Overview

The findings presented in this factsheet are indicative of the broad CCCM (Camp Coordination and Camp Management) trends in assessed settlements in June 2019, and are not statistically generalisable.

Assessment Coverage

- **2,130** Key Informants interviewed
- **1,736** Settlements assessed
- **65** Counties assessed
- **64** Counties with 5% or more coverage

Selected KIs are purposively sampled and have knowledge from within the last month about a specific settlement in South Sudan, with data collected at the settlement level. About half of settlements assessed have more than one KI reporting on the settlement. In these cases, data is aggregated at the settlement level according to a weighting mechanism, which can be found in the Terms of Reference (ToRs).

[Link to AoK Terms of Reference]

All percentages presented in this factsheet, unless otherwise specified, represent the proportion of settlements assessed with that specific response.

Assessment coverage

Proportion of settlements assessed:
- 0 - 4.9%
- 5 - 10%
- 11 - 20%
- 21 - 50%
- 51 - 100%

IDP Presence

Proportion of assessed settlements reporting presence of IDPs:
- 0%
- 1 - 20%
- 21 - 40%
- 41 - 60%
- 61 - 80%
- 81 - 100%
- Insufficient data

1Data is only represented for counties in which at least 5% of settlements have been assessed. The most recent OCHA Common Operational Dataset (COD) released in February 2016 has been used as the reference for settlement names and locations.

Selected KIs are purposively sampled and have knowledge from within the last month about a specific settlement in South Sudan, with data collected at the settlement level. About half of settlements assessed have more than one KI reporting on the settlement. In these cases, data is aggregated at the settlement level according to a weighting mechanism, which can be found in the Terms of Reference (ToRs).

[Link to AoK Terms of Reference]
Leadership Structures and IDP Representation

**Proportion of assessed settlements reporting the absence of local leadership structures in the community**

- Budi (100%)
- Kapoeta North (100%)
- Kapoeta South (100%)
- Nagero (100%)
- Juba (97%)

**Proportion of assessed settlements reporting IDPs not included in local community leadership structures**

- Akobo (100%)
- Ayod (100%)
- Maban (100%)
- Luakpiny/Nasir (100%)
- Nagero (100%)

*Other assessed counties reporting 100% no humanitarian assistance received in the past 3 months include: Nyirg, Tonj East, Tonj South, and Uror.*

32 assessed counties reporting 100% elderly represented in local leadership. The chart is only showing the top 5 ones based on their names alphabetic order. Click on [this link](http://example.com) to download the entire list.

**Top five assessed counties reporting community leadership meetings occurring only once every few months**

- Budi
- Kapoeta North
- Kapoeta South
- Nagero
- Juba

**Top five assessed counties reporting women represented in local leadership**

- Abiemnhom
- Ayod
- Maban
- Fashoda
- Juba

**Top five assessed counties reporting youth represented in local leadership**

- Akobo
- Ayod
- Luakpiny/Nasir
- Maban
- Nagero

**Top five assessed counties reporting elderly represented in local leadership**

- Abiemnhom
- Aweil Centre
- Aweil East
- Aweil North
- Aweil South
Displacement and Population Movement

Proportion of assessed settlements with IDPs who have arrived within the last three months

Proportion of assessed settlements reporting presence of returnees

Information sources

Top five assessed counties reporting their main source of information originating from family/friends

1. Abiemnhom 100%
2. Pariang 98%
3. Twic 81%
4. Bor South 69%
5. Awerial 63%

Top five assessed counties reporting directly accessing information from in-person conversations or loudspeakers

1. Abiemnhom 100%
2. Akobo 100%
3. Budi 100%
4. Fangak 100%
5. Guit 100%

Lack of IDPs support

Top five assessed counties reporting IDPs not receiving food, non-food-items or shelter, from the local community or an NGO

1. Manyo 100%
2. Mvolo 100%
3. Maridi 93%
4. Melit 91%
5. Renk 88%

Living conditions: IDPs

Top five assessed counties reported where most IDPs are staying in temporary shelters or in the open

1. Nagero 100%
2. Duk 67%
3. Uror 33%
4. Ulang 30%
5. Nyirol 29%

*Other assessed counties reporting 100% directly accessing information from in-person or loudspeakers include: Iba, Kapoeta East, Kapoeta North, Kapoeta South, Mayom, Mundri East, Mundri West, Nagero, Panyijiar, and Pariang.