



# MOBILITY TRACKING ROUND 8

Site and Village / Neighbourhood Assessments Report

Food Security and Livelihoods

Data collection February - March 2020



Funded by  
European Union  
Humanitarian Aid



**UKaid**  
from the British people



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**Canada**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>DEFINITIONS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>KEY INFORMANTS: 6,628 INDIVIDUALS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>LEVEL OF ANALYSIS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>DISTRIBUTION OF IDPS AND RETURNEES BY SETTLEMENT TYPE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>REPRESENTING NEEDS AND CHANGE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS KEY INSIGHTS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>STATE-LEVEL NEEDS OVERVIEW: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
F1. % IDP population living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by state [n = 2,221] .....	8
F2. % returnee population living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by state [n = 2,221] .....	8
F3. % IDP population living in IDP settlements with access to a local food market, by state [n = 2,221] .....	8
F4. % returnee population living in returnee settlements with access to a local food market, by state [n = 2,221] .....	8
<b>COUNTY-LEVEL NEEDS OVERVIEW: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS</b> .....	<b>9</b>
F5. % IDP population living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [n = 2,167] .....	9
F6. % returnee population living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [n = 2,167] .....	9
F7. Number of IDPs living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [n = 2,167] .....	9
F8. Number of returnees living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [n = 2,167] .....	9
<b>COUNTY-LEVEL NEEDS OVERVIEW: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS</b> .....	<b>10</b>
F9. % IDP population living in IDP settlements without access to a local food market, by county [n = 2,189] .....	10
F10. % returnee population living in returnee settlements without access to a local food market, by county [n = 2,189] .....	10
F11. Number of IDPs living in IDP settlements without access to a local food market, by county [n = 2,189] .....	10
F12. Number of returnees living in returnee settlements without access to a local food market, by county [n = 2,189] .....	10
<b>STATE-LEVEL CHANGE BETWEEN ROUNDS 6 AND 8: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
F13. Change in share of IDPs living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by state [n = 1,526] .....	11
F14. Change in share of returnees living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by state [n = 1,526] .....	11
F15. Change in share of IDPs living in IDP settlements without access to a local food market, by state [n = 1,550] .....	11
F16. Change in share of returnees living in returnee settlements without access to a local food market, by state [n = 1,550] .....	11

<b>COUNTY-LEVEL CHANGE BETWEEN ROUNDS 6 AND 8: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
F17. Change in number of IDPs living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [n = 1,526].....	12
F18. Change in number of returnees living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [n = 1,526] .....	12
F19. Change in number of IDPs living in IDP settlements without access to a local food market, by county [n = 1,550].....	12
F20. Change in number of returnees living in returnee settlements without access to a local food market, by county [n = 1,550].....	12
<b>FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS INDICATORS BY SETTLEMENT TYPE AND SIZE .....</b>	<b>13</b>
F21. % IDP population living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by settlement type and size [n = 2,221].....	13
F22. % IDP population living in IDP settlements with access to a local food market, by settlement type and size [n = 2,221] .....	13
F23. % returnee population living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by settlement type and size [n = 2,221].....	13
F24. % returnee population living in returnee settlements with access to a local food market, by settlement type and size [n = 2,221].....	13
<b>FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS INDICATORS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
F25. % IDP population living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by GHSL urban classification [n = 2,221].....	13
F26. % IDP population living in IDP settlements with access to a local food market, by GHSL urban classification [n = 2,221].....	13
F27. % returnee population living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by GHSL urban classification [n = 2,221].....	13
F28. % returnee population living in returnee settlements with access to a local food market, by GHSL urban classification [n = 2,221].....	13
<b>DISTRIBUTION OF IDPS / RETURNEES LIVING IN ASSESSED LOCATIONS BY TYPE AND SIZE OF SETTLEMENT .....</b>	<b>14</b>
F29. Number of assessed IDP locations by type and size of settlement [n = 2,746].....	14
F30. Number of IDPs by type and size of settlement [n = 2,746] .....	14
F31. % of assessed IDP locations of given size by settlement type [n = 2,746].....	14
F32. % of IDPs living in IDP settlements of given size by settlement type [n = 2,746].....	14
F33. Number of assessed returnee locations by size of settlement and place of displacement of the majority [n = 2,746].....	14
F34. Number of returnees by size of settlement and place of displacement [n = 2,746].....	14
F35. % of assessed returnee locations of given size by place of displacement of the majority [n = 2,746].....	14
F36. % of returnees living in returnee settlements of given size by place of displacement [n = 2,746].....	14
<b>DISTRIBUTION OF IDPS / RETURNEES LIVING IN ASSESSED LOCATIONS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
F37. Number of assessed IDP / returnee locations by GHSL urban class [n = 2,746].....	15
F38. Number of IDPs / returnees by GHSL urban class [n = 2,746].....	15
F39. % of assessed IDP locations by GHSL urban class [n = 2,746].....	15
F40. % of IDPs by GHSL urban class [n = 2,746].....	15
F41. % of assessed returnee locations by GHSL urban class [n = 2,746].....	15
F42. % of returnees by GHSL urban class [n = 2,746].....	15
<b>MOBILITY TRACKING PRODUCTS.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ROUND 8 MAPS.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ROUND 8 DATASETS.....</b>	<b>16</b>

## BACKGROUND

Mobility tracking aims to quantify the presence and needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees and relocated individuals in displacement sites and host communities across South Sudan. The assessments are repeated at regular intervals to track mobility dynamics and needs over time. This summary presents the main findings from the multi-sectoral location assessment component of the eight round of Mobility Tracking in South Sudan, complementing the [Baseline Initial Data Release](#). Other products available on the [DTM website](#) include displacement site profiles and an atlas of IDP and returnee settlements, as well as the raw datasets.

As of Mobility Tracking round six, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) IDP baseline was [consolidated with DTM findings](#). The two agencies continue working together to maintain a unified and regularly updated baseline for the IDP population in South Sudan.

Data collection for Mobility Tracking Round 8 took place in February and March 2020, coinciding with the formation of the Transitional Government of National Unity (TGoNU). While this represented an important political development in the transition process and was accompanied by a lull in large-scale armed conflict, sub-national conflict with the National Salvation Front (NAS) continued in the Greater Equatoria region, while other parts of the country have faced rising instances of localized conflict, often related to land issues or livestock and revenge raids. The lines between livestock-related conflict, other forms of communal tensions and politically motivated violence are frequently blurred (SC/13857, 25 June 2019).

While Round 8 took place during the dry season, many communities continued to suffer the indirect effects of severe seasonal flooding in the 2019 rainy season.

## METHODOLOGY

Mobility Tracking comprises two interrelated tools: baseline area assessments and multi-sectoral location assessments.

**Baseline area assessments** provide information on the presence of targeted populations in defined administrative sub-areas (following roughly the 10-state payam system), and capture information at the group level on population categories (IDPs, returnees, relocated) and some of their key attributes (e.g. reasons for displacement, dates of displacement/return). The baseline assessment form also comprises a list of locations (defined as villages / neighbourhoods / displacement sites) hosting displaced and / or returned populations.

**Multi-sectoral location assessments** are carried out in villages / neighbourhoods hosting IDPs and / or returnees and at displacement sites. They gather data at a more granular level and include indicators on the main humanitarian sectors such as Health, WASH, S/ NFI, Protection, FSL and Education. The objective of the location level assessments is to collect key multi-sectoral indicators on the living conditions and needs of affected populations to enable partners to prioritize locations for more in-depth sector-specific assessments.

## DEFINITIONS

### IDPs

Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border.

*South Sudan: Time of arrival in assessed area considered: 2014 to March 2020*

### Returnees: internal / from abroad

Someone who was displaced from their habitual residence either within South Sudan or abroad, who has since returned to their habitual residence. Please note: the returnee category, for the purpose of DTM data collection, is restricted to individuals who returned to the exact location of their habitual residence, or an adjacent area based on a free decision. South Sudanese displaced persons having crossed the border into South Sudan from neighboring countries without having reached their home are still displaced and as such not counted in the returnee category.

*South Sudan: Time of arrival in assessed area considered: 2016 to March 2020*

## KEY INFORMANTS: 6,628 INDIVIDUALS

Information is obtained through a network of key informants, with data captured at the location level during multi-sectoral location assessments helping to improve initial estimates provided by key informants at the sub-area level. Key informants commonly comprise local authorities, community leaders, religious leaders and humanitarian partners.

In Round 8, DTM enumerators consulted an estimated 6,628 key informants, including 1,727 at the sub-area level, 5,063 at the village or neighbourhood level and 196 at displacement sites. Some key informants were consulted at multiple levels. Data is triangulated with direct observation by the enumerators and subsequently verified against secondary data from partners and other DTM sources, including biometric registration figures.

## GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE

In Round 8, DTM accessed 2,746 locations (villages / neighbourhoods and displacement sites) in 500 sub-areas

across every county (78) in all ten states, representing a 7 per cent increase since round 7 (2,558 locations accessed). Locations are assessed upon confirmation of presence of IDPs and / or returnees.

DTM conducted multi-sectoral assessments at:

- 81% per cent of mapped villages / neighbourhoods (2,134/ 2,631).
- 76% per cent of mapped displacement sites (87 / 115).

The settlements included in the multi-sectoral location assessment were estimated to host 1,412,548 IDPs (88% of 1,600,254 IDPs estimated in the Baseline) and 1,377,133 returnees (90% of 1,533,390 returnees estimated in the Baseline).

## LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

Since the assessments are carried out at the location level on the basis of key informant interviews and direct observation, they provide general estimates for the population of concern without accounting for differences between households in each location.

For example, we can say that X per cent of the IDP population in a given state lives in settlements where the main water source is within 20 minutes walking distance. This is a description of the general situation for the majority of the population in the assessed settlement, however one needs to keep in mind that individual households live at different distances from the water source.

This report combines population estimates for IDPs and returnees with selected sectoral indicators to provide state- and county-level overviews of needs and their evolution since Round 6 (June 2019). Comparisons with Round 6 are based only on locations assessed in both rounds.

Needs are also compared across three analytical dimensions: i) settlement type (IDPs only), host community or camp / camp-like setting; ii) settlement size, based on the number

of IDPs or returnees; and iii) settlement urban/peri-urban or rural location based on the [Global Human Settlement Layer \(GHSL\)](#)<sup>1</sup>.

## DISTRIBUTION OF IDPS AND RETURNEES BY SETTLEMENT TYPE

While the majority of IDPs live in host-community settings, 26.7 per cent (or 426,693 individuals) live in camps and camp-like settings. [F30, F32]

Both IDPs and returnees tend to be concentrated in large settlements. 68.2 per cent of IDPs live in settlements hosting over 1,000 IDPs (95.2% of the IDPs living in camps and 58.4% of those living in host community settlements), compared to 61.4 per cent of returnees (65.1% of returnees from abroad and 59.6% of returnees from within South Sudan). [F30, F32, F34, F36]

<sup>1</sup> The GHSL is provided by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre in collaboration with the OECD and the World Bank. Malakal PoC site has been manually recoded as urban by DTM.

While most IDPs and returnees live in large settlements, 84.2 per cent of locations hosting IDPs and 84.8 per cent of locations hosting returnees are medium (301-1,000 IDPs / returnees) or small (1-300 IDPs / returnees). [F29, F31, F33, F35]

Based on a spatial overlay with JRC's GHSL, 87.7 per cent of IDPs (or 1,403,069 individuals) and 85.8 per cent of returnees (or 1,316,232 individuals) live in rural areas. IDPs living in camps are more likely to be in urban/peri-urban areas compared to those living with host communities (17.8% vs 10.3%); the same applies to IDP returnees as compared to returnees from abroad (16.3% vs 9.9%). [F37-F42]

## REPRESENTING NEEDS AND CHANGE

Different indicators can affect the way in which needs are compared geographically and over time.

While the number of individuals living in affected settlements in a certain region of the country links most directly with operational planning, it tends to downplay severe needs in smaller or less populous areas in favour of larger ones. As a result, prevalence is used at the state-level and accompanies absolute figures in the county-level section.

When looking at change over time, starting levels and population inflows / outflows affect indicators in different ways. Percentage change in the number of

individuals living in affected settlements is unbounded and tends to overstate change in less populous areas or ones that performed better in Round 6, since these had fewer individuals living in affected settlements.

This report uses the change in the proportion of individuals living in affected settlements – or change in prevalence – at the state level and the change in the number of individuals living in affected settlements at the county level. Change in prevalence is not sensitive to population inflows / outflows that maintain the same distribution of individuals across affected and better-performing settlements, and is less affected by the state's initial population and needs situation, helping to highlight underlying sectoral changes.

## KEY INSIGHTS

Click on the links to see the figures. Change relative to Round 6 (June 2019) is calculated for locations assessed in both rounds only.

### FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS

1. Seven IDP settlements (17,003 individuals) and thirteen returnee settlements (12,786 individuals) reported having no source of food at the time of the assessment. Of these, nine settlements are located in Juba County, two in Twic County, and one each in Raja, Abiemnhom and Gogrial East Counties. Further verification is recommended for these locations.
2. At the time of the assessment, 53.5 per cent of IDPs, or 756,033 individuals, and 37.9 per cent of returnees, or 521,813 individuals, lived in settlements relying on food assistance, cash assistance or host community donations as their main source of food. [F1, F2]
3. At the state level, the share of IDPs and returnees living in settlements relying on donations or assistance as their main source of food was highest in Unity (86.9% of IDPs, or 182,250 individuals, and 84.4% of returnees, or 124,554 individuals), Jonglei (78.4% of IDPs, or 153,038 individuals, and 73.9% of returnees, or 131,096 individuals) and Northern Bahr El Ghazal (70.7%, or 51,710 individuals, and 47.6% of returnees, or 59,213 individuals). [F1, F2]
4. In sixteen counties, at least 5,000 IDPs or returnees and 90 per cent of one or both population groups lived in settlements that rely on cash assistance, food assistance or host community donations as the main source of food. Seven of these counties are in Unity (Guit, Leer, Mayom, Koch, Rubkona, Mayendit and Panyijiar), four in Jonglei (Ayod, Canal/Pigi, Nyirol and Duk), two in Northern Bahr El Ghazal (Aweil West and Aweil East) and Lakes (Awerial and Yirol East), and one in Warrap (Tonj South). In addition to the above, Wau, Juba, Bor South and Awerial Counties are notable with a total number of IDPs and returnees living in settlements reliant on aid or donations exceeding 40,000. [F5-F8]
5. 28.2 per cent of IDPs, or 398,811 individuals, and 35.9 per cent of returnees, or 494,455 individuals, live in settlements without access to a local food market.
6. The share of IDPs/returnees living in settlements without access to a food market was highest in Jonglei (53.9%, or 201,049 individuals), Lakes (44.7%, or 111,793 individuals) and Upper Nile (38%, or 162,920 individuals). For returnees, Central Equatoria (43.3% of returnees, or 62,447 individuals) and Unity (39.7% of returnees, or 58,483 individuals) also reported high proportions living in settlements without access. [F3, F4]
7. Four counties reported over 40,000 IDPs and returnees living in settlements without access to a food market: Wau (Western Bahr El Ghazal), Rumbek North (Lakes), Renk (Upper Nile) and Duk (Jonglei). [F9-F12]
8. A higher proportion of IDPs in large camps lives in settlements reliant on food assistance / donations as compared with host-community settings and small displacement sites, reflecting differences in the availability of food distribution as well as in need and ability to engage in livelihood activities. Nevertheless, IDPs in large camps are also more likely to live in a settlement with access to a food market. Urban areas and larger host-community settings fare better in terms of access to food markets for both IDPs and returnees. [F21-F28]
9. Comparing locations assessed in both round 6 and round 8, the proportion of IDPs and returnees living in settlements relying on cash assistance, food assistance or host-community donations as the main source of food remained stable for IDPs<sup>1</sup> but increased by 8.6 percentage points, or 113,378 individuals, for returnees.
10. At the state level, the proportion of IDPs living in settlements reliant on assistance or host community donations increased most in Northern Bahr El Ghazal (+22.0 p.p., or +36,822 individuals) and Jonglei (+20.8 p.p., or +21,541 individuals). The most significant increase for returnees was in Western Bahr El Ghazal (+20.3 p.p., or +42,439 individuals). [F13, F14]
11. The overall proportion of IDPs and returnees living in settlements without access to food markets increased by 3.5 percentage points, or 30,880 individuals, for IDPs and by 3.0 percentage points, or 58,273 individuals, for returnees. The number of IDPs living in such settlements experienced the greatest increase in Lakes (+15.6 p.p., or +27,511 individuals), Warrap (+17.2 p.p., or

<sup>1</sup> A slight 0.45% increase in prevalence was balanced by an absolute decrease of 14,488 IDPs living in such settlements.


## KEY INSIGHTS

*Click on the links to see the figures. Change relative to Round 6 (June 2019) is calculated for locations assessed in both rounds only.*


+19,269 individuals) and Central Equatoria (+8.5 p.p., or +14,128 individuals), while the number of returnees living in such settlements increased the most in Western Bahr El Ghazal (+17 p.p., or +36,283 individuals), Upper Nile (+12 p.p., or +32,678 individuals) and Central Equatoria (+14 p.p., or +19,631 individuals). [F15, F16]

**STATE-LEVEL NEEDS OVERVIEW: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS**


F1. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY STATE [N = 2,221]




F2. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY STATE [N = 2,221]



F3. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITH ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY STATE [N = 2,221]



F4. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITH ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY STATE [N = 2,221]







**COUNTY-LEVEL NEEDS OVERVIEW: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS**



F5. % IDP population living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [N = 2,167]

F6. % returnee population living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [N = 2,167]




F7. NUMBER OF IDPs living in IDP settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [N = 2,167]

F8. NUMBER OF returnees living in returnee settlements reliant on food assistance / donations, by county [N = 2,167]




**COUNTY-LEVEL NEEDS OVERVIEW: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS**


F9. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY COUNTY [N = 2,189]




F10. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY COUNTY [N = 2,189]



F11. NUMBER OF IDPs LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY COUNTY [N = 2,189]




F12. NUMBER OF RETURNEES LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY COUNTY [N = 2,189]




**STATE-LEVEL CHANGE BETWEEN ROUNDS 6 AND 8: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS**


F13. CHANGE IN SHARE OF IDPs LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY STATE [N = 1,526]




F14. CHANGE IN SHARE OF RETURNEES LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY STATE [N = 1,526]



F15. CHANGE IN SHARE OF IDPs LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY STATE [N = 1,550]




F16. CHANGE IN SHARE OF RETURNEES LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY STATE [N = 1,550]




**COUNTY-LEVEL CHANGE BETWEEN ROUNDS 6 AND 8: FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS**


F17. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF IDPs LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY COUNTY [N = 1,526]




F18. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF RETURNEES LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY COUNTY [N = 1,526]



F19. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF IDPs LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY COUNTY [N = 1,550]




F20. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF RETURNEES LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY COUNTY [N = 1,550]




**FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS INDICATORS BY SETTLEMENT TYPE AND SIZE**


F21. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY SETTLEMENT TYPE AND SIZE [N = 2,221]




F22. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITH ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY SETTLEMENT TYPE AND SIZE [N = 2,221]



F23. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY SETTLEMENT TYPE AND SIZE [N = 2,221]




F24. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITH ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY SETTLEMENT TYPE AND SIZE [N = 2,221]




**FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS INDICATORS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS**


F25. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY GHSL URBAN CLASSIFICATION [N = 2,221]




F26. % IDP POPULATION LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS WITH ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY GHSL URBAN CLASSIFICATION [N = 2,221]



F27. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS RELIANT ON FOOD ASSISTANCE / DONATIONS, BY GHSL URBAN CLASSIFICATION [N = 2,221]




F28. % RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS WITH ACCESS TO A LOCAL FOOD MARKET, BY GHSL URBAN CLASSIFICATION [N = 2,221]




Notes: Settlement size categories (1-300, 301-1,000, 1,001+) are based on the number of IDPs (for IDP settlements) or returnees (for returnee settlements).

**DISTRIBUTION OF IDPS / RETURNEES LIVING IN ASSESSED LOCATIONS<sup>1</sup> BY TYPE AND SIZE<sup>2</sup> OF SETTLEMENT**


F29. NUMBER OF ASSESSED IDP LOCATIONS BY TYPE AND SIZE OF SETTLEMENT [N = 2,746]




F30. NUMBER OF IDPS BY TYPE AND SIZE OF SETTLEMENT [N = 2,746]




F31. % OF ASSESSED IDP LOCATIONS OF GIVEN SIZE BY SETTLEMENT TYPE [N = 2,746]




F32. % OF IDPS LIVING IN IDP SETTLEMENTS OF GIVEN SIZE BY SETTLEMENT TYPE [N = 2,746]




F33. NUMBER OF ASSESSED RETURNEE LOCATIONS BY SIZE OF SETTLEMENT AND PLACE OF DISPLACEMENT OF THE MAJORITY [N = 2,746]




F34. NUMBER OF RETURNEES BY SIZE OF SETTLEMENT AND PLACE OF DISPLACEMENT [N = 2,746]



F35. % OF ASSESSED RETURNEE LOCATIONS OF GIVEN SIZE BY PLACE OF DISPLACEMENT OF THE MAJORITY [N = 2,746]



F36. % OF RETURNEES LIVING IN RETURNEE SETTLEMENTS OF GIVEN SIZE BY PLACE OF DISPLACEMENT [N = 2,746]



Notes: [1] These figures include all 2,746 settlements covered in Round 8 of the Baseline assessment, including 525 for which the multi-sector component is not available. [2] Settlement size categories (1-300, 301-1,000, 1,001+) are based on the relevant population group only.

**DISTRIBUTION OF IDPS / RETURNEES LIVING IN ASSESSED LOCATIONS<sup>1</sup> BY GHSL URBAN CLASS**


F37. NUMBER OF ASSESSED IDP / RETURNEE LOCATIONS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS [N = 2,746]




F38. NUMBER OF IDPS / RETURNEES BY GHSL URBAN CLASS [N = 2,746]




F39. % OF ASSESSED IDP LOCATIONS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS [N = 2,746]




F40. % OF IDPS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS [N = 2,746]



F41. % OF ASSESSED RETURNEE LOCATIONS BY GHSL URBAN CLASS [N = 2,746]



F42. % OF RETURNEES BY GHSL URBAN CLASS [N = 2,746]



Notes: [1] These figures include all 2,746 settlements covered in Round 8 of the Baseline assessment, including 525 for which the multi-sectoral component is not available.

## MOBILITY TRACKING PRODUCTS

The Baseline Assessment Initial Data Release presents an overview of identified IDP and returnee populations in South Sudan.

The Site Profiles contain a two-page dashboard for each assessed camp or camp-like setting, displaying a broad range of collected indicators. They aim to provide in-depth location-level information to partners planning operations in specific areas.

The datasets contain the raw data used for DTM reports and allow users to carry out their own analysis. A limited amount of sensitive data, including additional protection and vulnerabilities indicators, is available upon request.

## MOBILITY TRACKING ROUND 8 REPORTS

[Baseline Assessment Initial Data Release](#)

[Site Assessment Profiles](#)

[Site and Village / Neighbourhood Assessment Reports](#)

1. WASH I (Water)
2. WASH II (Hygiene)
3. WASH III (GBV Risk)
4. Protection
5. SNFI
6. Food Security and Livelihoods
7. Health
8. Education

## ROUND 8 MAPS

[Baseline IDPs by County](#)

[Baseline Returnees by County](#)

## ROUND 8 DATASETS

[Baseline Location Dataset](#)

[Baseline Summaries \(period of arrival, reasons for displacement, returnee shelter status\)](#)

[Site Assessment Dataset](#)

[Village / Neighbourhood Assessment Dataset](#)