IDP SITE MULTI-SECTOR NEEDS AND VULNERABILITIES SURVEY (FSNMS+)

MALAKAL POC SITE

DTM
IOM DISPLACEMENT
TRACKING MATRIX
SOUTH SUDAN

In collaboration with:

Shelter NFI Cluster South Sudan
ShelterSouthSudan.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter

SOUTH SUDAN
CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES
www.cccmcluster.org

Protection Cluster
South Sudan

GBV Sub-Cluster
South Sudan

Child Protection
South Sudan Child Protection Sub-Cluster

South Sudan
Education
Cluster

FOOD SECURITY
CLUSTER

WASH Cluster
South Sudan

HEALTH
CLUSTER
SOUTH SUDAN

Generously supported by funding from:

Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection and
Humanitarian Aid

South Sudan
Humanitarian
Fund

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Canada

UKaid
from the British people

DTM SOUTH SUDAN

dtm.iom.int/south-sudan

SouthSudanDTM@iom.int

Photo (cover page):

An enumerator looking upon people queueing for food distribution.

© IOM / Liatile Putsoa 2021

Table of Contents

Aims

Between September and November 2021, the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM DTM) undertook its second household-level multi-sector assessment of selected urban areas and camps for internally displaced persons (IDPs) in South Sudan. The assessment aims to:

- Quantify the prevalence of vulnerabilities and humanitarian needs across sectors, with a focus on food security, economic vulnerability and nutrition as well as selected indicators on shelter and non-food items (SNFI), education, health, water, hygiene and sanitation (WASH), protection (including child protection and gender-based violence) and mental health and psycho-social support (MHPSS).

- Generate a better understanding of urban displacement and migration, including return and relocation after displacement in South Sudan or abroad.

This survey is part of the country-wide extended Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System (FSNMS+) assessment in South Sudan, jointly conducted by IOM, the World Food Programme (WFP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), REACH and several humanitarian clusters. It was designed to be an independent, crisis-wide and coordinated inter-agency multi-sectoral needs assessment, mandated by the Humanitarian Country Team and endorsed by the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group. Together, the joint findings provide an evidence-base for the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification, the Humanitarian Needs Overview and the Humanitarian Response Plan.

This report presents sectoral findings for Malakal Protection of Civilians (PoC) Site. Separate profiles have been published for Juba's urban area and IDP Camps I and III, Wau's urban area and Naivasha IDP Camp, the urban area of Bentiu / Rubkona and Bentiu IDP Camp, Malakal's urban area and the urban areas of Bor and Yei.

Humanitarian Context in South Sudan

Despite a relative lull in large-scale hostilities since the signature of the Revitalized Peace Agreement for the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan (R-ARCSS) in September 2018 and the formation of the Transitional Government of National Unity in February 2020, sub-national and localized conflicts have continued to affect communities and cause new displacement across the country (IOM DTM Event Tracking[1]). Between January and September 2021, 138,637 individuals were displaced due to conflict, and 84,861 individuals were displaced due to communal clashes (IOM DTM Mobility Tracking Round 11). Although the overall number of casualties has decreased compared to 2020 figures, escalations in violence in Western Equatoria – particularly in Tambura – and Jonglei and Greater Pibor Administrative Area were flagged as concerning (HRD UNMISS). After two years of severe seasonal flooding, 2021 witnessed another year of extreme flooding, affecting over 835,000 people (OCHA). Three consecutive years of high levels of flooding have depleted resources and severely increased needs in many communities while simultaneously limiting humanitarian access. In this climate, the economic and health impact of COVID-19, including restrictions cross-border movement (IOM DTM Flow Monitoring), has further compounded the humanitarian effects of protracted insecurity.

As of September 2021, South Sudan hosts over 2 million IDPs and 1.78 million returnees, with over 400,000 new IDP arrivals[2] and over 400,000 former IDPs and refugees returning to their areas of habitual residence prior to displacement in the first nine months of 2021 (IOM DTM Mobility Tracking Round 11). Often, returnees find themselves in conditions of need comparable to those of the displaced population (IOM DTM Mobility Tracking Round 11 Multi-Sector Location Assessment).

According to the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) analysis for February to March 2022, 6.8 million people – more

---

1   Due to limitations in coverage and access, DTM Event Tracking does not provide a comprehensive picture of displacement events.

2   Including both new displacement incidents and individuals moving to a different location of displacement.

than half of South Sudan's population – are estimated to be facing severe acute food insecurity, with parts of Jonglei and Unity states of extreme concern for food insecurity. The 2022 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) estimates a total of 8.9 million people in need out of a projected population of 12.4 million. In the intersectoral severity of needs analysis, the HNO also classifies five counties – Duk, Fangak, Pibor, Cueibet and Rumbek East – to be in catastrophic need and another 71 counties to be in extreme need.

After the successful conclusion of the first round of the expanded FSNMS+ assessment in urban areas and IDP sites (FSNMS+ 2020), the second round enlarged its coverage to include the urban areas of Bor and Yei. The assessment took place after the former PoC sites in Juba, Wau and Bentiu transitioned out of their special status under the protection of the United Nations Mission In South Sudan (UNMISS) in 2020 and early 2021. All five targeted camps continue to be affected by congestion and sub-standard living conditions that are only partly mitigated by access to humanitarian services.

Methodology

Sampling Frame Development

In Malakal PoC site, shelter footprints extracted from high-resolution satellite imagery in combination with headcount data from April 2021 provided by Danish Refugee Council were used as the sampling frame for the study, following a desk review to identify and remove non-residential shelters. To guide field teams during data collection, updated maps of the camp were produced based on high-resolution satellite imagery and information on the location of inhabited and deserted shelters from the population count. As per the April 2021 headcount, Malakal PoC site hosted a total of 5,821 households and 34,056 individuals.

Sampling Design

In Malakal PoC site, the study adopted a stratified sampling strategy designed to be approximately self-weighting. The sample was distributed between the IDP camp blocks proportional to the number of shelters in each block.

Enumerators were provided with the address number of the sampled shelter as well as georeferenced maps helping them locate the sampled shelters on hand-held devices and were instructed to interview the household living in the pinpointed shelter or record it as non-existent, empty[3], non-residential or destroyed or abandoned. Informed consent was sought prior to each interview, with non-consenting households recorded as such in the data collection tool. Random reserve shelters were used as a replacement in case of non-response or other sampling failure.

For the purposes of the survey, a household was defined as a group of people who regularly eat out of the same pot (sharing food and other resources) and sleep in the same shelter or combination of shelters most nights of the week, regardless of family relationships. When multiple households lived in the same shelter, enumerators used a simple paper draw to randomly select one.

The targeted sample size of 404 households from 30 camp blocks was calculated to provide a 5 per cent margin of error on a 95 per cent confidence interval using the standard formula, assuming a design factor of 1 and a non-response rate of 10 per cent. While a higher sample size had initially been considered to enable further sub-group analysis, this was ruled out due to the increased risk of COVID-19 transmission.

Data Collection

Data collection in Malakal PoC site took place in October and November 2021, and 391 households were successfully interviewed. Challenges included non-response and empty and destroyed shelters in blocks.

To prevent transmission of COVID-19 during the survey, enumerators were instructed to carry out the interviews with sufficient physical distancing outside the respondents' shelters and were provided with masks and hand sanitizer for use during data collection.

---

3   Before recording a shelter as empty, enumerators had to visit it at least twice at different times of the day and attempt to set up an appointment through neighbors.

Statistical Analysis

Confidence intervals – denoted in the summary text by a (±X.X) – were calculated using R's survey package[4] to account for the survey's sampling design (stratification). Descriptive statistics reflect unweighted means and standard errors since the sample was designed to be approximately self-weighting. While non-response and other sampling failure rates differed across enumeration areas, it was not possible to correct for these differences due to lack of reliable, geographically disaggregated population estimates and the likelihood of correlation between sampling failure rates and error in the estimated number of residential buildings used as a proxy for population. The following table shows the deviation between sampled households and shelters in each camp sector.

% SAMPLED HOUSEHOLDS, % SHELTERS AND PERCENTAGE POINT DIFERENCE BY CAMP SECTOR [N IN TABLE]

Sector	N SAMPLED	% SAMPLED	% SHELTERS	P.P. DIFFERENCE
1	179	45.8	45.8	0.0
2	123	31.5	32.7	-1.2
3	39	10.0	9.4	0.6
4	50	12.8	12.1	0.7

Using the estimated proportion of shelters in each block as weights results in slight difference for vulnerability and need indicators. However, because it is not feasible to identify the cause for sampling failure in certain enumeration areas, weighting estimates may result in the introduction of another bias. All findings are therefore reported without correcting weights.

The impossibility of stratifying based on household attributes constrained the ability to carry out representative sub-group analysis and cross-tabulations of needs and vulnerabilities with sufficient statistical confidence. However, given the importance of this analysis for the humanitarian response, indicative findings have been included where relevant. The subset function from R's survey package was used

---

4   Lumey. T. (2020). "Survey: analysis of complex survey samples". R package version 4.0.

IDP SITE BLOCKS IN MALAKAL POC SITE BY NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS

No. of HH surveyed

10   15   20   25   30

to accurately compute confidence intervals for sub-group analysis.

Confidence intervals are a measure of the statistical uncertainty regarding our estimate. The 95 per cent confidence interval will contain the true quantity of interest 95 per cent of the time over repeated samples. This means that if we were to repeat this survey one hundred times under identical conditions, on average ninety-five of the calculated intervals would contain the true value of our target quantity.

The confidence interval does not account for uncertainty due to systematic biases in the sample, such as that due to sampling bias (systematic under or over-representation of households with certain characteristics in the sample) or reporting bias (systematic under or over-reporting of certain indicators by respondents due to their sensitivity, surrounding stigma or perceived incentives). To the extent possible, these sources of bias were minimized through the survey's sampling design, training and monitoring of enumerators, and appropriate communication of the purposes of the study with respondents. A small number of data anomalies that may be due to reporting bias are flagged in the sectoral narratives.

IDP Site Vulnerability Index Calculation

The IDP Site Vulnerability Index (SVI) uses Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to assess the relative impact of a set of high priority indicators on needs and vulnerabilities of households in urban areas. The index summarizes the variation around the complex drivers of vulnerability and need in site settings, or how multiple categories of vulnerability (displacement, disability, poverty, age, gender, etc.), sectoral needs (SNFI, health, WASH, food security, protection, etc.), and broader distributional and societal factors interact and compound each other.

The index ranges from 0 to 100, with 100 signifying the highest level of needs and vulnerability.

Vulnerability is defined as the set of household characteristics that reduces their resilience to internal and external shocks, or capacity to rely on sustainable coping mechanisms, resulting in a higher level of humanitarian needs and likelihood of adverse outcomes unless the household can benefit from appropriate mitigation measures, such as access to humanitarian services.

Index indicators:

Area of origin	Single Head of Household
Disability	Chronic Illness
Shelter Damage	Property Status
Crowding	School Dropout
Access To Sufficient Water	Safe and Timely Access to Water
Access to WASH NFI	Sanitation Facility
Distance to Health Facility	Access to Health Facilities
Security Incidents	Protection Service Availability
GBV Risk	Behavioral Changes in Children
Coping Strategies	Hunger Levels
Livelihoods	Access to Assistance

For a detailed definition of the used indicators and importance of components, see the IDP Site Vulnerability Index and Intersectoral

Population Groups

Displacement and migration status are self-reported by households. Population group definitions are based on IOM DTM Mobility Tracking.

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[5]. There is no time limit on being an IDP. This status ends when the person is able and willing to return to their original home or makes a free choice to settle in a new location[6].

Returnees

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 but who are unable to reach their former home are still displaced and as such not counted in the returnee category.

Relocated Persons

A person who was displaced from their habitual residence either within South Sudan (former IDP) or abroad (former refugee), who has since relocated voluntarily (independently or with the help of other actors) to a location other than their former habitual residence, without an intention to return to their former habitual residence.

5   UN OCHA. (2004). *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*. Article 2.
6   These conditions for ending IDP status are in line with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's *Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons* (April 2010).

Demographics and Household Vulnerabilities

In this assessment, 83.9 (±3.2) per cent of responses are given by heads of household (HoH), while 16.1 (±3.2) per cent of households are represented by some other household member. These respondents tend to be younger members of the household (average age of 25 years compared to 37 years for heads of households responding).

The average household size is 6.4 (±0.3) persons, with a median of 6 persons. The average size of households hosting individuals is 7.4 (±0.6) persons whereas the size of households not hosting any individuals is 6.4 (±0.3) persons. Most households are headed by women (68.0% ±4.6%). Compared to their female counterparts, male heads of household are more likely to have attended secondary or university education. 21.1 (±1.4) per cent of household members are between the ages 0 and 5, and 31.7 (±1.7) per cent are between the ages of 6 and 17. Only 3.8 (± 0.7) per cent are above the age of 60.

Among all households, 10.7 (±3.1) per cent of households have at least one member with a chronic illness, and 2.8 (±1.6) per cent report to have at least one member with a disability, as measured by the Washington Group Short Set questions. In comparison to figures from previous assessments and national estimates of the prevalence of persons with disabilities[1], these figures should be treated as an estimation of the lower bound of the real prevalence.

68.0%
Female-headed HH

83.9%
of respondents were the head of household

Disability Prevalence
2.8%

Chronic Illness Prevalence
10.7%

% INDIVIDUALS BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER [N IND. = 2,516; N HH = 391]

% HH WITH A MEMBER WITH A DISABILITY OR CHRONIC ILLNESS [N = 391]

% MALE AND FEMALE-HEADED HH BY AGE AND EDUCATION LEVEL OF HH HEAD [N = 391]

HH with vulnerable heads of HH
9.0%

Children and/or elderly-only HH
1.5%

Single female-headed HH
2.3%

Single male-headed HH
5.1%

% HH BY NATIONALITY [N = 391]

Nationality	%	LL	UL
South Sudan	97.4%	95.9%	98.9%
Mixed Foreign	2.0%	0.7%	3.4%
Sudan	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%

1   The 2022 Humanitarian Needs Overview applies a standard rate of 15 per cent for their sectoral and inter-sectoral analysis.

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Displacement History

Most of the surveyed households (99.0% ±1.0%) were initially displaced from within Upper Nile state, with Malakal, Panyikang and Fashoda being the most prominent counties. 6.9 (±2.5) per cent have spent time abroad as refugees or asylum seekers since being first displaced, with most having stayed in Sudan, Kenya or Uganda. The main reason for displacement is personal insecurity due to generalized violence (46.5% ±3.5%) after conflict interrupting access to livelihoods (22.0% ±2.6%). Tha majority (86.2% ±3.4%) arrived in Malakal PoC site between 2013 and 2015.

While 15.6 (±2.9) per cent of households report having been displaced more than once since 2013, over a quarter of households (28.4% ±3.8%) have stayed in another location since being first displaced besides Malakal PoC site, most of which moved to the site from Malakal and Fashoda counties. Of these households, about one in three moved to the site due to conflict interrupting access to livelihoods (26.1% ±6.2%).

The majority of households report being in need of CCCM or site management services (97.2% ±1.6%). Most are in need of care and maintenance (77.5% ±2.8%), complaint and feedback mechanisms (56.5% ±3.6%) and capacity-building training (46.0% ±3.9%) services.

Spent time abroad as refugee
6.9%

Displaced multiple times since 2013
**15.6%**

Most households come from:

MALAKAL   PANYIKANG   FASHODA

97.2% of households are in need of CCCM or site management services

% HH BY YEAR OF ARRIVAL IN CURRENT SITE AND COUNTY OF LOCATION BEFORE MOVING TO SITE [N = 391]

Legend: Same County, Same State, Different State, Abroad

2013: 26.9%
2014: 29.2%
2015: 30.2%
2016: 3.3%
2017: 5.4%
2018: 2.0%
2019: 1.0%
2020: 0.0%
2021: 2.0%

% HH THAT STAYED IN ANOTHER LOCATION BEFORE BY MAIN REASON FOR MOVING TO SITE (TOP 5)[1] [N = 111]

REASON	%	LL	UL
Conflict - No Access To Livelihoods	26.1%	19.9%	32.3%
Personal Insecurity (Generalized)	22.5%	15.2%	29.8%
Personal Insecurity (Targeted)	16.2%	9.9%	22.5%
Food Insecurity	12.6%	7.4%	17.8%
Site Has Better Access To Food	10.8%	6.7%	15.0%

% HH BY NUMBER OF TIMES FORCIBLY DISPLACED SINCE 2013 [N = 391]

1: 84.4%
2: 11.0%
3: 3.6%
4: 1.0%
5: 0.0%
6+: 0.0%

% HH PREVIOUSLY ABROAD BY COUNTRY OF REFUGE [N = 27]

Sudan: 92.6%
Kenya: 3.7%
Uganda: 3.7%

% HH BY MAIN REASON FOR FIRST DISPLACEMENT SINCE 2013 (TOP 5) [N = 391]

REASON	%	LL	UL
Personal Insecurity (Generalized)	46.5%	43.1%	50.0%
Conflict - No Access To Livelihoods	22.0%	19.4%	24.6%
Personal Insecurity (Targeted)	11.0%	8.1%	13.9%
Communal Clashes	7.2%	5.4%	8.9%
Natural Disaster Destroyed Home	6.1%	4.8%	7.5%

1   The questionnaire included answer choices for both push and pull factors to moving to the IDP site. However, less than one per cent selected pull factors, such as 'Joining my friends and family' and 'This location has better access to food'.

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Return Intentions

While the majority of households intends to return to their area of habitual residence (71.6% ±3.9%), a substantial proportion is unsure about their plans for the next two years (17.9% ±3.3%). Only 1.8 (±1.3) per cent intend to relocate to a different location, and 8.7 (±2.6) per cent intend to remain in the site.

Of the households intending to return or relocate, over half of households (57.5% ±4.3%) do not know when to do so while 16.4 (±3.5) per cent intend to return or relocate after a year. Only 7.7 (±2.9) per cent intend to return or relocate within six months. Those intending to return within six months are mainly destined to locations in Malakal, Panyikang, Renk and Cueibet counties. Those unsure of the timing of return or relocation intend to return or relocate to locations in Malakal, Panyikang, Fashoda and Baliet counties.

Households not reutrning or relocating within six months cite insecurity (76.0% ±4.4%), a lack of services (33.1% ±4.6%), houses or land being destroyed (30.3% ±4.5%) and discrimination (25.9% ±4.6%) in their area of return as the top barriers preventing sooner return or relocation.

Within the next two years, households intend to...

Return **71.6%**   Relocate **1.8%**

Remain **8.7%**

57.5% do not know when to return or relocate

7.6% intend to return or relocate within 6 months

% HH BY INTENTION TO RETURN OR RELOCATE IN NEXT TWO YEARS [N = 391]

% HH NOT RETURNING / RELOCATING WITHIN SIX MONTHS BY BARRIERS TO (SOONER) LEAVE SITE (TOP 10) [N = 175]

Barrier	%	LL	UL
Insecurity In Area Of Return (AOR)	76.0%	71.7%	80.4%
Lack Of Services In AOR	33.1%	28.5%	37.7%
House / Land Destroyed	30.3%	25.7%	34.8%
Discrimination In AOR	25.9%	21.2%	30.5%
No Means	20.5%	16.6%	24.4%
Lack Of Livelihoods In AOR	16.4%	12.7%	20.1%
House / Land Occupied	15.8%	12.2%	19.3%
Disagreement About Destination	6.9%	4.4%	9.5%
No Barriers	0.6%	0.0%	1.5%
Other	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%

% HH REPORTING LACK OF SERVICES IN AREA OF RETURN AS A KEY BARRIER BY TYPE OF LACKING SERVICES [N = 105]

% HH INTENDING TO RETURN / RELOCATE BY TIMEFRAME [N = 287]

DESTINATION OF RETURN OR RELOCATION [N = 287]

Same County **90.9%**   Different State **0.7%**

Different County Same State **8.4%**   Abroad **0.0%**

% HH INTENDING TO RETURN OR RELOCATE BY MAIN REASON FOR CHOOSING TO GO TO LOCATION (TOP 5) [N = 287]

Driver	%	LL	UL
Improvement Of Security	80.5%	76.8%	84.2%
Access To Food Distribution	28.9%	24.2%	33.6%
Access To Health / Education	27.9%	23.0%	32.7%
Cultural Ties	20.6%	16.6%	24.6%
Better Economic Opportunities	17.4%	13.5%	21.3%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

The majority of households reports that improvements in the security situation in their area of return influences their decision to return (85.4% ±2.7%), followed by resolution of communal clashes (25.3% ±3.2%) and improvements in humanitarian support (18.4% ±3.5%).

Only one in five households (22.3% ±3.1%) know someone personally who has returned to their former area of habitual residence, including family members, friends and members of the community. Households displaced from locations outside of Malakal county are more likely to know someone personally who has returned compared to those displaced from locations within the county (32.6% ±13.3% vs 21.0% ±3.4%). Over four in five households (85.7% ±2.7%) report that they require more information on their preferred destination. They cite information on the infrastructure (67.5% ±4.5%), the security and safety situation (60.0% ±4.1%) and education services or facilities (59.4% ±4.5%) as the most needed information.

Households report that the most needed household-level assistance to support their return are means to repair their shelters (87.7% ±3.1%) or set up a business (39.9% ±4.2%), food assistance in their area of return (34.8% ±4.2%) and transportation assistance (32.3% ±4.1%).

Only 4.2 (±2.2) per cent of households intending to return or relocate within the next two years indicate that they are not planning to leave the site with their whole family, mostly due to disagreements on where to go.

Main information needed on area of return:

**INFRASTRUCTURE   SECURITY**
EDUCATION

22.3%
know somebody personally who has returned to their former area of habitual residence

39.1%
feel pressured to return or leave the site even though they want to stay

% HH BY GENERAL IMPROVEMENTS IN AREA OF RETURN INFLUENCING DECISION (TOP 5) [N = 391]

Improvement	%	LL	UL
Security Situation In AOR	85.4%	82.8%	88.1%
Resolution Of Communal Clashes	25.3%	22.1%	28.5%
Humanitarian Support	18.4%	14.9%	21.9%
Gov. Assurance On Safety	16.6%	13.5%	19.8%
End Of Discrimination For My Group	15.9%	12.4%	19.3%

% HH NEEDING INFORMATION ON AREA OF RETURN BY TYPE OF INFORMATION [N = 335]

% HH BY HH-LEVEL ASSISTANCE NEEDED TO SUPPORT RETURN (TOP 5) [N = 391]

Assistance	%	LL	UL
Means To Repair My Shelter	87.7%	84.7%	90.8%
Means To Set Up A Business	39.9%	35.7%	44.1%
Food Assistance In Area Of Return	34.8%	30.5%	39.0%
Transportation Assistance	32.2%	28.2%	36.3%
Seeds And Tools For Farming	29.2%	25.4%	32.9%

% HH KNOWING ANYONE WHO HAS RETURNED TO FORMER AREA OF HABITUAL RESIDENCE [N = 391]

From Malakal   From Other Counties

% HH NOT PLANNING TO LEAVE SITE WITH ENTIRE FAMILY BY REASON FOR SEPARATION [N = 12]

Reason	%	LL	UL
Disagreement On Where To Go	50.0%	21.4%	78.6%
See Conditions In Destination First	50.0%	21.7%	78.3%
Not Enough Money For Transport	16.7%	0.0%	38.0%
Not Be Possible For Whole Family To Make A Living There	8.3%	0.0%	24.0%
Keep Access To Services In The Site	8.3%	0.0%	24.0%

% SUB-GROUP HH FEELING PRESSURED TO RETURN / LEAVE SITE EVEN THOUGH THEY WANT TO STAY

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Mobility

Over two in five households (40.4% ±3.9%) have close family members living elsewhere in South Sudan (13.6% ±3.2%), abroad (14.1% ±3.3%) or both (12.8% ±3.1%). 27.1 (±4.1) per cent of households have children living elsewhere, mostly to attend studies (56.4% ±8.6%) or because they got married (30.0% ±7.6%).

Less than one in ten households (8.7% ±2.8%) possesses identification documents for all their members, while in 44.2 (±4.4) per cent none of the members do. Households that were displaced from locations within Malakal county are significantly more likely to lack IDs than households displaced from other locations (46.3% ±4.8% vs 27.9% ±13.2%).

Three in five households (61.9% ±4.5%) leave the site on a daily or weekly basis, most of whom do so to collect firewood (30.2% ±5.3%) or for regular employment purposes (28.5% ±4.9%). Members of female-headed households are equally likely to leave the site compared to those of male-headed households (62.4% ±8.1% vs 61.7% ±5.5%).

Less than one in ten households has experienced challenges in the 12 months preceding the assessment affecting their ability to travel safely within South Sudan (4.9% ±2.1%), abroad (1.5% ±1.2%) or both (2.6% ±1.5%).

44.2% of households do not have IDs for any household member

Family Living Elsewhere

Abroad **26.9%** In South Sudan **26.4%**

9.0% faced travel challenges (internal and abroad) affecting their safety in past 12 months

% SUB-GROUP HH WITH CLOSE FAMILY CURRENTLY LIVING ELSEWHERE

Legend: Overall | Prev. Abroad | From Malakal | From Other Counties

% HH WITH CHILDREN LIVING ELSEWHERE BY REASON [N = 116]

Reason	%	LL	UL
Attend Studies	56.4%	47.8%	64.9%
Married	30.0%	22.4%	37.6%
Missing (Left And No News)	22.7%	16.1%	29.3%
Seek Employment	15.5%	9.3%	21.6%
Visit Family Members Elsewhere	12.7%	6.6%	18.8%
Sent To Relatives	9.1%	3.8%	14.4%
Joined Army / Armed Groups	5.5%	1.3%	9.6%
Other	4.5%	0.7%	8.4%
Kidnapped	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No Answer	5.5%	1.3%	9.6%

% SUB-GROUP HH WITHOUT ACCESS TO VALID IDENTITY DOCUMENTATION FOR ALL MEMBERS

% HH BY ACCESS TO VALID IDENTITY DOCUMENTATION FOR THEIR HH MEMBERS [N = 391]

ID	%	LL	UL
All HH Members	8.7%	5.9%	11.5%
Not In Possession	9.0%	6.4%	11.5%
Some HH Members	32.2%	28.0%	36.4%
No HH Member	44.2%	39.9%	48.6%
Don't Know	5.9%	3.9%	7.9%
No Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

% HH BY FREQUENCY OF ANY MEMBER OF HH LEAVING THE SITE [N = 408]

Legend: Female | Male

% HH LEAVING THE SITE DAILY / WEEKLY BY REASON (TOP 5) [N = 275]

Reason	%	LL	UL
Collect Firewood	30.2%	24.8%	35.5%
Regular Employment	28.5%	23.6%	33.4%
To Buy Things / Go To The Market	20.7%	16.3%	25.0%
Farming / Fishing / Livestock	15.7%	11.6%	19.9%
Education	10.7%	7.1%	14.4%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Community-driven Assistance

Overall, 6.1 (±2.4) per cent of households host IDPs (4.9% ±2.0%) and/or unaccompanied, separated or orphaned children (4.1% ±1.9%). Indicatively, over a quarter of households hosting others are worried that they may have to stop hosting some or all of them over the next three months while they still need support, citing a lack of space and bad relations as the main reasons.

In the 12 months preceding the assessment, more households were sending remittances to support friends or relatives living elsewhere (12.8% ±2.9%) than households receiving remittances (11.0% ±2.8%). Indicatively, households displaced from locations outside of Malakal county are more likely to receive remittances compared to those displaced from locations within the county (14.0% ±10.1% vs 10.6% ±3.0%). Three in four households sending remittances did not see any changes in the amounts they sent in the past six months (76.0% ±11.8%), while 20.0 (±11.0) per cent note a slight decrease and 4.0 (±5.4) per cent a substantial decrease in the amount. Indicatively, households receiving remittances are slightly more likely to report a decrease in the amount received in the past six months (30.2% ±13.8%).

6.1%
hosting IDPs or unaccompanied / separated children

Good	IDP - Host Community Relations	Poor
37.3%		**27.4%**

30.2%
experienced a decrease in the amount of remittances received

% HH BY HOSTING IDPS OR UNACCOMPANIED / SEPARATED CHILDREN [N = 391]

Hosting	%	LL	UL
Any Individual	6.1%	3.8%	8.5%
Other IDPs	4.9%	2.8%	6.9%
Unaccompanied Children	4.1%	2.1%	6.0%

% HH WORRIED ABOUT STOPPING HOSTING INDIVIDUALS IN THE NEXT THREE MONTHS BY REASON [N = 7]

Reason	%	LL	UL
Not Enough Space	42.9%	6.9%	78.8%
We Are Not Getting Along	28.6%	0.0%	61.8%
No Longer Able To Bear The Cost	14.3%	0.0%	40.3%
Too Ill To Continue Hosting	14.3%	0.0%	40.3%

% HH SENDING REMITTANCES TO SUPPORT FRIENDS / RELATIVES IN LAST 12 MONTHS [N = 391]

No	87.2%
Yes, To South Sudan	6.4%
Yes, Abroad	4.6%
Yes, Both	1.8%

% HOSTED INDIVIDUALS BY AGE AND GENDER [N HH = 24; N IND = 49]

M | F

Age	M	F
60+	2.0%	2.0%
18-59	12.2%	10.2%
0-17	38.8%	34.7%

29.2%
worried that they might need to stop hosting in the next 3 months

Sending remittances **12.8%** | Receiving remittances **11.0%**

% HH RECEIVING REMITTANCES TO SUPPORT FRIENDS / RELATIVES IN LAST 12 MONTHS [N = 391]

No	89.0%
Yes, To South Sudan	7.4%
Yes, Abroad	2.6%
Yes, Both	1.0%

% HH RECEIVING REMITTANCES FROM FRIENDS / RELATIVES BY CHANGE IN AMOUNT IN LAST SIX MONTHS [N = 43]

Change	%	LL	UL
Increased Substantially	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increased Slightly	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Same	67.4%	53.4%	81.5%
Decreased Slightly	27.9%	14.3%	41.5%
Decreased Substantially	2.3%	0.0%	6.8%
Not Applicable	2.3%	0.0%	6.8%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Shelter and Non-Food Items

One in eight households (12.6% ±5.8%) live in partially damaged or completely destroyed shelters. Affected households report mainly rain (85.7% ±3.4%) to have damaged their shelters.

About nine in ten households (89.8% ±2.9%) own a house or land in South Sudan. Of these households, 85.8 (±3.4) per cent report that their properties are destroyed, damaged and/or deserted, while 26.5 (±3.6) per cent report that theirs is being occupied without permission. Further, 96.8 (±3.1) per cent of these households report being involved in open disputes relating to their property. The most common issues leading to open disputes are disputed ownership (41.1% ±8.0%), lack or loss of tenancy or ownership documents (31.5% ±7.6%) and unlawful occupation (30.6% ±7.2%). 43.5 (±7.4) per cent of affected households report that they did not take any action. 39.5 (±6.9) per cent report using traditional courts while 29.0 (±6.9) per cent report using community leaders or chiefs to resolve disputes. 32.3 (±6.6) per cent rely on formal dispute resolution mechanisms.

28.4 (±4.2) per cent of households live in shelters made of only one room. 44.8 (±4.5) per cent do not have security risk mitigation measures (such as doors, locks or lighting) in place.

Households living in shelters that are

partially damaged   completely destroyed
12.0%   **0.3%**

89.5%
own a house/land in South Sudan

Households in shelter
with four or more   **52.5%**
persons per room

% HH LIVING IN SHELTERS BY SHELTER CONDITION [N = 391]

Shelter Condition	%	LL	UL
Good Condition	37.6%	33.8%	41.4%
Minimally Damaged	50.1%	45.8%	54.5%
Partially Damaged	12.0%	9.0%	15.0%
Completely Destroyed	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%

% HH BY STATUS OF HOUSES / LAND OWNED IN SOUTH SUDAN (MULTIPLE OPTION) [N = 351]

Destroyed 61.8%
Damaged 34.2%
Occupied Without Permission 26.5%
Deserted / Abandoned 16.5%
Used By My Family 2.6%
Sold 1.7%
I Do Not Know 1.4%
Renting To Someone 0.6%
Other 0.0%
No Answer 0.0%

% HH BY MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY FOR COOKING [N = 391]

Firewood 54.5%
Charcoal 42.7%
No Cooking 1.8%
Other 0.8%
Grass 0.3%

% HH BY NUMBER OF ROOMS / PARTITIONED SPACES IN SHELTER [N = 391]

1 — 28.4%
2 — 54.0%
3 — 13.8%
4 — 2.3%
5+ — 1.5%

44.8%
do not have security risk mitigation measures in place

% HH BY MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY FOR LIGHTING [N = 391]

Torch 47.3%
Candle Wax 30.7%
Other 6.9%
No Lighting 6.1%
Firewood 3.8%
Solar Power 3.8%
Grass 0.5%
Paraffin 0.3%
Private Electricity 0.3%
Public Electricity 0.3%

HLP DISPUTE INVOLVEMENT

| None	Disputed ownership	Document loss
3.2%	**41.1%**	**31.5%**

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Education

With an attendance rate of 49.6 (±3.6) per cent, over half of all children did not regularly attend formal school in the current school year (2021-2022), defined as attending an institution within a system of full-time education developed by and overseen by the National Ministry of Education. 10.4 (±2.8) per cent of children dropped out of school in the 2021-2022 school year. Boys are slightly more likely to be attending schools compared to girls. Boys between the ages of 14 and 17 and girls between the ages of 6 and 13 are more likely to drop out. Indicatively, male-headed households are more likely to have children attending schools than female-headed households (55.0% ±7.9% vs 48.1% ±4.0%).

The top barrier that boys and girls face to accessing education are financial issues (34.0% ±4.1% for boys; 35.3% ±4.3% for girls). Notably, households see marriage or pregnancy closure of schools as a key barrier to education particularly for girls (11.0% ±2.7%). 72.4 (±3.8) per cent of households report that it takes less than half an hour by foot to reach the nearest functional education facility.

Estimates of attendance and dropout rates were calculated based on the total number of children reported in the household demographics section.

50.4% of children did not attend formal school in the 2021-2022 school year

**10.4%** of children dropped out of school in the 2021-2022 school year

14.1% of households received training in the past 12 mo.

Top trainings:
Nutrition
Agriculture

Attendance rate of children in

Female-headed households	Male-headed households
48.1%	**55.0%**

Dropout rate of children in

Female-headed households	Male-headed households
11.9%	**5.0%**

% HH BY WALKING DISTANCE TO NEAREST FUNCTIONAL EDUCATION FACILITY [N = 391]

47.8% < 15 Min
24.6% 15-29 Min
12.8% 30-59 Min
1.8% 1-2 H
0.5% > 2 H
12.0% Don't Know
0.5% No Answer

% CHILDREN ATTENDING SCHOOL FOR THE PAST SCHOOL YEAR BY AGE AND GENDER [N IND = 537]

■ M ■ F

14-17 **15.1%** ... **11.9%**
6-13 **30.7%** ... **30.2%**
3-5 **6.1%** ... **6.0%**

% CHILDREN HAVING DROPPED OUT OF SCHOOL IN THE PAST SCHOOL YEAR BY AGE AND GENDER [N IND = 113]

■ M ■ F

14-17 **24.8%** ... **13.3%**
6-13 **20.4%** ... **26.5%**
3-5 **8.0%** ... **7.1%**

% HH RECEIVING TRAINING IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS BY TYPE OF TRAINING [N = 55]

Training	%	LL	UL
Agriculture	34.5%	22.2%	46.9%
Nutrition	20.0%	9.4%	30.6%
Other	14.5%	5.5%	23.6%
Childcare	10.9%	2.6%	19.2%
Business Skills Training	9.1%	1.4%	16.7%
Functional Adult Literacy (FAL)	5.5%	0.0%	11.2%
Vocational Training	5.5%	0.0%	11.5%

Top barriers to education girls and boys face

Financial Issues **35.3%** / **34.0%**

Closure due to COVID-19 **10.7%** / **12.0%**

Marriage / Pregnancy **11.0%** / **2.0%**

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

Overall, 37.3 (±3.9) per cent of households lack access to a safe and timely water source[1], with households across different sub-groups faring similarly. The lack of access is mostly driven by the fact that 9.7 (±2.7) per cent feel unsafe when collecting water from their main water source in the last two weeks and 29.7 (±3.3) per cent need more than 30 minutes to collect their water. As water is supplied by the camp, the majority of households need less than 30 minutes to collect water (70.3% ±3.3%). On average, households use 9.8 liters per household member per day for cooking, washing and drinking.

The main water sources for households are public taps serving more than five households (67.5% ±3.0%) and tap stands serving less than five households 31.5% ±3.1%), both of which are considered safe sources for drinking water. All households treat their water, with the majority using chlorine (96.7% ±1.6%).

The survey did not include questions about the cost of water but asked about the change in the price experienced by households in the past six months. 83.6 (±2.9) per cent of households report that the price of water has not changed, while 11.0 (±2.5) per cent report an increase.

37.3% lack access to a safe and timely water source

11.5% cannot meet any of their water needs

Main drinking water source:

PUBLIC TAP SERVING MORE THAN 5 HHS

Households not having enough water to meet needs:

Drinking	**12.0%**
Cooking	**14.1%**
Handwashing	**23.8%**
Personal hygiene	**55.5%**
Domestic purposes	**89.5%**

% HH BY MAIN SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER [N = 391]

Source	%	LL	UL
Public Tap (> 5 HH)	67.5%	64.5%	70.5%
Tap Stand (< 5 HH)	31.5%	28.4%	34.5%
Bottled Water	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Buy Water From Tank / Truck	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Other	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Shallow Well / River / Stream / Pond	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%

% SUB-GROUP HH WITH ACCESS TO SAFE AND TIMELY WATER

Group	N	%	LL	UL
Overall	391	62.7%	58.7%	66.6%
Female HoH	266	62.8%	57.7%	67.9%
Male HoH	125	62.4%	54.3%	70.5%
Prev. Abroad	27	55.6%	36.8%	74.4%
From Malakal	348	61.8%	57.6%	66.0%
From Other Counties	43	69.8%	56.0%	83.6%

% HH BY TIME TAKEN TO COLLECT WATER [N = 391]

- < 30 Min. — 70.3%
- 30 Min. - 1 H — 22.5%
- 1 H - Half A Day — 7.2%
- Half A Day — 0.0%
- > Half A Day — 0.0%
- No Answer — 0.0%

% HH BY MOST COMMON WATER TREATMENT [N = 391]

- Chlorine/ PUR Powder — 96.7%
- None — 3.1%
- Solar Disinfection — 0.3%

% SUB-GROUP HH FEELING UNSAFE COLLECTING WATER

Group	N	%	LL	UL
Overall	391	9.7%	7.0%	12.5%
Female HoH	266	10.5%	7.1%	13.9%
Male HoH	125	8.1%	3.3%	12.9%
Prev. Abroad	27	22.2%	6.6%	37.9%
From Malakal	348	9.8%	6.8%	12.7%
From Other Counties	43	9.5%	0.7%	18.4%

1   "Access to safe and timely water" is fulfilled by the following criteria: the main water source is either deep borehole / protected well, tapstand serving no more than five households, public tapstand serving more than five households, bottled water or piped water into the house; households do not feel unsafe when collecting water; and households need less than 30 minutes to collect water.

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

53.7 (±4.5) per cent of households do not have access to basic WASH NFIs, including at least two jerrycans in good conditions and soap. 24.6 (±3.4) per cent of households do not have solid, liquid or powder soap at home. Of the households without soap, more than half (51.5% ±5.8%) state that they ran out of soap or detergent.

Most households (77.5% ±3.5%) report that women use sanitary pads in dealing with menstruation. 5.9 (±2.1) per cent report that women use nothing.

No surveyed household reports having to rely on buckets, bushes or open spaces for defecation. The most commonly cited sanitation location are communal latrines, with water-seal or pour-flush latrines (36.1% ±3.8%) or improved pit latrines with concrete slabs (32.5% ±3.5%) being the most common types. Of households with children under 5, one in ten (9.8% ±3.2%) indicate that children defecate openly while 60.2 (±4.7) per cent state that their children use buckets or plastic bags. 29.3 (±4.7) per cent report that their children use communal, shared or family latrines.

For disposing waste, most households discard their solid waste in garbage bins (82.6% ±3.0%) or pits (13.6% ±2.4%), while 2.8 (±1.5%) per cent rely on solid waste truck collection.

53.7%
of households do not have access to WASH NFI

NFI

Households not using soap

24.6%

Main reason for not using soap

RAN OUT / USED IT ALL

Main female hygiene product:

SANITARY PADS

% SUB-GROUP HH WITHOUT ACCESS TO SOAP

19.8%	22.6%	13.6%	40.0%	19.9%	18.5%	
Overall	Female HoH	Male HoH	Prev. Abroad	From Malakal	From Other Counties	

% HH BY WASTE DISPOSAL LOCATION [N = 391]

Location	%	LL	UL
Garbage Bin	82.6%	79.6%	85.6%
Garbage Pit	13.6%	11.1%	16.0%
Solid Waste Truck Collection	2.8%	1.3%	4.3%
Burn	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%
On The Street	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Other	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%

% HH BY ACCESS TO SANITATION [N = 391]

Location	%	LL	UL
Communal Latrine - Water-seal / Pour-flush Latrine	36.1%	32.2%	39.9%
Communal Latrine - Improved Pit Latrines With Concrete Slab	32.5%	29.0%	35.9%
Family Latrine - Improved Pit Latrines With Concrete Slab	13.6%	11.7%	15.4%
Communal Latrine - Traditional Pit Latrine / Open Pit	8.2%	6.1%	10.3%
Family Latrine - Traditional Pit Latrine / Open Pit	6.4%	4.7%	8.1%
Other	3.1%	1.5%	4.6%
Family Latrine - Water-seal / Pour-flush Latrine	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%

% HH BY TIMES WHEN THEY USUALLY WASH HANDS [N = 391]

Timing	%	LL	UL
Before Eating	99.2%	98.4%	100%
After Defecation	88.2%	85.4%	91.0%
Before Cooking	82.4%	79.2%	85.5%
Before Breastfeeding	36.5%	32.0%	41.1%
Before Feeding Children	23.7%	19.8%	27.6%
After Handling A Child's Stool	11.7%	8.8%	14.7%
After Interacting With People	5.4%	3.1%	7.6%
After Coughing / Sneezing	2.3%	0.8%	3.8%
Other	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
No Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

% HH BY PRODUCT/MEASURE FOR DEALING WITH MENSTRUATION [N = 391]

77.5%	12.8%	5.9%	0.8%	3.1%
Sanitary Pads	Piece Of Cloth	Nothing	Other	- Not Know / Prefer Not To Answer

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Healthcare and COVID-19

About one in three households (33.0% ±4.1%) had a health problem and needed to access healthcare in the past three months, of which most were unable to do so (55.0% ±7.8%). Indicatively, households who were previously abroad as refugees are more likely to lack access to healthcare compared to other households. Of the households that could access health care, 10.3 (±7.6) per cent needed more than one hour by foot to reach the nearest functional health facility. This highlights the difficulty of households to access timely health services when they need them.

Among households with unmet healthcare needs, the main barriers to access are long waiting times (56.3% ±10.9%), a lack of staff (28.2% ±9.2%) and the distance to the health facility (18.3% ±3.8%). 23.0 (±3.6) per cent have attempted to access ante-natal care services.

Most households aware of COVID-19 know that washing hands with soap (95.1% ±2.1%), avoiding close contact with sick people (73.9% ±3.0%), using hand sanitizer frequently (61.1% ±3.8%) and staying at home (54.5% ±4.3%) are prevention measures against the transmission of COVID-19. However, only less than half know of other preventive measures, such as social distancing or using masks, and only 1.8 (±1.2) per cent know of vaccination.

Experienced health issues in past 3 mo. **33.0%**

Needing care who were unable to access **55.0%**

Accessed ante-natal care services **23.0%**

Ante-natal care services not available **0.0%**

% HH BY WALKING DISTANCE TO NEAREST FUNCTIONAL HEALTH FACILITY [N = 391]

% HH WITH UNMET HEALTH CARE NEEDS BY BARRIER TO ACCESS IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS [N = 67]

Barrier	%	LL	UL
Long Waiting Time	56.3%	45.4%	67.2%
Lack Of Staff	28.2%	19.0%	37.4%
None	25.4%	15.9%	34.8%
Distance	18.3%	10.0%	26.6%
Specific Service Needed Unavailable	15.5%	7.1%	23.9%
Only Accessible At Certain Times	9.9%	3.1%	16.6%
Incorrect Medications	9.9%	3.2%	16.5%
Language Barriers	5.6%	0.2%	11.0%
Other	4.2%	0.0%	8.9%
No Functional Facility Nearby	2.8%	0.0%	6.7%
Unaffordable Treatment Cost	2.8%	0.0%	6.7%
No Means Of Transport	2.8%	0.0%	6.7%
Did Not Need To Access	1.4%	0.0%	4.1%
Distrust Services	1.4%	0.0%	4.1%
Unaffordable Consultation Cost	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disability	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Insecurity	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Untrained Staff	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Discrimination	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

% SUB-GROUP HH UNAWARE OF COVID-19

% HH THAT TOOK ACTION AGAINST COVID-19 BY MEASURE (TOP 5) [N = 374]

Action	%	LL	UL
Washing Hands With Soap	95.1%	93.1%	97.2%
Avoiding Close Contact With Sick People	73.9%	70.1%	77.8%
Using Hand Sanitizer Frequently	61.1%	57.3%	64.9%
Staying At Home	54.5%	50.2%	58.7%
Social Distancing	43.0%	38.8%	47.1%

% SUB-GROUP HH WITH HEALTH ISSUES UNABLE TO ACCESS HEALTH CARE WHEN NEEDED IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS

Group	N	%	LL	UL
Overall	129	45.0%	37.2%	52.7%
Female HoH	89	44.9%	35.2%	54.7%
Male HoH	40	45.0%	30.3%	59.7%
Prev. Abroad	18	5.6%	0.0%	16.2%
From Malakal	111	46.8%	38.3%	55.4%
From Other Counties	18	33.3%	11.7%	55.0%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Economic Vulnerabilities and Livelihoods

Over one in three households (32.7% ±3.8%) report a decrease in their income level or amount during the past six months, with 7.4 (±2.3) per cent reporting a substantial decrease. Households relying on begging, kinship and the sale of humanitarian aid are indicatively less likely to experience a decrease in income levels than those relying on other livelihood activities (27.5% ±9.1% vs 34.1% ±4.6%).

Own agricultural production (28.6% ±3.5%), begging, support from kins and sale of humanitarian aid (20.5% ±3.5%) and casual work or petty trading (10.2% ±2.4%) are the top three current sources of livelihoods. These have changed significantly from the top livelihoods prior to displacement, when own agricultural production (39.4% ±4.0%), skilled labor (12.8% ±3.1%) and salaried work (12.0% ±2.9%) ranked highest. Some households that relied on own agricultural production prior to displacement reskilled to engage in the sale of firewood and other essential items (11.0% ±4.7%), while a significant proportion now relies on begging, kinship or the sale of aid (16.9% ±4.7%).

Overall, 48.1 (±3.9) per cent of households have experienced difficulties or shocks in the six months prior to the assessment.

Experienced a decrease in income in past 6 months **32.7%**

Experienced an economic schock in past 6 months **48.1%**

Top economic shocks experienced in the past 6 mo.

⚠️ *Unusually high food prices*

⚠️ *Unusually high non-food prices*

⚠️ *No food in markets*

% HH BY MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITY FOR GETTING FOOD AND INCOME IN LAST 3 MONTHS AND BEFORE DISPLACEMENT [N = 391]

Before Disp. — Current

% HH BY ASSETS OWNED (TOP 15) [N = 391]

Asset	%	LL	UL
Bed	75.2%	71.7%	78.7%
Sleeping Mat	61.4%	57.1%	65.7%
Mattress	59.8%	55.6%	64.1%
Mosquito Net	50.6%	46.7%	54.6%
Chairs	46.8%	42.6%	51.0%
Blanket	41.7%	37.9%	45.5%
Tables	34.0%	30.1%	37.9%
Phone	26.9%	23.1%	30.6%
Kitchen Utensils	22.8%	19.4%	26.2%
Radio	17.4%	14.0%	20.8%
Stove	7.4%	5.4%	9.4%
TV	6.4%	4.2%	8.6%
Mask For COVID-19	5.9%	3.8%	8.0%
Wheel Barrow	2.6%	1.0%	4.1%
Lighting Tools	2.3%	0.8%	3.8%

% HH BY INCOME LEVEL CHANGE DURING THE PAST SIX MONTHS [N = 391]

% HH BY DIFFICULTIES OR SHOCKS EXPERIENCED IN PAST SIX MONTHS (TOP 5) [N = 391]

| Shock	%	LL	UL
No Shock Experienced	51.9%	48.0%	55.8%
Unusually High Food Prices	35.3%	31.5%	39.1%
Unusually High Non-food Prices	7.9%	5.6%	10.2%
No Foods In Markets	5.4%	3.2%	7.5%
Loss Or Reduced Employment	5.1%	3.1%	7.2%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

30.2 (±3.5) per cent of households spend at least 65 per cent of their total household expenditure on food alone in the past three months while 18.9 (±3.4) per cent spend over 65 per cent of their expenditure on cereals and pulses only on average per month – these households are particularly vulnerable to market shocks. 13.6 (±2.7) per cent of households use over three quarters of their expenditure on food. Indicatively, female-headed households are more affected by high to very high expenditure (over 65%) on food than male-headed households (32.7% ±4.6% vs 24.8% ±7.4%).

Most households households (72.9% ±3.0%) can reach their nearest operational marketplace or grocery store within 30 minutes by foot, with 48.3 (±3.0) per cent needing less than 15 minutes. While 1.3 (±1.1) per cent do not know the distance to the nearest market, 25.8 (±2.9) require more than 30 minutes.

22.3 (±3.6) per cent of households attempted to use or used credit or borrowed money in the three months prior to the assessment, with 13.0 (±3.0) per cent having used credit or borrowed money more than once. Of these households, most did so to purchase food (66.0% ±12.6%).

Despite living in a site, 26.9 (±4.3) per cent have access to land for cultivation, and 6.6 (±2.4) per cent own livestock or farm animals.

Households spending more than 65% of expenditure on food in past 3 months
30.2%

Borrowed / used credit more than once
13.0%

Attempted to borrow but was refused
1.3%

Most households borrowed to
PURCHASE FOOD

% HH BY FREQUENCY USING CREDIT OR BORROWING MONEY IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS [N = 391]

% HH BY PROPORTION OF EXPENDITURE GOING TO FOOD IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS [N = 391]

% HH BY CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED DURING TRAVEL TO MARKET IN THE LAST MONTH [N = 391]

Challenge	%	LL	UL
None	73.7%	69.9%	77.4%
Distance	9.7%	7.1%	12.4%
Too Hot	8.4%	6.0%	10.9%
Floods	4.6%	2.9%	6.3%
Children Have To Join	4.1%	2.1%	6.0%
Lack Of Water And Food On The Way	3.1%	1.6%	4.6%
Other	3.1%	1.4%	4.7%
Conflict / Violence	2.0%	0.7%	3.4%
Checkpoints	1.3%	0.2%	2.4%
Lack Of Shelter On The Way	1.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Struggled To Carry All Purchases	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%
Unsafe	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Robberies / Crime	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
COVID-19 Movement Restrictions	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Markets Closed Due To COVID-19	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%

% HH USING CREDIT OR BORROWING MONEY IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS BY REASON (TOP 5) [N = 87]

Reason	%	LL	UL
Purchase Of Food	86.2%	79.0%	93.4%
Health Care	4.6%	0.2%	9.0%
Payment Of Tuition Fees	4.6%	0.3%	8.9%
Investment In Business/shop	1.1%	0.0%	3.4%
Repair Or Improve House / Shelter	1.1%	0.0%	3.4%

% HH BY WALKING DISTANCE TO NEAREST OPERATIONAL MARKET/GROCERY STORE [N = 391]

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Food Security

On average, households consume cereals on 5.5 (±0.2) days, oil on 5.0 (±0.2) days, sugar on 3.7 (±0.2) days and spices on 3.1 (±0.1) days per week. All other food groups are consumed less than 2.5 days per week. Indicatively, male-headed household consume foods on more days than female-headed households.

Households in the site mainly rely on food assistance for cereals (84.0% ±3.5%) and legumes (54.3% ±5.6%), although a sizeable proportion of households obtains these foods from markets (13.8% ±3.4% and 43.9% ±5.6%), indicating that food assistance does not suffice for many households' subsistence. For fresh foods, such as vegetables and fruits, most households rely on markets (88.2% ±3.5% for vegetables and 69.2% ±14.7% for fruits).

Most households do not purchase any staple foods (45.8% ±3.7%). 15.1 (±3.2) per cent of households purchase their staple foods from the local market within the neighborhood, while 14.8 (±3.1) per cent purchase theirs locally from community members and 12.5 (±1.7) per cent buy theirs from mobile traders. Of households that buy their staple foods, households spend the most in cash or credit on sorghum (flour or grain; 83.0% ±4.5%), fish (35.4% ±5.8%), sugar (27.8% ±5.2%) and vegetable oil (25.9% ±3.9%).

Cereals eaten
5.5 days/week

Vegetables eaten
2.4 days/week

Meat, egg, fish eaten
2.4 days/week

Cereals

Days per week consumed
5.5

Main source: Food Assistance
84.0%

Grains
5.2 Days per week consumed

Roots
0.5 Days per week consumed

Vegetables

Days per week consumed
2.4

Main source: Market
88.2%

Orange vegetables
0.7 Days per week consumed

Leafy vegetables
0.6 Days per week consumed

Spices

Days per week consumed
3.1

Main source: Market
90.4%

Dairy

Days per week consumed
0.6

Main source: Market
84.6%

Meat, egg, fish

Days per week consumed
2.4

Main source: Market
88.6%

Organ meat
0.3 Days per week consumed

Eggs
0.2 Days per week consumed

Flesh meat
1.1 Days per week consumed

Fish
2.4 Days per week consumed

Oil

Days per week consumed
5.0

Main source: Food Assistance
53.4%

Fruits

Days per week consumed
0.8

Main source: Market
69.2%

Legumes

Days per week consumed
1.4

Main source: Food Assistance
54.3%

Sugar

Days per week consumed
3.7

Main source: Market
93.0%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Coping Strategies

Livelihood-based coping strategies illustrate households' capacity to cope with future shocks and maintain productivity. 36.8 (±4.0) per cent of households engaged in at least one type of livelihood-based coping strategy in the 30 days prior to the interview. Most report borrowing money or purchasing food on credit (36.3% ±3.7%), followed by sending household members to eat with another household (29.2% ±3.4%), reducing health or education expenses (28.1% ±3.2%) and reducing resale or agricultural expenses (27.4% ±3.4%) because of a lack of food or money for food. 13.6 (±2.7) per cent indicate engaging in emergency coping strategies.

Overall, 30.9 (±3.6) per cent of households report to have used food-based coping strategies during the 12 months prior to the survey. Over 55.2 (±4.2) per cent ate only a few kinds of foods while 52.7 (±3.9) per cent skipped meals because of a lack of resources to obtain food. Over half of households (55.5% ±3.8%) went to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food in the past 12 months, of which 83.4 (±4.3) per cent did so within four weeks prior to the interview.

Indicatively, female-headed households are more likely to engage in food-based coping strategies in the past 4 weeks while male-headed households are more likely to engage in livelihood-based coping strategies.

Maximum livelihood-based coping strategy

Stress strategies
15.6%

Crisis strategies
7.7%

Emergency strategies
13.6%

Main food-based coping strategy:

EATING LESS VARIED FOODS

% FEMALE AND MALE-HEADED HH BY LIVELIHOOD-BASED COPING STRATEGIES IN THE PAST 30 DAYS [N = 391]


% FEMALE AND MALE-HEADED HH BY FOOD-BASED COPING STRATEGIES IN THE PAST 4 WEEKS [N = 391]

% FEMALE AND MALE-HEADED HH BY MAXIMUM LIVELIHOOD-BASED COPING STRATEGIES IN THE PAST 30 DAYS [N = 391]

% HH BY MAXIMUM LIVELIHOOD-BASED COPING STRATEGIES IN THE PAST 30 DAYS [N = 391]

1   Breakdown of livelihood coping strategies by actions taken within 30 days prior to assessment due to a lack of food or money to buy food: **Stress coping strategies**: sent household members to eat with another household, sold more animals than usual for this time of the year or spent savings, borrowed money or purchased food on credit more than usual during this time of year, sold household assets / goods; **Crisis coping strategies**: reduced expenses on goods for resale or on business / petty trade or agricultural inputs, reduced expenses on health and education, sold productive assets or means of transport; **Emergency coping srategies**: sold house or land or sold or slaughtered the last of their cows and goats, traveled back to the village / out of town to look for / search for (begging) food or other resources, used community leaders or local court to collect debts or bride wealth / dowry or engaged in illegal income activities.

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Communication and Social Cohesion

Radios are the most common main source of information of households (59.6% ±4.0%) followed by public announcements (18.9% ±3.0%). 66.0 (±4.4) per cent of households have at least one member owning a functioning mobile phone that is reliably charged, with adult women (74.4% ±5.2%) and men (58.1% ±5.5%) being the most likely owners.

Although only 14.8 (±3.0) per cent of households have members who participate in social groups, the majority (90.3% ±2.5%) feels welcomed and accepted in their current community. Indicatively, male-headed households are more likely to feel welcome or accepted in their community (93.6% ±4.1% vs 88.7% ±3.5%) while female-headed households are more likely to participate in social groups (15.8% ±3.8% vs 12.8% ±5.7%). Of the households that participate in social groups, over half report that men (58.6% ±12.2%) and women (63.8% ±12.1%) are members.

Most households report that women are either significantly involved (36.8% ±3.4%) or moderately involved (54.2% ±3.6%) in community decision-making. 3.8 (±1.8) per cent state that women never partake in decision-making.

Main source of information

Radio
59.6%

Public announcements
18.9%

14.8%
participate in social groups

90.3%
feel integrated in community

% HH BY MAIN SOURCE OF INFORMATION [N = 391]

Source	%	LL	UL
Radio	59.6%	55.6%	63.6%
Public Announcements	18.9%	15.9%	22.0%
Community Mobilisers	6.1%	4.2%	8.0%
Local Authorities	5.6%	3.7%	7.5%
Word Of Mouth	4.9%	3.3%	6.4%
Television	1.5%	0.3%	2.7%
Church Authorities	1.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Communal Meetings	1.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	1.6%
Social Media	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%

% HH WITH MOBILE PHONES BY MAIN OWNER OF FUNCTIONAL AND CHARGED MOBILE PHONE [N = 258]

Women **74.4%**
Men **58.1%**
Girls **4.7%**
Boys **3.1%**
Prefer Not To Answer **0.0%**

% HH BY EXTENT TO WHICH WOMEN ARE INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY DECISION-MAKING [N = 391]

Significantly **36.8%**
Moderately **54.2%**
Rarely **5.1%**
Never **3.8%**
No Answer **0.0%**

% HH BY EXTENT TO WHICH FEEL WELCOMED IN CURRENT COMMUNITY [N = 391]

Feeling integrated	%	LL	UL
A Lot	38.1%	34.2%	42.0%
Moderately	52.2%	48.1%	56.3%
A Little	6.1%	3.9%	8.4%
Not At All	3.6%	1.9%	5.2%
No Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

% SUB-GROUP HH FEELING INTEGRATED AND WELCOME IN CURRENT COMMUNITY

Overall **90.3%**
Female HoH **88.7%**
Male HoH **93.6%**
Prev. Abroad **85.2%**
From Malakal **90.2%**
From Other Counties **90.7%**

% SUB-GROUP HH INVOLVED IN SOCIAL GROUPS

Overall **14.8%**
Female HoH **15.8%**
Male HoH **12.8%**
Prev. Abroad **25.9%**
From Malakal **13.8%**
From Other Counties **23.3%**

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Protection

One in five households (19.2% ±3.4%) state that they are not aware of any protection services in their area.[1] While most households are aware of police services (33.2% ±3.8%) and GBV-related services being available (66.0% ±4.0%), only very few (5% or less) are aware of any other protection services related to child protection, housing land and property, and others. 3.1 (±1.6) per cent report to have been affected by a safety or security incident in the past month. Indicatively, male members and female members of these households are equally likely to be affected (75.0% ±24.2% vs 75.0% ±23.7%).

Households cite harmful traditional practices (36.6% ±3.9%), emotional violence (31.2% ±3.4%), domestic violence (22.0% ±3.4%) and sexual abuse (19.4% ±2.9%) as the most serious protection concerns in their community at the time of assessment. The top concerns differ between the genders of the head of household. Overall, female-headed households are more likely to flag serious concerns than female-headed households. Female-headed households rank lack of resources and sexual abuse among the top five most serious concerns while male-headed households include sexual exploitation and labor exploitation in their top five most serious concerns.

Unaware of available protection services
19.2%

Affected by security incident
3.1%

Top three protection issues of serious concern:

Harmful traditions
36.6%

Emotional violence
31.2%

Domestic violence
22.0%

% HH BY CHANGE IN LIKELIHOOD OR FREQUENCY OF PROTECTION ISSUES IN COMMUNITY OVER THE PAST SIX MONTHS [N = 391]

Legend: Decreased Slightly | Decreased Substantially | Increased Slightly | Increased Substantially

% HH WITH TRAVEL OFFER IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS BY MEMBER RECEIVING OFFER [N = 38]

Member	%	LL	UL
Women	60.5%	45.3%	75.8%
Men	50.0%	34.2%	65.8%
Girls	13.2%	3.0%	23.3%
Boys	10.5%	1.1%	19.9%
No Answer	2.6%	0.0%	7.7%

% SUB-GROUP HH AFFECTED BY A SECURITY INCIDENT IN THE LAST 30 DAYS

Group	N	%	LL	UL
Overall	391	3.1%	1.4%	4.7%
Female HoH	266	3.0%	1.0%	5.0%
Male HoH	125	3.2%	0.1%	6.3%
Prev. Abroad	27	14.8%	1.5%	28.1%
From Malakal	348	2.9%	1.2%	4.6%
From Other Counties	43	4.7%	0.0%	11.0%

% HH BY AWARENESS OF AVAILABLE PROTECTION SERVICES IN AREA (TOP 5) [N = 391]

Service	%	LL	UL
Health Services (GBV)	55.0%	51.0%	59.0%
Police	33.2%	29.5%	37.0%
Counselling (GBV)	31.2%	27.2%	35.2%
None	19.2%	15.8%	22.6%
MHPSS Services	17.9%	14.6%	21.2%

% HH BY CURRENT PROTECTION ISSUES THAT CAUSE SERIOUS CONCERN (TOP 5) [N = 391]

Concern	%	LL	UL
Harmful Traditions	36.6%	32.7%	40.5%
Emotional Violence	31.2%	27.8%	34.6%
Domestic Violence	22.0%	18.6%	25.4%
Sexual Abuse	19.4%	16.5%	22.3%
Lack Of Resources	19.2%	15.7%	22.6%

1   This question was posed to all respondents, regardless of potential protection services needs.

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Over one in three households (39.9% ±3.0%) report that there are areas in their location that women and / or girls avoid because they feel unsafe. The main areas routes to collect firewood (19.7% ±2.6%), latrines (18.7% ±3.1%) and distribution areas (7.7% ±2.4%), underlining the challenges women face when conducting daily, essential tasks.

Less than one in ten households (9.2% ±2.6%) include at least one member who feels distressed to the extent that they have a lot of difficulty to work or perform daily routine activities. Indicatively, households who had been previously abroad are significantly more likely to experience psychological distress (37.0% ±11.3%).

Although households agree that a lack of education is a main risk to both girls and boys (30.7% ±3.9% for boys and 32.0% ±3.8% for girls), they report vastly different risks for girls and boys in the site. Households are more likely to see boys at risk of substance abuse (50.9% ±3.9%) and involvement in youth gangs (19.2% ±3.3%) while they see girls most at risk of forced or arranged marriage (40.4% ±3.5%) and GBV or sexual exploitation (31.5% ±3.8%).

18.2 (±3.0) per cent of households report seeing behavioral changes in their children during the month before the assessment, with households being equally likely to see changes in boys and girls (16.6% ±2.8% vs 15.6% ±3.0%). The most common behavioral changes are, for boys, disrespectful behavior in the family (9.2% ±2.2%) and, for girls, unwillingness to help in the family (6.4% ±2.0%).

39.9%
report areas in their location avoided by women and / or girls

Areas avoided include:

Firewood Collection Latrines Distributions

9.2%
have household members who feel distressed

18.2%
report behavioral changes in either girls or boys

% HH BY PERCEIVED BIGGEST RISKS CHILDREN UNDER 18 ARE EXPOSED TO IN COMMUNITY [N = 391]

- Boys Girls

% HH OBSERVING BEHAVIORAL CHANGES IN CHILDREN IN THE LAST MONTH

Boys **16.2%**   Girls **15.6%**

% SUB-GROUP HH OBSERVING THREE OR MORE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES IN BOYS IN THE LAST MONTH

% SUB-GROUP HH OBSERVING THREE OR MORE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES IN GIRLS IN THE LAST MONTH

% SUB-GROUP HH WITH HH MEMBERS FEELING DISTRESSED

Group	N	%	LL	UL
Overall	391	9.2%	6.6%	11.8%
Female HoH	266	10.5%	7.2%	13.8%
Male HoH	125	6.4%	2.2%	10.6%
Prev. Abroad	27	37.0%	19.7%	54.4%
From Malakal	348	9.5%	6.8%	12.2%
From Other Counties	43	7.0%	0.0%	14.6%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Humanitarian Assistance

During the three months preceding the assessment, despite humanitarian presence at the site, 71.1 (±3.0) per cent of households received some form of humanitarian assistance, most of them receiving general food for all (95.0% ±2.3%), health services or medicine (11.5% ±3.3%) and WASH materials (10.8% ±3.3%). 70.3 (±3.4) per cent report to be dependent on humanitarian services to cover basic needs such as food, WASH, health and education. Female-headed households are significantly more likely to be dependent on these services compared to male-headed households (75.9% ±4.5% vs 58.4% ±8.0%).

Households report an overall decrease in their ability to access humanitarian or basic services over the six months prior to the asessment, with access having decreased the most in humanitarian food distribution – 39.9 (±3.5) per cent report a slight and 14.6 (±2.5) per cent report a significant decrease in access.

Over one in three households (37.3% ±3.7%) indicate that they do not receive adequate information about the different available humanitarian services. The discrepancy between the shares of households dependent on assistance and having access to information about assistance indicates that many households in need of assistance are not receiving any.

71.1%
received humanitarian assistance in the last 3 mo.

70.3%
are dependent on hum. services to cover basic needs

Most accessed assistance / basic service in last 3 months

GENERAL FOOD

In the last 6 months, access to humanitarian services / basic needs has generally

DECREASED

% SUB-GROUP HH RECEIVING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS

Overall 71.1% | Female HoH 71.4% | Male HoH 70.4% | Prev. Abroad 74.1% | From Malakal 72.1% | From Other Counties 62.8%

% SUB-GROUP HH DEPENDENT ON HUMANITARIAN SERVICES TO COVER BASIC NEEDS

Overall 70.3% | Female HoH 75.9% | Male HoH 58.4% | Prev. Abroad 81.5% | From Malakal 69.0% | From Other Counties 81.4%

% HH BY CHANGE IN ABILITY TO ACCESS HUMANITARIAN OR BASIC SERVICES OVER THE PAST SIX MONTHS [N = 391]

	Clean Water	Education	Food Markets	Health Facilities	Hum. Food Distribution	Hum. NFI Distribution	Legal Services	Pharmacies
	8.7%	13.0%	32.0%	10.5%	3.8%	5.1%	4.3%	24.0%
	17.6%	44.8%	19.2%	28.4%	54.5%	37.1%	21.2%	14.6%

■ Decreased Slightly   ■ Decreased Substantially   ■ Increased Slightly   ■ Increased Substantially

% HH WHO HAVE ACCESSED ASSISTANCE OR BASIC SERVICES IN THE PAST THREE MONTHS BY TYPE [N = 278]

ASSISTANCE	%	LL	UL
General Food For All	95.0%	92.7%	97.3%
Health / Medicines	11.5%	8.2%	14.8%
WASH Materials	10.8%	7.5%	14.1%
Food For Assets	7.2%	4.5%	9.9%
Shelter Material	5.8%	3.3%	8.2%
Nutrition	4.3%	2.0%	6.6%
Food For School Children	2.9%	1.0%	4.8%
Cash For Work / Cash For Training	2.9%	1.0%	4.8%
School Fees / Uniforms	0.7%	0.0%	1.7%
Unconditional Cash / Voucher Transfer	0.4%	0.0%	1.1%
Agricultural Tools	0.4%	0.0%	1.1%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

Of the households that received assistance in the three months prior to the assessment, 53.1 (±13.5) per cent report to be unsatisfied with the assistance. Most of these households report being unsatisfied due to quantity (75.7% ±13.8%), timeliness of the assistance provided (24.3% ±13.3%) and issues understanding how to register for aid (21.6% ±13.1%). The services households are most dissatisfied with are general assistance (67.6% ±14.9%), food assistance (48.6% ±15.2%) and shelter and NFI services (40.5% ±15.5%).

While households could use complaint and feedback mechanisms to address their concerns about assistance, 29.9 (±3.9) per cent of households receiving assistance report that they do not feel able to provide feedback or make complaints if they or a member of their household wanted to. Among those who felt as if they could, 8.2 (±3.8) per cent did not trust these mechanisms – especially for response time, confidentiality and sensitive issues.

43.2 (±4.4) per cent of households receiving assistance experienced protection or safety issues while accessing assistance in the past three months, with female-headed households indicatively being more likely to be affected than male-headed households (46.3% ±6.0% vs 36.4% ±9.3%).

As top priority needs for their household, respondents name food (89.3% ±2.9%), shelter or housing (70.3% ±3.1%), healthcare (63.7% ±4.0%) and livelihoods support or employment (16.4% ±2.6%).

53.1%
accessing humanitarian assistance are unsatisfied with the assistance

Main reasons for dissatisfaction:

QUANTITY   TIMELINESS
REGISTRATION

Households with members who have experienced protection / safety issue while accessing assistance:

43.2%

Preferred feedback mechanism: Top priority needs:
FACE-TO-FACE WITH COMMUNITY LEADER

% sub-group hh unsatisfied with assistance received in the past three months

	Overall	Female HoH	Male HoH	Prev. Abroad	From Malakal	From Other Counties
	53.1%	51.6%	55.6%	44.4%	55.3%	45.5%

% sub-group hh having faced protection issues when accessing humanitarian assistance

	Overall	Female HoH	Male HoH	Prev. Abroad	From Malakal	From Other Counties
	43.2%	46.3%	36.4%	60.0%	42.2%	51.9%

% hh by top priority needs [n = 391]

Need	%	LL	UL
Food	89.3%	86.4%	92.2%
Shelter / Housing	70.3%	67.3%	73.4%
Healthcare	63.7%	59.7%	67.7%
Livelihoods Support / Employment	16.4%	13.8%	19.0%
Education	7.4%	5.1%	9.7%
Seeds / Other Agricultural Inputs	1.8%	0.5%	3.1%
Protection	1.8%	0.5%	3.1%
NFIs	1.3%	0.2%	2.4%
Training	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%
Cash	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%
PSS	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Need To Repay Debt	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
None	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

% hh by unsatisfactory service (top 10) [n = 37]

Assistance / Service	%	LL	UL
General Assistance	67.6%	52.7%	82.5%
Food	48.6%	33.5%	63.8%
S/NFI	40.5%	25.1%	56.0%
WASH	35.1%	20.3%	49.9%
Health	29.7%	15.6%	43.9%
Nutrition	18.9%	6.6%	31.2%
Education	18.9%	6.6%	31.3%
Protection	10.8%	0.9%	20.8%
Livelihood	8.1%	0.0%	17.0%
Cash / Vouchers	8.1%	0.0%	17.0%

% hh by preferred feedback mechanisms [n = 278]

Mechanism	%	LL	UL
Face To Face With Community Leader	46.8%	42.7%	50.8%
Face To Face At Home With Aid Worker	34.5%	30.0%	39.1%
Face To Face In Office Or Other Venue With Aid Worker	10.8%	7.6%	14.0%
Community Meetings / Group Feedback Sessions With Aid Workers	5.4%	3.0%	7.8%
Complaints / Suggestions Box	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%
Phone Call	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%
Don't Know / No Answer	0.4%	0.0%	1.1%

Note: The error bars and LL/UL columns in the summary tables indicate 95% confidence intervals. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding error.

# IDP Site Vulnerability Index and Intersectoral Analysis

The IDP Site Vulnerability Index (SVI) uses Principal Component Analysis (PCA) – a dimensionality reduction technique. In this usage, PCA aggregates and simplifies the various component indicators into a single index that reflects the greatest variation in needs and vulnerability. The technique weights more highly indicators for which the data displays greater variance, and weights lower on indicators for which we see little variation. The computed weights of the indicators are used to calculate the vulnerability score of each assessed household, ranging from 0 to 100. The scale is grouped into five ranges: minimum (0% - 20%), moderate (21% - 40%), medium (41% - 60%), high (61% - 80%) and maximum (81% - 100%).

Overall, the largest proportion of households fall in the high range of the SVI (38.4% of HH), closely followed by the medium range (35.5% of HH). As the population's most vulnerable category, one in ten households fall into the maximum range (9.2% of HH). Comparing different sub-groups, female-headed households tend to score significantly worse than male-headed households in both the maximum and high vulnerability categories (55.7% of which 10.2% in the maximum range, vs 30.4% of which 7.2% in the in the maximum range). Although these interpretations are only indicative due to the small sample size by return intention sub-group, the SVI indicates that households intending to return within the next two years fare worse than those intending to remain, with higher proportions of households falling into the high and maximum range (42.5% and 11.4% vs 41.2% and 5.9%). This indicates that increased vulnerability may be a driver of households to exit the site.

SVI Indicators with largest weights:

County Of Origin
45.7%

Sufficient Water
**43.5%**

Safe and Timely Water
41.0%

% HH BY VULNERABILITY INDEX SCORE RANGE (MINIMUM TO MAXIMUM) BY SUB-GROUP

AVERAGE INDEX SCORE BY ASSESSED IDP SITE BLOCKS IN MALAKAL POC SITE

VULNERABILITY INDEX SCORE WEIGHT BY SELECTED INDICATORS

Indicator	Weight
Within County Area of Origin	45.7%
Sufficient Water	43.5%
Safe and Timely Water	41.0%
Property Status	36.7%
GBV Risk	24.5%
Hunger	24.5%
WASH NFI	22.5%
Assistance Access	15.3%
Shelter Damage	13.1%
LCS	12.1%
Livelihoods	11.6%
Crowding	11.1%
School Dropout	11.0%
Protection Services	9.6%
Health Access	9.0%
Health Distance	8.7%
Beh. Changes	8.2%
Distress	4.8%
Single HoH	3.7%
Chronic Illness	1.6%
Incidents	1.6%
Disability	0.6%

METHODOLOGY ANNEX I: PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS - IMPORTANCE OF COMPONENTS

MEASURE	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4	PC5	PC6	PC7	PC8
Standard deviation	19.605	5.956	5.502	4.885	4.416	4.307	3.901	3.823
Proportion of Variance	0.616	0.057	0.048	0.038	0.031	0.030	0.024	0.023
Cumulative Proportion	0.616	0.672	0.721	0.759	0.790	0.820	0.844	0.868

METHODOLOGY ANNEX II: PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS - INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

INDICATOR	SCORE RANGE
Household Vulnerabilities	
Households displaced from locations within the same county	0 – 1
Single-headed household or elderly / children-only household	0 – 1
Number of household members with a disability	0 – Inf
Number of household members with a chronic illness	0 – Inf
SNFI	
Shelter damage	0 – 3
Number of persons in most crowded room	1 – Inf
Ownership of accessible property	0 – 1
Education	
Number of children in household having dropped out of school	0 – Inf
WASH	
Access to safe and timely water	0 – 1
Access to sufficient water	0 – 1
Access to latrines	0 – 1
Access to WASH NFIs	0 – 1
Health	
Access to health facility when needed	0 – 1
Availability of health facility within 30 min. walking distance	0 – 1
Protection	
Protection services available	0 – 1
Household affected by security incident	0 – 1
Behavioral changes in children observed	0 – 1
Concerns about GBV or sexual exploitation issues	0 – 4
Households with members feeling distressed	0 – 1
Humanitarian Assistance	
Access to humanitarian assistance	0 – 1
Food Security and Livelihoods	
Begging, Kinship or Sale of Aid as main livelihood	0 – 1
Whole day and night spent hungry in last 4 weeks	0 – 1
Livelihood-based Coping Strategy employed	0 – 3

Note: All indicators were demeaned and rescaled before PCA was run.
Indicators without variation were excluded.