

Vulnerability Verification and Return Intentions Don Bosco IDP Collective Site Juba | January 2020



#### **OVERVIEW**

Vulnerability verification exercise was conducted to verify and update the status of the existing most vulnerable case load in Don Bosco and to identify new vulnerable cases at household level. This report compiles and analyses data from 139 vulnerable IDPs households comprised of 202 individuals with specific needs. It builds on the protection profiling exercise routinely conducted by Humanitarian Development Consortium (HDC). The 139 vulnerable households identified is equivalent to 25% of the total households in Don Bosco collective site

#### **METHODOLOGY**

The verification exercise was conducted by UNHCR in partnership with Humanitarian Development Consortium (HDC), IsraAid in close collaboration with Don Bosco IDP collective site management. The leaders participated actively in mobilizing and sensitizing the households. Due to the sensitive nature of the information collected at household/individual levels, all interviewers were trained on data collection and protection of sensitive information. Data was collected using mobile devices. The interviews were conducted by community workers from protection partners under the supervision of UNHCR

#### Geographic scope:

protection staff.

The verification exercise was conducted exclusively in Don Bosco IDP collective site.

#### Verification/Screening methodology:

Mobilization and sensitization was initially conducted by Don Bosco IDP collective site leaders to describe the purpose of the exercise. Interviewers collected information at household level as follows:

- Each household was visited. Interviewers pre-screened the households according to the established checklist to determine whether the households meet UNHCR heightened protection risks criteria. If this was the case, the household was interviewed, if not, interviewers would stop and proceed to the next household.
- Detailed interviews were conducted with the head of households/vulnerable persons meeting the criteria. Interviewers used a vulnerability assessment tool loaded onto mobile tablets to capture extensive information including details on categories of core vulnerabilities, additional protection risks, needs, household composition and intentions to return/relocate.

 Don Bosco and Word Food Programme registration card was captured. The information was also checked against the existing UNHCR PSN database.

#### Vulnerability database:

Verification exercise provided updated information on the most vulnerable individuals, forming targeting basis for UNHCR and partners' operational response, including psychosocial support, SGBV intervention and protection-based material assistance. Humanitarian agencies can use the vulnerability data to provide interventions responding to pressing protection risks/needs of the most vulnerable households as well as tracking interventions to such households to minimize gaps and overlap, based on Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) and protocols on confidentiality and data protection.



## DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE PSNs HOUSEHOLDS VERIFIED

State of Origin (HHs)			Age and Gender Breakdown of Vulnerable Individuals Identified		
Eastern Equatoria	109	78.4%	60+	17% 3%	
Central Equatoria	25	18.0%	18-59	47% 10%	
Western Equatoria	2	1.4%	92-12-17 ≻	3% 2%	
Upper Nile	2	1.4%	5-11	6%	
			0-4	1% 5%	
Jonglei	1	0.8%			

78.4% of vulnerable households verified originate from Eastern Equatoria state, 18.0% Central Equatoria, 1.4% Western Equatoria, 1.4% from Upper Nile, 0.8% originate from Jonglei state. Refer to figure above.

# Priority Needs at Don Bosco IDP collective site.



The vast majority of vulnerable displaced households prioritized basic domestic/household items, adequate food, shelter, medical care and livelihood.



**139** vulnerable households in Don Bosco comprised of **202** individuals verified. Of the vulnerable individuals, **57% are** adults ages 18-59 years (115individuals), **23%** are children under 18 years(47individuals), **20%** adults ages 60 years and above(40 individuals). In terms of gender **74%** of the vulnerable individuals are females (**150 individuals** ) and **26%** are males (**52 individuals**).

#### Priority Needs at Place of Return/Relocation for those vulnerable HHs who expressed intentions to leave Don Bosco.



The vulnerable displaced households prioritized shelter, livelihood ,food, basic domestic/household items and medical care as top five priority needs in the areas of return/relocation.





### **VERIFIED VULNERABILITY IN DON BOSCO IDP COLLECTIVE SITE**





BOSCO

23

9

## South Sudan

delitional Destantion Dislos O No.

Key Vulnerabilities		Additional Protection Risks & Needs of Vulnerable Households	
36%	of the PSN verified at household level in Don Bosco have Serious Medical Conditions (SMC)	81%	of the vulnerable HHs cannot produce income for their households
26%	of the PSN verified at household level in Don Bosco are Persons with Disability (DS) $% \left( \left( DS\right) \right) =0$	61%	of the vulnerable HHs lack legal documentation (National ID Card, Birth Certificate)
23%	of the PSN verified at household level in Don Bosco are Women at Risk (WR)	37%	of the vulnerable HHs are in need of psychosocial support or counselling services
17%	of the PSN verified at household level in Don Bosco are Elderly at Risk (ER)	17%	of the vulnerable HHs reported property destruction
14% 7%	of the Persons with Specific Needs (PSN) verified at household level in Don Bosco are Single Parent (SP) without support	11%	of the vulnerable HHs reported to have experienced multiple displacement
1%	of the verified PSN at household level are Children at Risk (CR) of the verified PSN are Unaccompanied or Separated Children (SC)	9%	of the vulnerable HHs have experienced discrimination in access to basic services
1%	of the PSN verified at household have Family Unity (FU) needs	4%	of the vulnerable HHs reported tensions/hostilities between IDP groups

## INTENTIONS OF VULNERABLE HOUSHOLDS TO RETURN/RELOCATE.



The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this m Republic of South Sudan. Final status of the Abyei area is not yet deter

#### **IDP Households Preconditions for Return/Relocation**

South Sudan



Of the 46% of the IDP households who expressed intentions to return/relocate, 53% households reported that they are able to return on conditions that the area of returns are safe, 14% are able to return within the next 3 months, 13% are able to return when they are able to have money to go, 9% Don't know, 5% of the households are yet to get the information from the family members in the areas of returns, 5% of the households would wish to return upon the next dry season, 2% of the households intend to return when they are told to leave Don Bosco collective site.

#### **IDP Households Reasons for Return/Relocation**

Reunite with family in area of intended return/relocation	
Livelihoods are better in intended area of return/relocation	39%
Reunite with community / Community support in the area of intended return/relocation	20%
Check on my house/land /property in the area of intended return	17%
Shelter is better in intended area of return/relocation	16%
Insecurity in Don Bosco	16%
Security in intended area of return/relocation is good /has improved	14%
Health services are better in intended area of return/relocation	13%
Education is better in intended area of return/relocation	9%
Road access to intended area of return/relocation has improved	6%
Infrastructure is better in intended area of return/relocation	3%

Of the **46%** of the IDP households who expressed intentions to return/relocate, **53%** of the households reported reasons as being family unity, **39%** cited that livelihoods are better where they would wish to return, **20%** to reunite with community and receive community support, **17%** cited to check on property, **16%** cited better shelter in the intended area of return /relocation, **16%** cited insecurity in Don Bosco collective site, **14%** cited improvement of security in the intended area of return, **13%** cited better health services in the area of return, **9%** cited better education services, **6%** cited improvement in road access, **3%** cited better infrastructure in the intended areas of return/relocation.

5

53%