

---

## PROTECTION CLUSTER DATA MANAGEMENT SUPPORT MISSION REPORT

---



*Women's discussion group in Nimule, Magwi County, Eastern Equatoria State, September 2010.*

---

**SOUTH SUDAN, August - September 2010**

by Shelley Gornall, [gornall@unhcr.org](mailto:gornall@unhcr.org)  
Operational Data Management Specialist  
FICSS / DPSM, UNHCR HQ  
on behalf of the Global Protection Cluster

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Part 1:	Rapid Needs Assessment
Part 2:	IDP Population Statistics
Annex 1:	Summary of Mission Recommendations
Annex 2:	List of Indicators Possible to Obtain from the PCRNA
Annex 3:	Main Activities of the Mission
Annex 4:	Mission Terms of Reference

# PROTECTION CLUSTER RAPID NEEDS ASSESSMENT

## Background

---

The South Sudan Protection Cluster requested the support of the mission in designing a Rapid Needs Assessment (RNA) in order to:

1. Inform an intervention strategy for the remainder of 2010 and 2011;
2. Establish some needs assessment baseline data prior to the January referendum;
3. Build needs assessment and data management capacity in the Protection Cluster prior to January as part of preparedness;
4. Conduct a joint project within the Protection Cluster to engender a spirit of collaboration and teamwork.

The mission also examined IDP population statistics and estimations within South Sudan, as population figures are a necessary part of needs assessment in order to understand scale and magnitude. IDP population data systems are covered in the second part of this mission report.



*Protection Rapid Needs Assessment Design Workshop, Juba, August 2010.*

## Rapid Needs Assessment (RNA) Design

---

In order to be rapid, a decision was made early in the design process that the assessment team could not exceed 12 people and that the assessment for each site could not be longer than 1 day.

The assessment had 3 primary components:

1. A closed question community-level interview form, in which separate questions would be asked to the Payam Administrator, a Displaced Community Representative, a Non-Displaced Community Representative and
2. Focus Group discussions with 5 strata: Displaced Women, Non-Displaced Woman, Displaced Men, Non-Displaced Men and Children
3. A Capacity Mapping data collection form upon which already-present humanitarian actors and projects in the assessed area would be recorded.

Please see the Field Guide for the RNA for further detail on the assessment design and practical consideration for conducting the assessment.

Please refer to annexes for details on assessment products designed by the mission and activities undertaken during the mission.

### **Next Steps in the Development of the PCRNA:**

---

The following tasks need to be undertaken to improve or support the PCRNA:

1. Develop a **key informant interview training guide**. This should be a quick guide (perhaps 1 page) which should provide tips on interview techniques, how to use skip patterns and how to fill out the data collection form for assessment team members who will undertake the closed question community level interviews. There should also be a **more elaborate discussion group facilitation team training guide** than the quick guide developed by the mission that could further explain the roles of team members and reinforce the classroom training.
2. Form an **interagency qualitative data analysis group** which will analyze the results of the focus group discussions and draft summary analyses of the results. This group can also make recommendations on how to improve the quality of the documented output from the focus group discussions.
3. Develop an **Observation Questionnaire** upon which the assessment team members can record what they see when they visit the sites.
4. **Review the structure of the discussion group Prioritization and Systematization Form** in case usability could be improved.
5. **Try to make the assessment site selection less resource driven and more representative.** As the number of sites assessed increases, try to select sites systematically based on a geographic sampling method in order to ensure that the assessment.
6. **Create a roster of trained needs assessment facilitators and re-use them.** Always keep track of the trained discussion group facilitators' / key informant interviewers' names, organizations, languages spoken and telephone numbers. Build on their capacity over time, as they might be used in another needs assessment or for the purposes of a different information system if requirements change on the ground. Otherwise, you will be starting from scratch each time.
7. **Develop a database** in which to store and analyze the data from the needs assessment (once the needs assessment forms are finalized post-pilot).

### **Next Steps: Data Analysis & Reporting Requirements**

---

Data volume and analysis solutions are dependent on the frequency with which the assessment will be carried out.

Manual analysis of the assessment results using Excel and other tools can be done during the first phases of the implementation because the data volume is low and the assessment may change. As more and more sites are assessed (so the data volume accumulates) and the assessment design solidifies, it may become necessary to store and analyze the data in a relational database.

Tentative plans are to do the assessment once a month in each state (10 states) as a rough guide, although some states should be more frequent.

**Recommendation: 5 primary types of analytical reports should be made from the needs assessment data.**

#### **1. Community Profile Report**

This report would show all the data for a single Payam. It could be used in discussions and programme planning at the local level, for coordination purposes or for when organizations are deploying to a particular location.

Ideally, a summary of the qualitative data from the discussion groups, in addition to the answers from the closed questionnaire and the Capacity Mapping information, should appear on this report.

#### **2. Community Comparative Report**

This report would do statistical analysis of the closed question community level questionnaires between payams. The indicators for these statistical reports are in Annex 2.

If enough payams were surveyed for the sampling to be representative, the results could be aggregated to the County or State level. The level of aggregation for statistical purposes may change as the assessment is gradually rolled out and the number of assessed payams increases.

An interpretation of the statistical data through the lens of the qualitative data analysis should also appear on this report.

#### **3. Population Statistical Report**

This would be a report for internal use which would pull all the population statistics for assessed locations. It would be used during interagency/cluster population statistics estimation meetings in order to triangulate other agencies' population figures. Because the Protection Cluster is not a primary source of population data (aside from estimates) and is usually gathering secondary population data, the Mission does not recommend using this report externally.

Please refer to the second half of this mission report, which deals with Population Statistics, for further detail on how this report would be used.

#### **4. Protection Thematic Reports**

These reports would focus on particular protection themes, such as reports covering only issues relevant to child protection, women, land issues, etc.

Thematic reporting requirements would need to be defined within the Protection Cluster by the relevant stakeholders.

## **5. Protection Maps**

At a later date and if the assessment is rolled out successfully in numerous locations, then maps that spatially analyze some of the data could be produced.

If enough payams are surveyed such that the sample could be considered representative, then the results of the assessments could be aggregated to the county or state level in order to map particular phenomena, such as the counties that have reported land claim issues with returnees, or counties where particular protection services are available.

### **Recommendations to Global Level about Protection Rapid Needs Assessments:**

---

The following recommendations are aimed at the Global Level Protection Cluster, where there is an initiative to develop a rapid protection needs assessment.

1. Decide on the constraints of resources and time for the assessment at the beginning of the project (i.e. the amount of time it takes to conduct the assessment and the number of personnel required to conduct it). Make the assessment design fit within these constraints from the very beginning. Forcing the assessment design team to fit the constraints from the start by prioritizing what is really important and feasible will assist in keeping the assessment rapid and to prevent it from sprawling.
2. Keep needs assessment design simple. Needs assessments should not be overwhelming burdens on field operations, nor should they be so complex that they require a major time investment from field actors in order to understand them. Needs assessment processes that are too heavy or complex will likely either not be embraced at the country level or, if attempted, implemented incorrectly.





*Protection Rapid Needs Assessment Training Workshop, Magwi Town, Eastern Equatoria State, September 2010.*

### **Protection Incident Monitoring**

---

**Recommendation: The mission does not recommend the introduction of an IDP protection incident monitoring system yet, as the Protection Cluster is still ramping up its capacity and its current focus seems to be on community-level interventions rather than individuals.**

That said, it might be possible to use the Protection Cluster Rapid Needs Assessment as a trigger system for installing particular protection incident monitoring systems (e.g. ones that cover GBV, land-grabbing, etc.) in areas with unusually acute problems with particular types of protection incidents. This method of using the needs assessment to target the introduction of monitoring systems is a way to use monitoring resources economically and to have the most impact.

## IDP POPULATION STATISTICS

### OCHA's Current IDP Population Statistics

---

OCHA is currently maintaining an Incident Monitoring System from which statistics on the numbers of people injured, killed and displaced are tracked.

The displacement figures arising from this system are “area of origin” information and should be interpreted as such. These figures are good indicators for security levels in specific geographic locations and specific periods of time, as well as important information on causes of displacement and areas of origin.

The mission is concerned that this system is being over-extended by some humanitarian actors and the figures – while useful for several purposes – are being interpreted in ways which are not valid from a technical perspective.

While the system shows places of origin for displaced people, it does not track the location to where people flee, namely the locations of displacement. It is also not able to record if people counted as displaced went home, including a relatively short time after the incident occurred, and are no longer living in displacement.

OCHA is currently aggregating the numbers from the system such that they are cumulative over time, but when interpreted as stock figures, these cumulative population figures will be biased high over time. Because aggregate numbers of displaced people are tracked, there is no “deregistration” process: it is impossible to avoid double-counting multiple displacements or returns, both of which will result in inclusion errors that accumulate over time.

Because of these reasons, **one cannot create stock figures for the number of internally displaced persons in South Sudan from this system.**

### IOM's IDP Population Tracking System (Working in Cooperation with OCHA)

---

IOM is currently developing a tracking system for IDP populations in South Sudan, leveraging capacity from its already-existing extensive network of monitors from its long-established returnee monitoring system as well as the expertise of their in-country Statistician.

With the new IDP tracking system, if an incident is reported, monitors will move quickly to the area to determine the displacement impact. IDP populations, once found and recorded, will be monitored for further movement for a period of 3 weeks, in order to see if new arrivals, quick departures home or secondary displacement happens so that figures can be adjusted. The system will cover the 6 main States where displacement is occurring. The unit of measurement for the system is household, and only population numbers (no names) will be recorded.

Creating stock figures from this system might be challenging in the longer term because of the need to deregister returned populations.

At the time of the mission, this system was in the design phase and was scheduled be implemented fully over the following weeks.



## WFP Food Distribution Monitoring

---

Since WFP's adoption of the Darfurian food distribution reporting system in early 2010, one can no longer see the unique number of IDP beneficiaries assisted in the WFP data nor those beneficiaries' demographic breakdown, as was previously possible.

The Darfurian system was designed for a stable population of IDPs that is regularly assisted, month by month, whereas the displacement pattern and food assistance strategy in South Sudan is quite different, aimed at a mobile, unstable population of IDPs who can be assisted several times or only once. Due to these differences, while the Darfurian food distribution reporting matrix may be completely appropriate for Darfur and while it is more sophisticated in some ways than the previously used South Sudan food distribution tracking matrix, its data structure is ill-suited to the South Sudan context, particularly if one wants to know the unique number of IDPs assisted.

**Recommendation: Adjust the current reporting format to differentiate between "New" and "Old (Carry Forward)" Caseloads such that the "New" column can be totaled to see the number of new IDP beneficiaries of food distribution. (Note that this method of counting food beneficiaries was previously used in South Sudan prior to the introduction of the Darfurian reporting matrix.)**

Using this revised data structure would provide a population data source against which other sources can be triangulated. It may also provide population data in areas which are not covered by other IDP population monitoring systems.

This revised way of counting won't be perfect as it will not subtract the number of IDPs that have returned or moved home, so the numbers will be biased high if aggregated over time, but it will reflect how many unique IDPs have been present in a particular area in a given period of time.

*Note: For more detailed information about the conclusions and recommendations made about the WFP distribution monitoring matrix, please consult Shelley Gornall ([gornall@unhcr.org](mailto:gornall@unhcr.org)) or WFP Juba.*

## Protection Cluster Role in Population Statistics

---

While the Protection Cluster is a smaller stakeholder in population statistics than the above-mentioned organizations who have dedicated primary data collection systems for IDPs, the Protection Cluster will get IDP population estimates from actors in the field and NGO registration statistics with lots of metadata through its new needs assessment initiative.

The needs assessment solicits figures on displaced populations from Payam Administrators, humanitarian actors and displaced people themselves in order to compare figures and find the most reliable one readily available within the community. The quality of the resulting figures – which will be apparent in the accompanying metadata collected – will vary from payam to payam.

These figures can either be used to triangulate with other IDP population monitoring systems or to fill in gaps in locations where no other data is available.

## **IDP Profiling Surveys**

---

IDP Profiling Surveys are another method of obtaining stock figures on the IDP population that can be considered.

At this time, the mission does not recommend IDP profiling because the IOM / SSRRC IDP monitoring system is just being developed and introduced, thus possibly making IDP profiling unnecessary. IOM, as previously mentioned, has an extensive, pre-existing network of monitors and in-house statistical capacity, such that its ability to undertake an IDP population tracking system currently exceeds that of any other agency the mission encountered. At present, there is no need to develop another IDP population monitoring system, although this position will need to be reviewed as the situation changes and evolves.

If any of the following occurs, the Protection Cluster may wish to revisit the idea of IDP profiling:

1. If the IOM IDP population monitoring system does not cover all affected states
2. If the IOM IDP population monitoring system cannot create stock figures
3. If there is a sudden mass movement of IDPs or the situation suddenly drastically changes

**Recommendation: The Protection Cluster should not plan to undertake an IDP profiling survey at this time, but this decision should be revisited if other IDP population systems cannot produce required population figures or if the situation in South Sudan changes drastically.**

## **IDP Registration**

---

**Recommendation: The mission does not advise the Protection Cluster to register IDPs in the current South Sudan context.**

Given how interspersed IDPs are in host populations, the movement of the population, the high volume of the IDPs and the difficulty in deregistering populations, registration does not appear to be an appropriate solution. Registration is a heavy undertaking in terms of time, human and financial resources. If the Protection Cluster were to undertake registration, it would risk using Protection Cluster resources in a massive registration effort to the detriment of other core protection activities and interventions.

If non-food items are distributed to IDPs, coordination of these distributions with WFP could be an alternative to creating new distribution lists through an IDP registration system.

*Note: The recommendation against registration does not preclude identifying and registering extremely vulnerable individuals for case management purposes, if the Protection Cluster has the capacity for that type of individual level case management. Also, if the situation in South Sudan changes to one of protracted displacement with little secondary movement, then the decision to register the displaced populations or not may need to be revisited.*

## **IDP Population Statistics Working Group**

---

Currently, agencies and clusters are at risk of having differing IDP population estimations for South Sudan, which can be confusing for the humanitarian community, the media and donors.

**Recommendation: In order to coordinate IDP population statistics and estimates within the interagency community, IOM, WFP, UNHCR and OCHA should form a Population Statistics Working Group.**

In terms of how the IDP Population Statistics Working Group would function, each participating agency would send a technical representative with the agency's IDP population statistics and accompanying metadata to the meeting. The group would go through district by district, deciding which agency's population statistic to use for a particular geographic area (depending on reliability, how current the figure is, etc.) and record the accompanying metadata (data source, date, method, etc.). Adding all the selected figures together would then produce an official IDP population estimation that could be used by the interagency community for all of South Sudan. While the first meeting of the group might be long, subsequent meetings where the established population statistics are revised would go much quicker (the mission says this based on her own experience doing this in another country operation).

This method of collaboration and triangulation to produce population estimations will increase the accuracy of IDP population figures and also make estimation processes more transparent. It will also ensure that all agencies are "singing from the same song sheet" to the donors and media about the total number of IDPs in South Sudan.

Ideally, OCHA would chair this working group, according to its responsibilities as stipulated in the *IASC Operational Guidance on the Responsibilities of Sector / Cluster Leads & OCHA in Information Management*. However, if OCHA is unable to do this, the Protection Cluster's Data Manager or IOM's Statistician might be able to fulfill this role.

## **ANNEX 1: SUMMARY OF MISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

### **Protection Cluster Rapid Needs Assessment Recommendations:**

1. Develop a key informant interview training guide and a more elaborate discussion group facilitation team training guide.
2. Form an interagency qualitative data analysis group.
3. Develop an Observation Questionnaire.
4. Review the structure of the discussion group Prioritization and Systematization Forms.
5. Over time, make the assessment site selection less resource driven and more representative.
6. Create a roster of trained needs assessment facilitators and re-use them.
7. Develop a database in which to store and analyze the needs assessment data.
8. Develop 5 types of analytical reports from the needs assessment data:
  - a. Community Profile Report
  - b. Community Comparative Report
  - c. Population Statistical Report
  - d. Protection Thematic Report
  - e. Protection Maps
9. Do not introduce an IDP protection incident monitoring system yet, but possibly use the needs assessment results as a trigger for introducing protection incident monitoring systems in particular communities when the Cluster has a capacity for individual-level interventions.

### **IDP Population Statistics Recommendations:**

1. WFP should ideally adjust the current food distribution reporting format to differentiate between “New” and “Old (Carry Forward)” caseloads in order to obtain a figure for the unique number of IDP food beneficiaries.
2. The Protection Cluster should not undertake IDP profiling at this time, but this decision might be revisited if circumstances significantly change in South Sudan.
3. The Protection Cluster should not attempt registration of IDPs (except for extremely vulnerable individuals if individual case management is planned).
4. An interagency IDP Population Statistics Working Group should be formed by OCHA, IOM, WFP and UNHCR in order to triangulate and coordinate IDP population figures within the South Sudan humanitarian community.

## ANNEX 2: LIST OF INDICATORS POSSIBLE TO OBTAIN FROM THE PCRNA

---

1. % of assessed payams with a structure to handle disputes (disaggregated by type of structure)
2. % of assessed payams reporting disputes in the payam over returnees claiming their land
3. % of assessed payams where a dispute resolution mechanism is available to handle returnee land disputes (disaggregated by type of dispute resolution mechanism)
4. % of assessed payams having no dispute resolution mechanism handling land disputes
5. % of assessed payams with law and order enforcement mechanisms (disaggregated by type)
6. % of assessed payams without a law and order enforcement mechanism
7. % of assessed payams with services for UACs / SCs
8. % of assessed payams with services for persons with disabilities
9. % of assessed payams with services for persons with HIV / AIDS
10. % of assessed payams with services for persons with severe medical conditions other than HIV / AIDS
11. % of assessed payams with services for older persons (without their family)
12. % of assessed payams with services for single heads of household
13. % of assessed payams with services for sexually abused women or children
14. % of assessed payams with reports of unaccompanied minors or separated children
15. Average number of unaccompanied minors or separated children per assessed payam
16. Payams with the highest number of unaccompanied minors or separated children
17. % of assessed payams where residents are unable to obtain or replace identity documents (disaggregated by reason for inability to obtain documents)
18. % of payams by document residents are able to obtain or replace identity documents
19. % of assessed payams reporting that a school has been occupied by armed groups in the last 6 months
20. Number of occupations of schools reported in assessed payams
21. Average period of occupation of a school by armed groups
22. Longest period of occupation of a school by armed groups
23. % of schools occupied by armed groups
24. % of assessed payams reporting that a health clinic has been occupied by armed groups in the last 6 months
25. Number of occupations of health facility reported in assessed payams
26. Average period of occupation of a health facility by armed forces
27. Longest period of occupation of a health facility by armed forces
28. % of health facilities occupied by a particular armed group
29. % of assessed payams reporting that other community facilities have been occupied by armed groups in the last 6 months
30. Number of occupations of other community facilities reported in assessed payams
31. Average period of occupation of an other community facilities by armed forces
32. Longest period of occupation of an other community facilitiesfacility by armed forces
33. % of other community facilities occupied by a particular armed group
34. Estimated number of persons in payam non-displaced
35. Estimated number of households in payam non-displaced
36. Estimated number of persons in payam non-displaced
37. Estimated number of displaced persons in payam
38. Estimated number of displaced households in payam
39. Estimated number of displaced persons in payam
40. % of assessed payams by movement patterns
41. % of assessed payams by situation

42. % of assessed payams reporting death in the last month
43. number of persons who died
44. % of assessed payams where a main cause of death is illness
45. % of assessed payams where a main cause of death is violence
46. % of assessed payams where a main cause of death is accident
47. List of payams where a main cause of death is violence
48. % of assessed payams with a male leader by population group
49. % of assessed payams with a female leader by population group
50. % of assessed payams reporting an armed presence in the payam (disaggregated by type of armed presence, if possible)
51. % of assessed payams reporting a threatening armed presence in the payam (disaggregated by type of armed presence, if possible)
52. % of assessed payams reporting discrimination in assistance
53. % of assessed payams reporting discrimination in assistance disaggregated by grounds for discrimination
54. % of assessed payams reporting limitations on movement
55. % of assessed payams by type of restrictions to free movement
56. % of assessed payams by type of restrictions to safe movement
57. % of assessed payams by type of threat to life and safety
58. % of assessed payams reporting a particular perpetrator for abductions (disaggregated by type of perpetrator, if possible)
59. % of assessed payams reporting secondary displacement
60. % of assessed payams reporting secondary displacement by reason for displacement
61. % of payams reporting problems for children (disaggregated by type of problem)
62. % of assessed payams where population groups report having difficulty in accessing water (disaggregated by reasons why population groups report having difficulty in accessing water)
63. % of assessed payams by number of reasons why displaced persons report having difficulty in accessing water
64. Origin of displaced persons in payam
65. % of assessed payams with boundary disputes with another community
66. % of assessed payams reporting use of land of another community
67. % of assessed payams reporting problems caused by the arrival of IDPs or IDP returnees (disaggregated by type of problem)
68. % of assessed payams with reports of boys/girls associated with armed groups
69. % of assessed payams reporting boys/girls associated with armed groups disaggregated by type of activities they carry out
70. % of assessed payams reporting access restrictions on humanitarian personnel disaggregated by type of restriction

*Note that this list is not exhaustive. The mission would like to thank Daniel Kamphuis for his assistance in compiling indicators.*



### **ANNEX 3: MAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE MISSION**

---

1. Introduced concepts of the Needs Assessment to the Juba-level Protection Cluster Working Group
2. Solicited feedback and researched the information requirements for the assessment
3. Conducted a Design Workshop with Protection Cluster stakeholders
4. Trained pilot assessment teams in Magwi Town
5. Organized and (for Nimule) conducted pilot needs assessments in Nimule and Palotaka
6. Reviewed and documented the results of the pilot with the Protection Cluster Working Group in Juba
7. Revised the assessment data collection forms based on the lessons learned from the pilot
8. Performed transition and handover data management activities with newly arrived Protection Cluster Data Manager
9. Throughout the mission, analyzed existing and planned IDP population data management systems

*The mission would like to thank Protection Cluster colleagues for their support and enthusiasm during the mission. The mission would also like to thank WFP, IOM and OCHA for their openness and cooperative spirit in examining issues pertaining to IDP population statistics.*

## **Terms of Reference**

### **OPERATIONAL DATA MANAGEMENT SUPPORT MISSION**

**Managed by:** FICSS, DPSM and  
PCS, DIP (on behalf of the Global Protection Cluster)

**Destination:** Juba, Sudan

**Personnel:** Shelley Gornall

**Time Frame:** 27 August 2010 – 16 September 2010

---

#### **Overall Objectives / Goals**

- To provide operational data management support for the newly established Protection Cluster in South Sudan.
- To develop a protection needs assessment strategy for South Sudan.

#### **Specific Objectives**

1. To assess Protection Cluster information needs and requirements.
2. To work collaboratively with other agencies, actors and cluster members on information management activities.
3. To analyze existing data systems and data sources in order to generate baseline information and to satisfy information requirements with existing information where possible and appropriate.
4. To design a protection needs assessment to be piloted in 6 locations. Note that given the short duration of the mission, executing the needs assessment is not within the mission's scope.
5. To look at the complementarity of introducing other data systems, such as IDP profiling and protection incident monitoring systems.

#### **Working Arrangements**

The Mission will work under the overall responsibility of the Head of Office, UNHCR Sub-Office Juba. Functional guidance and support will be provided by the Global Protection Cluster via the Protection Capacity Section (PCS) and by the Field Information & Coordination Support Section (FICSS), Geneva.

---

### **Key activities**

In consultation with all stakeholders, the mission will:

- a) Facilitate a discussion among Protection Cluster stakeholders to determine what high priority information needs exist;
- b) In collaboration with protection leads, generate a list of protection indicators that will be used for needs assessment purposes;
- c) Assess the data management capacity of local implementing partners;
- d) Design a protection needs assessment based on the feedback of protection colleagues;
- e) Advise the protection cluster on the formulation of protection questions to be included in the inter-sector rapid assessment form;
- f) Aid in the establishment of formal information sharing networks;
- g) Provide advice on the establishment of a Protection Analysis Unit;
- h) Spend one day analyzing general indicators, baselines and targets for Sub-Office Juba and provide recommendations;
- i) Carry out other related activities, as appropriate.

### **Expected Deliverables**

1. A documented protection needs assessment strategy
2. Data collection forms and analysis tools
3. A mission report

### **Further Information**

For further information, please contact:

Shelley Gornall, Operational Data Management Specialist, FICSS  
UNHCR Geneva  
[gornall@unhcr.org](mailto:gornall@unhcr.org)