# **South Sudan - Jonglei State**

Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan


### Overview

Conflict in Jonglei State first broke out in late December 2013, only days after fighting began in Juba. Since then, the state has been one of the worst affected by the conflict, and currently hosts the second highest reported numbers of internally displaced persons in the country after Unity State. Many areas in Jonglei 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) approach to collect data in hard-to-reach areas of Unity State. The pilot was expanded to Jonglei State in March 2016. Through AoO, REACH collects data from a network of Key Informants (KIs) who have sector specific knowledge of an area, from regularly traveling to and from the area, direct or indirect contact with

people in the area, or recent displacement from the area. Although current AoO coverage is still limited and its findings not statistically significant, they provide a good indication of the needs and current humanitarian situation in assessed areas of Jonglei State.

Findings presented in this document are drawn from primary data collected from KIs in October 2016, covering 39 communities across 7 of Jonglei's 11 counties. Data was collected from 981 KIs in Juba Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites, as well as Mingkaman, Bor town and Akobo, who reported on communities about which they have received up-to-date information in the month prior to data collection. The study focuses on the situation in villages or local communities from which many individuals have already fled, but where some families still remain. Health, shelter, food security, WASH, education and protection sectors are covered. No information has been collected for any PoC. Note that when reporting on level of access to services this refers to the proportion of KIs responding 'yes' with regards to access in October 2016.




### Demographics \*\*







mostly men

Primary demographic composition of internally displaced persons (IDPs) population



### **Displacement**





Top two reported reasons for leaving their last location, by IDPs1

Insecurity

Lack of food

Top two reported reasons for coming to their current location, by IDPs1

Access to food

The area is secure




location, by local community<sup>1</sup>

Access to food

The area is secure












# Displacement \*\*\*


### Communities reporting returned local community<sup>1</sup>



# Health 🕏

### Reported level of access to healthcare

# Top two reasons why health services are not available<sup>3</sup>



### **Living situations**

### Reported living locations of IDPs


,	With the local community	54%
<b>i</b> →	With relatives	46%

# Reported living locations of local community<sup>2</sup>

	Own home	64%
1	In another village	33%
	In the bush (nearby)	3%

### **Health concerns**

### Top three reported health concerns<sup>3</sup>



# Top three reported most needed items in health care centers<sup>3</sup>









<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Local community displaced and returned home

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The current location of LCs was asked in order to assess persons who were displaced within their local community

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Key informants could choose more than one answer




# **South Sudan - Jonglei State**

Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan

# Shelter/NFI

# Reported proportion of local community sleeping outside



### Reported main shelter types1

### Top two reported shelter types, by IDPs

1	Rakooba	87%	1
2	Tukul	73%	<b>→</b> /\

# Top two reported shelter types, by local community


1	Tukul	95%
2	Rakooba	78%

# Top two reported shelter types, by returned local community<sup>2</sup>

	Tukul	94%
)	Rakooba	82%

### WASH =


# Reported level of access to safe drinking water



# Reported primary sources of those with access to safe drinking water



For those with access to safe drinking water, reported time of a return trip to the water source



51% Under 30 minutes49% 30 minutes to 1 hour

### **NFIs**

### Reported uses of new mosquito nets<sup>3</sup>

Protection from mosquito	100%
Building materials	4%
Fishing	2%
Crop protection	2%
Rope	1%
Clothing	1%

# Reported number of people sharing a shelter

1 to 5 people	100%
6 to 10 people	0%
11 to 15 people	0%
More than 15 people	0%

### Water availability and sanitation

# Of communities reporting presence of boreholes




59% are reportedly functional

# Reported access to primary sanitation facilities



100% Bush/Field







<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Key informants could choose more than one answer; responses refer to percentage of communities having a reported shelter type, not the percentage of the population living in them

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Local community displaced and returned home

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  Key informants could choose more than one answer; respondents chose all uses for new mosquito nets in their community

Reported level of access to agricultural



# South Sudan - Jonglei State


Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan


# Food Security Reported level of access to food Top three reported reasons why food is not available¹ 1 Crop destroyed 100% 2 Unsafe to plant 67% 3 Livestock stolen 48%

# Top three most commonly reported coping strategies


1 Forage for wild food 43%
2 Reduce daily meals 42%
3 Eat less expensive food 42%

### Livelihoods 👰






# Reported level of access to food distribution



### **Current access to market**



# Reported current location of the assets of fishermen, drivers, and labourers<sup>2</sup>

Stolen/looted	46%
Hidden in a safe location	23%
Looked after by the immediate family	13%
Looked after by owner	10%
Looked after by the community	8%

# Reported current location of the communities' cattle

Moved to a safe location	44%
Looked after by the community	41%
With the original owner	8%
Looked after by immediate family	5%
On seasonal migration	2%








<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Key informants could choose more than one answer


<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Assets included things such as cars, cooking tools, boats, building tools etc.

# **Education**

# Reported level of access to education services



# Overall reported level of available education in assessed communities<sup>1</sup>




# In 19 communities where education is reportedly available, the reported reasons for children not attending school are

78%	
17%	
5%	
	17%

### Protection

## Protection concerns

Primary reported protection concerns for men and women



### Reported proportion of boys and girls aged 6-17 attending school



### **Community**

# Relationships between IDPs, returnees and local communities



**97%** of communities reported relations between these groups were "good" **3%** of communities reported relations between these groups were "poor"

### **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.







<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Key informants could choose more than one answer

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Accelerated learning programs