



# South Sudan - Protection

## Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis

May 2019

### 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 is aggregated at the settlement level according to a weighting mechanism, which can be found in the Terms of Reference (ToRs).

[\( Link to AoK Terms of Reference \)](#)

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 2019, and are not statistically generalisable.

### Assessment Coverage

**2,126** Key Informants interviewed


**1,696** Settlements assessed

**62** Counties assessed

**61** Counties with 5% or more coverage<sup>1</sup>


### Assessment coverage

#### Proportion of settlements assessed



### Conflict composite indicator

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



<sup>1</sup> 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

South Sudan Displacement Crisis


May 2019

### 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

Top five assessed counties reporting main protection concern for women (18 years and above) conflict related

Twic	35%	<div></div>
Nyirol	17%	<div></div>
Baliet	13%	<div></div>
Canal/Pigi	12%	<div></div>
Manyo	10%	<div></div>

Top five assessed counties reporting main protection concern for men (18 years and above) conflict related

Manyo	60%	<div></div>
Jur River	58%	<div></div>
Canal/Pigi	53%	<div></div>
Twic	49%	<div></div>
Baliet	38%	<div></div>

Top four assessed counties reporting main protection concern for girls (below 18 years) conflict related

Twic	16%	<div></div>
Tonj North	6%	<div></div>
Jur River	5%	<div></div>
Yirol West	3%	<div></div>

Top five assessed counties reporting main protection concern for boys (below 18 years) conflict related

Kapoeta North	50%	<div></div>
Jur River	42%	<div></div>
Twic	38%	<div></div>
Panyikang	35%	<div></div>
Manyo	30%	<div></div>



# South Sudan - Protection


## Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis

May 2019


### 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

Leer	24%
Mayendit	21%
Magwi	18%
Twic	16%
Rubkona	12%

Top five assessed counties reporting landmines contaminating roads

Magwi	18%
Yei	5%
Leer	5%
Luakpiny/Nasir	5%
Rubkona	4%

### Community relations

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

Mvolo	88%
Mundri East	62%
Mundri West	57%
Nyirrol	42%
Maridi	40%

Top five assessed counties reporting disputes about land ownership

Tonj East	71%
Tambura	67%
Mvolo	63%
Mundri East	62%
Juba	60%



# South Sudan - Protection


## Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis


May 2019

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

Jur River	17%
Ulang	10%
Tonj South	7%
Maridi	7%

### Insecurity: education services

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

Jur River	22%
Twic East	13%
Duk	12%
Bor South	7%
Yirol West	3%

### Insecurity: boys attendance

Top four assessed counties reporting protection-related concerns as main reason for boys not attending school where facilities were available

Tonj East	36%
Twic	24%
Tonj South	7%
Tonj North	3%

### Insecurity: girls attendance

Top four assessed counties reporting protection-related concerns as main reason for girls not attending school where facilities were available

Tonj East	36%
Twic	27%
Tonj South	7%
Tonj North	3%



# South Sudan - Protection


## Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis


May 2019

### Displacement and Population Movement

Proportion of assessed settlements with IDPs who have arrived within the last three months



Proportion of assessed settlements reporting presence of returnees



### Information sources

Top five assessed counties reporting their main source of information originating from family/friends

Abiemnhom	100%
Pariang	100%
Magwi	73%
Yirol East	69%
Twic	65%

### Information sources

Top five assessed counties reporting directly accessing information from in-person conversations or loudspeakers

Abiemnhom	100%
Budi	100%
Ezo	100%
Fangak	100%
lbba	100%

Other assessed counties reporting 100% directly receiving information in-person conversations or loudspeakers include: Kapoeta East, Kapoeta North, Kapoeta South, Koch, Mayom, Mundri East, Mundri West, Pariang, Terekeke

### Lack of IDPs support

Top five assessed counties reporting IDPs not receiving food, non-food-items or shelter, from the local community or an NGO

Mundri West	100%
Mundri East	92%
Ayod	88%
Mvolo	81%
Maridi	80%

### Living conditions: IDPs

Top five assessed counties reported where most IDPs are staying in temporary shelters or in the open

Nyiröl	58%
Torit	42%
Uror	42%
Ulang	38%
Duk	35%