



South Sudan - Upper Nile State

Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Overview

In 2014 and 2015, Upper Nile State was the site of some of the most intense conflict in South Sudan. Although the state had enjoyed a period of relative calm in 2016, since January 2017, conflict has reignited across the state. Many areas in Upper Nile are largely inaccessible to humanitarian actors due to insecurity and logistical constraints. As a result, only limited information is available on the humanitarian situation outside major displacement sites.

In order to fill such information gaps and facilitate humanitarian planning, in late 2015, REACH piloted its Area of Origin (AoO) methodology, which takes a territory-based approach that may cover several bomas, to collect

data in hard-to-reach areas of Unity State.

In December 2016, REACH decided to refine the methodology, moving from the AoO to the Area of Knowledge (AoK) methodology, an approach collecting information at the settlement level. The most recent OCHA Common Operational Dataset (COD) released in February 2016 has been used as the reference for settlement names and locations. Through AoK, REACH collects data from a network of Key Informants (KIs) who have sector-specific knowledge and gain information from regular direct or indirect contact, or recent displacement.

Using this new methodology, in February 2017, REACH has collected information on Upper Nile through KIs in

Juba PoC site 1 and PoC site 3, as well as recently arrived IDPs in Akobo. Data collection was expanded to Renk in Upper Nile State in April 2017.

Data collected is aggregated to the settlement level and all percentiles presented in this factsheet, unless otherwise specified, represent percent of settlements within Upper Nile with that specific response. The displacement section on page 2 refers to the proportion of assessed KIs arrived within the previous month (newly arrived IDPs).

Although current AoK coverage is still limited and its findings not statistically significant, it provides an indicative understanding of the needs and current humanitarian situation in assessed areas of Upper Nile State.


Assessment coverage

223 Key Informants interviewed
119 Settlements assessed


Contact with Area of Knowledge

100% KIs reported to be newly arrived IDPs.
23% KIs reported to have visited the AoK within the last month.
77% KIs reported to be in contact with someone living in the AoK within the last month.

Assessment coverage



Assessed settlements



Reached settlements

County	Assessed settlements	OCHA (COD) settlements	Cover percentage
Baliet	1	127	1%
Fashoda	18	198	9%
Longochuk	17	101	17%
Luakpiny/Nasir	25	151	17%
Maban	1	117	1%
Maiwut	16	82	20%
Malakal	10	115	9%
Manyo	7	75	9%
Melut	4	216	2%
Panyikang	8	94	9%
Renk	1	278	1%
Ulang	11	131	8%
Total	119	1,685	7%

¹ Counties with under 5% of settlement coverage are not disaggregated to the county level, but are included in state-level analysis.



South Sudan - Upper Nile State


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

New arrivals




Push factors

Top three reported reasons newly arrived IDPs left their previous location:²




Pull factors

Top three reported reasons newly arrived IDPs came to their current location:²




Previous location

Top three reported most recent long-term locations for newly arrived IDPs:



Displacement



Reported time of first displacement for newly arrived IDPs:



Displacement




Percent of settlements reporting presence of IDPs:




Demographic composition

Reported gender ratio of IDPs in assessed settlements:



Reported age ratio of IDPs in assessed settlements:





² Most frequently cited as first, second and third most important reasons.

Local community



Percent of settlements reporting local community remaining:




Demographic composition

Reported gender ratio of local community remaining in assessed settlements:



Reported age ratio of local community remaining in assessed settlements:







South Sudan - Upper Nile State

Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Health




Percent of settlements reporting access to health care:




Health concerns

Most commonly reported health concerns in the assessed settlements:³



Healthcare distance

Reported distance of the nearest healthcare facilities from the assessed settlements:




Healthcare unavailability

Top three reported reasons why healthcare facilities are not available from the assessed settlements:⁴



Feeding programmes

Reported availability of feeding programmes that provide Plumpy Sup, CSB++ or other nutrition supplements in the assessed settlements:





³ Key informants could choose up to three answers.

⁴ Key informants could choose up to two answers.



Shelter/NFI



Percent of settlements reporting tukuls as a primary shelter type for local community:



Percent of settlements reporting tukuls as a primary shelter type for IDPs:




Shelter sharing

Reported number of people sharing a shelter in assessed settlements:



Sheltering IDPs

Reported proportion of the local community sharing shelters with IDPs:





South Sudan - Upper Nile State


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Food Security



Percent of settlements reporting access to adequate amounts of food:

- Insufficient data
- 0 - 25%
- 26 - 50%
- 51 - 75%
- 76 - 100%



Market distance

Reported distance of the nearest market from the assessed settlements:

Under 30 minutes	29%
30 minutes to under 1 hour	53%
1 hour to under half a day	12%
Half a day	6%

Food unavailability

Top three reported reasons why people cannot access enough food in the assessed settlements:⁵

1 Unsafe to plant	73%
2 Crops destroyed by fighting	64%
3 Lack of fishing nets	30%

Coping strategies

The average number of reported coping strategies used in the assessed settlements:

2.1 coping strategies reported on average


Land availability

Reported availability of land for agriculture in the assessed settlements:



Market availability

Reported availability of a functioning market accessible from the assessed settlements:




WASH



Percent of settlements reporting access to clean drinking water:

- Insufficient data
- 0 - 25%
- 26 - 50%
- 51 - 75%
- 76 - 100%



Water distance

Reported distance of the nearest safe water source from the assessed settlements:

Under 30 minutes	35%
30 minutes to under 1 hour	54%
1 hour to under half a day	8%
Half a day	4%

Water availability

Reported availability of a safe water source accessible from the assessed settlements:



Sanitation

Reported use of sanitation facilities over open defecation in assessed settlements:

All	1%
More than half	2%
Around half	12%
Less than half	31%
None	54%

Water sources

Reported primary safe water source available from the assessed settlements:

Borehole	81%
Protected well	7%
Chlorine tabs	3%
Water yard	3%
Donkey	2%
Water truck	2%

⁵ Key informants could choose up to three answers.



South Sudan - Upper Nile State


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

Education



Percent of settlements reporting access to education:

- Insufficient data
- 0 - 25%
- 26 - 50%
- 51 - 75%
- 76 - 100%



Education availability

Reported available education services in the assessed settlements:⁶

None	60%	<div style="width: 60%; height: 10px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
Pre-primary	27%	<div style="width: 27%; height: 10px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
Primary	40%	<div style="width: 40%; height: 10px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
Secondary	3%	<div style="width: 3%; height: 10px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
ALP ⁷	3%	<div style="width: 3%; height: 10px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
Vocational training	2%	<div style="width: 2%; height: 10px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>

Education attendance and availability

Top two reported reasons why children are not attending school in the assessed settlements:


1 High fees	89%	<div style="width: 89%; height: 15px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
2 Children need to work in the household	33%	<div style="width: 33%; height: 15px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>

Top two reported reasons why education services are not available in the assessed settlements:

1 No available facilities	46%	<div style="width: 46%; height: 15px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>
2 Facilities destroyed by conflict	29%	<div style="width: 29%; height: 15px; background-color: #e74c3c;"></div>

School attendance

Reported proportion of settlements where 6-17 years old boys and girls attend school respectively:



⁶ Key informants could choose more than one answer.

⁷ Accelerated learning programmes.

Protection



Women

Reported primary protection concerns for women in the assessed settlements:

1 Killing/injury by other community	28%
2 Sexual violence	26%
3 Domestic violence	13%
4 Killing/injury by same community	11%
5 Looting	11%

Men

Reported primary protection concerns for men in the assessed settlements:

1 Killing/injury by other community	43%
2 Forced recruitment	16%
3 Cattle raiding	14%
4 Looting	14%
5 Killing/injury by same community	9%

Children

Reported primary protection concerns for children in the assessed settlements:

1 Abduction	23%
2 Killing/injury by other community	20%
3 Family separation	15%
4 Killing/injury by same community	9%
5 Forced recruitment	6%


Community relations

Reported relationships between IDPs, returnees⁸ and local community in the assessed settlements:

Very Good	0%
Good	78%
Neutral	0%
Poor	22%

Land disputes

Reported presence of disputes over land ownership in the assessed settlements:



⁸ Local community displaced and returned home, reported in 64% of assessed settlements.

About REACH

REACH facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. All REACH activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. For more information, you can write to our in-country office: south.sudan@reach-initiative.org or to our global office: geneva@reach-initiative.org.

Visit www.reach-initiative.org and follow us @REACH_info.