

July 2016

Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan


### **Overview**

Conflict in Unity 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 highest reported numbers of internally displaced persons in the country. Many areas in Unity 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, REACH has remotely collected data on hard-to-reach areas in Unity State since December 2015. Through AoO, REACH collects data from a network of Key Informants (KIs) who have sector specific knowledge of an area, from regularly travelling 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 Unity State.

Findings presented in this document are drawn from primary data collected from KIs in June and July 2016, covering 58 communities across 7 of Unity's 9 counties. Data was collected from 489 KIs currently in Bentiu and Juba Protection of Civilians (PoC) sites and 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 July 2016.



## Demographics M

Primary demographic composition of remaining local community (LC) population



Primary demographic composition of

**iii**i **Population** 

ABIEMNHO

...

% of LC having left:

0 - 50%

51 - 75% > 75% no change

# of IDPe

100 400 900

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SD

Estimated population of IDPs and proportion of local population who has left since the onset of the crisis

 $\bigcirc$ 

PARIANO

Top two reported reasons for leaving their last location, by IDPs<sup>1</sup>

1	Insecurity	100%
2	Lack of food	100% 75%

Top two reported reasons for coming to their current location, by IDPs<sup>1</sup>

1	Security	95%
2	Food	78% 🔶

Top two reported reasons for not leaving location, by local community<sup>1</sup>

1	Security	88%	
2	Food	59%	T

<sup>1</sup> Most frequently cited as first and second most important reasons

PANYIJIAI









Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan

July 2016

## Population






### Living situation and short-term displacement

#### **Reported living locations of IDPs**

With relatives	<b>53%</b>
With local community	26%
In a spontaneous settlement	21%

#### **Reported living locations for local** community<sup>2</sup>

Own home	76%	
In the near bush	15%	i
Another home	4%	
In another village	4%	
In the far bush	2%	



### Health concerns

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

1	Malaria	99%	
2	Malnutrition	55%	
3	Diarrhea	45%	

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

- Medicine (not specified) 84% 1
- 2 Medicine for malaria

3 Paracetamol



#### <sup>1</sup>Local community displaced and returned home

<sup>2</sup> The current location of LCs was asked in order to assess persons who were displaced within their local community <sup>3</sup> Key informants could choose more than one answer





1-




Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan

**Reported main shelter types<sup>1</sup>** 

July 2016

## Shelter/NFI 🕋



Reported proportion of local community

### Top two reported shelter types, by IDPs Rakooba 100% 2 Tukul 100% Top two reported shelter types, by local community Rakooba 100% 2 Tukul 69% Top two reported shelter types, by returned local community<sup>2</sup> Rakooba 86% 2 Tukul 78%

## **NFIs**

Reported	use	of	new	mosquito	nets1
----------	-----	----	-----	----------	-------

Protection from mosquitos	91%
Building material	28%
Rope	23%
Fishing	9%
Protection of crops	7%
Clothing	3%


<b>Reported number</b>	of people	sharing a
shelter		

1 to 5 people

6 to 10 people

11 to 15 people





56% of the boreholes are reportedly functional<sup>3</sup>



<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>2</sup>Local community displaced and returned home

<sup>3</sup> Of the 31 communities reporting safe drinking water and presence of boreholes








Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan

July 2016

## Food Security 🙇



## Top three reported reasons why food is not available<sup>1</sup> 1 Unsafe to plant 95%

1 Unsafe to plant95%2 Crops destroyed95%3 Crops stolen54%


#### **Reported most common coping strategies**

Sell livestock	36%
Borrow food	29%
Buy less expensive food	14%
Reduce number of meals	14%
Children eat first	7%

#### **Current access to market**



## Livelihoods 🙇



# Reported current location of the assets of fishermen, drivers, and labourers<sup>1</sup>

Stolen/looted	73%
Looked after by the owner	18%
Hidden	5%
Looked after by immediate family	2%
Don't know	2%

# Reported current location of the communities' cattle

Stoler	n/looted	48%
Move	d	25%
Looke	ed by immediate family	16%
Seaso	onal migration	7%
Don't	know	4%

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

<sup>1</sup>Assets included things such as cars, cooking tools, boats, building tools etc. 378 KIs reported on this indicator for July



2016 Eidgenossenschaft


ossenschaft a ilopment



Assessment of Hard to Reach Areas in South Sudan

## July 2016

## Education




1 C C
T

In 11 communities where education is reportedly available, the reported main reasons for children not attending school are



# Reported proportion of boys and girls aged 6-11 attending school



<sup>1</sup>Key informants could choose more than one answer <sup>2</sup>Accelerated learning programs



Verv good

very good	0%	
Good	94%	
Moderate	0%	
Poor	3%	I
Not specified	3%	I
Don't know	0%	

**n**0/

### **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-intiative.org and follow us @REACH\_info.

**REACH** Informing more effective humanitarian action

## Protection 🕎

### **Protection concerns**

#### Primary reported protection concerns for men and women

-	ń		Ť	
54%		Killing/injury same tribe		6%
32%		Killing/injury other tribe		0%
2%	I	Sexual violence		85%
0%		Abduction		0%
4%	1	Forced recruitment	I.	2%
5%	- I	Looting		0%
0%		Cattle raids		0%
0%		Family separation		0%
0%		Domestic violence	I.	2%
2%	I	Restricted freedom of movement		0%
2%	I	Don't know		6%
0%		I don't want to answer		0%

### Community

### Reported relationship between IDPs, returnees and local communities