

SOUTH SUDAN

Displacement associated with Conflict and Violence

Figure Analysis – GRID 2020

CONTEXT

South Sudan's government and the largest rebel group signed a peace deal in September 2018, revitalising a collapsed peace deal from 2015. Conflict, however, continued in several places of the country in 2019, although on a lower scale than in 2018. The most affected states were Warrap, Upper Nile and Central and Eastern Equatoria. Warrap and Upper Nile were badly affected by cattle raiding, and more than 100,000 people were displaced during the year with spikes in February and August. In Central Equatoria, the areas most affected by violence and displacement were around Yei. There the National Salvation Front (NAS), which did not sign the peace deal, engaged in heavy fighting with government forces, and more than [30,000 people](#) were forced from their homes.

In Western Bahr el Ghazal, more than 26,000 people were displaced between early March and mid-May in and from Jur River county, to as far as the towns of Tambura and Raja. Cattle keepers from Tonj had come to Jur River searching for pasture for their livestock since early March. This caused conflict. There [have been reports](#) that the keepers' attacks on villages involved killing, rape, beating and looting.

The peace deal held through the year and continued to be slowly [implemented](#). This encouraged cross-border and internal returns in early 2019. More than 276,000 internally displaced people (IDPs) returned throughout the year and achieved partial solutions to their displacement. About 80,000 refugee returnees, however, ended up displaced upon their return to South Sudan.

| New displacements that occurred in 2019 | Total number of IDPs as of 31 December 2019 <i>(Year figure was last updated: 2019)</i> | Partial Solutions and Unverified Solutions | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | Number of IDPs who have made partial progress towards a durable solution* | | Number of IDPs whose progress towards durable solutions cannot be verified** |
| | | Flows <i>(1 January – 31 December 2019)</i> | Stocks <i>(Year figure was last updated: 2019)</i> | Flows <i>(1 January – 31 December 2019)</i> |
| 259,000 | 1,433,000 | 276,000 | 901,000 | - |

*This corresponds to the number of IDPs whom our data providers have identified as having returned, resettled or locally integrated in 2019 and for whom the evidence obtained by IDMC suggests that progress toward durable solutions is only partial given their living conditions. In a few instances, this number may refer to movements having taken place in 2019 (flows) rather than a total number of people (stock).

**This corresponds to the number of IDPs whom our data providers have identified as having returned, resettled or locally integrated in 2019 but for whom there is no available evidence to corroborate progress toward durable solutions. In a few instances, this number may refer to movements having taken place in 2019 (flows) rather than a total number of people (stock).

NEW DISPLACEMENTS THAT OCCURRED IN 2019

This corresponds to new instances of internal displacement that occurred in 2019.

IDMC figure and rationale

IDMC's estimate is based on the sum of new displacement figures reported by the sources mentioned below through event-based monitoring.

Sources and methodologies

IDMC's estimate for new displacements is based on data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM DTM) mobility assessments and event tracking. IDMC also used reports by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), compiled from figures collected by OCHA field offices, as well as by REACH, the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the Protection Cluster, and the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC). The methodologies among the agencies vary, but are a combination of multi-sector assessments, key informant (KI) interviews, head counts and registrations.

IDMC also used articles from Radio Tamazuj, a daily news service covering South Sudan, the southern states of Sudan and the borderlands between the two countries. It usually cites local media or affected people.

Main caveats and monitoring challenges

The figure is an underestimate because humanitarian access in South Sudan is extremely difficult, and areas deemed too insecure are not covered. There is also no systematic monitoring of new displacements in the country; IDMC relies on a wide range of sources to produce the figure. This creates a challenge when producing nationally aggregated estimates based on data that was collected using several different methodologies.

South Sudan is a pastoral society where people are constantly on the move. It is not easy to distinguish those who are internally displaced from those who are moving for another reason. Another caveat is that many Key informants are local authorities and tend to inflate and fabricate data in order to get humanitarian assistance. This decreases our confidence in their estimates.

Significant changes from last year

The decrease is mainly a result of the reduction in violence since the signing of the peace deal in September 2018.

TOTAL NUMBER OF IDPS

This corresponds to the total number of individuals living in internal displacement as of 31 December 2019.

IDMC figure and rationale

IDMC's estimate is based on the IOM DTM data. We used the total number of IDPs which also included the number of refugee returnees living in a situation of internal displacement upon their return to South Sudan.

Sources and methodologies

IDMC's estimate for new displacements is based on data from IOM DTM mobility tracking. Mobility tracking aims to quantify the presence of IDPs, returnees and relocated individuals across South Sudan in displacement sites and host communities. It is updated at regular intervals to identify and track mobility dynamics over time. The methodology 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 and capture information at the group level on population categories (IDPs, returnees, relocated). It also captures attributes such as the target population's periods of arrival in the assessed location, the reasons for displacement, IDPs former home areas, the presence of and dates of displacement, and return and shelter conditions. Multi-sectoral location assessments at the village, neighbourhood or site level are conducted to gather data on a more granular level, including sectors such as health, protection, and education. The goal of these location assessments is to collect key multi-sectoral indicators on the living conditions and needs of affected populations which can enable partners to prioritize locations for more in-depth, sector-specific assessments.

Information is obtained and triangulated through consultation with key informants. Data captured at the location level during the location assessments helps to improve initial estimates provided by the Key informants at the pavam (subarea) level. Key informants are usually representatives from local authorities, community and religious leaders, and humanitarian partners.

Main caveats and monitoring challenges

Failed returns are returnees who end up in camps, collective shelters or with host families. IDMC was unable to estimate the number of failed returns that should be added to the total number of IDPs. The disaggregation in the dataset did not allow us to make this distinction. As a result, the stock figure is an underestimate. Only people displaced after 2014 are included in the dataset. People displaced prior 2014 are not counted

Significant changes from last year

The decrease is mainly the result of an 18-month-long review exercise between IDP datasets maintained by OCHA and IOM DTM. This was done through verification of the IDP estimates and removal of duplicates. The process resulted in a new updated figure.

NUMBER OF IDPS WHO HAVE MADE PARTIAL PROGRESS TOWARDS A DURABLE SOLUTION

This corresponds to the number of IDPs whom our data providers have identified as having returned, resettled or locally integrated in 2019 and for whom the evidence obtained by IDMC suggests that progress toward durable solutions is only partial given their living conditions. In a few instances, this number may refer to movements that occurred in 2019 rather than a total number of people.

IDMC figure and rationale

IDMC's estimate is based on the IOM DTM data. We used the total number of people who returned to their areas of origin in 2019 as the basis for the estimate. In the case of the total number of people who were still considered to have made partial progress towards durable solutions as of 31 December 2019, we used the total number of people who returned to their areas of origin since 2016 as the basis for the estimate.

Sources and methodologies

See section above.

Main caveats and monitoring challenges

IDMC was not able to estimate the number of failed returns to remove from the estimate for partial solutions. The disaggregation in the dataset did not allow us to make a distinction. As a result, the partial solutions figure is a slight overestimate.

Significant changes from last year

IDMC did not publish data on this metric for South Sudan in the past year.

CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

The Confidence Assessment provides an at-a-glance overview of the comprehensiveness of the data available regarding displacement associated with conflict for each country. It describes the methodologies used, frequency of reporting, data disaggregation and geographical coverage. Here two key metrics are analysed: the new displacements and the total number of IDPs.

| Displacement metric | New displacements | Total number of IDPs |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Reporting units | People, Households | People, Households |
| Methodology | Key informants, Media monitoring, Other | Key informants |
| Geographical disaggregation | Admin 2 or more | Admin 2 or more |
| Frequency of reporting | Other | Other |
| Disaggregation by sex | No | No |
| Disaggregation by age | No | No |
| Data triangulation | Some local triangulation | No Triangulation |
| Data on settlement elsewhere | No | No |
| Data on returns | Yes | Yes |
| Data on local integration | No | No |
| Data on cross border movements | Partial | Partial |
| Data on deaths | No | No |
| Data on births | No | No |

For any additional questions please email: data@idmc.ch

For the full country profile on South Sudan please visit:

<http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/south-sudan>