



South Sudan - Protection

Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis

January 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 January 2019, and are not statistically generalisable.

Assessment Coverage

1,820 Key Informants interviewed


1,422 Settlements assessed

61 Counties assessed

57 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

South Sudan Displacement Crisis


January 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

Tonj East	33%	<div></div>
Bor South	26%	<div></div>
Gogrial West	21%	<div></div>
Duk	21%	<div></div>
Twic East	17%	<div></div>

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

Gogrial West	61%	<div></div>
Kapoeta South	43%	<div></div>
Canal/Pigi	38%	<div></div>
Kapoeta North	38%	<div></div>
Twic East	38%	<div></div>

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

Tonj East	33%	<div></div>
Bor South	15%	<div></div>
Gogrial West	14%	<div></div>
Duk	5%	<div></div>
Twic East	4%	<div></div>

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

Manyo	83%	<div></div>
Kapoeta South	57%	<div></div>
Tonj East	33%	<div></div>
Kapoeta North	31%	<div></div>
Fashoda	31%	<div></div>



South Sudan - Protection


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis

January 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

Mayendit	59%
Leer	39%
Rubkona	33%
Tambura	17%
Koch	16%

Top five assessed counties reporting landmines contaminating roads

Rubkona	17%
Mayendit	16%
Magwi	14%
Yei	14%
Leer	11%

Community relations

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

Mvolo	60%
Mundri West	56%
Maridi	38%
Mundri East	36%
Terekeka	30%

Top five assessed counties reporting disputes about land ownership

Mundri West	81%
Mvolo	70%
Tonj East	67%
Maridi	54%
Aweil South	52%



South Sudan - Protection


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis


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

Canal/Pigi	31%	■
Malakal	31%	■
Panyikang	30%	■
Manyo	17%	■
Tonj East	8%	■

Insecurity: education services

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

Tonj East	17%	■
Panyikang	15%	■
Twic East	13%	■
Malakal	8%	■
Luakpiny/Nasir	4%	■

Insecurity: boys attendance

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

Twic East	13%	■
Mundri East	9%	■
Tonj East	8%	■
Gogrial East	6%	■
Luakpiny/Nasir	4%	■

Insecurity: girls attendance

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

Tonj East	8%	■
Twic East	8%	■
Gogrial East	6%	■
Gogrial West	4%	■
Tonj North	3%	■



South Sudan - Protection


Assessment of Hard-to-Reach Areas in South Sudan

South Sudan Displacement Crisis


January 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

Yei	79%
Magwi	71%
Pariang	69%
Abiemnhom	67%
Awerial	56%

Information sources

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

Abiemnhom	100%
Duk	100%
Ezo	100%
Guit	100%
Kapoeta North	100%

*Other assessed counties reporting 100% directly accessing information from in-person or loudspeakers include: Koch, Mayom, Nagero, Panyijiar, Pariang, Torit

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 East	100%
Mvolo	100%
Ibba	94%
Maridi	92%
Mundri West	81%

Living conditions: IDPs

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

Mayendit	54%
Nagero	50%
Leer	48%
Torit	38%
Duk	32%