52,268 IDPs arrived Jan-March 2019

1,420,189 IDPs currently present since 2014

5 counties accounting for most IDP arrivals
Jan-Mar 2019
- Jur River: 8,343
- Tonj North: 4,795
- Magwi: 3,555
- Fashoda: 3,234
- Mundri East: 3,206

534,082 returnees: 39% from abroad since R-ARCSS (Sept 2018 – March 2019)

1,183,683 returnees: 36% from abroad currently present, with arrivals since 2016

5 counties accounting for most returnee arrivals since R-ARCSS
- Luakpiny / Nasir: 88,044
- Wau: 49,017
- Terekeka: 23,041
- Akobo: 19,077
- Jur River: 16,231

accounting for 44% of the caseload displaced in this period

KEY FINDINGS
- Increase in the monthly average of returnees in the three months following the revitalised peace agreement (R-ARCSS) but declining trend in the first quarter of 2019.
- The average percentage of returnees from abroad per period of analysis pre-R-ARCSS was 37%, increasing to 41% Sept-Dec 2018 (post-R-ARCSS).
- Over 50,000 IDPs arrived in assessed areas in the first quarter of 2019 (77% primary displacement)

For more information please contact SouthSudanDTM@iom.int or visit displacement.iom.int/south-sudan
BACKGROUND

Data collection for Mobility Tracking Round 5 took place in March 2019. In order to identify possible changes in displacement and return dynamics as a consequence of the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan (R-ARCSS), DTM disaggregated returnee arrival periods by the following periods: 2016 and 2017; 2018 pre R-ARCSS (January – mid-September 2018); 2018 post R-ARCSS (mid-September 2018 – December 2018) and January – March 2019.

Whilst national-level conflict has continued in certain areas of South Sudan, notably around Yei County in Central Equatoria State, some parts of the country have faced rising instances of intercommunal conflict, which are distinguished from conflict including national actors for the purposes of the DTM data collection exercise. However, the lines between cattle raiding, other forms of communal tensions and politically motivated violence have at times become blurred as described in the below section on internal displacement.

Mobility tracking aims to quantify the presence of internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees and relocated individuals across South Sudan in displacement sites and host communities, updated in regular intervals to identify and track mobility dynamics over time. This summary represents findings for the fifth round of Mobility Tracking, conducted in South Sudan through key-informant based assessments at sub-area and location levels.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology comprises two interrelated tools: baseline area assessments, and multi-sectoral location assessments.

1. **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 attributes such as time of arrival of the target population in the assessed location, return from abroad or South Sudan, reasons for displacement and former home areas for IDPs (both captured on majority basis), presence of and dates of displacement / return, and shelter conditions. The baseline area assessment form also comprises a list of locations (defined as villages / neighbourhoods / displacement sites) hosting displaced and/or returned populations.

2. **Multi-sectoral location assessments** at village / neighbourhood or site level are conducted to gather data on a more granular level, comprising sectors such as Health, WASH, S/NFI, Protection, FSL and Education. The objective of the location level assessments is to collect some key multisectoral indicators on the living conditions and needs of affected populations which can enable partners to prioritize locations for more in-depth sector-specific assessments.

**Key Informants: 4,994 individuals**

Information is obtained and triangulated through consultation with key informants, commonly comprised of local authorities, community leaders, religious leaders and humanitarian partners. In round 5, DTM consulted 4,994 key informants, of whom 1,395 at the sub-area level and 3,599 at the location level (neighbourhood, village or displacement site). Direct observation at each location in addition to the triangulation and the subsequent verification process serves to further ensure maximum accuracy of findings.

SCOPE

In Round 5, DTM accessed 1,973 locations (villages / neighbourhoods and displacement sites) in 444 sub-areas across every county (78) in all 10 states. This signifies an increase from 87% to 100% in coverage on a county-level and an increase in the number of locations accessed by 37% since Round 4. Locations are only assessed upon confirmation of presence of targeted populations. DTM conducted multi-sectoral assessments at

- 85% of mapped villages / neighbourhoods (1,621/ 1,879), and
- 99% of mapped displacement sites (93 / 94).
Overall, a third of IDPs were reported to live across the 94 displacement sites identified by DTM in Round 5. The other two-thirds are living in host community settings. The proportion of IDPs living in displacement sites was especially high in Unity State and Central Equatoria (both hosting large PoC sites) with 53 per cent each.
Available data indicates a reduction in displacement caused by conflict involving national actors, an increase in communal clashes induced displacement and an increase in more localized displacement.

Overall, the majority of individuals displaced since 2014 moved to their current locations due to conflict (76.6%) and 13.4 per cent due to communal clashes which encompass other forms of violence that do not directly involve the state (<1% natural disaster and unknown for 9.2%). The differentiation between more localized instances of armed violence (commonly referred to as intercommunal clashes and cattle raiding) from more politicised instances of armed conflict has become increasingly difficult, as described by Andrew Gilmour, Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, during the 8,560th meeting of the Security Council (SC/13857, 25 June 2019).

The proportion of IDPs displaced due to communal clashes has been higher amongst those arriving at their current location in 2018 (29.8%) and the first quarter of 2019 (30.5%) than amongst those having arrived in 2014-2015 (7.4%) and 2016-2017 (13.6%).

By looking at average numbers of IDP arrivals per month by reason for displacement, one can recognize a downward trend in the number of individuals displaced due to conflict and an increase in the number of individuals displaced due to communal clashes – both in totals and proportionally to the overall average number of displaced individuals per month for a given period. In 2018, Lakes and Jonglei saw especially high numbers of individuals having moved due to communal violence with over 22,000 and 21,000 IDPs respectively. For the first quarter of 2019 the proportion was especially high for Western Bahr el Ghazal where clashes broke out in March 2019, namely in Jur River. This is also the county with the highest overall number of individuals displaced within January – March 2019.
The county with the second most displaced individuals of these three months is Wau County, which has been the destination of many individuals fleeing Jur River as reported on in Event Tracking reports after the reporting period in April and May 2019. Unity State continues to host the largest number of IDPs, a total of 217,031, primarily due to the presence of Bentiu PoC site, currently the largest PoC site in the country. This is reflected in the fact that Rubkona County hosts 48.5 per cent of the state’s IDPs.

Movements of IDPs have been more localized amongst those having arrived at current locations more recently. Of locations with IDP arrivals in 2019, 64 per cent of sub-areas saw most IDPs arriving from within the same county in contrast to only 49 per cent of sub-areas where IDPs arrived in 2014-16.

### Monthly average of IDP arrivals for given period of analysis comparing conflict / communal clashes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Monthly average for analysis period (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-March 2019</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average # of IDPs arriving

- **Conflict**
- **Communal clashes**

#### % of overall monthly IDP arrival average:

- **Conflict**
- **Communal clashes**

### Sub-areas with majority of IDPs having come from same / other state and county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Other State Other County</th>
<th>Same State Other County</th>
<th>Same State Same County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 (101 SAs)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (244 SAs)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (349 SAs)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2016 (305 SAs)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage in number of IDPs since round 4 by state for same locations assessed

- **Northern Bahr el Ghazal**: -47%
- **Warrap**: -29%
- **Western Bahr el Ghazal**: -18%
- **Eastern Equatoria**: -14%
- **Upper Nile**: -13%
- **Central Equatoria**: -12%
- **Western Equatoria**: -10%
- **Unity**: -8%
- **Jonglei**: -6%
- **Lakes**: -4%

* Please note that this graph does not represent the number of individuals displaced during a given period. Figures are limited to those who remain currently displaced persons, i.e. excluding anyone who was displaced but has since returned. Time of displacement is unknown for 12,464 IDPs (not represented). NOTE: in 2017-2018 for 1% of the displaced populations, the reason is unknown.
INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT:
COMPARING ROUND 4 AND 5

Comparing round 4 (December 2018) with round 5 (March 2019) shows that there has been a significant reduction in the number of IDPs across areas assessed in both rounds (excluding locations that were not re-assessed or new locations). In total, DTM saw a net reduction of 158,954 individuals across 1,370 locations. In terms of number of locations, 39 per cent reported no change, 23 per cent reported an increase and for 38 per cent the number of IDPs decreased. Counties with a decrease of over 10,000 IDPs are Kajo Keji (23,736 IDPs), Ikotos (18,562 IDPs), Tonj North (17,057 IDPs), Wau (15,754 IDPs), Aweil West (14,754 IDPs), Melut (13,315 IDPs) and Jur River (11,657 IDPs). For an overview on IDP number changes by sub-area please refer to page 9.

Please note that a decrease in the number of IDPs for a given administrative area does not signify return but can also be due to repeated instances of displacement. The above figures are net reductions whereby certain locations within a same county might have seen an increase in IDPs and others a decrease.

**Locations with net increases, decreases and no changes in the number of IDPs present since Round 4**

- **Unity (338)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 104
  - Decrease of IDPs: 73
  - No change: 161
- **Jonglei (168)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 63
  - Decrease of IDPs: 23
  - No change: 73
- **Eastern Equatoria (160)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 56
  - Decrease of IDPs: 48
  - No change: 56
- **Western Equatoria (147)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 69
  - Decrease of IDPs: 30
  - No change: 48
- **Upper Nile (130)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 41
  - Decrease of IDPs: 28
  - No change: 61
- **Western Bahr el Ghazal (121)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 55
  - Decrease of IDPs: 29
  - No change: 37
- **Lakes (116)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 55
  - Decrease of IDPs: 50
  - No change: 11
- **Central Equatoria (104)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 18
  - Decrease of IDPs: 24
  - No change: 62
- **Warrap (45)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 21
  - Decrease of IDPs: 11
  - No change: 13
- **Northern Bahr el Ghazal (41)**
  - Increase of IDPs: 24
  - Decrease of IDPs: 7
  - No change: 10

- # locations with net decrease # of IDPs
- # locations with net increase # of IDPs
- # locations with no change in # of IDPs
More than half of all returnees were estimated to live in either partially damaged housing (39%) or makeshift shelters (20%). Just over a quarter was said to live in undamaged shelters (27%) and the proportion was unknown in 14 per cent of cases. The largest share of returnees living in damaged shelters was found in Upper Nile State where 80 of returnees lived in either partially (70%) or severely (10%) damaged housing. The largest share of returnees living in makeshift shelters was found in Eastern Equatoria with 40 per cent. Returnees in Western Bahr el Ghazal were most likely to live in undamaged shelters (39%).
RETURN MOVEMENTS

For the period since the R-ARCSS, 534,082 individuals have returned to their habitual residence of whom 210,199 (39%) came from abroad. Of all individuals returned since 2016, 45 per cent arrived since the peace agreement. In other words, the seven-month period post R-ARCSS accounted for 45 per cent of all returnees compared to the 39-month period pre R-ARCSS, which accounted for 48 per cent of returnees (the rest unknown). The average number of returnees per month in the three months after R-ARCSS (October - December 2018) was 96,278 individuals. This represents a 169 per cent increase compared to the monthly average of the preceding months of 2018. However, this monthly average decreased again (by 48%) in the first quarter of 2019, suggesting returns to not maintain a linear upward trend. Round 6 data will provide more insight into the potential effect the revitalized agreement had on return movements in the continuation of 2019.

NUMBER OF RETURNES POST R-ARCSS (SEPT 2018 - MARCH 2019) BY ARRIVAL FROM ABROAD OR WITHIN SOUTH SUDAN

RETURNS FROM ABROAD: 36% of all returnees

Overall, 36 per cent of all returnees arrived from abroad. Amongst periods of analysis, the proportion of returnees arriving from abroad was the slightly greater in the three months after R-ARCSS, namely 41 per cent with an average of 37 per cent per analysis period pre R-ARCSS. Less than a quarter of counties (18 out of 78) hosted over three quarters of returnees and 13 of these border neighbouring countries like Uganda (Kajo-Keji, Magwi, Torit and Ikotos), Ethiopia (Akobo, Ulang and Nasir) and Sudan (Renk, Aweil Centre, East, North, South and West).

Over half of all returnees accounted for in March 2019 in Upper Nile had arrived after the peace agreement (59%) and three quarters of these arrived from abroad (74%). The proportion of returnees having arrived from abroad after R-ARCSS was even higher in Northern Bahr el Ghazal, with 85 per cent albeit lower in totals.
RETURNEE TRENDS: comparing round 4 and 5

During round 5 (March 2019), the number of returnees overall for the same assessed locations only (1,370 locations) has increased by 26,314 individuals since round 4 (December 2018). Whilst this is a net increase, Jonglei and Central Equatoria saw proportional decreases of 6 and 22 per cent respectively. The number of returnees for a given area of analysis can fluctuate as a result of renewed displacements or onwards movements. A lack of significant net increases of decreases of returnees does not signify a lack of population movements as similar numbers of new arrivals and departure would cancel each other out.

The highest increase in the number of returns was found in Western Bahr el Ghazal with 21,609 individuals whereas Warrap State saw the highest proportional increase with a figure 147 per cent higher than in round 4. On a county level the increases were most pronounced in Wau (37,782 individuals), followed by Magwi (20,689 individuals), Nagero (8,000), Pariang (6,327 individuals), Aweil North (6,144 individuals) and Duk (6,051 individuals). For an overview on return number changes by sub-area please refer to page 9.

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 2019

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 2019

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

Note on returnee definition
The IOM DTM returnee figure from abroad cannot be compared directly with the spontaneous refugee returnees reported by UNHCR. The latter can have returned home (this would be captured as part of the returnees from abroad category in IOM DTM), but they may also find themselves in a situation of continued displacement or have chosen a new habitual residence (in both cases, they would be considered but not directly visible as part of the IDP and relocated figures reported by IOM). UNHCR and IOM technical teams are exploring how to improve data sharing to enable comparison and integration of numbers published by each agency.
IDPs by County: Comparison of round 4 and 5 for same locations

Returnees by County: Comparison of round 4 and 5 for same locations
Data collection attributes:

IDPs:
- Numbers (individuals and households)
- Reason for displacement
- Type of settlement (displacement site or host community setting)
- Multiple displacement

Returnees:
- Numbers (individuals and households)
- Returnees from within South Sudan or abroad
  - Displacement area for majority of returnees per period of arrival
  - Reason for displacement for majority of returnees per period of arrival
- Status of returnee housing (no damage, partial damage, server damage [makeshift shelter])

- Number of relocated, estimates of host community population size, occupation of shelters by non-owners, number of non-returned individuals / households by sub-area.

CLICK TO ACCESS DATA COLLECTION FORM - SUBAREA LEVEL