="width: 16%; background-color: red;"></div>
Akobo	11%	<div style="width: 11%; background-color: red;"></div>
Rubkona	7%	<div style="width: 7%; background-color: red;"></div>
Wau	6%	<div style="width: 6%; background-color: red;"></div>

Insecurity: boys attendance

Top five assessed counties reporting protection-related concerns as main reason for boys not attending school

Twic East	17%	<div style="width: 17%; background-color: red;"></div>
Raja	8%	<div style="width: 8%; background-color: red;"></div>
Nyirrol	5%	<div style="width: 5%; background-color: red;"></div>
Ulang	5%	<div style="width: 5%; background-color: red;"></div>
Uror	5%	<div style="width: 5%; background-color: red;"></div>

Insecurity: girls attendance

Top five assessed counties reporting protection-related concerns as main reason for girls not attending school

Raja	13%	<div style="width: 13%; background-color: red;"></div>
Guit	10%	<div style="width: 10%; background-color: red;"></div>
Akobo	9%	<div style="width: 9%; background-color: red;"></div>
Duk	8%	<div style="width: 8%; background-color: red;"></div>
Nyirrol	5%	<div style="width: 5%; background-color: red;"></div>




South Sudan - Protection


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Displacement and Population Movement

Proportion of assessed settlements reporting presence of IDPs



Proportion of assessed settlements reporting presence of returnees³



Push factors: IDPs

Primary reported reason newly arrived IDPs left their previous location

Lack security	42%
Lack food	16%
Lack healthcare	13%
Far from family	12%
Lack education	9%



Pull factors: IDPs

Primary reported reason newly arrived IDPs came to their current location

Security	40%
Food distribution	15%
Family	13%
Healthcare services	12%
Education services	9%



Previous locations: IDPs

Top five states reported by newly arrived IDPs as previous location

Unity	33%
Jonglei	27%
Upper Nile	13%
Western Bahr el Ghazal	9%
Northern Bahr el Ghazal	9%

Intentions: IDPs

Amount of time that newly arrived IDPs intend to stay

More than 6 months	42%
Don't know	21%
3-6 months	16%
1-3 months	13%
2 weeks - 1 month	5%

³ Returnees defined as local community members that were displaced to another area (either inside SSD or outside the country) and have since returned.