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# Executive Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country of intervention** | South Sudan | | | | | | | |
| **Type of Emergency** | x | Natural disaster | x | Conflict | | | x | Other *- Displacement* |
| **Type of Crisis** | x | Sudden onset | □ | Slow onset | | | x | Protracted |
| **Mandating Body/ Agency** | BHA | | | | | | | |
| **IMPACT Project Code** | 32AZW | | | | | | | |
| **Overall Research Timeframe** *(from research design to final outputs / M&E)* | August 14, 2023 to September 8, 2023 | | | | | | | |
| **Research Timeframe**  *Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)* | 1. Pilot/ training: N/A | | | | 6. Preliminary presentation: N/A | | | |
| 2. Start collect data: August 14 | | | | 7. Outputs sent for validation: September 8 | | | |
| 3. Data collected: August 21 | | | | 8. Outputs published: After IPC embargo, date TBC | | | |
| 4. Data analysed: August 24 | | | | 9. Final presentation: Ad-hoc | | | |
| 5. Data sent for validation: August 24 | | | |
| **Number of assessments** | x | Single assessment (one cycle) | | | | | | |
| □ | Multi assessment (more than one cycle) | | | | | | |
| **Humanitarian milestones**  *Specify* ***what*** *will the assessment inform and* ***when***  *e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;* | **Milestone** | | | | **Deadline (can be tentative)** | | | |
| x | Donor plan/strategy | | | Roughly one week before 2023 IPC  September 15, 2023 (tentative)[[1]](#footnote-2) | | | |
| x | Inter-cluster plan/strategy | | |
| x | Cluster plan/strategy | | |
| □ | NGO platform plan/strategy | | | \_ \_/\_ \_/\_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| □ | Other (Specify): | | | \_ \_/\_ \_/\_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| **Audience Type & Dissemination** *Specify* ***who*** *will the assessment inform and* ***how*** *you will disseminate to inform the audience* | **Audience type** | | | | **Dissemination** | | | |
| x Strategic  □ Programmatic  □ Operational  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | **□** General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors)  x Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting  x Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting)  x Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre)  x In-person to IPC state-analysts | | | |
| **Stakeholder mapping** *Has a detailed stakeholder mapping been conducted during research design to identify all actors that could* ***contribute*** *to and/or* ***benefit******from*** *the research?* | x | Yes | | | □ | No | | |
| **General Objective** | To provide a better understanding of how the food security and livelihood status of populations residing in areas of return has been impacted throughout the prior 3 to 6 month period - looking specifically at the impacts of the Sudan crisis - to augment and contextualize quantiative analysis of FSNMS data and ultimately inform county-level classification at the October 2023 Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) workshop. | | | | | | | |
| **Specific Objective(s)** | * Explore the drivers of food insecurity and livelihood loss in areas of return over the prior 3 to 6 month period, looking specifically at linkages between the the food security status of returnees and host community populations and the Sudan crisis, inlcuding which pillars of food security (availability, accessibility, utilization, stability) have been impacted. * Outline the extent of life-saving humanitarian service provision in areas of return, including response gaps and challenges, as well as how services have changed over the past 3 to 6 months and why, and how different groups have different access to assistance. * Identify factors that may impact food security in the subsequent 6 month period, and outline how food security is most likely to be impacted. | | | | | | | |
| **Research Questions** | 1. How has the food security and livelihoods of populations residing in areas of return (including returnees and the host community) been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period?    1. In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return?       1. In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted the ability of affected populations to cope with inadequate access to food and basic needs?       2. How has the Sudan crisis impacted population movement to assessment areas, and how has this impacted food security and livelihoods?       3. In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted social cohesion in areas of return, and how has this in turn impacted food security and livelihoods?    2. Which food security pillars (access, availability, utilization, stability) have been impacted, and how? 2. How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period?    1. How are changes to the provision of humanitarian assistance related to the Sudan crisis?    2. What challenges are service providers facing in the provision of assistance, and how are these challenges linked to the Sudan crisis?    3. What are the current response gaps?    4. What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups?    5. What challenges are service providers anticipating in the coming 6 months? 3. How is food security in assessed areas likely to evolve in the coming 6 months?    1. Which food security pillars are most likely to be impacted and how? | | | | | | | |
| **Geographic Coverage** | Rubkona and Malakal counties. | | | | | | | |
| **Secondary data sources** | 2023 Food Security and Nutrition Monitoing System (FSNMS)  IOM / UNHCR Displacement Dashboard  FEWS Net Livelihood Zones Descriptions and Profiles  Joint Market Monitoring Initiative (JMMI) Dashboard | | | | | | | |
| **Population(s)**  *Select all that apply* | □ | IDPs in camp | | | □ | IDPs in informal sites | | |
| □ | IDPs in host communities | | | □ | IDPs | | |
| □ | Refugees in camp | | | □ | Refugees in informal sites | | |
| □ | Refugees in host communities | | | □ | Refugees | | |
| x | Host communities | | | x | Returnees in any setting | | |
| **Stratification**  *Select type(s) and enter number of strata* | x | Geographical #: 2  Population size per strata is known? □ Yes x No | x | Group #: 2  Population size per strata is known?  □ Yes x No | | | x | *Gender* #: 2  Population size per strata is known?  □ Yes x No |
| **Data collection tool(s)** | □ | Structured (Quantitative) | | | x | Semi-structured (Qualitative) | | |
| **Sampling method** | | | | **Data collection method** | | | |
| **Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1** | x Purposive  x Snowballing  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | x Key informant interview (Target #): at least 6  □ Individual interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ Focus group discussion (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ [Other, Specify](Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| **Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 2**  *.* | x Purposive  □ Snowballing  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | □ Key informant interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ Individual interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  x Focus group discussion (Target #): 12-16  □ [Other, Specify] (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| **Target level of precision if probability sampling** | N/A | | | | N/A | | | |
| **Disaggregation by gender and age**  *Are you planning to conduct sex/age disaggregated analysis?* | Gender | | | | Age | | | |
| x | Yes | | | □ | Yes | | |
| □ | No | | | x | No | | |
| **Data management platform(s)** | □ | IMPACT | | | □ | UNHCR | | |
| x | IMPACT in-country server | | | | | | |
| **Expected ouput type(s)** | x | Brief #: 2 | □ | Report #: \_ \_ | | | □ | Profile #: \_ \_ |
| □ | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: \_ \_ | □ | Presentation (Final) #: \_ \_ | | | □ | Factsheet #: \_ \_ |
| □ | Interactive dashboard #:\_ | □ | Webmap #: \_ \_ | | | □ | Map #: \_ \_ |
| □ | Other | | | | | | |
| **Access** | x | Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms) | | | | | | |
| □ | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) | | | | | | |
| **Visibility** *Specify which* ***logos*** *should be on outputs* | ***REACH*** | | | | | | | |
| ***Donor:*** *BHA* | | | | | | | |
| ***Coordination Framework:*** *N/A* | | | | | | | |
| ***Partners:*** *N/A* | | | | | | | |

# Rationale

* 1. Background

Since the outbreak of fighting in Khartoum on April 15 2023, UN agencies have recorded more than 200,000 people entering South Sudan from Sudan, over 90% of whom are South Sudanese nationals who had been living in Sudan as refugees prior to the conflict.[[2]](#footnote-3) Tens of thousands of people have already travelled from transit centres near the border to their final area of return - typically to areas that they or their families occupied prior to the Sudanese and South Sudanese wars fought between the 1950s and 2018. These include areas throughout the three regions of Greater Upper Nile, Greater Equatoria, and Greater Bar El Ghazal, many of which are currently experiencing extraordinarily acute needs including emergency-or-worse food insecurity and critical rates of acute malnutrition, and thus have little-to-no capacity to absorb new arrivals.[[3]](#footnote-4)

Moreover, the Sudan crisis appears to be driving needs on both sides of the border. Assessments conducted since April indicate that the crisis has exacerbated already severe humanitarian conditions in areas of South Sudan by disrupting supply lines, hampering market functionality, increasing the burden on humanitarian organizations to provide a growing caseload with life-saving assistance and basic services, and driving the displacement of tens of thousands of people into areas with limited communal coping capacity, putting additional pressure on already scarce resources.[[4]](#footnote-5)

There remain, however, significant information gaps regarding the precise impact of the crisis and the resultant displacement on food security, particularly in areas of return. Such information will be central to food security analysis at the 2023 Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) workshop, specially to the analysis of “contributing factors,” which is “necessary to critically evaluate and contextualize evidence to different severities of food insecurity.”[[5]](#footnote-6) Research questions and methods have been developed with the aim of supplementing quantitative findings obtained through the FSNMS, which will provide findings on outcomes (i.e the severity of food security and acute malnutrition experienced by different groups residing in areas of return), on household demographics and underlying vulnerability, access to livelihoods, access to food sources, etc. Taken together, the FSNMS and findings from this assessment should provide food security analysts with a more comprehensive understanding of the food security situation in areas of return, including how availability, access, and utilization of food has been impacted by the crisis in Sudan.

* 1. Intended impact

This research aims to inform a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of the Sudan crisis on food security in areas of return at the 2023 Integrated Phase Classification workshop (scheduled for late-September early-October). The IPC is the primary mechanism used to allocate funding for humanitarian food assistance annually, and as such, is critical to ensuring humanitarian resources are distributed on a needs-based basis. The contribution of assessment findings to the IPC will ensure that food security classifications are evidence based, ensuring that life-saving food assistance is reaching those who need it most, and ensuring that donors have an accurate understanding of the extent of needs. The primary audience for assessment outputs include IPC food security state-analysts, the IPC vetting committee, and donors.

Assessment findings may also be used outside of the IPC as an advocacy tool to demonstrate the impact of the Sudan crisis on needs in South Sudan. While quantitative data generated by the FSNMS is well suited to determine, among other things, the severity of first and second-level outcomes, qualitative findings generated through this assessment will help firmly link food insecurity and needs to the Sudan crisis, which will allow for more informed strategic decision making and targeting.

# Methodology

* 1. Methodology overview

This assessment will utilize both primary and secondary data. Primary data collection will comprise two qualitative components – focus group discussions and key informant interviews. Focus group discussions will be held with two population groups – 1. recent arrivals from Sudan and 2. the host community. Discussions will be disaggregated by gender to allow for a freer exchange of ideas and to better capture differences in experiences and/or access to basic needs that may be linked to participants’ gender. Heads of household will be targeted for FGDs, or alternatively an adult household member who is familiar with household decision-making and resource attainment and allocation. Key informant interviews will be held with humanitarian service providers and community leaders. Secondary data will be used to corroborate and augment findings, and to conduct analysis on how needs are likely to be impacted by seasonality, future shocks, and market conditions.

Key informant interviews will be conducted first to gain a broad understanding of the context including any recent or compounding shocks, acquire rough population estimates (i.e. the number of returnees and their whereabouts) and to better understand the parameters of humanitarian service provision and the extent of disruptions or changes to service provision. Key informants for this assessment will include humanitarian coordinators (i.e. heads of UN agency field offices), locally based humanitarian service providers (i.e. project coordinators or healthcare providers), government personnel, and community leaders. These profiles have been selected because they are presumed to have expert knowledge on either the local context, or sector-specific needs and interventions. Second, focus group discussions will be held with community members to better understand 1) how food security in their community has changed over a 3-6 month recall period, and 2) current access to humanitarian services, and whether access has changed over the past 3-6 months.

Key Definitions:

Returnee: For this assessment, a returnee is a South Sudanese national who entered South Sudan since April 15 as a result of the conflict in Sudan.

Host Community: For this assessment, a host community member is an individual who had been residing in the assessment area prior to the April 15 outbreak of conflict in Sudan.

First level outcomes: Food consumption (including quantity and nutritional quality), and livelihood change, including loss or change of assets, and net-impact of coping strategies on ones capacity to meet their basic needs.

Second level outcomes: Nutritional status (i.e. prevalence of acute malnutrition) and mortality.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RQ** | **Sub-RQ** | **Data collection components** |
| Has the Sudan crisis impacted the food security and livelihoods status of populations in areas of return? | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return? | FGDs, KIIs |
| Which food security pillars (access, availability, utilization, stability) have been impacted and how? | FGDs, secondary data on prices, markets, and disease burden |
| In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted the ability of affected populations to cope with inadequate access to food and basic needs? | FGDs |
| How has the Sudan crisis impacted population movement to assessment areas, and how has this impacted food security and basic needs? | FGDs, KIIs, secondary data on displacement |
| What are the dynamics of population movement to assessment areas? | How many people have arrived to assessment areas from Sudan since April 15? | KIIs, secondary data on displacement |
| Where are they located? | KIIs |
| What are their movement intentions, and why? | FGDs |
| How might population movement be expected to develop in the coming 6 months? | KIIs, FGDs, secondary data on displacement and seasonality |
| To what extent has the crisis in Sudan impacted the provision of life saving assistance (HFA, health, and nutrition assistance)? | Has the extent of humanitarian service provision changed since the Sudan crisis? If yes, how, and how are these changes linked to the Sudan crisis? | KIIs, FGDs |
| What challenges are service providers facing in the provision of assistance, and how are these challenges linked to the Sudan crisis? | KIIs |
| What are the current response gaps? | KIIs, FGDs |
| What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups? | KIIs, FGDs |
| What challenges are service providers anticipating in the coming 6 months? | KIIs |
| How is food security in assessed areas likely to evolve in the coming 6 months? | Which food security pillars are most likely to be impacted and how? | KIIs, FGDs, secondary data on markets and seasonality |

* 1. Population of interest

The geographic coverage for this assessment will be Rubkona and Malakal counties. These two counties were selected because they a) have received substantial numbers of returnees since April, b) have been flagged by the NAWG as high-risk of severe humanitarian needs, c) have historically experienced severe levels of food insecurity and/or other severe sectoral needs, d) host permanent REACH bases, e) were identified by WFP-VAM as high-interest areas for the upcoming IPC, f) are locations in which the FSNMS has oversampled for returnee households and will therefore have robust quantitative data to supplement qualitative findings, and g) are areas of exceptional interest to the IPC given substantial IDP populations there, and the presence of protection of civilian sites (PoCs). The number of counties were selected based on the operational capacity of REACH field staff at the time of data collection.

The population of interest for this assessment are returnees and host community households residing in areas of return. These two groups have been identified because it is assumed that they have both been particularly impacted by the conflict in Sudan either a) directly, through exposure to conflict, disruption of livelihoods, or displacement, or b) via the impact of the crisis on economic systems and markets, and the impact of large-scale population influx to their area of residence, putting additional pressure on household and community resources. Specific data collection areas may include a) locations where returnees are living among the host community, b) locations where returnees are living within informal sites, or c) host community areas where there are no returnees living but have nonetheless been impacted by the crisis in Sudan. Such locations will be identified by stakeholders including humanitarian organizations or local government representatives. This assessment has opted not to target refugees because secondary literature suggests both assessment areas are uncommon destinations for refugees; the response plan re-directs most to Maban, while other substantial pockets have been recorded in Juba or in counties further west, South of Darfur. Findings for this assessment will be presented at the county-level, with disaggregated analysis by population group or gender as appropriate.

* 1. Secondary data review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Secondary source** | **Purpose of source** |
| 2023 Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System (FSNMS) dataset and sampling stategy – a nation-wide household survey counducted annually that aims to monitor and analyze trends of food availability, access, and utilization. Representative at the county-level. The central quantiative data source for IPC analysis. | * Supplement qualitative assessment findings with quantitative findings on AFI and AMN outcomes, access to basic needs, food and livelihood sources, household demographics, underlying vulnerabilities, etc. * Triangulate assessment findings * Determine geographic coverage |
| IOM / UNHCR Displacement Dashboard – tracks the number of people crossing the border between Sudan and South Sudan. | * Provides information on whereabouts of returnee populations, to inform county selection. |
| FEWS Net Livelihood Zones Descriptions and Profiles | * Provides information on traditional livelihood systems and seasonality of livelihoods and food sources. |
| Joint Market Monitoring Initiative (JMMI) Dashboard – tracks the price of key commodities at markets across South Sudan on a monthly basis. | * Provides information on changes in the price of essential commodities since the Sudan crisis. |
| IMPACT Research Design Guidelines | * To build research objectives and questions and determine the appropriateness of research methods. |
| REACH SSD2305b Research Terms of Reference – emergency assessment held in May-June 2023 in Renk and Malakal counties. | * Used to build data collection tools. |
| Assessments and other research products on Rubkona and Malakal counties, including: | * Used to inform the assessment team’s overall understanding of the humanitarian context. |

* 1. Primary Data Collection

The data collection team will consist of one REACH senior assessment officer, one REACH assessment officer, one REACH field officer, and 2 locally hired translators. One assessment officer will oversee data collection in Rubkona, and one will oversee data collection in Malakal. Data collection will take place between August 14 and August 21st. The assessment team will aim to visit as many areas within each county as possible where returnees are residing. In Rubkona this will minimally include the Bentiu PoC, Rubkona Town, and Bentiu Town, and in Malakal will include the Malakal PoC and Malakal Town, though a more detailed participatory mapping exercise will be conducted with government representatives on arrival to understand the whereabouts of new arrivals, to target specific neighbourhoods, villages, or informal sites on the periphery of these locations.

This assessment will utilize qualitative methods comprised of key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Qualitative methods have been selected for this assessment because a) the FSNMS exercise - which covers the same counties as this assessment and has also oversampled returnee households in these specific areas of return - will determine the severity of food insecurity and acute malnutrition faced and collect additional quantitative information on the prevalence of shock exposure and household vulnerability, and b) the assessment aims to *identify* contributing factors of food insecurity in areas of return, and specifically to understand the repercussions of the Sudan crisis on the food security status of the affected populations, making the research questions primarily descriptive or relational in nature. Taken together, the FSNMS results and findings from this assessment should present a comprehensive picture of both contributing factors and food security outcomes within the assessed counties.

Minimally, six key informant interviews will be conducted with the following profiles: 1. Health service provider, 2. Nutrition service provider, 3. Humanitarian food assistance service provider, 4. Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) service provider, 5. UN Humanitarian Coordinator 6. Government of South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Coordinator (RRC) representative. Additional service providers may be interviewed as appropriate/necessary to answer research questions or triangulate information, and community leaders may be interviewed should they be identified/available. Key informant interviews have two broad research aims: 1. Understand the humanitarian context of the assessment area, including population flows, their geographic distributions (i.e. areas of residence of returnee populations) and the timeline of recent or compounding shocks, and 2. Understand the current parameters of humanitarian service provision, including challenges and disruptions to service provision. Key informants will be identified with the assistance of humanitarian stakeholders in Juba, who will connect the assessment team to their colleagues in the assessment area. Further KIs will be snowballed as necessary to achieve the above mentioned profiles.

Focus group discussions will be held with two separate groups – “host community” members (i.e. those who were residing in the assessment area since at least January 2023), and returnees from Sudan post-April 2023. FGDs will further be divided by gender, making the final (minimum) target sample per county as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Population Group** | **Gender** | **Minimum no. of FGDs** |
| Host community | Female | 3 |
| Host community | Male | 3 |
| Recent arrivals | Female | 3 |
| Recent arrivals | Male | 3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key informant profile** | **Minimum no. of interviews** |
| Humanitarian food assistance provider | 1 |
| Humanitarian healthcare provider | 1 |
| Humanitarian nutrition provider | 1 |
| Relief and rehabilitation commission | 1 |
| Camp coordination and camp management | 1 |
| UN humanitarian coordination | 1 |
| Community leaders | As available / necessary to fill information gaps and triangulate findings |

Previous assessments demonstrate that it is often difficult to mobilize men for FGDs during the day, as they are typically out of the home or the community, and social norms tend to designate female household members as primarily responsible for the allocation, preparation, and distribution of food and resources within the household unit. The sample may therefore increase the number of female interviews to account for decreased male interviews, though the field team will aim to hold at least one male FGD discussion to ensure that the experiences of male community members are minimally captured. Any deviation from the above sample strategy will have repercussions on the disaggregation of analysis. In such an instance, a disaggregation by gender may not be feasible, given the dearth of male interviews, and the inability to achieve the initial sample will be reported as a limitation in any research outputs. The field officer or local guide/translator will be tasked with the mobilization of FGD participants.

A short enumerator debrief will be conducted following each focus group discussion. The debrief will comprise the following questions:

1. Were the participant’s/key informant able to provide answers to all the sections of the questionnaire? If not, what is missing and why? (Please be as specific as possible.)
2. If there were any questions that went unanswered, might be unreliable, or were not well understood, please indicate them here (with the reason).
3. How would you describe the reliability of the information gathered? (include your observation of the dynamics of the group, body language etc.)
   1. Data Processing & Analysis

Notes from FGD will be typed up the same day as interviews and entered into a data saturation grid no later than 24 hours afterwards. Soft-copies of transcripts will be held on REACH computers and will be password protected. All transcripts will be backed-up on the IMPACT OneDrive.

Qualitative data will be analyzed in a data saturation grid, and will follow the [IMPACT Standards Checklist for Semi-Structured Data Processing and Analysis.](https://acted.sharepoint.com/sites/IMPACT-Research/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?csf=1&web=1&e=o4GDJk&cid=fcc6074c%2Dbe9f%2D433c%2D965f%2D88c4a82e9429&FolderCTID=0x012000A63C13E676312947AFCF96A5D6B4BE0C&id=%2Fsites%2FIMPACT%2DResearch%2FShared%20Documents%2FRDD%2F2%20%2D%20Data%2FGuidelines%20%26%20Templates%2F2%5FQual%20data%20processing%20%26%20analysis%2FIMPACT%20Qual%20Data%20Guidelines%5FAnnex1%5FMin%20Standards%20Checklist%5FENGLISH%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FIMPACT%2DResearch%2FShared%20Documents%2FRDD%2F2%20%2D%20Data%2FGuidelines%20%26%20Templates%2F2%5FQual%20data%20processing%20%26%20analysis) It is unlikely, given the time allocated for this assessment, that data saturation will be reached, and this will be noted as a limitation in any research outputs. Data analysis will be conducted by the same assessment officer that facilitated the respective interviews. The analysis will aim to identify key topics and tends emerging across the KIs and FGDs while identifying key differences by gender and displacement status of the focus group. Findings from KIIs will be triangulated via other KIIs or using secondary data to the maximum extent possible.

* 1. **Limitations**

Due to the qualitative and non-probabilistic nature of the methodology design, findings can be considered indicative only. However, by stratifying the focus groups further by displacement status and gender, is it assumed that a wide variety of perspectives and experiences will be captured to provide a good enough understanding of the wider population of interest in each county of assessment.

It is unlikely given the sample size that saturation will be reached for any of the data collection tools. This means that findings should not be interpreted as exhaustive of all themes.

Because REACH is unable to record the audio of interviews, it is likely that “transcripts” will more resemble notes. Because responses will be translated from the local language to English during the interview, it is also likely that some details will be lost in translation, or that responses may be abbreviated by the translator.

# Key ethical considerations and related risks

The proposed research design meets / does not meet the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***The proposed research design…*** | ***Yes/ No*** | ***Details if no (including mitigation)*** |
| … Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to **avoid unnecessary duplication** of data collection efforts? | Yes |  |
| … **Respects respondents, their rights and dignity** (*specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants’ time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided*)? | Yes |  |
| … Does not **expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result** of participation in data collection? | Yes |  |
| … Does not **expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result** of participation in data collection? | Yes |  |
| … Does not involve **collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatising** for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)? | No | This assessment involves collecting information on sensitive topics, including on displacement, protection risks, and potentially severe humanitarian needs. A growing body of literature indicates the extreme protection risks that returnees faced during their journey from Sudan to South Sudan, including physical and/or SGB violence, suggesting that at least some FGD participants are likely to be survivors to such incidents. To mitigate the risk of re-traumatisation, participants will be briefed on the subject matter of the interviews prior to beginning, and will be told that consent can be revoked at any time during the interview. Field teams will be made aware of services providers in the area to whom respondents may be referred, with their consent, including protection actors and healthcare providers. Facilitators will remain cognizant of signs of psychosocial distress[[6]](#footnote-7) and end or pause interviews as needed, taking time to ensure that either a) the participant would like to continue, or b) would like to end the interview, in which case the facilitator will ensure that the participant is referred to the appropriate service provider. |
| … Does not involve **data collection with minors** i.e. anyone less than 18 years old? | Yes |  |
| … Does not involve **data collection with other vulnerable groups** e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.? | No | It is likely that respondents will include individuals who have experienced protection incidents. While some protection incidents may be reported during data collection, these topics will not be probed. Field teams will be familiar with protection partners operation in the area, to which respondents can be referred, upon their consent. |
| … Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of **personally identifiable information**? | Yes |  |

# Roles and responsibilities

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Description** | **Responsible** | **Accountable** | **Consulted** | **Informed** |
| Research design | Emergency Response Senior Assessment Officer (SAO) | SAO | IMPACT HQ, WFP VAM, Research Manager (RM) | REACH Deputy Country Coordinator (DCC), REACH County Coordinator (CC) |
| Supervising data collection | SAO, Population Movement Assessment Officer (AO), REACH Field Officer (FO) | SAO | RM | DCC |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | SAO, AO | SAO | RM | IMPACT HQ, DCC |
| Data analysis | SAO, AO | SAO | IMPACT HQ | DCC |
| Output production | SAO, AO | SAO | RM, IMPACT HQ | DCC, WFP VAM |
| Dissemination | SAO, AO, RM | DCC | CC | WFP VAM, IPC TWG, IPC state analysts |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | SAO | RM | DCC | IMPACT HQ, CC |
| Lessons learned | SAO, AO | RM | DCC | IMPACT HQ, CC |

***Responsible:*** *the person(s) who executes the task*

***Accountable:*** *the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone*

***Consulted:*** *the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented*

***Informed:*** *the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed*

# Data Analysis Plan

Focus Group Discussion:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q#** | **Research Question** | **RQ#** | **Sub-RQ** | **Sub-RQ#** | **Questionnaire Question** | **Probes** |
| **HOST COMMUNITY** | | | | | | |
| PART 1: LIVELIHOODS | | | | | | |
| 1.0 | How has the food security and livelihoods of populations residing in areas of return (including returnees and the host community) been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 1 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return? | 1.1 | What are typically the main sources of income in your community? | Use "before the crisis in Sudan" as a reference point, if necessary. Agricultural vs non-agricultural? Seasonal, monthly, or daily? Describe in general the most common types of casual labor in the community. |
| 1.1 | Do income opportunities usually change between the dry and rainy seasons? | *Make list of dry season income activities and rainy season income activities.* |
| 1.2 | Over the past 3 to 6 months would you say that income opportunities have changed for the better, the worse, or have stayed the same? | How have income opportunities {gotten worse/better}? *Probe for each income source listed in previous question.* |
| 1.3 | Why do you think this has happened? | *Probe for each income opportunity listed and* ***explore if the reasons for these changes are related to the effects of the Sudan crisis*** *or other types of shocks.* |
| 1.4 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted the ability of affected populations to cope with inadequate access to food and basic needs? | 1.1.1 | When income sources are not sufficient, what do people in your community do to cope? (Compile list of coping strategies) |  |
| 1.5 | Has the ability of people in this community to engage in any of these strategies changed over the past 3-6 months? | *Probe for each strategy.* How? (Explore the different or new coping strategies employed) Why? (Explore the main factors driving this change of coping) |
| PART 2: FOOD SECURITY | | | | | | |
| 2.0 | How has the food security and livelihoods of populations residing in areas of return (including returnees and the host community) been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 1 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return? | 1.1 | What can you tell me about the food situation that you are currently facing? |  |
| 2.1 | Over the past 3 to 6 months, would you say that the food security status of people in your community has changed for the better, the worse, or has stayed the same? | How has food security {gotten worse/better}? *Probe for availability and access* Would you say that most people in your community are currently able to access enough food? |
| 2.2 | Why do you think this has happened? | *Probe for main drivers of deterioration / improvement of the situation and* ***explore if the reasons for these changes are related to the effects of the Sudan crisis*** *or other type of shocks.* Price increases, access to humanitarian assistance, sharing of resources, loss of livelihoods, other acute shocks? |
| 2.3 | Where do most people typically get their food **during the dry season**? List all sources. | Proportional piling exercise: use beans to illustrate the proportion of household food consumption through each food source listed. |
| 2.4 | Where do most people typically get their food **during the rainy season**? List all sources. | Proportional piling exercise: use beans to illustrate the proportion of household food consumption through each food source listed. |
| 2.5 | How has the ability of people in your community to access food through [source 1] changed over the past 3 to 6 months? (Repeat for all sources mentioned in the previous question) | Why has this change occurred? *(Explore the main factors driving this change and whether they are* ***related to the effects of the Sudan crisis****)* |
| 2.6 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted the ability of affected populations to cope with inadequate access to food and basic needs? | 1.1.1 | When food is not sufficient, what do people in your community do to cope? (Compile a list of coping strategies) | Probes: - Find new sources of food? - Make the food that you have last longer? - Reduce the number of people in your household? - Move to another location? - Purchase food on credit? - Beg? |
| 2.7 | Has the ability of people in this community to enagge in any of these strategies changed over the past 3 to 6 months? | *Probe for each strategy reported:* How? (Explore the different or new coping strategies employed) Why? (Explore the main factors driving this change of coping) |
| 2.8 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return? | 1.1 | Can you share anything else about how your household's access to food or other basic needs has changed in the last 3-6 months? | *Probe specifically for impacts of the Sudan crisis.* Probe on: access to water, security, freedom of movement, access to services, inter-household food allocation. |
| PART 3: ACCESS TO HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE | | | | | | |
| 3.0 | To what extent has the crisis in Sudan impacted the provision of life saving assistance (HFA, health, and nutrition assistance)? | 2 | Has the extent of humanitarian service provision changed since the Sudan crisis, if yes, how, and how are these changes linked to the Sudan crisis? | 2.1 | Are people in your community currently receiving any food assistance? | Can you describe the type of food assistance received? For in kind assistance: What type of foods? How much? How often? From when to when? For cash/voucher assistance: How much? How often? From when to when? Any other types of assistance? |
| 3.1 | Have there been any changes to the food assistance received over the past 3 to 6 months? | If there have been changes, why do you think these changes have occurred? *(Explore the main factors driving this change and whether they are* ***related to the effects of the Sudan crisis****)* Probe for differences in access between men and women. |
| 3.2 | Has there been any changes to how your household is utilizing food assistance over the past 3 to 6 months? | Probe on increase sharing, increasing selling of food assistance. Etc. |
| 3.3 | What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups? | 2.4 | Who is receiving assistance? Everyone or only some people? | If only some people are receiving assistance, are you aware of the reasons why? |
| 3.4 | What are the main challenges for people to register/receive food assistance? | Are you aware of any people in your community who are not registered to receive food assistance?  Probe for returnees, IDPs, refugees, host community, men, women |
|  | What are the current response gaps? | 2.3 | What do you think are the main ways that humanitarian organizations can support your household right now? |  |
| PART 4: SHOCKS / CLOSING | | | | | | |
| 4.0 | How is food security in assessed areas likely to evolve in the coming 6 months? | 4 | Which food security pillars are most likely to be impacted and how? | 1.2 | How do you expect the food security situation in your community will change the next 6 months? Why do you expect this to happen? | *Probe for impact of Sudan crisis / population movement.* |
| **RETURNEES** | | | | | | |
| PART 1: LIVELIHOODS | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | How has the food security and livelihoods of populations residing in areas of return (including returnees and the host community) been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 1 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return? | 1.1 | In your household's previous area of residence (in Sudan) what were the primary sources of income utilized? | *(Explore main sources of income for these population in Sudan)* |
| 5.2 | What are the main sources of income currently available and operational to you and other returnees in the area? | (Explore the current livelihood opportunities for these populations) |
| 5.3 | Have these sources changed since you first arrived from Sudan?  How and why they have changed? | (Explore if new livelihood opportunities have been made available for returnees) |
| 5.4 | Is the amount of income your household is earning sufficient to meet your basic needs (food, shelter, clothing)? | If no, what are some of the strategies your household and/or other recent arrivals use to cope? |
| PART 2: FOOD SECURITY | | | | | | |
| 6.0 | How has the food security and livelihoods of populations residing in areas of return (including returnees and the host community) been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 1 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return?   Which food security pillars (access, availability, utilization, stability) have been impacted, and how? | 1.1  1.2 | What can you say about the food situation among your households as well as other households that have also arrived here from Sudan? | Would you say that most people who have recently arrived from Sudan are currently able to access enough food? If no, what are the main reasons why people are unable to acccess enough food in this location? |
| 6.1 | Where do most returnees currently get their food? List all food sources. | *Proportional piling exercise:* use beans to illustrate the proportion of household food consumption through each food source. |
| 6.2 | How does this differ from the food sources you had access to in Sudan? |  |
| 6.3 | What would you say are the main challenges you have faced in accessing sufficient quantities of food since arriving in this location? | Probe for challenges related to access to water sources and firewood, distance to markets, diseases outbreak, freedom of movement, insecurity. |
| PART 4: ACCESS TO HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE | | | | | | |
| 7.0 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups?  What are the current response gaps? | 2.4  2.3 | Are people in your community currently receiving any food assistance? | Who is receiving assistance? Everyone or only some people? If only some people are receiving assistance, are you aware of the reasons why? |
| 7.1 | Can you describe this assistance to me? | For in kind assistance: What types of foods? How much? How often / how many times? For cash/voucher assistance: How much? How often? From when to when? Food for assets? |
| 7.2 | What are the main challenges for people to register/receive food assistance? | Are you aware of any people in your community who are not registered to receive food assistance?  Probe for returnees, IDPs, refugees, host community, men, women |
| 7.3 | How is food security in assessed areas likely to evolve in the coming 6 months? | 3 | Which food security pillars are most likely to be impacted and how? | 3.1 | How do you expect the food security situation in your community will change the next 6 months? Why do you expect this to happen? |  |
| 7.4 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | What are the current response gaps? | 2.3 | What do you think are the main ways that humanitarian organizations can support your household right now? |  |
| PART 3: INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION | | | | | | |
| 8.0 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return?  How is food security in assessed areas likely to evolve in the coming 6 months? | 1 3 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted social cohesion in areas of return, and how has this in turn impacted food security and livelihoods? | 1.1.3 | Have you found any challenges upon your arrival to this area? |  |
| 8.1 | Have you faced any challenges related to conflict/friction with the host community? |  |

Key Informant Interview:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q#** | **Research Question** | **RQ#** | **Sub-RQ** | **Sub-RQ#** | **Questionnaire Question** | **Probes** |
| PART 1: SHOCKS AND DISPLACEMENT | | | | | | |
| 1.0 | How has the food security and livelihoods of populations residing in areas of return (including returnees and the host community) been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 1 | In what ways has the crisis in Sudan impacted food security and livelihoods in areas of return? | 1.1 | In your view, what are the most significant ways in which food security or other basic needs in this area have been impacted over the last 3 to 6 months? | Conflicts, environmental events, price increases, disease outbreaks, displacement in/out, crop pests, reductions in HFA. *Create a timeline of events as necessary. For each event, probe as to how needs were impacted.* Ensure to include "protracted" events or factors, such as inflation, standing flood waters, or decreased cattle ownership. |
| 1.1 | How has the Sudan crisis impacted population movement to assessment areas, and how has this impacted food security and livelihoods? | 1.1.2 | Do you know how many people have arrived to this area since April 15? Do you know how many of these people arrived from Sudan? |  |
| 1.2 | Can you list all of the areas where these people are currently residing? How many people are residing in each of these areas? Location 1: Location 2: Location 3: |  |
| 1.3 | Are people still arriving regularly here? Do you know roughly how many people are arriving per day/week/month? |  |
| 1.4 | How are these people arriving? | By what means of transport? Along what routes/via which entry points? |
| 1.5 | Do you know why people are choosing to come to this location? | Proximity to family/support networks, access to humanitarian services, access to other types of basic needs, access to livelihoods, access to markets, safety/security considerations. |
| PART 2: HUMANITARIAN FOOD ASSISTANCE | | | | | | |
| 2.0 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | Has the extent of humanitarian service provision changed since the Sudan crisis? If yes, how, and how are these changes linked to the Sudan crisis? | 2.1 | Can you provide an overview of humanitarian food assistance in {county}? | Between which months are assistance delivered? How many people receive in-kind, cash/voucher, food for assets? What are the ration sizes/food items distributed? How frequently are distributions carred out? Where are the distribution points? Are any beneficiary criteria used? |
| 2.1 | Can you describe how the provision of humanitarian food assistance has changed or been impacted in the last 3 to 6 months? Why? | Probe for all above questions. |
| 2.2 | What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups? | 2.4 | Do you know if returnees from Sudan have received any food assistance since arriving in this location? | How many returnees? Provide the full breakdown receiving each type of assistance. |
| 2.3 | What was the ration they received? |  |
| 2.4 | Do you know if this was a one-off distribution, or if they have been registered through SCOPE? | Do you know if there are any registrations planned? |
| 2.5 | What are the current response gaps? | 2.3 | Have there been any groups of returnees from Sudan who have not received food assistance since their arrival? Why? |  |
| 2.6 | In your view, is the current food assistance being provided sufficient to meet needs in this location, and if not, why? |  |
| 2.7 | What challenges are service providers facing in the provision of assistance, and how are these challenges linked to the Sudan crisis? | 2.2 | Are there particular groups or locations that face greater barriers accessing assistance? | Probe for returnees, IDPs, host community, specific payams |
| 2.8 | Are there any other barriers you are aware of that humanitarian service providers face in the provision of food assistance? | Probe for: supply shortages, resupply issues, staffing shortages, lack of funding, insecurity, poor infrastructure |
| 2.9 | What challenges are service providers anticipating in the coming 6 months? | 2.5 | Are you anticipating any other changes to the way food assistance is delivered over the coming 6 months? Why? |  |
| PART 3: HEALTHCARE SERVICE PROVISION | | | | | | |
| 3.0 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | How are changes to the provision of humanitarian assistance related to the Sudan crisis? | 2.1 | *Complete health facility mapping excersize (see FGD guide 1).* |  |
| 3.1 | Can you describe how the provision of healthcare has changed or been impacted in the last 3 to 6 months? Why? |  |
| 3.2 | Has the Sudan crisis had any impact on the food security and livelihoods status of populations in areas of return? | 1 | Which food security pillars (access, availability, utilization, stability) have been impacted, and how? | 1.2 | Do you know if any of these facilities have witnessed an increased caseload in the last 3 to 6 months? | When did this happen? Do you know why this happened? What health challenges have been most common over the past 3-6 months? |
| 3.3 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | What challenges are service providers facing in the provision of assistance, and how are these challenges linked to the Sudan crisis? | 2.2 | Are you aware of any challenges faced in the provision of health services at any of these facilities in the last 3 to 6 months? *Ask at each health facility.* | Probe for: logistical issues, issues with resupply, issues with storage, issues with security, issues with reaching affected populations, issues with fundings |
| 3.4 | What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups? | 2.4 | Are there any groups (demographic groups or geographic areas) that you feel have greater difficulties accessing health services? | Probe for returnees, IDPs, host community |
| 3.5 | How are changes to the provision of humanitarian assistance related to the Sudan crisis? | 2.1 | Do you have any other comments on how the Sudan crisis has impacted health needs and/or the provision of health services? |  |
| 3.6 | How is food security in assessed areas likely to evolve in the coming 6 months? | 3 | Which food security pillars are most likely to be impacted and how? | 3.1 | Are you anticipating any other changes to the health needs of this community and/or the provision of health services over the coming 12 months? |  |
| PART 4: NUTRITION SERVICE PROVISION | | | | | | |
| 4.0 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | How are changes to the provision of humanitarian assistance related to the Sudan crisis? | 2.1 | *Complete nutrition facility mapping exercise (see FGD guide 1).* |  |
| 4.1 | Can you describe how the provision of nutrition services has changed or been impacted in the last 3 to 6 months? Why? | Probe for: supply shortages, resupply issues, staffing shortages, lack of funding, insecurity, poor infrastructure |
| 4.2 | Has the Sudan crisis had any impact on the food security and livelihoods status of populations in areas of return? | 1 | Which food security pillars (access, availability, utilization, stability) have been impacted, and how? | 1.2 | Has there been any change in the prevalence of acute malnutrition in this area over the past 6 months? | When did this happen? Is this normal for this time of year |
| 4.3 | How has the provision of life saving humanitarian assistance been impacted over the prior 3 to 6 month period? | 2 | What challenges are service providers facing in the provision of assistance, and how are these challenges linked to the Sudan crisis? | 2.2 | Are there any other barriers you are aware of that humanitarian service providers face in the provision of health services? | Probe for: logistical issues, issues with resupply, issues with storage, issues with security, issues with reaching affected populations, issues with fundings |
| 4.4 | What are the differences in service provision to / access of different groups? | 2.4 | Are there any groups (demographic groups or geographic areas) that you feel have greater difficulties accessing nutrition services? | Probe for returnees, IDPs, host community |
| 4.5 | What challenges are service providers facing in the provision of assistance, and how are these challenges linked to the Sudan crisis? | 2.2 | Do you have any other comments on how the Sudan crisis has impacted nutrition needs and/or the provision of nutrition services? |  |
| 4.6 | What challenges are service providers anticipating in the coming 6 months? | 2.5 | Are you anticipating any other changes to the needs of this community and/or the provision of nutrition services over the coming 12 months? |  |

1. The official IPC date has not yet been decided, but is likely to be in late September or early October. As a result, this ToR aims to have outputs finalized around mid-September. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. IOM and UNHCR. [“Population Movement From Sudan to South Sudan” dashboard.](https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiZTMwNTljNWYtYmVhYi00ZGI2LTgwYzAtN2UyNDZmZTRlNjBkIiwidCI6IjE1ODgyNjJkLTIzZmItNDNiNC1iZDZlLWJjZTQ5YzhlNjE4NiIsImMiOjh9&pageName=ReportSection95859b8850a76994e6fb&disablecdnExpiration=1687629067) Accessed August 1, 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. IPC. [“Acute Food Insecurity Situation October – November 2022 and Projections for December 0222 – March 2023 and April – July 2023.”](https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1155997/?iso3=SSD) October 2022. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See for instance: IRNA conducted in Fangak in May, REACH situation overviews from Renk and Malakal in June, Food Security and Livelihood Cluster assessments conducted in Renk, Malakal, Fangak, and Abyei between May and June, Nonviolent Peaceforce assessment “From Conflict to Conflict” published in June. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. IPC Technical Manual Version 3, page 32 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Visual and auditory signs of psychological distress include aversion of eye contact, shaking, rapid breathing, tearfulness or crying, “freezing,” and declining to answer multiple successive questions. Useful guidance on identifying and minimizing participant distress during interviews available [here.](https://www.swansea.ac.uk/media/guidance-on-identifying-and-minimising-participant-distress-during-interviews-and-focus-groups-(2).pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)